



THE UNANSWERED RECORD

MONTHLY EDITION / ISSUE 001 / SEPTEMBER 2026

The agreement. The emails. The answers still sought.

THE CASE SO FAR

A disputed email. A competing claim to BH68. A costs order made at the same hearing, according to Mr J. Miss E and Mr J allege that the underlying costs records remain missing from disclosure and are being deliberately withheld. Identify the agreement. Authenticate the email. Explain the costs. This is the case so far, not the end of the story.

Mark John Mayo v Miss E / L00BP152

BH68 rights and plans / Disputed correspondence / Court costs

Questions of public importance deserve answers.

Evidence. Enquiry. Accountability.

Publication date: 15 September 2026 | Revision 1.1

IN THIS EDITION

A record you can follow.

Read the narrative first, then use the question register and source index to examine a particular point. The contents and references are clickable. The website may contain later developments than this fixed edition.

Reporting through 13 September 2026, with the hearing connection and withholding allegation supplied on 15 September 2026. Revised 15 September 2026. Historical correspondence and earlier response-status updates retain their own dates.

A record you can follow.	2
One hearing. Two demands for the record.	3
The sequence behind the questions.	4
Which instrument supports the claim?	5
Which words were actually sent?	6
Where is the substantive answer?	7
Show the calculation. Show the reasons.	8
What happened after the concerns were raised?	10
The next test is the record.	11
The questions, by party.	12
Follow the supporting record.	24
Dates. Revisions. Responsibility.	27

The source record, in reach

This is a consolidated publication, not a bundle of original court documents. Its source references link to substantive notes explaining the material examined. Original case PDFs have not been included for download.

01 / The case in five minutes

One hearing. Two demands for the record.

Mr J reports that at the hearing on 10 March 2025, Mr Mayo relied on the email attributed to Amelia Skea to support his claimed BH68 wayleave, and a costs order was made against Miss E at that same hearing.

Miss E and Mr J say the underlying costs statement and calculation remain missing from the material disclosed to her despite repeated requests. They allege deliberate withholding because, in their view, no supporting record can justify the amount imposed.

That is why the missing record matters: without the calculation and reasons, Miss E cannot properly examine or challenge how the amount imposed on her was reached.

What did the email establish? What documents and reasons supported the costs? This investigation follows both questions.

What the family alleges

Miss E and Mr J allege that material connected with Mr Mayo's claimed BH68 rights created an impression the underlying records do not justify. Their allegations include deliberate evidential manipulation, disputed wording in an email exchange and a plan said to have been relied upon beyond what it could establish. The publication's October-notice source notes record the formal allegations and the documents sought to test them.

The immediate task is specific: put the executed agreement, the later plan, the retained emails and the court-filed versions alongside one another. The costs strand poses a different test: identify the itemised statement, evidence of service and reasons supporting the assessment.

Who is involved

Miss E and Mr J are the protected contributor names used here. Mark John Mayo is the claimant named in claim L00BP152. National Grid Electricity Distribution (South West) plc is the company named in Miss E's agreement; National Grid is used as a shorter brand reference where appropriate. Nick Shackson and Amelia Skea feature in the operator correspondence. Luke Cornwell and Seldons LLP feature in the disputed-copy and representation questions. Mark Hacking and Geldards LLP feature in the subsequent response trail.

The connected costs questions concern Judge Paul Mitchell and Barnstaple County Court. The publication's proposed SRA questions concern whether the material warrants regulatory examination. A published question is not, by itself, evidence that a new enquiry has been delivered to its recipient.

Three things to keep distinct

The agreement describes rights concerning apparatus. The plan depicts apparatus and location. The email exchange describes a requested records update. Their dates, parties, purposes and underlying records must be compared; one cannot simply be treated as a substitute for another.

The greater the trust, the greater the duty to answer.

[The case overview and connected reporting >](#)

[The hearing connection and costs questions >](#)

02 / A reading timeline

The sequence behind the questions.

9 and 15 April 2024

The attributed request names BH67 and BH68; the attributed reply refers to “your wayleave” and an annual £25 payment. The supplied copy is an annotated printout, not the native exchange. [F]

4 June 2024

Miss E’s executed agreement identifies BH68, a 14-year term and a one-off £2,000 payment provision. It includes a signed apparatus plan. [A]

31 January 2025

The outer forwarding header names Luke Cornwell as both sender and recipient. The family later challenges the copy’s provenance and editing. [F, K, L]

February and March 2025

The correspondence records authentication requests and an internal referral. The costs hearing took place on 10 March; the later request refers to an order dated 21 March. Mr J reports that the attributed BH68 email was relied on at the same hearing. [G; costs feature; contributor account added 15 September 2026]

28 April 2025

The plan correspondence uses the description “showing the apparatus on your title”. The relationship between that wording and later explanations becomes a focus of the investigation. [C]

October 2025

Court submissions and formal notices record the family’s allegations and preservation requests. The expanded Annex E also bears an update date of 6 February 2026; not every passage can be treated as October wording. [K-Q]

February 2026

Shackson asserts transfer of existing wayleaves, then describes a general-area map, “not any particular title”. Miss E asks who drew it and which apparatus the earlier phrase meant. [B]

April and May 2026

The family reports office visits. A signed costs final notice is dated 29 April. Geldards’ replies address the requests and promise a substantive response to recent Shackson correspondence. [D, H, J; costs feature]

12 and 13 September 2026

Mr J reports that substantive verification answers remain outstanding; the published costs reporting records the family’s continuing requests. These are the contributor-update dates retained in this edition.

