

From: John Donovan <john@shellnews.net>
Subject: Handling Job Applications Meant for Shell
Date: 22 March 2012 23:14:56 GMT
To: john@shellnews.net

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Waller, Martin" <martin.waller@thetimes.co.uk>
Subject: RE: Reserves Class Action Settlement and other matters
Date: 20 September 2007 15:26:03 GMT+01:00
To: "John Donovan" <john@shellnews.net>

I might hold this for a day. have you spoken to anyone else? Martin Waller.

From: John Donovan [mailto:john@shellnews.net]
Sent: 20 September 2007 12:25
To: Waller, Martin
Subject: FW: Reserves Class Action Settlement and other matters

Hello Martin

This was my response to Michiel Brandjes. We have forwarded on three job applications at one time. Some include CV's. We even passed on a terrorist threat against Shell installations in The Netherlands. Also, as mentioned, business proposals meant for Shell. I can forward on some examples on a confidential basis if you so desire. On one occasion, Brandjes asked me to reply to an enquiry on his behalf because he could not get through with his own email.

Is it not bizarre in the extreme that the arch enemies of Shell are handling such matters?

Regards

John

From: John Donovan [mailto:john@shellnews.net]
Sent: 01 August 2007 18:19
To: 'michiel.brandjes@shell.com'
Cc: 'jeroen.vanderveer@shell.com'; 'jorma.ollila@shell.com'; 'malcolm.brinded@shell.com'; 'richard.wiseman@shell.com'
Subject: RE: Reserves Class Action Settlement and other matters

Dear Mr Brandjes

I am grateful for the response. It is nice to see that you have good sense of humor. However it would be challenging to operate a gripe site focused on Shell without actually mentioning the name of the company. As you are aware, we do so in a entirely lawful manner endorsed by the World Intellectual Property Organisation in a unanimous verdict by three eminent lawyers, including a Professor of Intellectual Property Law. They rejected the allegations made by Shell

and the success of the website is such that we have subsequently further enhanced our global reputation in the name of royaldutchshellplc.com, as a search on any of the main internet search engines will confirm. Indeed, my guess is that our website receives far more traffic than shell.com. Perhaps you would care to divulge shell.com traffic stats for comparison purposes?

Your phrase "all those people" is presumably intended to convey the impression that there are numerous individuals involved, when in fact the numbers are small. In any event, I have no objection to being an unpaid representative of Shell in regard to any queries mistakenly directed at us and have never foisted our opinions on anyone contacting us in such circumstances. As mentioned, I have always been polite and friendly as the correspondence demonstrates. However I would have thought that Shell would prefer to deal with such matters directly, as you might not necessarily consider me to be the best ambassador for Shell. If your website is made more user friendly in the manner constructively suggested, perhaps more people will turn to Shell for information and to make job applications. Thank you for passing on my comments

I am also grateful to you for explaining about the Court Order although I remain confused that the Judge says that the motions by the plaintiffs and the defendants (Shell) are dismissed, while you say that the litigation is "ongoing", but I will not press you further on the matter.

Mr Wiseman has kindly supplied his response outstanding from yesterday, so we are now up to date.

Best Regards

John Donovan

From: michiel.brandjes@shell.com [mailto:michiel.brandjes@shell.com]

Sent: 01 August 2007 17:11

To: john@shellnews.net

Subject: RE: Reserves Class Action Settlement and other matters

Dear Mr Donovan,

Thank you for your suggestion which we will pass on to the department that deals with website lay out and design.

If we may help you with a suggestion in return, a truly alternative solution for all those people inadvertently contacting you is for you to choose a website and email address without the word "shell" in it.

The type of court order you refer to is a mere procedural so called "clean up order". It would be inappropriate for us to comment on the implications of that in the course of ongoing litigation.

