

February 16, 2025

Admissibility of 'Without Prejudice' Communications - Morris v Williams [2025] EWHC 218 (KB)

[Morris v Williams \[2025\] EWHC 218 \(KB\)](#)

Date: 5 February 2025

Key Words:

Without prejudice rule, Unambiguous impropriety, Fundamental dishonesty, Settlement negotiations, Public interest, Admissibility of evidence, Exaggerated injuries, Interim stage

Summary

Keith Morris, the Claimant, sought damages for injuries from a road traffic accident caused by the Defendant, William Simon Williams [2]. The Defendant admitted negligence but alleged the Claimant exaggerated his injuries [3]. He applied to admit a "without prejudice" letter from the Claimant's former solicitors, Minster Law, arguing it showed fundamental dishonesty [4]. District Judge Dodsworth allowed the letter, finding it fell within the "unambiguous impropriety" exception [21].

Key Themes:

The key themes in this case are:

1. **Without Prejudice Rule:** Settlement communications are generally inadmissible [7]
2. **Exceptions:** Evidence may be admitted if it conceals perjury, blackmail, or "unambiguous impropriety" [8].
3. **Fundamental Dishonesty:** The Defendant alleged the Claimant exaggerated his injuries [3, 10, 11].
4. **Public Interest:** The judgment weighs encouraging settlement against ensuring full disclosure in litigation [7, 21].

Background

The Claimant was injured in a road traffic accident on 20 July 2018 due to the Defendant's negligence [1, 2]. The Defendant alleged fundamental dishonesty regarding the Claimant's injuries [3, 10]. He sought to admit a "without prejudice save as to costs" letter from Minster Law, claiming it revealed an admission of dishonesty, triggering the exception to the without prejudice rule [4, 10].

Legal Issues and Analysis

1. **Admissibility of Without Prejudice Correspondence:** "Without prejudice" communications are generally inadmissible to encourage settlement [7]. This principle is grounded in *Rush & Tompkins Ltd v Greater London Council* [1989] AC 1280 and *Cutts v Head* [1984] Ch 290 [7].
2. **The "Unambiguous Impropriety" Exception:** This exception applies when excluding correspondence would cloak perjury or other clear impropriety [7, 8]. The court referenced *Unilever PLC v Procter & Gamble Co* [2000] 1 WLR 2436, noting the exception should be applied with caution [7, 8, 9, 1, 12, 13].
3. **Application to the Letter:** The judge found the letter contained an explicit admission of fundamental dishonesty [19, 20], proposing the Claimant admit to dishonest representations [Annex to the Judgment].
4. **Balancing Public Interests:** The court balanced promoting settlements against ensuring full disclosure [7, 8, 21]. It ruled that preventing the Claimant from pursuing a false claim outweighed protecting the without prejudice communication [21].

Conclusion

District Judge Dodsworth admitted the letter as evidence, finding it revealed fundamental dishonesty and met the threshold for the "unambiguous impropriety" exception [20, 21, 22]. Excluding it would let the Claimant benefit from dishonesty [21].

Key Takeaway:

While "without prejudice" communications are usually protected, the exception applies when excluding them would facilitate "unambiguous impropriety" [7, 8]. An admission of dishonesty during such negotiations can be admitted if it meets this threshold [20, 21].

Parting Thoughts

*In legal disputes, communications marked "without prejudice" are typically protected to encourage open settlement negotiations [6, 7]. However, this protection is not absolute [8]. The case of *Morris v Williams* illustrates that **if a party makes an unambiguous admission of impropriety within such communications, the court may allow that evidence to be admitted** [8, 10, 11, 20, 21]. This exception is invoked when excluding the evidence would allow a party to benefit from their dishonesty [21, 22]. This serves as a reminder that while candid discussions are encouraged, **overstepping into clear dishonesty can remove the shield of "without prejudice,"** and that the courts will balance the public interest in encouraging settlement with that of ensuring full and honest disclosure [7, 8, 21].*

My thanks to Len Bunton and his Adjudication Mentee Group for bringing this case to my attention.

**#WithoutPrejudiceRule #UnambiguousImpropriety #FundamentalDishonesty
#SettlementNegotiations #PublicInterest #AdmissibilityOfEvidence #ExaggeratedInjuries
#InterimStage #Morris #Williams**

Nigel Davies BSc(Hons) (Q.Surv), PGCert.Psych, GDipLaw, PGDipLP, DipArb, MSc (Built Environment), LLM (Construction Law & Practice), MSc (Mechanical & Electrical), MSc (Psychology), FRICS, FCIQB, FCIInstCES, FCIArb, CARb, GMBPsS, Panel Registered Adjudicator, Mediator, Mediation Advocate, Chartered Builder & Chartered Construction Manager, Chartered Surveyor & Civil Engineering Surveyor, Chartered Arbitrator, Author, and Solicitor-Advocate

Adjudicator Assessor and Re-Assessor for the ICE and the CIArb

Arbitrator Assessor for the CI Arb
ICE DRC Member
ICE DRC CPD Committee Chairman
Adjudicator Exam Question Setter for the ICE
CI Arb Adjudication Panel Member since 2006
CI Arb Arbitration Panel Member since 2006
CIC Adjudication Panel Member since 2010
Law Society Panel Arbitrator
RIBA Adjudication Panel Member since 2018
RICS Adjudication Panel Member since 2006
TECSA Adjudication Panel Member since 2012
FIDIC Adjudication Panel Member since 2021
ICE Adjudication Panel Member since 2021
RICS Dispute Board Registered since 2013

The information & opinions expressed in this article are not necessarily comprehensive, nor do they represent the trenchant view of the author; in any event, this article does not purport to offer professional advice. This article has been prepared as a summary and is intended for general guidance only. In the case of a specific problem, it is recommended that professional advice be sought.