15 September 2026

Mr J describes the connection between reliance on the attributed email and the costs hearing. Miss E and Mr J allege deliberate withholding of the underlying costs records despite repeated requests. This revision adds that account; it does not re-date earlier replies.

[Dated developments in the publication >](#)

03 / The BH68 agreement and plan

Which instrument supports the claim?

The strongest starting point is the agreement that can be inspected. The reviewed six-page bundle includes an executed agreement dated 4 June 2024 naming National Grid Electricity Distribution (South West) plc and identifying BH68. Its terms include a 14-year period and a one-off £2,000 payment provision. A signed apparatus plan accompanies it. [A, pp. 4-6]

That record gives the investigation a concrete point of comparison. Which agreement or other instrument supports the competing BH68 position attributed to Mr Mayo? What land, apparatus and parties does it cover? If it is an older instrument, what establishes its continued application after changes in ownership or subdivision?

The wording that needs explaining

The plan sent on 28 April 2025 was accompanied by the description “showing the apparatus on your title”. On 10 February 2026, Shackson described a general-area map, “not any particular title”. Miss E’s subsequent questions ask who drew the plan and which apparatus the earlier phrase referred to. [B, pp. 2-5; C, p. 2]

Those descriptions are not interchangeable. An explanation identifying the source, purpose and limits of the map would allow the earlier wording to be tested. Shackson’s confirmation that he sent a plan answers the sending question; it does not identify its author.

The reported use in court

Mr J says the plan was introduced late in the proceedings and relied upon in court to support Mr Mayo’s claimed rights, despite not being suitable as the plan for a wayleave agreement. The direct question to Luke Cornwell and Seldons is what precise assertion it supported, which filing contained it and what justified that use. The published question also seeks the associated statement of truth, its signatory and the version exhibited.

The family’s concern is not merely that two plans look different. It is that the evidential purpose assigned to a document may have exceeded its actual scope. The filing and the underlying agreement are the records needed to examine that allegation.

What the replies say

Shackson’s 2 February 2026 reply states that existing wayleaves transferred to Mr Mayo. The supplied replies do not identify each agreement or establish the particular BH68 coverage asserted. Historic agreement copies have also been supplied; the question is their application to the relevant apparatus and land, not whether any historic documents exist. [B, pp. 5-7]

The edition does not convert the agreement’s £2,000 provision into proof of payment, or treat an apparatus plan as a determination of the disputed boundary. The force of the enquiry lies in asking the records to establish exactly what is claimed for them.

Produce the instrument. Identify the land. Explain the connection.

[Read the complete plan-and-wayleave investigation >](#)

[Agreement source note \[A\] >](#)

[April plan source note \[C\] >](#)

04 / The disputed exchange

Which words were actually sent?

The family alleges that wording in the exchange attributed to Mr Mayo and Amelia Skea was manipulated to support a BH68 position for which the requested agreement has not been produced to them. The expanded Annex E specifically alleges insertion of BH68 into correspondence originally concerning BH67. The question therefore concerns both the incoming message and the reply, not just the appearance of one sentence. [M, pp. 12-13, 19-20]

What the displayed copy contains

The two-page printout shows a request attributed to Mr Mayo dated 9 April 2024 naming BH67 and BH68. The reply attributed to Skea, dated 15 April, refers to “your wayleave”, an annual £25 payment, arrears and reference 2624773. The pole numbers appear in the incoming message; they are not separately repeated in the reply. [F, pp. 1-2]

The connection matters because a reply can appear to confirm the request above it. If the request differs from the retained incoming email, the apparent meaning of the exchange could change. The plan and completion letter said to be attached to the request are absent from this supplied printout. A certified transfer was offered if required, rather than described as attached.

The self-forwarded copy

The outer 31 January 2025 header identifies Luke Cornwell as both sender and recipient. The October 2025 rebuttal and oral summary allege editing and challenge a redaction explanation. Mr J says that the explanation concerned private client information and was supplied only after the family questioned the self-forwarding. [F, K, L]

That is a specific account to test against specific versions: the message received by the solicitor, the retained native exchange, the self-forwarded version, the court-filed exhibit and the dated redaction explanation. The supplied submissions describe the alleged admission; Cornwell’s original explanatory reply is not reproduced in them.

The comparison requested

Amelia Skea is asked whether she received the displayed request and sent the displayed reply, and whether BH68 was in the message National Grid actually received. Luke Cornwell is asked to identify each addition, removal or change, who made it, when it occurred and where it was disclosed. Mr Mayo is asked for his sent message, attachments and the reply received.

The payment comparison is another route to the underlying records. The annual £25 wording and Miss E’s later one-off £2,000 provision concern different stated periods and arrangements. A numerical difference alone does not identify the apparatus. The question is which instrument, pole and recipient reference 2624773 actually concerned, and how that relates to Miss E’s agreement.

Authenticate the request. Authenticate the reply. Account for every change.

The displayed exchange: source note [F] >

The family’s expanded formal allegation: source note [M] >

05 / Requests and recorded replies

Where is the substantive answer?

The record contains replies. The unresolved issue is whether those replies supply the authentication finding and supporting agreements the family requested. A referral, an acknowledgement and a substantive verification answer perform different jobs.

