
From: John Breeden [GRO]
Sent: Wed 17/07/2013 10:49:04 AM (UTC)
To: [GRO]
Subject: FW: Urgent - FW: FOR ACTION: Ref: ECT 524/13 Customer name: Anna Skoczen
Feedback due: 19/7/13 Case signatory: ? Lin Norbury

John Breeden
Agents Contracts Deployment Manager North



Upper Floors, The Markets Post Office,
6/16 New York Street, Leeds LS2 7DZ



Tel: [GRO] Mobex: [GRO]



[GRO]

POST
OFFICE

From: Nick Beal
Sent: 17 July 2013 08:46
To: John Breeden
Cc: Lin Norbury; Kevin Gilliland; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; Michael Larkin
Subject: Urgent - FW: FOR ACTION: Ref: ECT 524/13 Customer name: Anna Skoczen Feedback due: 19/7/13 Case signatory: ? Lin Norbury

Hi John

Please can you call me asap to discuss this and associated issues regarding suspension and termination process.

We need to review the processes and in the meantime introduce an additional step regarding authorisation of suspensions. I have laid out the few thoughts that I have had on this as follows – please can we discuss.

1. From as soon as we can, any **suspension** needs to be authorised by either Lin or yourself (or presumably Craig). The contracts manager will need to contact one of you to ensure agreement to the decision. We should also consider whether we establish a process whereby you (or Lin or Craig) in these circumstances get authority from a SLT manager – proposed list would be Kevin, Michael, Angela and I – initially I think this would be appropriate in the immediate future for all cases so we can have visibility of this in the centre.
2. We also need to consider the appropriateness of suspension on the following basis:
 - a. If the amount is below a certain level (e.g. £2k) and the spm makes a commitment to pay back (say within a certain period e.g. 1 week max) then no suspension – and these case should be obviously recorded but not necessary to seek authority.
 - b. Can we review this amount on the basis of branch size – e.g. a sliding scale for larger branches

For my own benefit, please can you clarify the approaches we take with multiple and franchise branches – is there anything in the processes we use with these that can be utilised?

Thx

GRO

Nick Beal | Head of Network Development

1st Floor, 148 Old Street, London, EC1V 9HQ

GRO

Postline

GRO

Mobex

GRO

GRO

POST
OFFICE

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 and then delete this email from your system.

From: Kevin Gilliland

Sent: 17 July 2013 08:23

To: Nick Beal

Subject: Fwd: FOR ACTION: Ref: ECT 524/13 Customer name: Anna Skoczen Feedback due: 19/7/13 Case signatory: ? Lin Norbury

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Susan Crichton <

GRO

Date: 17 July 2013 07:48:55 BST

To: Kevin Gilliland <

GRO

Cc: Alwen Lyons <

GRO

Subject: Fwd: FOR ACTION: Ref: ECT 524/13 Customer name: Anna Skoczen Feedback due: 19/7/13 Case signatory: ? Lin Norbury

Kevin have you made any progress re looking at the process for suspension and termination?

Obviously if you have this hasn't filtered down the line.

Also Paula will be chasing for an update today

Susan

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Alwen Lyons <

GRO

Date: 17 July 2013 07:45:23 BST

To: Susan Crichton <

GRO

Subject: Fw: FOR ACTION: Ref: ECT 524/13 Customer name: Anna Skoczen Feedback due: 19/7/13 Case signatory: ? Lin Norbury

Were we reviewing this after the David case

Thanks

Alwen

Alwen Lyons
Company Secretary

GRO

Sent from Blackberry

From: Lin Norbury
Sent: Tuesday, July 16, 2013 10:25 PM
To: Alwen Lyons
Cc: John Breeden
Subject: RE: FOR ACTION: Ref: ECT 524/13 Customer name: Anna Skoczen Feedback due: 19/7/13 Case signatory: ? Lin Norbury

Alwen
No, the process at the time of this termination case and currently has not changed. Suspension cases are progressed by the relevant Contracts Advisor who recommends the case outcome eg re-instatement or summary termination and depending on the geographical location of the branch (North or South) either John Breeden or I review the case and give concurrence as appropriate.
Regards
Lin

Lin Norbury | Agents Contracts Deployment Manager - South

6-16 New York Street LEEDS LS2 7DZ

GRO or Mobex GRO

GRO

From: Alwen Lyons
Sent: 16 July 2013 19:26
To: Lin Norbury
Subject: Re: FOR ACTION: Ref: ECT 524/13 Customer name: Anna Skoczen Feedback due: 19/7/13 Case signatory: ? Lin Norbury

Lin
In view of everything that is going on is there now a new process for signing off terminations etc

Thanks
Alwen

Alwen Lyons
Company Secretary
GRO

On 16 Jul 2013, at 16:31, "Lin Norbury" <GRO> wrote:

Hi Val

Case details entered below as requested. Account was taken that she had repaid all the monies, but that did not out way the facts of theft, fraud, false accounting and password sharing.

Let me know if you think you will need the hard copy file to be retrieved?

