From: Claire Gill <[redacted]@carter-ruck.com>
Sent: 12 April 2017 17:54
To: 'Terence Fane-Saunders'; 'irina@onelife.eu'
Cc: 'Frank Schneider'; [redacted]; Pierre Arens
Subject: RE: Ыфгп Ыегске. [CR-PCR1.FID113720]
Attachments: ONECOIN_ Letter to Crytocoinnews.com 7.3.17.DOCX; v.2 ONE LIFE L to COLP DRAFT 6.1.17.DOCX

Dear Terence

Further to our call a moment ago, and further to my call with Frank, I agree it seems we need to take action against Mr Bjerke, or another suitable target to send a clear message which can be used for PR purposes.

We did start to prepare a complaint to the site publishing his original claims (see working draft letter that was circulated internally but not sent). The focus at that time was on his claims attacking the blockchain, which he repeats in his YouTube video apparently uploaded on 7 April. The complaint stalled as we did not have information from the IT team about the blockchain and I gather we cannot expect to get more information at this point, pending the report that I understand Pitt has commissioned. I agree with you that we should therefore now focus on his claims about suspected criminal operations. However, the underlying allegation is that OneCoin is suspected to be a criminal fraud; it may be impossible therefore to avoid getting into technical areas about the blockchain if we issue and pursue proceedings.

If you all agree, I will instruct Counsel here to advise on merits and also liaise with the Norwegian lawyer to see if it may be more straightforward to bring a claim in Norway. We will also see if we can get the video taken down via YouTube's take down procedures.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6DZsxavDpks

In general, as you know, I am loathe to recommend legal action unless we have a decent prospect of success, particularly whilst the police investigation is ongoing and we would not want to put into the public domain through court proceedings any information that the police may try and use against the company or Ruja. However, I do see the force in the argument that the company has to take a stand, and show itself ready to fight. This consideration has to be weighed against the risks.

As to the police, the attached draft letter was set up just after Christmas, before we found out that the letter to the Dutch website may be a fake. Provided Colin Nott confirms that there is no downside, I would recommend we either send this or something along these lines (as adapted to reflect developments since then) to the police, alternatively to the Professional Standards Directorate. Please note that I did not finish revising this version at the time and have not gone back to this draft so it needs work.

I suggest we speak again after your meeting in Luxembourg tomorrow.

Kind regards

Claire Gill
Partner, Carter-Ruck
[redacted]

Carter-Ruck Solicitors
6 St Andrew Street
London EC4A 3AE
T 020 7353 5005
F 020 7353 5553
DX 333 Chancery Lane
www.carter-ruck.com