26 February and 7 March 2025

The material records an authentication request followed by a message explicitly copying Skea. The embedded recipient header for the earlier request is absent from the export. [G]

10 March 2025

Angela Caddy records a referral to Nigel Merrifield. The message does not record an authentication finding. [G]

24 April 2026

Mark Hacking of Geldards says he is instructed that earlier requests “were dealt with” and asks what further material is sought. Mr J disputes substantive resolution. [J]

7 May 2026

Hacking acknowledges the forwarded Skea letter and promises a substantive response to recent Shackson correspondence. That promise concerns the Shackson material specifically; it should not be rewritten as a promise to authenticate Skea’s emails. [J]

Mr J reported on 12 September 2026 that no later substantive authentication or agreement answer had been received. The edition retains that date rather than silently turning it into a fresh confirmation on publication day.

The corporate question

The proposed executive question asks National Grid Electricity Distribution (South West) plc to identify who took responsibility, which records were checked, what the review concluded and where the written outcome is. The proposed Geldards follow-up asks for the promised response and, separately, the dated answer resolving the authentication and agreement questions. Neither new publication question is labelled as already sent or overdue.

An answer should identify the record it stands behind.

Verification requests: [source note \[G\] >](#)

Geldards correspondence: [source note \[J\] >](#)

06 / The court costs strand

Show the calculation. Show the reasons.

Miss E's public review raised questions about the costs record at Barnstaple County Court. The developing feature identifies requests concerning the hearing on 10 March 2025, an order dated 21 March, the itemised calculation, service and the reasons for the assessment.

The link to the BH68 email

Mr J reports that at the hearing on 10 March 2025, Mr Mayo relied on the email attributed to Amelia Skea to support his claimed BH68 wayleave, and a costs order was made against Miss E at that same hearing.

Miss E and Mr J say the underlying costs statement and calculation remain missing from the material disclosed to her despite repeated requests. They allege deliberate withholding because, in their view, no supporting record can justify the amount imposed.

That is why the missing record matters: without the calculation and reasons, Miss E cannot properly examine or challenge how the amount imposed on her was reached.

The December request describes £3,500 assessed, of which £1,750 was imposed. These figures are related, not two demands to add together. The family questions the basis of the assessment and the immediate-payment requirement.

The family's allegation: an unjustified order used as pressure.

Miss E and Mr J allege that the costs order was fictitious and illegitimate, intended to exert coercive pressure rather than reflect a justified assessment. They point to the continued non-production of the underlying costs statement, calculation and adequate reasons as the basis for that allegation.

Mr J says Miss E presented her signed BH68 wayleave agreement at the hearing, while Mr Mayo relied on the disputed email attributed to Amelia Skea. He questions why costs were imposed against Miss E in those circumstances and what the court recorded about the competing material.

Mr J says requests for the basis of the amount have been put to Judge Paul Mitchell, Jack Webb, Luke Cornwell and Mark John Mayo. The question is specific: identify the costs statement, the work and figures claimed, the filing and service record, and the reasons for the amount ordered. If those records cannot be produced, explain why.

10 March hearing. 17 March claimed service.

Mr J also reports that Mr Mayo stated under oath that the N260 was sent to all parties on 17 March 2025. Miss E and Mr J dispute that account, say no statement or proof of that service has been produced to them, and allege a deliberate false statement. They seek investigation of that allegation as possible contempt of court.

The reported service date is seven days after the 10 March hearing. What costs statement was before the judge on 10 March? What was allegedly sent on 17 March, to whom and by what method? Produce that document and the dispatch and service evidence, and explain how the dates relate to the assessment and the order dated 21 March.

For summary assessment of costs, Practice Direction 44, paragraph 9.5, requires an itemised, signed statement broadly following N260; for hearings other than fast-track trials, filing and service are required at least 24 hours before the hearing. Paragraph 9.6 addresses non-compliance in the court's costs decision. The question is what was supplied, when, and how any failure was addressed.

What justified the amount, and what consideration was given to Miss E's evidence and objections? The hearing record and the costs record are both needed to examine the family's challenge.

Miss E and Mr J's allegation and Mr J's hearing account, supplied 15 September 2026.

[Practice Direction 44, paragraphs 9.5-9.6 >](#)

The signed final notice

The publication has examined the signed two-page final notice dated 29 April 2026 addressed to Judge Paul Mitchell. It asks for the N260 or equivalent itemised statement, evidence of filing and service, and the reasons for the order. Its assertion that no N260 appears on the court file is the author's statement. Its seven-day response period was requested by the author.

Miss E and Mr J say the underlying requests remain unanswered; Mr J reaffirmed that position on 13 September 2026. The reporting will expand as additional material is examined. The questions concern the actual work and calculation, not an assumption that every recoverable cost must have been incurred during the hearing itself.

Five questions at the centre of this strand

1. What statement supported the assessment?

Identify the N260 or equivalent itemised costs statement used for the 10 March 2025 hearing, including its author, date and total.

2. When was it filed and served?

Identify the filing record, the version relied upon, evidence of service on Miss E and the opportunity she had to challenge it.

3. What work and figures explain the total?

Identify the work, hours, rates, fees, deductions and other items underlying the assessed amount.

4. What reasons explain the order?

Identify the reasons for the costs assessment and immediate-payment requirement, and any transcript or other record containing them.

5. Which reply supplies these records?

Identify the dated response and documents that answer the family's requests. If the records cannot be supplied, explain the reason and what steps are being taken.

These are an editorial summary of the historical requests and published questions, not newly served enquiries or a finding about the judge's conduct. Their integrity purpose is straightforward: make the basis of a decision affecting a litigant open to examination.

