



Breaking News: Trustee Response Received

Trustee Rejects Complaints - Refuses to Seek Beddoe Order

We have received lengthy responses to our Internal Dispute Resolution Procedure (IDRP) complaint to the Trustee (Route 2) and to our solicitor's legally detailed request that the Trustee should seek to have key legal questions considered by the Court via a Beddoe application (Route 1).

The Trustee has rejected in its entirety the IDRP complaint and proposed remedies which were submitted in December 2024. It has also, separately, refused to seek the guidance of the Court to help resolve the matters in dispute.

Furthermore, the Trustee has either rejected - or has reserved making a decision on - the IDRPs submissions made by individual BPPG members (the 'sub-categories' of the main complaint).

You will recall that BP has rejected earlier our separate but related IDRPs complaint to them also.

As you might expect, we intend to take some time to study the details of the Trustee's responses (which run to more than 50 pages) and their grounds for rejecting the complaints. Once complete, we will endeavour to share as much as possible with members - subject always to the Non-Disclosure Agreement restrictions imposed on the Steering Group members by BP and the Trustee.

What we can say now is how extremely disappointed we are that in rejecting our formal complaints, the Trustee makes the following claims:

1. That *“there were no breaches of duty or material errors in relation to the 2022 and 2023 discretionary increase decisions”*
2. That *“BP withdrew its agreement to the Pension Increases Policy during the 2005 Valuation process, and references to the Pension Increase Policy were then deliberately and consciously removed from all scheme-wide publications for this reason.”*
3. That *“the Trustee accepts that the withdrawal of the Pension Increase Policy was not explicitly communicated to members.”*
4. That *“there is ample evidence that by 2022, the vast majority of members were not under the misapprehension that the Pension Increase Policy was still in place.”*
5. That *“the Trustee has seen no material to suggest that the Pension Increase Policy itself was promoted (in any respect) as a term of employment contracts.”*

While we are naturally extremely disappointed, we are somewhat unsurprised by this rejection and these claims by the Trustee and the earlier rejection by BP. The signal failure of the Trustee to entertain a single meeting let alone enter into a dialogue with a body representing 3,000+ pension fund members tells its own story. BP's leadership has repeatedly declared the matter as “closed” even in the face of evidence that it was far from closed.

Despite our scepticism, from early on in this campaign, we realised that there was no short cut to achieving an independent legal determination without first taking expert legal advice and then following appropriate protocols involving evidence gathering and ascertaining the views and position of both BP and the Trustee.

We still have much work to do but we will keep you updated on our progress in the next Bulletin.

Meantime, let us know your thoughts and reactions to this latest development in our campaign at this email address: contact@bppensionergroup.co.uk

Thank you for your support.

Suzie Baverstock
Colum Doyle
Mike Hennessy
Jonathan Popper
Mike Slingsby
Adrienne Tallents

The BPPG Steering Group

Want to know more about the Legal Pathways?

Follow this link to read more <https://tinyurl.com/LegalPathways>



BP Pensioners Group

BP Pensioner Group

contact@bppensionergroup.org

This email was sent to xxxxxxxx
You've received it because you've subscribed to our newsletter.

[View in browser](#) | [Unsubscribe](#) | [Update contact info](#)