

SUPPLEMENT No. 1

TO: THE CASE OF PHILIP HYLAND EXAMINED

SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENTIAL UPDATE

THE MINERVA ADVISORY GROUP: PAUL EASTER AND GARY GRACEY - A MATERIAL CHRONOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT

21 August 2026

Purpose of this Supplement

This bulletin is issued as Supplement No. 1 to the paper, THE CASE OF PHILIP HYLAND EXAMINED.

Its purpose is narrow but important.

Following publication and compilation of the principal paper, further examination of archived material relating to the Minerva Advisory Group has materially clarified the chronology concerning Paul Easter and Gary Gracey.

The significance lies not merely in establishing that both men were associated with the same organisation. The newly identified archived material indicates that their respective associations with Minerva were publicly recorded before Paul Easter's February 2022 approach to the Solicitors Regulation Authority concerning PJH Law and continued through the period culminating in Gary Gracey's participation in the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal hearing concerning Philip Hyland in July 2024.

That chronology requires the evidential position recorded in the principal paper to be supplemented.

1. The Earlier Evidential Position

The principal paper identified a potentially relevant connection between Paul Easter and Gary Gracey through the Minerva Advisory Group.

Caution was required as to chronology.

In particular, it was necessary to avoid suggesting that a subsequently identified organisational association necessarily existed at the time of the events beginning in February 2022.

Further archived material now substantially resolves that chronological question.

2. The 25 January 2022 Archived Record

A Wayback Machine capture dated 25 January 2022 of the Minerva Advisory Group website publicly identifies both men within the Minerva structure.

The archived material identifies:

Gary Gracey - “Policing/ Counter Terrorism”

and:

Paul Easter - “counter Terrorism/Intelligence”

Separate archived Minerva profile material describes Gracey's extensive policing, intelligence and counter-terrorism background.

The archived profile for Easter similarly records extensive counter-terrorism and intelligence experience, including roles associated with the UK Joint Defence School of Intelligence, the Joint Terrorism Analysis Centre and Cabinet Office Crisis Machinery.

The significance of the date is immediate.

25 January 2022 predates Paul Easter's approach to the SRA concerning PJH Law.

The common Minerva association therefore cannot properly be characterised merely as a connection arising after the material events.

3. Paul Easter's Approach to the SRA

As documented in the principal paper, on 15 February 2022, Paul Easter approached the Solicitors Regulation Authority concerning PJH Law.

That communication forms part of a wider DHSC documentary sequence concerning Philip Hyland and his firm.

The principal paper examines, among other matters, DHSC records referring to:

“our interest in this individual and the steps we took with the Solicitors Regulation Authority.”

The newly clarified Minerva chronology means that, when Easter made his approach to the SRA, both Easter and Gracey were already publicly presented within the same specialist advisory organisation.

That is a fact.

What, if anything, followed from that association is a separate evidential question.

4. Gary Gracey's Subsequent SDT Role

Gary Gracey subsequently became a lay member of the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal.

Of particular significance, he was then one of the three members comprising the Tribunal which heard the substantive proceedings:

SOLICITORS REGULATION AUTHORITY LTD

and

PHILIP JULIAN PAUL HYLAND

The judgment records the Tribunal as:

Mr E Nally (in the Chair)

Mr C Cowx

Mr G Gracey

The hearing took place between 1 and 4 July 2024.

Accordingly, the relevant chronology now contains three established points:

- 25 January 2022 - archived Minerva material publicly associates both Easter and Gracey with Minerva.
- 15 February 2022 - Easter approaches the SRA concerning PJH Law.

- 1 to 4 July 2024 - Gracey sits as a member of the Tribunal determining the substantive SRA proceedings against Philip Hyland.

But, the newly examined archive also provides a fourth point.

5. The 19 July 2024 Archived Record

A further Wayback Machine capture dated 19 July 2024 continues publicly to identify both men within Minerva's organisational structure.

Gracey is shown in connection with:

“Policing/ Counter Terrorism”

while Easter is identified in connection with:

“counter Terrorism/Intelligence”

This capture post-dates the 1 to 4 July 2024 SDT hearing.

The evidenced Minerva overlap therefore appears to straddle the material period.

Put chronologically:

- Easter and Gracey are publicly associated through Minerva before Easter's SRA complaint
- Easter approaches the SRA concerning PJH Law.

- Gracey subsequently becomes involved as an SDT member.
- Gracey sits upon Philip Hyland's substantive disciplinary hearing.
- archived Minerva material continues publicly to present both Easter and Gracey within the Minerva structure after that hearing.