[The public review and signed final notice >](#)

[Read the original public-review feature >](#)

[Judge Paul Mitchell: the named costs question pack >](#)

07 / Formal notices and regulatory questions

What happened after the concerns were raised?

The source record includes the family's formal allegations and preservation requests, not merely later recollections of a complaint. Annex E, Annex J-1, Annex J-2 and the October emails connect the alleged manipulation to requests for original messages, metadata and a checkable account of how the material was handled. [M-Q]

The 27 October 2025 notice addresses Luke Cornwell and Seldons and asks for firm-wide preservation. The proposed firm-level question asks who took responsibility for that notice, what was preserved, whether the disputed copy was compared with the original, whether verification was sought from National Grid and what correction any review required.

The SRA questions

The regulatory page asks whether the alleged conduct warrants examination, what evidence would permit the competing accounts to be tested, what responsibilities arise for an individual solicitor and firm, and what outcome or next step should be communicated. These publication questions are proposed and have not been sent.

The 29 October 2025 CPS referral request establishes an outgoing request. It does not establish an investigation, prosecution decision or finding. Similarly, the publication's SRA page is a route for precise regulatory questions, not an announcement of regulatory action.

[Regulatory questions and cited SRA provisions >](#)

[Formal notices within the investigation >](#)

08 / The next stage

The next test is the record.

Authenticate the email. Identify the agreement. Explain the costs.

The next question is how the disputed material travelled through this case: who relied on which version, for what purpose, and what happened when it was challenged.

This is one part of a case extending over more than two years. Further reporting will trace the connections as additional documents, accounts and responses are received and examined. Each chapter will show what changes the account, what answers a question, and what remains unresolved.

Future editions will identify what changed since the previous issue. New evidence and material replies will be linked to the questions they address. The dated edition preserves the record at a point in time; the website carries the continuing story.

[Follow the developing record >](#)

[Receive future editions by email >](#)

Responses and corrections

National Grid, Seldons, Geldards, the court and the individuals named are invited to provide a response through the appropriate official channel or contact theunansweredrecord@gmail.com. Identify the question, state the response and provide the supporting record. Material answers belong beside the questions they resolve.

The questions remain open. So does the opportunity to answer them.

[Editorial standards and disclosure >](#)

09 / QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

The questions, by party.

Each question has a stable reference. Historical requests and newly proposed publication questions are distinguished below. Dates describe the existing record; publication does not establish service of an enquiry.

Nick Shackson

Questions: BH68-01, BH68-02, BH68-03

[Open this party's response pack >](#)

National Grid Electricity Distribution (South West) plc

Questions: BH68-03, BH68-05, BH68-06, BH68-09

[Open this party's response pack >](#)

Mark Mayo

Questions: BH68-11

[Open this party's response pack >](#)

Luke Cornwell

Questions: BH68-04, BH68-08

[Open this party's response pack >](#)

Seldons Solicitors

Questions: BH68-04, BH68-08, BH68-10

[Open this party's response pack >](#)

Amelia Skea

Questions: BH68-05, BH68-06

[Open this party's response pack >](#)

Mark Hacking

Questions: BH68-07

[Open this party's response pack >](#)

Geldards LLP

Questions: BH68-07

[Open this party's response pack >](#)

BH68-01 / No direct answer in supplied record

Who prepared the plan?

Nick Shackson • Estates Specialist • National Grid

Related historical request: 13 February 2026

Did you personally draw the plan sent to Mr Mayo on 28 April 2025? If not, who prepared it?

Why it matters

A plan should be traceable to its author and source material. That allows its reliability and limitations to be checked. Confirming who sent it does not establish who prepared it: integrity requires that distinction to remain clear.

The recorded response

The 2 February reply confirms sending the email and plan. It does not establish who drew the plan.

What remains to be established

Miss E asked about personal authorship on 13 February 2026. The earlier reply confirms sending the plan, which is a different point. No direct answer to the later authorship question appears in the supplied bundle.

Related material reviewed through 7 May 2026; no later direct answer established

Source references: B, pp. 2-3

[Full question and source record >](#)

BH68-02 / No direct answer in supplied record

Which apparatus - and which title?

Nick Shackson · Estates Specialist · National Grid

Related historical request: 13 February 2026

Which apparatus and which title did “the apparatus on your title” refer to? What supported that wording, and how does it relate to your later description, “not any particular title”? Did you carry out the Bodmin records check you proposed on 13 March 2025 before sending the April plan? If so, what did it establish? Was this intended as the plan accompanying a particular wayleave agreement? What could it establish about BH68, and what could it not establish? Identify any agreement to which it was attached.

Why it matters

A general apparatus map and a statement about a particular title do not necessarily establish the same thing. Integrity requires the wording to match what the underlying records can support, so those relying on it understand its limits.

The recorded response

The 10 February reply describes a general-area map, not a particular title. A direct identification of the apparatus intended by the earlier phrase is not present.

What remains to be established

The 13 February request asked which apparatus the phrase meant. The 24 February follow-up says this remained unanswered. The February reply explains that the map displayed a general area; the available copies contain no direct answer identifying the apparatus intended by the earlier wording.

Related material reviewed through 7 May 2026; no later direct answer established

Source references: C, p. 2; B, pp. 1-5, 8; D, pp. 4-5

[Full question and source record >](#)

BH68-03 / Clarification not found in supplied record

Which wayleaves cover BH68?

