POL00052228

Graham C Ward
04/08/2009 11:54

To: Jarnail A Singh/e/POSTOFFICE GRO
cc:
Subject: Rudkin - Confiscation hearing 21st August - (CRM260283)

Jarnail

In response to the letter dated 24th July, received from Richard Nelson Solicitors.

I've checked Ged's notes and can confirm the Section 16(3) statement was posted to your office on the 6th July, in time for it to be served by the 10th (as per the POCA timetable). If the defence are seeking to adjourn the full confiscation hearing scheduled for the 21st Aug in favour of a 'mention' only, then that is a matter for them to deal with, directly with Stafford Crown Court.

As for the benefit figure, when Ged originally e-mailed you the Section 18, he quoted a figure of £44,689.82 (this figure included the increase in value of money at that time) as being an agreed benefit figure should the court 'incorrectly' decide when sentencing, to award Post Office Ltd compensation without a full POCA 2002 confiscation hearing.

Ged is not aware (as is stated in the Solicitors letter) whether prosecuting Counsel stated in court on the 1st May, that this figure would be the total benefit figure we would be seeking. We would not agree to a 'final' benefit figure, without first conducting a full financial investigation, which is now the case and the reason for a benefit figure of over £300K being detailed on the Section 16(3).

I have also confirmed that Mr Rudkin (the current Subpostmaster) is paying back the loss from his remuneration at £1000 per month which started in December 2008, the outstanding amount is now £35,925.57. However this case involves Mrs Rudkin and it is her benefit from crime figure that is detailed in the Section 16(3).

I hope this clarifies our position, but please ring if there are any queries.

Regards

Graham
Accredited Financial Investigator – Fraud Strand

: Post Office Ltd Security Team, PO BOX 1, Croydon, CR9 1WN
: GRO (Mobex: GRO
: GRO
: GRO Post-line: GRO Fax: GRO