



# Telephone attendance

Client: Royal Mail Group PLC Sub Postmaster Litigation

Matter: Mr Lee Castleton

Matter no: 348035.134

Attending:

Name: Stephen Dilley

Location: N/A

Date: 22 December 2006

Start time:

Units:

I had a telephone conversation with Richard Morgan. He was calling from Australia. He explained that he had a text from his clerks about the hearing on 11 January 2007. He said that in his view we should adopt the position that if there was anything new from the documents that he wanted to put to our witnesses or make any submissions about it, that he could. If there wasn't, then the hearing would stand and judgment should follow that day.

I agreed. I reminded Richard that it was Anne Chambers evidence that the only thing that that document showed was the error that would not have effected the IT system at Marine Drive in such a way as to cause the losses. In other words her evidence was that it was irrelevant.

Also explaining to him that the spreadsheet doesn't make a great deal of sense. It does refer to a software upgrade on 1 April (the date that Ruth Simpson had problems balancing), but that the upgrade took place in the evening after she would have left for the day and it is therefore irrelevant. Reading him the few lines of the narrative. I said that I had asked Fujitizu to explain what that meant.

Time engaged including attendance note: 12 minutes