

NatWest, Savile and the courts

Sunday, 23 February 2014

I heard a rumour which seems to have escaped the big national media.

Which makes me assume it is false. However, it's worth passing on, just in case incompetence, and not inaccuracy, is the cause of the silence. And, after appearing on Leveson and seeing an agenda being followed which included deliberately ignoring the aspects of the relationship between police and media (specifically the Surrey Police "inability" to find Milly Dowler's killer, allowing Levi Belfield years to kill two other innocent young girls), I would not be surprised if the media is simply not seeing, or is choosing not to report the fact that NatWest are being dragged into court to defend their Executor behaviour in the case of one Jimmy Savile.

I hear that NatWest are very nervous indeed about this court case, because their Probate division (representing the estates of dead people) is highly profitable. They could never accept a decision declaring them Unfit Executors. It could do serious damage to their reputation.

If the rumour is true - and I hasten to repeat that I don't think it is, and would never dream of claiming it is - I would have thought that the typical, caricature "hack in a hat", puffing ciggies whilst gulping alcohol (if they weren't in the Old Bailey dock) approach would, surely, be "poor innocent girl victims of Worst Paedophile in history to get no compensation from his Estate".

The other sub editor headline could be "poor children dying because Leeds Hospital could not build their Heart Specialist department with Savile's millions" but dead children are, of course, a far less sympathetic tabloid story than abused ones.

The case - I heard - might be being brought by those benefiting from Savile's will, most of which are charities or hospitals seeking to save lives. I assume, if this is true, that the point to be heard by Judges is that a person is, in British law, innocent, until or unless proven guilty - whether alive or dead - and that, therefore, there are no legal "victims" of his abuse and his frozen assets should be released so that, amongst other things, Leeds Hospital can build that Heart Block and start saving lives.

And I can see Judges being rather sympathetic to this argument. After all, most of them are mere inches away from death themselves. Would they really want to pass a judgement allowing strangers to make claims against them after their demise, grabbing their hard earned High Court millions instead of allowing them to be used by their wives and children?

The NatWest and, indeed, BBC and Government approach seems to be - "do what the tabloids tell us to do" but ramifications are immense. If this situation is true I would not be at all surprised if licence fee and tax payers take similar action, also banning those organisations from donating our hard earned monies to compensation claims. I suspect they would all, after consideration and legal advice, tell claimants "sorry, no can do".

Still, as I say, it's probably all rubbish... though I'd even heard the specific date during which the case might be heard - tomorrow, February the 24th.