

Message

**From:** Rodric Williams [GRO]  
**on behalf of** Rodric Williams [GRO]  
**Sent:** 23/04/2014 14:32:04  
**To:** Westbrook, Mark \(\UK - Manchester\) [GRO]  
**CC:** James, Gareth \(\UK - Manchester\) [GRO]; Belinda Crowe [GRO]  
**Subject:** STRICTLY PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL – SUBJECT TO LEGAL PRIVILEGE FW: Post Office Mediation Claims  
**Attachments:** Lepton Report - Appendix 1 (redacted).pdf; Lepton credence data for 04-10-12.xls; Lepton fujitsu data for 04-10-12 GJ.XLSX; Lepton 4 to 25 Oct 12.xls; Lepton Events 4 to 25 Oct 12.xls; Spot Review 1 Response - redacted.pdf; Re: Post Office Mediation Claims.

STRICTLY PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL – SUBJECT TO LEGAL PRIVILEGE

Mark,

As discussed, I am forwarding the "Lepton Report" (with attachments) as sent in response to an email from a solicitor advising a number of applicants to the Mediation Scheme (also attached).

As you will see from our email response, the issue raised in the Lepton Report was more fully addressed in our response to "Spot Review 1", which you have already seen. I nevertheless attach this now in case it assists in providing an example of how Post Office uses Horizon data. My apologies if it would have been helpful for you to have received this sooner

Kind regards, Rodric

Rodric Williams | Litigation Lawyer



148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ



[Post Office stories](#)

[@postofficenews](#)



**From:** Rodric Williams  
**Sent:** 15 April 2014 18:39  
**To:** p.singh [GRO]  
**Subject:** Post Office Mediation Claims

Dear Ms Maru-Singh

I refer to your email of 7 April 2014 to Chris Aujard.

The version of the report sent to Ms Robinson ("the Lepton Report") was redacted to protect the privacy and personal information of the individuals named in that Report. This was done to ensure compliance with the Data Protection Act 1998. We will therefore not be providing an un-redacted copy of the Lepton Report.

As requested, please find attached a copy of Appendix 1 to the Lepton Report along with copies of the spreadsheets embedded in Appendix 1. To protect the privacy of those referred to in these documents we have again redacted any personal data. In particular, in the spreadsheets we have deleted the data from the "user id" and "employee id" columns.

I also attach a copy of Post Office's response to Second Sight's Spot Review 1, which was prepared and disclosed to Second Sight before the publication of its interim report. Again, this document has been redacted to protect the privacy of the individuals involved. This Spot Review addresses the same transactions as raised in the Lepton Report. However, whereas the Lepton Report is focused on the presentation of data from Horizon, the Spot Review 1 Response directly addresses the issue raised in your email about reversal transactions. I trust that this document helps demonstrate that the reversal transactions in question did not occur without the knowledge of the subpostmaster.

For the sake of good order, I note that Post Office disagrees with the statements in your email about the integrity of data on Horizon and the safety of convictions. Further, Post Office maintains that the disclosure of the un-redacted Lepton Report or Appendix 1 to that report was not required for it to comply with its prosecution disclosure duties.

I do not believe that this matter should delay the submission of your clients' CQRs. However, should you require further time on any particular case you may of course apply in the usual way to the Working Group for an extension – please make this request in writing to [schemeenquiries@postoffice.gov.uk](mailto:schemeenquiries@postoffice.gov.uk)

Yours sincerely, Rodric Williams

Rodric Williams I Litigation Lawyer

---



148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ

**GRO**

[Post Office stories](#)

[@postofficeneeds](#)

