

Catherine Churchard LLB
Solicitor & Legal Services Director

17 March 2005

Messrs Frisby & Co
Solicitors
26 Eastgate Street
Stafford ST16 2LZ
For the attention of Andrew W Broome
BY FAX (GRO)

Legal Services
Impact House
2 Edridge Road
Croydon
CR9 1PJ

Tel: [REDACTED]
Fax: [REDACTED]

Our Ref: CRM/23950-1/DH/dmt
Your Ref: AB/VK/10161

Dear Sirs

REGINA -v- CARL ADRIAN PAGE
STAFFORD CROWN COURT

I write in answer to your letter of 25th January 2005. I apologise for the delay, but your requests needed to be considered by Mr Manish Patel and I also asked Counsel to advise, and he has been heavily committed. For ease of reference, I will refer to the pages and paragraphs of your letter.

PAGE 1

Paragraph 2

I hope that an expert report upon which you intend to rely is served as soon as practicable, as is required under the Crown Court Rules 1982.

PAGE 2

Paragraph 1

With reference to exhibit LGH/04, an explanation of the make up of the schedule was provided on page 2, point 10 of my letter of 7th October 2004. There is no raw data for your expert to examine. If it is being suggested that the information contained on exhibit LGH/04 is incorrect, one merely has to compare the figures in terms of volume and value indicated on LGH/04 with what appears on the Forde Moneychanger till rolls (the rolls in their entirety having been copied and supplied to you). It will be seen that the volume of euros despatched matches with the Forde Moneychanger entries as the recipient is required to key in both the volume and exchange rates into the machine. If Mr Page had received a lesser amount of euros or indeed a greater amount of euros then ordered, one would have expected (a) that he would have queried that with Hemel Hempstead and (b) that he would have keyed into the Forde Moneychanger the amount of euros he actually received and not what was indicated on the despatch note. It can be seen the he keyed in the same values as those indicated on exhibit LGH/04, hence Mr Page acknowledged receipt of that quantity.

t:\criminal work folders\helszajn debbie\28135-6 page and **GRO** 440-defencefrsby.doc

Churchard LLB
Director & Legal Services Director

Paragraph 2

I confirm that we are not in possession of any such material.

Paragraph 3

This list was generated from the Borders system to encompass all currency types (and not just euros as requested by Mr Hutchins) despatched to Rugeley between the given period, and relies on the same data which made up LGH/04. Again I can confirm that no documents/material exist which show actual orders which make up those figures. The 16 page list is not an exhibit and was merely provided to you in an effort to answer your queries.

Paragraph 4

Mr Hutchins in his 1st statement dated 11th March 2003, page 5 and Mr Stacey in his 1st statement dated 23rd September 2003 refer to revaluation; indeed Mr Stacey provides a comprehensive explanation through the use of an example. I am not in a position to supply a fuller explanation, which will have to await cross-examination.

Paragraph 5 – Other matters

The schedule referred to in this paragraph is the working schedule which was produced and used by Customs & Excise during the initial stages of the enquiry. This schedule was not complete and has since been updated by schedule **MP/80** having taken the raw data from exhibits produced by Pippa Barker (Thomas Cook) and Clare Parker (First Choice Retail).

I have earlier indicated my position in relation to Customs & Excise material. If you wish to pursue it, you must do so by the normal third party procedure.

PAGE 3

Paragraph 1

I dealt with this at page 4, point 5 of my letter of 7th October. There is no further disclosure to be made. Any issue which arises can be dealt with in cross-examination of Mr Coney.

Paragraph 2

The date of issue of Exhibit RK/01 is dealt with at Point 3 of my letter of 1 December 2004.

Paragraph 3

I can confirm both points raised.

Paragraph 4

The Police, both the FIU (Financial Investigation Unit) and the MCU (Major Crime Unit) completed separate disclosure schedules, which have been served on you. Following receipt of the Defence Statements the Police have been made aware of the defence and have no further documents/material to disclose as a result of the Defence Statement.

t:\criminal work folders\helszajn debbie\28135-6 page and **GRO** 40-defencefrisby.doc

Cont...

Paragraph 5

As you know, in order to maintain a clear separation between the criminal and civil proceedings, the civil action is being conducted by Hugh James of Cardiff on behalf of this office. I have been assiduous in maintaining the separation between the two sets of proceedings because of suggestions made on behalf of GRO (misconceived in my view and that of Counsel, and long since abandoned) that this office conducting the civil proceedings might amount to an abuse of process. Accordingly, you should apply to that firm for any documentation which you seek.

For the avoidance of doubt, I do not consider that any such material could fairly be considered as secondary let alone primary disclosure. In any event, the documentation was plainly available to your client. It seems more than a little late to consider that this is material falling for primary disclosure.

Paragraph 6

Margaret Pearce no longer works as a clerk at Rugeley Post Office. We have her contact details, and will be happy to facilitate arrangements for you to speak to her. I understand that she and all the staff at Rugeley provided statements to Hand Morgan & Owen, but unsurprisingly they have not been supplied to me!

Yours faithfully

Debbie Helszajn

Senior Lawyer
Criminal Law Team