That is materially different from discovering only a later or incidental association between the two men.

6. What the Evidence Establishes

The evidence presently establishes that:

- Paul Easter and Gary Gracey were publicly presented within the Minerva Advisory Group structure by 25 January 2022;
- their identified specialist areas, counter-terrorism, intelligence and policing, were closely related;
- the documented Minerva association therefore existed before Easter's 15 February 2022 approach to the SRA concerning PJH Law;
- Gracey subsequently sat as a member of the SDT determining the substantive regulatory proceedings against Philip Hyland in July 2024; and

- archived Minerva material dated 19 July 2024 continued publicly to identify both men within the organisation.

Those matters can now properly form part of the evidential chronology.

7. What the Evidence Does Not Establish

The distinction between evidence and inference remains essential.

The material presently examined does not, without further evidence, establish that:

- Paul Easter and Gary Gracey personally knew one another;
- they worked together on any particular Minerva project;
- they communicated concerning Philip Hyland or PJH Law;
- Gracey knew that Easter had approached the SRA concerning PJH Law;
- Easter had any involvement in Gracey's appointment to, or participation in, the SDT;
- Gracey's decision-making was influenced by the Minerva association; or
- the constitution or determination of the Tribunal was improper.

No such conclusion is made in this Supplement.

The importance of the new evidence is instead that it identifies an objectively verifiable organisational association whose chronology now overlaps the events under examination.

8. The Disclosure Question

That gives rise to a legitimate and considerably narrower question:

What was the nature and extent of the professional association between Paul Easter and Gary Gracey through the Minerva Advisory Group during the period relevant to Philip Hyland's case?

That leads naturally to a second:

Was Gary Gracey aware, when sitting upon Philip Hyland's case, of Paul Easter's role in approaching the SRA concerning PJH Law?

And a third:

Was the common Minerva association known to, considered by, or disclosed to the SDT, the SRA, Philip Hyland or the parties before Mr Gracey participated in determining the proceedings?

Those questions should not be answered by speculation.

They are capable of being answered by evidence.

9. Why the Chronology Matters

The significance of this development must be understood within the wider documentary chronology examined in *THE CASE OF PHILIP HYLAND EXAMINED*.

The principal paper concerns an unusual sequence involving Government interest in a solicitor engaged in challenges concerning Covid policy; DHSC security structures; the criminal complaint recorded as CRN 6029679/21; an approach from within the Government vaccine-security environment to the solicitor's professional regulator; subsequent regulatory proceedings; and questions concerning disclosure.

Against that background, the identity and professional connections of those materially involved cannot simply be treated as biographical curiosities.

Equally, a professional association is not evidence of wrongdoing.

The correct forensic approach lies between those two positions.

Where an individual who initiated a regulatory complaint and an individual who subsequently participated in determining

the resulting regulatory proceedings are shown by contemporaneous archived material to have been associated through the same specialist organisation across the relevant period, the existence, nature and disclosure of that association become legitimate matters for examination.

10. The Evidential Position Has Changed

The principal paper deliberately distinguished between what could be established and what remained uncertain.

That discipline must continue.

But it works in both directions.

Where uncertainty is subsequently resolved by contemporaneous documentary evidence, the evidential record must be updated accordingly.

The proposition can now safely be put no higher, but also no lower, than this:

Contemporaneous archived material places Paul Easter and Gary Gracey within the Minerva Advisory Group structure before Easter's February 2022 approach to the SRA concerning PJH Law. Gary Gracey subsequently sat upon Philip Hyland's substantive SDT proceedings in July 2024.

Archived Minerva material continued to present both men within that structure after the hearing.

The existence of that chronology does not determine its significance. It requires its significance to be examined.

Conclusion

This Supplement makes no allegation of misconduct against Paul Easter, Gary Gracey, the Solicitors Regulation Authority or the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal arising from the Minerva association.

It does something more limited - It records newly clarified evidence.

The dates are now important.

The Minerva association did not merely follow the events.

On the presently available archived record, it preceded Easter's approach to the SRA and continued through the period in which Gracey ultimately sat upon Philip Hyland's disciplinary proceedings.

The appropriate response is therefore neither accusation nor dismissal.

It is disclosure.

- *What was the relationship?*

- *What did each man know?*
- *When did he know it?*
- *Was the association disclosed?*
- *And, if it was not disclosed, why not?*

Those questions now arise from the documentary chronology itself.

They should be answered in the same way - By evidence.

Ian Clayton

21 August 2026