Best Regards,
Michiel Brandjes

Company Secretary and General Counsel Corporate
Royal Dutch Shell plc

Registered office: Shell Centre London SE1 7NA UK
Place of registration and number: England 4366849
Correspondence address: PO Box 162, 2501 AN The Hague,
The Netherlands

Tel: +31 70 377 2625 **Fax:** 3687

Email: Michiel.Brandjes@shell.com

Internet: <http://www.shell.com>

-----Original Message-----

From: John Donovan [mailto:john@shellnews.net]

Sent: woensdag 1 augustus 2007 14:41

To: Brandjes, Michiel CM RDS-LC

Cc: van der Veer, Jeroen J RDS-CEJV; Ollila, Jorma RDS-RDS/CH; Brinded, Malcolm A RDS-ECMB;
Wiseman, Richard RM SI-LMAPF

Subject: Reserves Class Action Settlement and other matters

Dear Mr Brandjes

You will probably be pleased to know that one purpose of this email is to reduce the need for us to contact Shell.

As you will be aware, I have contacted you from time to time after receiving enquiries from people who despite the disclaimers on our website, believe that we are part of Shell. I suppose that this is likely to happen in a small number of cases with such a high traffic website. Some of the enquiries come from people who have visited shell.com but did not manage to find the information they were seeking. I have forwarded on separately one such instance this morning. We even receive job applications with CV's. I deal politely with all such enquires and sometimes end up on your website finding the information being sought.

The problem seems to be that there is no obvious way of contacting Shell by email via the shell.com home page. If visitors click on the "contact" button they are taken to a "Contact" webpage displaying your HQ address and telephone number, but no email address. The same end result occurs if selecting any other link option on the home page - you always end up with you HQ address and phone number.

I have managed to find the right webpage for making contact with Shell but only because I stumbled across it when navigating my way through the maze of pages on your site:
http://www.shell.com/home/form/aboutshell-en/contact_us/about_shell_contact_us.xml

Can I therefore respectfully suggest that a link for the email form webpage be added to the main contact page? You would hear less from me, I would have less work to do and most importantly of all, your customers would find it easier to get into contact with Shell (and without having to make a telephone call). People find it easy to contact me because my email address is prominently displayed on the home page of our site. Perhaps Shell should have an enquiries email address on your home page. That would be an even better solution.

Turning to our email correspondence yesterday, I did not receive the promised response from Mr Wiseman mentioned in one of your emails. I can only speculate that it was something I said, or

perhaps he is busy on events relating to Western Oil Sands Inc. In any event, Mr Wiseman is obviously a major asset to Shell bearing in mind his legal mastermind role in the unification of Royal Dutch Petroleum and Shell Transport into Royal Dutch Shell Plc, as reported in Managing Partner magazine. I am sure it must have been one of his underlings who neglected to register the dotcom domain name for the new company.

http://www.mpmagazine.com/xq/asp/sid.0/articleid.601EBC4E-58BF-447E-BE5B-533623F4F35B/eTitle.Profile_Richard_Wiseman/qx/display.htm

Finally, can you please throw any light on the following U.S. Court Order dated 30 July 2007:

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

:

IN RE ROYAL DUTCH/SHELL : Civ. No. 04-374 (JAP)

TRANSPORT SECURITIES : (Consolidated Cases)

LITIGATION ::

ORDER

_____:

The following motions are currently pending before the Court in the above-captioned matter: (1) the Royal Dutch/Shell Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and Motion to Sever (Dkt.

#317); (2) Lead Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction (Dkt. #319); and (3) the Royal Dutch/Shell Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (Dkt. #322). Pursuant to this Court's Order dated May 24, 2007, the Court dismisses these three motions without prejudice pending the outcome of proceedings currently taking place before Special Master retired United States District Judge Nicholas H. Politan.

Accordingly, IT IS ON this 30th day of July 2007,

ORDERED that the Royal Dutch/Shell Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and Motion to Sever (Dkt. #317) is hereby DISMISSED without prejudice; and it is further

ORDERED that Lead Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction (Dkt. #319) is hereby DISMISSED without prejudice; and it is further ORDERED that the Royal Dutch/Shell Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment (Dkt. #322) is hereby DISMISSED without prejudice.

/s/ Joel A. Pisano

JOEL A. PISANO, U.S.D.J.

The Order is of course in relation to the remaining class action lawsuit against Shell.

Am I right in saying that it means that basically the case brought by the shareholders (lead plaintiff) is dismissed without being resolved one way or the other, as are Shell's responses (Motion for Summary Judgement and Motion to Dismiss), thereby allowing the legal process to be replaced by the arbitration carried out under the auspices of the Special Master, but leaving open the possibility that the case could be re-opened? The implication seems to be that Shell and the other parties involved have agreed a settlement of the case? We have a special interest in this case, as may become apparent in due course.

