

Message

From: Chris Aujard [IMCEAEX-
_O=MMS_OU=EXCHANGE+20ADMINISTRATIVE+20GROUP+20+28FYDIBOHF23SPDLT+29_CN=RECIPIENTS_CN=CHRISTOPHER+20AA04
80B7-40D2-ADE7-6F6FEAE19CC3F88@C72A47.ingest.local]
on Chris Aujard <IMCEAEX-
behalf _O=MMS_OU=EXCHANGE+20ADMINISTRATIVE+20GROUP+20+28FYDIBOHF23SPDLT+29_CN=RECIPIENTS_CN=CHRISTOPHER+20AA04
of 80B7-40D2-ADE7-6F6FEAE19CC3F88@C72A47.ingest.local> [IMCEAEX-
_O=MMS_OU=EXCHANGE+20ADMINISTRATIVE+20GROUP+20+28FYDIBOHF23SPDLT+29_CN=RECIPIENTS_CN=CHRISTOPHER+20AA04
80B7-40D2-ADE7-6F6FEAE19CC3F88@C72A47.ingest.local]
Sent: 28/01/2014 08:09:22
To: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd [GRO]
CC: Paula Vennells [GRO]; Martin Edwards [GRO] David Oliver1
[GRO]
Subject:Re: URGENT

Hi Paula- just picking up on that part of Alice's question that relates to paying compensation, I think that it is fair to say that we acted within our contractual powers previously (under the "old" policy), and that we will continue to act within our contractual powers under the "new" policy. I think that any claim for compensation that is based on the notion that once we have set a policy, then it must be fixed in stone for all time (as otherwise it is an admission of liability) is flawed, and would arguably lead to very strange policy setting behaviour. It strikes me that it is also fair to say that our world has changed a lot in the last few years, and one would therefore expect our policies to change as well.....Chris

Sent from my iPhone

On 28 Jan 2014, at 07:47 am, "Angela Van-Den-Bogerd" [GRO] wrote:

Paula,

There are still cases today that we precautionary suspend as detailed on the example page that you have so not all of the 147 cases would fall into the no precautionary suspension category. Each case would need to be assessed on the facts and to put this in to context we have 147 cases over a period of 13 years.

From reviewing the 147 cases there are a few that if we were dealing with that case today we would probably have not precautionary suspended but for the majority these are probably at the other end of the spectrum.

Hope this helps.

Angela

GRO

From: Paula Vennells
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2014 07:21 AM
To: Chris Aujard; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; Martin Edwards; David Oliver1
Subject: URGENT

Hi all, please can I have a couple of lines re Alice's query immediately below - suggest everyone 'replies all' rather than try and coordinate at this stage. Thx Paula

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Alice Perkins <[REDACTED]>
Date: 27 January 2014 21:34:11 GMT
To: "david.oliver1" <[REDACTED]>, "paula.vennells" <[REDACTED]>
Cc: "martin.edwards1" <[REDACTED]>, "jorja.preston" <[REDACTED]>, "theresa.iles" <[REDACTED]>, "sarah.paddison" <[REDACTED]>, "christopher.aujard" <[REDACTED]>, "rodric.williams" <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: Further briefing for tomorrow

A question for tomorrow at 9am.

If we have changed our policies so dramatically on suspensions etc, isn't that an admission that we got it wrong in the past and should therefore automatically pay compensation to all affected?

Alice

From: David Oliver1 <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, January 27, 2014 06:14 PM GMT Standard Time
To: Paula Vennells <[REDACTED]>; Alice Perkins
Cc: Martin Edwards <[REDACTED]>; Jorja Preston <[REDACTED]>; Theresa Iles <[REDACTED]>; Sarah Paddison <[REDACTED]>; Chris Aujard <[REDACTED]>; Rodric Williams <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Further briefing for tomorrow

Alice, Paula,

Please find attached is further briefing from Chris following a phone call from Ian Henderson.

Also attached a draft agenda that James has sent through after seeing ours, I suggest we ask to take business improvement first at the start of the meeting as this sets the tone for our wider engagement.

There are some further bullet points below setting out a proposed response to the past cases issue:

- Cartwright King have reviewed past cases in line with a process that has been by endorsed by leading Counsel.
- 325 individuals cases were reviewed to see if any issues arising out of the Second Sight review ought to be disclosed to the defence in accordance with our duties as a prosecutor.
- Further disclosure was provided in 21 cases.
- It is up to the defence in cases where disclosure has been provided to review the material and take any appropriate action in the interests of their client.
- Thus far no convicted defendant has sought the leave of the Court of Appeal to challenge his conviction; this may of course change.
- Post Office is still confident that we have not seen an unsafe conviction. We continue to keep this matter under constant review as the Second Sight work and Post Office's own investigations into the complaints continue.

- All 147 applications (including those with a criminal conviction) are being overseen by a former Criminal Court of Appeal Judge Sir Anthony Hooper.

Regards

David

David Oliver
Programme Manager
Initial Complaint and Mediation Scheme
David.oliver1 **GRO**
Mobile **GRO**

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended for the addressee only. If you are not the named recipient, you must not use, disclose, reproduce, copy or distribute the contents of this communication. If you have received this in error, please contact the sender by reply email and then delete this email from your system. Any views or opinions expressed within this email are solely those of the sender, unless otherwise specifically stated.

POST OFFICE LIMITED is registered in England and Wales no 2154540. Registered Office: 148 OLD STREET, LONDON EC1V 9HQ.

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

This message has been scanned for malware by Websense. www.websense.com