
From: Lorraine Cordell [mailto:lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk]
Sent: 02 February 2015 15:08
To: Wood, Peter
Subject: RE: MT3574694 Simon Cordell

Dear Peter

Thank you for the reply to my email

Yes the below would cover everything I feel, so if you can go ahead and do this I would be most grateful.

As said, I just do not want any way that the CSP and Court could have any confusion with anything.

Regards

Lorraine

From: Wood, Peter [mailto:Peter.Wood@canopius.com]
Sent: 02 February 2015 14:56
To: Lorraine Cordell
Cc: Austin, Andrew
Subject: RE: MT3574694 Simon Cordell

Dear Lorraine,

Thanks for your comments, don't worry I want to get this resolved as much as you and Simon, its taken far too long already, so before I send an amended Indemnity Letter (LOI) please confirm my understanding as listed below –

- I will amend the registration of the Ford Zetec to show MA57LDY. Broadsure originally gave us the incorrect registration and as you say it was a while before this error was corrected and our policy history was confusing due to the incorrect Clio that I was not aware of previously.
- You are correct, looking back on the instructions from Broadsure I cannot see that they instructed Underwriters to delete the Renault Clio that was added in error following receipt of advices from Broadsure. I can amend the comment in the letter to show that this vehicle was added to the policy incorrectly following an effort on your part to correct the registration number of the Ford Zetec and was a broker error, are you happy with this?
- The letter states cover was for Social Domestic & Pleasure and Motor Trade Use. Motor Trade use would cover Simon to carry a Motor Mechanics tools being used in connection with Motor Trade but not any tools that would typically be used for any other purposes such as perhaps, paint/brushes/ladders/plumbing/Electrical(domestic/commercial except auto electrical) and so on. This is standard cover, however I am happy to expand on this statement in the letter if you would like me to in order to clarify that point?
- The Police officer asked if Simon would be covered for the carriage of tools to drive around doing "odd jobs". Later in the call he again confirmed that Simon was not covered "to drive around doing jobs". I sent you the call so you can listen to it yourself but the tone of the enquiry was suggesting that Simon was doing jobs not connected to the Motor Trade however I do feel there is plenty of room here for misunderstanding. If the question had been more specific with the officer stating that Simon had tools connected with the Motor Trade in the vehicle would he be covered – Yes. If he said that the tools were not connected to the Motor Trade (as per my comments above) then the answer is – No. Not something I can put into a Letter of Indemnity but certainly something to be argued with the CPS/Courts.
- I'm happy to confirm in the letter that cover was in force under this policy on the 14/11/2013.