National Grid Electricity Distribution (South West) plc · via Geldards LLP, the instructed firm, and Mark Hacking, its named contact

Related historical request: 6 May 2026

What agreement or other basis supports the claimed BH68 wayleave rights connected with Mr Mayo? Produce the agreement, its date, parties and plan. Identify the land and apparatus covered. If an older agreement is relied upon, what establishes its continued application after any ownership change or subdivision, and how does it relate to Miss E's signed 2024 agreement?

Why it matters

Miss E's signed agreement provides a specific record against which the claimed BH68 rights can be compared. A transfer assertion should identify the relevant agreement or other basis, the land and apparatus, and why an older arrangement is said still to apply. Without those records, the family cannot test the competing claim. Integrity requires that comparison to be possible.

The recorded response

The 2 February reply says existing wayleaves transferred to Mr Mayo. The supplied replies do not identify the individual agreements or establish whether one covers BH68. Mark Hacking's 7 May reply promises a substantive response to recent Shackson correspondence but does not identify those agreements.

What remains to be established

Mr Shackson's 2 February reply states that existing wayleaves transferred. The supplied replies do not identify the individual agreements or establish whether one covers BH68. The later 5 May reply confirms instruction of Geldards LLP and separately names Mark Hacking as a contact, not as the author of the original statement.

Related requests and replies supplied through 7 May 2026; later substantive clarification not established

Source references: A, pp. 1, 4-6; B, pp. 5-7; D, pp. 3-5; E, p. 3; J, pp. 1-3

[Full question and source record >](#)

BH68-04 / Proposed · not yet sent

Why rely on this plan - and where is the agreement?

Luke Cornwell / Seldons Solicitors · concerning Mr Mayo's representation described in the correspondence · Bideford, Devon, United Kingdom

This publication question is proposed and has not been sent.

Mr J says the April 2025 plan was introduced late in the proceedings and relied upon in court to support Mr Mayo's claimed BH68 rights. Why was it introduced at that stage, and what exactly was it presented as proving? Given Mr Shackson's later description of a general-area map, "not any particular title", what justified relying on it for that purpose? Identify the document and the assertion it supported. Where is the executed BH68 wayleave agreement in Mr Mayo's name and its accompanying plan that the family says it repeatedly requested? If your position rests on an older agreement or another instrument, identify it and explain how it applies to the relevant land and BH68. Identify the accompanying statement of truth, its signatory and the precise assertions it verified, including which email version was exhibited.

Why it matters

On Mr J's account, the plan was relied upon in court despite not being suitable as a wayleave-agreement plan. The integrity issue is the gap between what a document was presented as proving and what it could support. Producing the filing, the agreement and the explanation for the late introduction would allow that gap to be tested. A map's appearance cannot supply the missing terms, parties or scope of an agreement.

The recorded response

Mr Shackson's 10 February 2026 explanation describes a general-area map, "not any particular title", and says it was not produced through registered chartered-surveyor survey work. This does not answer why it was reportedly introduced and relied upon in court, or identify the executed agreement requested by the family.

What remains to be established

The issue is why this plan was introduced and what evidential basis supported its reported use - not simply whether it was used. Mr J says it was relied upon, was not suitable as a wayleave-agreement plan, and did not supply the missing executed agreement. The correspondence records Mr Shackson's later general-area explanation. The reported court use and timing are Mr J's account; this question seeks the precise filing, justification and underlying agreement.

Question wording updated 13 September 2026 · not sent by this publication

Source references: C, pp. 1-2; B, pp. 2-7; A, pp. 4-6; D, pp. 3-5; K, p. 7; L, pp. 2, 5

[Full question and source record >](#)

BH68-05 / Authentication not found in supplied record

Is the disputed email exchange authentic?

Amelia Skea · Wayleave Services, Bodmin Office · National Grid Electricity Distribution (South West) plc

Related historical request: 7 March 2025; renewed 7 May 2026

Did you send the 15 April 2024 message saying “Your wayleave will be paid annually in advance in September” in response to the displayed 9 April request naming BH67 and BH68? Was BH68 in the email National Grid actually received? Produce the retained request, reply, full headers and attachments. For each pole, identify the agreement or other instrument behind “your wayleave” and the record linked to reference 2624773. If any displayed wording is not what you received or sent, identify it, when you became aware of it and what correction or notification followed. Miss E’s verification requests began in February 2025: why do the supplied replies still contain no authentication answer? If you have answered, identify the dated reply. If you cannot verify the exchange, explain what prevents you, who is checking it and when an answer will be provided.

Why it matters

The reply can be read as confirming the request about two named poles. If the request was altered, or the reply concerned different records, the apparent confirmation could convey a materially different meaning. Authenticating both sides of the exchange and identifying the instrument for each pole tests that connection directly.

The recorded response

The recorded 10 March 2025 reply refers the enquiry to Nigel Merrifield. The May 2026 Geldards reply acknowledges the forwarded letter and directs correspondence through the firm. Neither provides an authentication finding on the printed exchange.

What remains to be established

Mr J reports that neither a BH68 nor a BH67 agreement in Mr Mayo’s name has been produced to the family. On 13 September 2026 he alleges possible knowing involvement by Ms Skea in misleading wording or failure to correct wording she knows was falsely attributed to her. The retained messages and agreement records are sought to test that allegation. The supplied referral and solicitor correspondence do not provide an authentication finding.

Documents reviewed through 7 May 2026; on 12 September 2026 Mr J reports no later substantive answer, not independently verified

Source references: F, pp. 1-2; G, pp. 2-5; H, pp. 1-3; I, p. 1; J, p. 1; M, pp. 12-13, 19-20

[Full question and source record >](#)

BH68-06 / Supporting update records not supplied

What exactly was changed in the payment records?

