

**A PERSONAL STATEMENT REGARDING THE MOTIONS PUT TO THE 2018 AGM IN THE MATTER OF TRACEY CURTIS-TAYLOR.**

By Brian Davies. Mem No 027125

Firstly, let me say that I agree with the sentiments expressed in both of the member's Motions put forward to the 2018 AGM.

Regrettably, the supporting statements put forward by Stewart Jackson and Tracey Curtis-Taylor seek to imply that the LAA Board, and more particularly me, were somehow colluding against Tracey and were engaged in irregular practices. It is very important that these allegations are challenged. The following part of this statement will explain why I think this is necessary.

The original member Motion put to the 2016 AGM came as an unpleasant surprise to the LAA Board and it created a great deal of debate on the best way to handle it. In the event, the members voted overwhelmingly in favour of the Motion, and the Board felt it was duty-bound to act on the result. The Board did, however, request a sub-committee of the Board to review the process used and it confirmed that things were correctly handled, even though some members of the Board disagreed with the outcome.

Within weeks of the Motion being passed, the LAA received a letter from Tracey Curtis-Taylor's lawyers, requesting that we reverse the decision of the AGM which, of course, we could not do. This was followed by a further three letters, culminating in a threat of legal action against the LAA and/or its officers.

This was followed, earlier this year, by Tracey making a formal complaint of wrongful and discriminatory actions by me, as Chairman of the LAA. I stood aside to allow a formal inquiry into these allegations and for the Board to consider the findings of the inquiry panel. I was found not guilty of any of the allegations made against me.

The particular issue of the rewriting of the original 2016 Motion is a red herring. The original Motion was considered by the Board to be libellous and, in accordance with Article 20 of the LAA Articles of Association, the Board agreed to the deletion of the libellous content. The then Company Secretary wrote to the member who had raised the Motion, explaining what had been deleted and why. No collusion or subterfuge, just good governance.

As I have said at the beginning of this statement, I agree with the sentiments expressed in both Motions but strongly refute the allegations made in Stewart Jackson's and Tracey Curtis -Taylor's supporting statements.

I therefore urge members to vote against the Motion put forward by Stewart Jackson but to vote in favour of the Motion put forward by David Mole.