MAM9

ForSa

、 在 展 】

jo. i nearc prospects

WARNING DO NOT TRUST SHELL UK

I caution all businesses contemplating trading with Shell UK Ltd to be on their guard. In my experience, they are masters of double talk and double-dealing. It has at times proved almost impossible to extract the truth from this company.

Bearing in mind that Shell has pirated a series of ideas that Don Marketing disclosed to them in confidence, I take the view that they should fly a "skull and crossbones" flag over Shell-Mex House as fair warning to all who enter.

Let me make it plain that there is irrefutable documentary evidence to support my allegations, including the fact that Shell deliberately obstructed an investigation by the Advertising Standards Authority. Some of the allegations have been published for several months on a unique and highly informative website (www.don-marketing.com). The fact that Shell has not taken action to prevent publication or to bring libel proceedings speaks volumes. They know that DM can substantiate all of its charges.

A free booklet setting out the scandalous conduct that DM Directors have suffered at the hands of Shell UK is available on request. It reveals that DM asked Mr David Varney, then Managing Director of Shell UK, to investigate the initial dispute. His response letter contained false information designed to deliberately mislead.

Even though Shell is a member of CEDR – the Centre for Dispute Resolution, it has ignored every mediation proposal that Don Marketing has put forward in respect of the SMART claim. Only one conclusion can be drawn. Shell intends to try to exhaust the funds of a financially weaker opponent in the hope that the case never comes before the courts.

Who could guess that Shell, with its pious claims of high moral principles, could stoop so low that it would be associated with a "cloak and dagger" operation against a small company. But that is exactly what recently happened. Only when put into a corner by DM's lawyers, did Shell UK come clean on the matter.

I will continue to speak out until Shell silences me. An evil invader tried to do that in Burma over 50 years ago, fortunately without any success.

AN OPEN LETTER TO DR FAY, CHAIRMAN AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE, SHELL UK LIMITED

Dear Dr Fay

As you know, I attended the Shell Transport AGM in May, just four months ago. I heard at first hand the up-beat speech given by Mr Moody-Stuart about Shell's future prospects. There was not the slightest hint of any impending financial debacle. In view of recent events, his address can be compared with the "welcome aboard" speech given by the Captain of the Titanic. The difference is that this time, the Captain and first officers will not go down with the ship. Unfortunately, hundreds of Shell UK staff will be the ones thrown overboard. Under the circumstances, many Shell employees may share my view that instead of the CMD concentrating on learning to dance the "Macarena" at a recent Shell jamboree, they should have been looking out for the financial storms ahead.

I have also suffered from Shell's ruthless business ethics. You have recently brought a £100,000 claim against me despite the fact that I am an 81-year-old war pensioner. An action that one solicitor has correctly described as petty and vindictive. You did this because my son launched a multimillion pounds legal action against Shell in respect of the SMART scheme - the fourth promotional idea that Shell has stolen from the company that he and I founded (Don Marketing). You have already settled three out of the four claims, at a cost to Shell shareholders of several hundred thousand pounds. As you know, all four claims involve the same <u>unscrupulous</u> Shell manager, Mr Andrew Lazenby. Anyone who doubts this assertion has only to listen to Mr Lazenby on DM's website.

You have known all about these matters for years. You even sent an unsolicited letter of apology to my son in October 1996, after settling claims two and three. You admitted that Shell UK had failed to meet "the high standards that we set ourselves" i.e. the Statement of General Business Principles. You went on to say: "On reflection it seems that, had this aspect been more focused on that the strict legal issues, we might have been able to resolve our differences more quickly". But when my son subsequently brought the SMART multipartner claim to your attention after it had been launched in Scotland, Shell UK reverted back to its former disreputable mode of conduct. Thus your apology letter has been exposed as a cynical ploy – another deception.

Does it not worry you that 55% of the respondents in DM's survey of over 1,500 Shell Stations (the results are published in "Marketing Week") say that Shell UK operates in an unethical manner. Half of the respondents believe that Shell's Statement of General Business Principles is a sham. It is no use making solemn pledges about honesty, openness and integrity, when Shell management is not prepared to honour them.

Alfred Donovan. Retired Director of Don Marketing. (Cell-phone No: 0411 526 769).

vill continue to speak out until shell stiences are. An ovil invader tried to do ti itma over 50 vests ago, fortunately without any success.