National Grid Electricity Distribution (South West) plc · concerning the payment-record update attributed to Amelia Skea · South West Wayleave Records, Bodmin

Related historical request: 7 May 2026

Which agreement or other instrument did “your wayleave” refer to, for BH67 and for BH68? Identify the land, apparatus and recipient linked to reference 2624773. What payment records were updated, by whom and on what documents? Produce the archived plan and completion letter referred to in the April 2024 request and explain whether the stated £25 annual amount concerned one pole, both poles or different apparatus. How does that position relate to Miss E’s June 2024 BH68 agreement, its signed plan, 14-year term and one-off £2,000 payment provision?

Why it matters

An assertion that payment records were changed should be traceable to the documents and apparatus it concerns. Integrity requires explaining whether the records describe the same pole and rights, rather than treating an administrative payment entry as proof of an agreement or of the disputed boundary.

The recorded response

The printed April response says records were updated for future wayleave payments. It does not identify the underlying agreement, include the referenced attachments or explain how BH68 relates to Miss E’s later executed agreement. The supplied 7 May solicitor’s reply addresses correspondence handling, not those records.

What remains to be established

The April 2024 printout predates the June agreement. Identify exactly what was updated, the documents supporting the change and how the later agreement relates to it. The supplied replies leave that comparison unresolved.

7 May 2026 formal request and acknowledged notification; on 12 September 2026 Mr J reports no later substantive clarification, not independently verified

Source references: F, pp. 1-2; A, pp. 4-6; G, pp. 3-5; H, pp. 2-3; I, p. 1; J, p. 1

[Full question and source record >](#)

BH68-07 / Proposed · not yet sent

Where is the promised substantive response?

Mark Hacking / Geldards LLP · for National Grid Electricity Distribution (South West) plc · Nottingham office

This publication question is proposed and has not been sent.

On 7 May 2026 you promised a substantive response to the recent Shackson correspondence. Where is that response? Separately, which dated answer resolves the Skea email-authentication and BH68 agreement questions? Produce the answers and supporting records. If these points remain unanswered, why, what prevents an answer, and when will you provide one?

Why it matters

A promise of a substantive response gives the family a concrete commitment against which to ask what happened next. An acknowledgement leaves the underlying verification work unfinished. Accountability requires the promised answer, its supporting records or an explanation of what prevents it.

The recorded response

The 10 March 2025 message records a referral. On 24 April 2026 Mark Hacking says he is instructed that earlier requests were dealt with and asks what further material is sought. On 7 May he acknowledges the Skea letter and promises a substantive response to recent Shackson correspondence. No later substantive answer is included in the supplied export.

What remains to be established

The correspondence contains real responses, but those pages do not identify an answer authenticating the disputed exchange or producing the particular BH68 supporting records. This is a proposed request for that identification, not a claim that Geldards has ignored this newly worded question.

Draft editorial follow-up based on replies through 7 May 2026 and Mr J's 12 September update; no new request sent

Source references: G, pp. 1-5; J, pp. 1-3

[Full question and source record >](#)

BH68-08 / Proposed · not yet sent

Why self-forward the disputed email - and what verifies it?

Luke Cornwell / Seldons Solicitors · Bideford, Devon, United Kingdom

This publication question is proposed and has not been sent.

The 31 January 2025 header names you as both sender and recipient: why did you self-forward the exchange attributed to Amelia Skea and Mr Mayo? The family's Annex E specifically alleges insertion of BH68 into correspondence originally about BH67. Was the phrase "The pole numbers are BH67 and BH68" present in the message received from your source? Produce that message and the native exchange, including attachments, and compare them with the self-forwarded and court-filed versions. Identify every addition, removal or change, who made it and when. If changes removed private client information, identify their scope, where they were disclosed and when the redaction explanation was first given. Mr J says the emails were relied upon while the requested agreement and Ms Skea's authentication remained outstanding: what checks supported that reliance, and which agreement supported the claimed BH68 rights? Provide the dated explanation and version comparison with appropriate protection for genuinely confidential information.

Why it matters

The concern is not self-forwarding in isolation. It is whether a disputed copy carried the weight of an agreement that the family says was never produced, without a checkable confirmation from the attributed sender. The integrity test connects provenance, meaning and reliance: which words were actually sent, what changed, what verified them and what justified the use made of them in court?

The recorded response

The supplied printout shows the forwarding header. The October 2025 rebuttal and oral summary expressly allege a written admission of editing and challenge a later redaction explanation. Mr J says the explanation concerned private client information and followed the family's challenge. The question seeks the dated explanation and a comparison of the versions.

What remains to be established

Mr J's concern is cumulative: no executed BH68 agreement in Mr Mayo's name has been produced to the family, the attributed sender has not provided the authentication they seek, and the court copy was self-forwarded with editing explained only after challenge, according to his account. He alleges these connected gaps raise serious doubts about the email's authenticity and its use as evidence. This question asks Mr Cornwell to address that connection directly: identify the checks, produce the originals and agreement, and account for each change and its disclosure.

Question wording updated 13 September 2026 · not sent

Source references: F, pp. 1-2; G, pp. 3-5; A, pp. 4-6; D, pp. 3-5; K, pp. 5, 7, 17-18; L, pp. 2, 5; M, pp. 12-13, 19-20; N, pp. 1-2; O, pp. 2-4

[Full question and source record >](#)

BH68-09 / Proposed · not yet sent

Who at National Grid will take responsibility for the answers?