Regards

Lin

Lin Norbury | Agents Contracts Deployment Manager - South

6-16 New York Street LEEDS LS2 7DZ

GRO

or Mobex

GRO

GRO

From: Valerie Stanley **On Behalf Of** ECT

Sent: 16 July 2013 13:37

To: Lin Norbury; Pressofficeengland

Cc: Colin Burston; Kathy Sulley; Nigel Parry; Alwen Lyons

Subject: FOR ACTION: Ref: ECT 524/13 Customer name: Anna Skoczen

Feedback due: 19/7/13 Case signatory: ? Lin Norbury

Importance: High

POST OFFICE LTD

**STAKEHOLDER CORRESPONDENCE
TEAM**

**INVESTIGATION & FEEDBACK
REQUIRED**

CASE REF NO: ECT 524/13

DEADLINE FOR FEEDBACK TO ECT:19/7/13

CUSTOMER DETAILS: Anna Skoczen

SUBJECT: termination of contract

BRANCH NAME: Ammanford **BRANCH CODE:** 427642

FOR THE SIGNATURE OF: ? *Lin Norbury*

Hi Lin

Please find attached letter sent to Paula Vennells by ex subpostmistress admitting to inappropriately "borrowing" funds.

I'm not sure if this is on the back of the interim report regarding Horizon integrity as she does mention the lack of support by POL and any management visits. She does also states that the NFSP advised her she shouldn't have admitted her actions and blamed Horizon instead. Were Mrs Skoczen's efforts to repay the money taken into account at all and is there anything that can be done at this late stage to review the case?? - it does look like an appeal has been unsuccessful so I wonder whether we have the full picture.

I'm happy to pull a draft together for your signature once I have the full background to this case, including the appeal and any correspondence already entered into with Mrs Skoczen.

Kathy/Nigel

I have copied this to you as there does seem to be a possibility that we may lose the service given the comments to the end of the first para on page 3.

Alwen

I know that Donna has already sent you over a copy of this - but have included you so you have a copy of all feedback.

pressoffice

I have put you on copy due to comments in penultimate para - threat of taking this further and letting public know how we treat our agents.

Kind regards

Val

Valerie Stanley
Stakeholder Correspondence Team

P/L

GRO

(See attached file: ECT 524-13 Skoczen Anna .pdf)

will be used to prepare the final response and will be shared with the signatory. It may also be recalled in any FOI enquiry.	
Background information & actions taken This should include details relating to customer complaint. (what went wrong/why it went wrong/ what has been done about it)	<image002.gif>An audit was performed at Upper Brynamman Post Office on 6th December 2012 which resulted in a shortage in the branch of £3,198.73. The charges were not keeping the account in the form prescribed by Post Office Ltd and not making losses good without delay, Section 12 paragraphs 4 & 12 of the Subpostmaster Contract refers. At the conduct interview on 16/01/13 Mrs Skoczen said that her problems started around July/August 2012 when she had problems paying her bills for the newspapers from her supplier and the mortgage on the business. Because of the hours she was working following her divorce she employed someone to open up at 05.30am for a couple of hours but this turned into more hours and she found that her expenditure was more than her income. To overcome this problem she made deposits into her business account but did not actually put the cash into the Post Office account. When she completed her branch trading statements she then inflated her cash to hide the losses. This continued until November 2012 when she decided that she had to do something about it as she was not happy with what she was doing. On the 28/11/12 the account was between £7k-£8k short and she settled £4,698.85 centrally as she could pay this off using a credit card and as her husband had said he was due to receive £3k from a job he had done she inflated her mutilated notes to hide this as she intended to put the money into the account when her husband collected the money owed to him. On the day of the audit Mrs Skoczen stated that her husband was in Birmingham collecting the £3k he was owed and that he was coming back to the branch to put it into the account. However at the conduct interview Mrs Skoczen stated that although she believed her husband when he said it was money due to him he had in fact borrowed the cash from his daughter the day before and was on his way to London when she called him. All monies owed have now been repaid. Mrs Skoczen lodged an appeal which was heard by Shirley Hailstones on 7 March 2013. Shirley upheld the original decision to summarily terminate the contract for services. This case was pursued by the POL Security Team; she was interviewed under caution and admissions of theft of Post Office cash of £7000 was made during interview. There were also admissions of fraud, false accounting and money laundering relating to the cash loss. Admissions were made that PO cash was deposited into own personal bank account. Sharing of Horizon username and passwords was also confirmed by offender during interview.

	There is an entry on the EFC which shows a branch visit by Sarah Williams on 12 Sept 06 in respect of the planned refurbishment but cannot see any other entries to suggest further face to face contact. Her appointment date in 2003 predates the EFC by about 3 years so there could be evidence of post appointment visits etc in the hard copy file – do you want this retrieved from Iron Mountain? I have requested the NBSC call logs but do not expect them to reveal anything of any significance. It is likely that this contact now from Mrs Skoczen is driven by her recent request and our refusal to consider an application from her husband for the subsequent Operator vacancy.
Additional Information: Please supply any additional information including any In Commercial Interest or In Confidence, which may assist in completing response or provide a better understanding to the background. Also advise if information can be used in response.	<image002.gif>I am not sure that I am the correct person to sign off the response as I authorised the termination decision.
Information supplied by:	<image002.gif>Lin Norbury

<ECT 524-13 Skoczen Anna .pdf>

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.