I have not yet revealed the existence of the Court Order to any media contacts and will await your comments. I know that if I do give a copy of the Order to one of the major news organisations, they will quickly get one of their lawyers to advise in the drafting of any related news article, but I thought it best to seek your comments in your capacity as Corporate Legal Counsel.

Regards

John Donovan

"Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail"

The Newspaper Marketing Agency: Opening Up Newspapers:

www.nmauk.co.uk

This e-mail and all attachments are confidential and may be privileged. If you have received this e-mail in error, notify the sender immediately. Do not use, disseminate, store or copy it in any way. Statements or opinions in this e-mail or any attachment are those of the author and are not necessarily agreed or authorised by News International (NI). NI Group may monitor emails sent or received for operational or business reasons as permitted by law. NI Group accepts no liability for viruses introduced by this e-mail or attachments. You should employ virus checking software. News International Limited, 1 Virginia St, London E98 1XY, is the holding company for the News International group and is registered in England No 81701

SHELL JOB APPLICATIONS ETC

-----Original Message-----

From: Michelle Efevberha [mailto:michelle@erabahrain.com] Sent: 08 November 2007 07:28

To: zubin999@yahoo.com

Subject: [Fwd: BAHRAIN 50 STOREY FREEHOLD TOWER]

Dear Sir/Madam

ERA PROJECT

MANAMA BAHRAIN

We launched our new a new project on the 21st of October 2007 known as Era tower.

It is a 50 story, residential freehold tower which consists of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom apartments with fabulous views of the Bahrain financial harbor, Ritz Calton, Seef city and sea views located in Seef Area.

Find attached the elevation, location, key plan and payment structure of the project.

For more information contact: +973 36328877.you can log on our website at www.erabahrain.com

Regards

Michelle

Sales and Marketing Executive
Era Project
P.O.Box 20139
Manama
Kingdom of Bahrain
Tel: +973 17580909
Fax: +973 17564747

Mob: +973 36328877

www.erabahrain.com

-----Original Message-----

From: John Donovan [mailto:john@shellnews.net]

Sent: Thursday, November 08, 2007 10:00 AM

To: Brandjes, Michiel CM RDS-LC

Subject: FW: [Fwd: BAHRAIN 50 STOREY FREEHOLD TOWER]

Dear Mr Brandjes

This probably comes under the heading of junk mail but I feel sure that in any event it is meant for Shell not for us.

If you would prefer us to use our judgment and not forward what may be junk mail, then please advise accordingly and we will simply delete when we deem appropriate.

Best Regards
John Donovan

-----Original Message-----

From: michiel.brandjes@shell.com [mailto:michiel.brandjes@shell.com] Sent: 08 November 2007 12:14

To: john@shellnews.net

Subject: RE: [Fwd: BAHRAIN 50 STOREY FREEHOLD TOWER]

Dear Mr.Donovan,

Thank you for forwarding this message. Please feel free not to bother forwarding obvious "spam" like the email about real estate in Bahrain. In case of doubt we would prefer to receive the email though in order that appropriate attention can be given to it. Thank you.

[The Times: Royal Dutch Shell at war with the Donovan family: 22 September 2007](#)

Martin Waller: City Diary

Since the 1990s, Royal Dutch Shell has been at war with a family who registered a website, royaldutchshellplc.com. The Donovan family, led by 90-year-old Burma veteran Alfred, perhaps quixotically want Shell to change its management. Shell has failed to shut down the site, which has

attracted **job applications and, allegedly, even a terrorist threat**, all of which are dutifully passed on to the company. Space does not allow exposition of all the correspondence between the two sides, but there are signs that Shell is developing a sense of humour. A recent letter from general counsel there suggests that “a truly alternative solution for all those people inadvertently contacting you is for you to choose a website and e-mail address without the word ‘shell’ in it”.

Prospect Magazine: Shell's Colchester headache: 12 September 2007

Extract

The Donovans say they have received CVs, business proposals, and even a terrorist threat sent to them: all were intended for Shell. (They kindly forwarded them on.)