National Grid Electricity Distribution (South West) plc · Chief Executive's Office / executive review

This publication question is proposed and has not been sent.

Is this handling of a wayleave-holder's verification requests consistent with National Grid's standards? Identify who took responsibility after the February and March 2025 requests, the referral and the April 2026 office visits. Who checked the disputed emails and agreement records, what did they conclude, and where is the written outcome? Will a senior officer review BH68-03, BH68-05 and BH68-06, explain any unresolved delay and give a date for a document-supported response?

Why it matters

Responsibility should remain traceable when a wayleave-holder's concern passes between departments and external solicitors. Integrity requires a checkable outcome: who investigated, which records they examined and what answer the company stands behind.

The recorded response

Angela Caddy's 10 March 2025 message refers the enquiry to Nigel Merrifield. Mark Hacking later states that previous requests had been dealt with, asks for further particulars and promises a substantive response concerning Shackson correspondence. Those replies do not supply the authentication finding or agreement comparison requested here. No executive response to this new question has been sought.

What remains to be established

Identify a responsible senior officer, the checks performed, their written outcome and the route to completing any unresolved work. Mr J reports that the substantive verification answers remain outstanding; this register does not mark the new executive question as overdue.

Proposed executive-review question · 12 September 2026 · not sent

Source references: G, pp. 1-5; D, pp. 1-3; H, pp. 1-3; J, pp. 1-3

[Full question and source record >](#)

BH68-10 / Proposed · not yet sent

What does Seldons stand behind - and what did it check?

Seldons LLP / Seldons Solicitors · managing partner or professional-standards partner · Bideford

This publication question is proposed and has not been sent.

The 27 October 2025 email addressed Luke Cornwell and Seldons, alleged falsification and requested firm-wide preservation of originals and metadata. What action did the firm take on that notice? Who was responsible, which records were preserved and where is the acknowledgement or substantive reply? Does Seldons stand behind the disputed email copy? Will a partner not involved in its preparation compare the received, self-forwarded and court-filed versions, identify every change, its disclosure and the dated redaction explanation? Was verification sought directly from Amelia Skea or National Grid? State the firm's position on the insertion allegation and what correction, if any, its review requires.

Why it matters

A firm-level answer should explain how evidence bearing its solicitor's name was handled and checked. The integrity test is whether the disclosed copy preserved the original meaning and made its changes traceable, including the action taken if a problem is found.

The recorded response

The printout shows the self-forwarding header. The family's submissions allege a written admission and challenge the redaction explanation. A firm-level version comparison and review outcome are not identified in the supplied material. The 27 October notice asks for acknowledgement and preservation within 24 hours, but its supplied copy contains no response.

What remains to be established

The firm is asked for its own position, the supervision record, a protected version comparison and any correction needed. The proposed review does not assume that a change necessarily altered the substantive meaning.

Updated firm-review question · 13 September 2026 · not sent by this publication

Source references: F, pp. 1-2; K, pp. 5, 7, 17-18; L, pp. 2, 5; M, pp. 12-13, 19-20; N, pp. 1-2; O, pp. 2-4

[Full question and source record >](#)

BH68-11 / Proposed · not yet sent

Mr Mayo: which agreement supports your BH68 position?

Mark John Mayo · response may be provided through his representative

This publication question is proposed and has not been sent.

Which agreement or other instrument do you rely on for rights concerning BH68? Identify its date, parties, plan, apparatus and the land to which it applies. If you rely on an older agreement rather than one in your name, identify the record establishing its continued application to your land. Explain how that position relates to Miss E's signed June 2024 agreement. If the family has misstated your position, provide the precise correction and supporting document. Did your 9 April 2024 email contain the words "The pole numbers are BH67 and BH68" as shown in the disputed copy? Provide your sent message, its attachments and the reply you received, and identify the agreement or other instrument relating to each pole.

Why it matters

A claim about particular land and apparatus should identify the instrument and reasoning that support it. Naming the agreement and its scope lets readers compare competing accounts against documents rather than implications.

The recorded response

The supplied record includes correspondence about the plan and the position attributed to Mr Mayo. Shackson asserts that existing wayleaves transferred. This proposed question asks Mr Mayo to identify his precise position and the instrument supporting it; it is not described as a question already ignored by him.

What remains to be established

Identify the instrument, its scope and the basis on which it is said to apply. The question is not whether any historic documents exist, but which document supports the particular BH68 position now relied upon.

Proposed direct question · 12 September 2026 · not sent

Source references: A, pp. 4-6; B, pp. 5-7; C, p. 2; D, pp. 3-5; F, pp. 1-2; M, pp. 19-20

[Full question and source record >](#)

10 / SOURCE INDEX

Follow the supporting record.

References A-Q identify the website's 17 source notes. Page numbers in the reporting refer to pages in the supplied copies, not pages of this edition. Follow each link for the document description, relevant passages and publication status.

A / The signed wayleave agreement

6 pages in supplied PDF | Agreement & accompanying letters

The 2024 contractual documents relied upon by Miss E, including a signed plan identifying Pole BH68.

[Read source note A >](#)

B / The questions and the replies

12 pages in supplied PDF | Email correspondence

The exchanges about the plan, payment records and wayleaves, including substantive replies and two later requests for clarification.

[Read source note B >](#)

C / The April 2025 plan and email

3 pages in supplied PDF | Plan & accompanying correspondence

The map and reproduced 28 April 2025 email containing the phrase 'showing the apparatus on your title'.

