
From: Andy Hayward[IMCEAEX-
_O=MMS_OU=EXCHANGE+20ADMINISTRATIVE+20GROUP+20+28FYDIBOHF23SPDLT+29
_CN=RECIPIENTS_CN=ANDY+2EHAYWARD FDF079BE-E651-417F-B3AB-
257F7B463F5E@C72A47.ingest.local]
Sent: Mon 11/03/2013 9:27:59 AM (UTC)
To: John M Scott [GRO] Helen
Dickinson [GRO]
Cc: Rob King [GRO] Keith Gilchrist [GRO] Darrell
Kennedy [GRO] Dave Posnett [GRO]
Andrew Daley [GRO]
Subject: RE: New Draft Criminal Enforcement & Prosecution Policy EPP

John,
Will do.

Helen,
Can we discuss and collate additional through yourself as before please.
Thanks,

Andy

Andy Hayward | Senior Security Programme Manager



Midway House 1 Elliott Way
Birmingham B6 7AP



GRO

Mobex:

GRO



GRO



post.office.securit

GRO

POST
OFFICE

From: John M Scott
Sent: 11 March 2013 09:11
To: Andy Hayward
Cc: Rob King; Keith Gilchrist; Darrell Kennedy; Helen Dickinson; Dave Posnett; Andrew Daley
Subject: FW: New Draft Criminal Enforcement & Prosecution Policy EPP

Andy & et al.

Please find the latest draft of the EPP with some of the amendments made from last time. I notice that they've not included all the areas raised (i.e. confiscation initiation before decision to prosecute).

Can you please review the document and feedback any comments by Friday of this week – through one person please. We need to challenge where appropriate.

Cheers.

John.

From: Hugh Flemington
Sent: 05 March 2013 18:00
To: John M Scott; Jarnail A Singh; Susan Crichton; Alwen Lyons
Subject: New Draft Criminal Enforcement & Prosecution Policy EPP

Redraft attached following our last meeting on it.

Have taken on board comments from John's team plus those made at the meeting. Some further explanation of changes below:

1. **Deterrence** – there was previous reference in the "focussed" section of the EPP but has been amended.
2. **Cover criminal activity against POL** – the policy does cover any type of criminal activity against POL which it then decides to prosecute.
3. **Can the investigation be handed over to the Police?** – This is possible and is discussed in the Internal Protocol. A couple of additions to this EPP made to also reflect this.
4. **Human Rights** – in investigating and prosecuting POL is exercising what would generally be considered a public function. Whilst it may not strictly be required to comply with the Human Rights Act (see previous advice from Stephen Hocking), previous criticism around the way in which POL is perceived to manage enforcement and prosecution (and questions in Parliament) has driven this exercise of looking at systems/ procedures and transparency and Beachcrofts therefore suggest the spirit of Art 6 HRA (i.e. due process/ fair trial) should be followed so as to avoid future criticism (and indeed prevent CPS terminating a private prosecution as they are entitled to do). In order to comply with the spirit of the HRA, having a clear and transparent policy and internal protocol is the first step. The next step is of course following it and of course following other requirements on prosecution such as CPIA disclosure, PACE etc. These Acts/ Regs are referenced in the EPP.
5. **Departure from Policy** – Amended in line with discussions.

Any more comments plse or does everyone now agree with this draft?

Kind regards
hugh

Hugh Flemington | Head of Legal



148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ



GRO

Mobex:

GRO



GRO



[Post Office stories](#)



[@postofficenews](https://twitter.com/postofficenews)

POST
OFFICE