
To: Chris Hodges [GRO]
Cc: Rob BRIGHTWELL (DBT) [GRO]
Subject: Letter to Lord Chancellor
Attachment: 240109 Nick Read to Lord Chancellor - FINAL.pdf
Attachment: Lord Chancellor - attachment.pdf

Chris

Thank you for your email requesting sight of Nick Read's letter to the Lord Chancellor, a copy of which is attached. I have also attached a copy of the Peters and Peters note referred to in Nick's letter. This note was not solicited by Post Office and as can be seen, was sent to express the personal views of its author. Post Office are fully supportive of any steps taken by Government to speed up the exoneration of those with wrongful convictions and to provide redress to victims, with the attached information having been provided to inform that consideration.

In the interests of transparency, we are publishing the letter and the Peters & Peters' note on our website shortly.

We stand ready to assist the Advisory Board and wider Government in any way we can. Similarly, Peters and Peters would be happy to attend to answer any questions you or your colleagues may have.

Regards

Simon

Simon Recaldin
Remediation Unit Director
Post Office Ltd | 100 Wood Street | London | EC2V 7ER
Tel: [GRO]
Email: [GRO]

The information classification of this email is confidential unless otherwise stated.

From: Christopher Hodges [GRO]
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 9:36 AM
To: Simon Recaldin [GRO]
Cc: Rob BRIGHTWELL (DBT) [GRO]
Subject: POL: Letter to Lord Chancellor

Caution: This email has been sent by an external contact. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments. When in doubt, please use the "Report Phishing" button.

Dear Simon,

There has been some press comment about the letter that Nick Reid apparently wrote to the Lord Chancellor around Christmas saying that PO (presumably on the advice of its independent KC team) concluded that 300 convictions were safe. The media reports seem to us unclear about exactly what was contended by POL. Colleagues and I on the HCAB are extremely interested to have some greater clarity on this, in the public interest, and also as a matter of compensation.

The letter might have contended that, as the KCs told us when we met them, that *on the basis of evidence available to the PO, and on the basis of the existing law*, PO would feel obliged to oppose an appeal in a particular case. However, we believe that (a) wider evidence is now available, albeit not having been necessarily put before the CACD, and that wider grounds for overturning are also available, again albeit that the arguments have not yet been put before CACD.

Alternatively, the letter might have contended that PO has 'separate/other' cogent evidence in the 300 cases that individuals were guilty.

May we please see the letter?

Thanks and kind regards,
Chris

Christopher Hodges OBE PhD FSALS FRSA
Emeritus Professor of Justice Systems, Centre for Socio-Legal Studies, University of Oxford
Supernumerary Fellow, Wolfson College, Oxford
Chair, Regulatory Horizons Council
Chair, Horizon Compensation Advisory Board
Chair, Housing and Property Redress Group
Co Founder, International Network for Delivery of Regulation