[Read source note C >](#)

D / The 6 May 2026 letter before action addressed to Nick Shackson

6 pages in supplied PDF | Letter before action

The family's 6 May 2026 account of its concerns and its requests for explanations and supporting records.

[Read source note D >](#)

E / The covering email and representation reply

4 pages in supplied PDF | Email correspondence

The family's covering email and a reproduced response confirming that the operator had instructed solicitors.

[Read source note E >](#)

F / The April 2024 correspondence attributed to Amelia Skea and Mr Mayo

2 pages in supplied PDF | Annotated correspondence printout

A disputed printed exchange referring to BH67 and BH68, a payment-record update, and supporting attachments that are not included in this copy.

[Read source note F >](#)

G / The verification requests and the March 2025 referral

5 pages in supplied PDF | Email correspondence export

Miss E's authentication and payment-record questions, a follow-up copying Amelia Skea, and a recorded referral to Nigel Merrifield.

[Read source note G >](#)

H / The 7 May 2026 letter before action addressed to Amelia Skea

4 pages in supplied PDF | Letter before action

The family's allegations and renewed requests for authentication, records and an explanation of the apparent BH68 position.

[Read source note H >](#)

I / The email transmitting the Skea letter and supporting documents

1 pages in supplied PDF | Covering email export

The 7 May 2026 covering email lists the letter, agreement and disputed correspondence as attachments and names corporate copied recipients.

[Read source note I >](#)

J / Geldards' April and May 2026 replies

4 pages in supplied PDF | Email correspondence export

Mark Hacking's replies about NGED's position, the disputed status of earlier requests, receipt of the Skea letter and routing of further correspondence.

[Read source note J >](#)

K / October 2025: the defendant's rebuttal to the claimant's reply

19 pages in supplied PDF | Party submission supplied as court-filed

The defendant's written challenge to the National Grid correspondence, including allegations of editing and a retrospective redaction explanation.

[Read source note K >](#)

L / October 2025: the summary of oral argument for the strike-out hearing

26 pages in supplied PDF | Party submission supplied as court-filed

The written oral-argument summary for the 14 October 2025 hearing at Barnstaple County Court, including the defendant's editing and redaction allegations.

[Read source note L >](#)

M / Annex E: the particularised allegation of email insertion and evidential manipulation

24 pages in supplied PDF | Signed party allegation and request for referral

The expanded Annex E alleges insertion of BH68 into correspondence originally about BH67, reliance on that material and omission of Miss E's executed documents from expert instructions.

[Read source note M >](#)

N / 27 October 2025: notice to Luke Cornwell and Seldons, with a demand to preserve originals

2 pages in supplied PDF | Outgoing formal-notice email

An email addressed to Luke Cornwell and Seldons expressly raises personal and firm-level allegations and asks for preservation of originals, metadata and related records.

[Read source note N >](#)

O / 26 October 2025: Annex J-2 challenges the email, disclosure history and claimed transfer

5 pages in supplied PDF | Formal warning addressed to Luke Cornwell

Mr J's warning challenges the alleged email alterations, newly listed historic agreements and the basis on which the claimed wayleave transfer was being advanced.

[Read source note O >](#)

P / 25-26 October 2025: Annex J-1 demands the underlying wayleave documents

3 pages in supplied PDF | Formal notice addressed to Luke Cornwell

The family's notice alleges that BH68 was inserted into fabricated correspondence and demands authentic supporting documents rather than disclosure lists alone.

[Read source note P >](#)

Q / 29 October 2025: the family's referral request addressed to the CPS

3 pages in supplied PDF | Outgoing request for criminal assessment

An outgoing email to CPS mailboxes alleges insertion of BH68 into National Grid correspondence and requests assessment and coordination with the SRA.

[Read source note Q >](#)

Additional costs record

Signed final notice dated 29 April 2026, two pages, and the public-review correspondence are described in the case feature. They are not included as original attachments to this edition.

[Costs feature and final notice >](#)

11 / PUBLICATION RECORD

Dates. Revisions. Responsibility.

Issue 001 | 15 September 2026 | Revision 1.1

Reporting through 13 September 2026, with the hearing connection and withholding allegation supplied on 15 September 2026. Revised 15 September 2026. Historical correspondence and earlier response-status updates retain their own dates.

Issue 001 - updated 15 September 2026, revision 1.1. This expanded first edition includes the BH68 hearing connection, the family's costs and service allegations, and the supporting procedural source. The original substantive reporting, questions and source notes are retained. Earlier documentary and response-status dates are unchanged. Further reporting and material corrections will be dated on the website.

How this edition was assembled

This edition consolidates the published reporting; it is not a facsimile of the original case documents. References A-Q point to the website's source notes describing supplied copies. The original case PDFs remain off-site. The signed costs final notice is described in the linked case feature. Contributor accounts, formal allegations, document contents and recorded replies retain their different status.

Editorial disclosure

The founder is a member of Miss E's family. This relationship is disclosed so readers can assess the reporting in context.

Responses and corrections

Contact theunansweredrecord@gmail.com, identifying the issue number, page and question reference. State the response or correction and provide the supporting material. The website will identify substantive corrections and material replies.

[Email the editorial desk >](#)

[Edition archive and revision notes >](#)

[Publication standards >](#)

Stay with the story

The monthly edition provides a dated reading copy. Follow the website's Latest developments and Daux Scythe's LinkedIn profile for the continuing reporting. Email subscription availability is shown on the website.

[Latest developments >](#)

[Daux Scythe on LinkedIn >](#)

The greater the trust, the greater the duty to answer.