

Message

---

**From:** Brian Altman [GRO]  
**Sent:** 28/08/2015 08:29:31  
**To:** Parsons, Andrew [/O=BOND PEARCE/OU=First Administrative Group/cn=Recipients/cn=ap6]  
**CC:** Matthews, Gavin [/O=BOND PEARCE/OU=First Administrative Group/cn=Recipients/cn=grm1]  
**Subject:** Re: Post Office - Balancing Transactions [BD-4A.FID26610170]

Andy

Your email reflects, as I now recall it, the effect of our discussions on that topic on 21 July.

While I was away I was alerted to the Panorama programme that went out. I have just watched it.

I think it amounts to little more than sensationalistic reporting.

I think the programme has confused the crime of theft with the crime of false accounting so that it leaves the viewer with the false idea there has to be theft of money to be guilty of false accounting.

The alleged pressure letter re theft/false accounting was clearly about the ease of POCA recovery & I doubt had any bearing on whether or not theft should be charged in order to trigger a false accounting plea.

The whistleblower only worked at Fujitsu between 2001 and 2004 so what's his relevance thereafter?

Ian Henderson failed to disclose any bugs we had not known about before and McLachlan (Misra's computer expert) complained that he would like to have had disclosure of another bug which the programme evens admits in passing had no relevance to her branch.

Brian

**Brian Altman QC**  
Chambers of William Clegg QC  
2 Bedford Row  
London WC1R 4BU  
personal website: [www.brianaltmanqc-barrister.com](http://www.brianaltmanqc-barrister.com)  
chambers website: [www.2bedfordrow.co.uk](http://www.2bedfordrow.co.uk)  
email: [baltman@2bedfordrow.co.uk](mailto:baltman@2bedfordrow.co.uk) [GRO]  
tel: [GRO]

---

**From:** Parsons, Andrew [GRO]  
**Sent:** 27 August 2015 10:49  
**To:** Brian Altman  
**Cc:** Matthews, Gavin  
**Subject:** Post Office - Balancing Transactions [BD-4A.FID26610170]

Brian

I hope your trial went well.

A few weeks back we discussed the issue of Balancing Transactions within Horizon and whether further disclosures were required (email attached).

My record of the output of those discussions was that:

- There is currently no need for POL to give any further general disclosure to SPMRs who have been prosecuted about BTs.
- In relation to New Horizon (ie. 2010 onwards), we know from information provided by Fujitsu that the only BT was in a branch not touched by any prosecution so there is no disclosure to give in this regard.
- In relation to Old Horizon (ie. before 2010), POL are not currently aware of any BTs, albeit that this is due to limitations in the ability to quickly search for this information within Old Horizon. POL does not have an obligation to go on a fishing expedition to find any possible BTs, particularly one that would be extremely onerous and costly.
  - General complaints by SPMRs about "remote access" or "mysterious transactions" was not sufficient to trigger a general disclosure around BTs. If a SPMR raises a focussed complaint targeted at particular transactions or events, POL may then need to make disclosures in those circumstances. However, it does not need to go looking for those circumstances.
  - If POL knew that a prosecuted branch operating Old Horizon had been subject to a BT, that specific fact may trigger a disclosure in that specific case. At present, we understand that POL is not aware of any affected branch and therefore does not need to go searching for this information.
  - If the CCRC were to make enquiries around this topic (given that the existence of BTs has been disclosed to the CCRC in Second Sight's reports), POL may then need to consider doing some form of investigation. However, such investigation would likely be limited to those cases before the CCRC ie. a more limited exercise and one within parameters agreed with the CCRC.

POL would you like your confirmation that I've accurately captured our discussions so that they have an audit trail on this point in case they need to revisit it later.

Do you agree with the above? If you would like to discuss, please feel free to call Gavin or me.

A response sometime next week would be great.

Kind regards  
Andy

**Andrew Parsons**  
Managing Associate

*Bond Dickinson*

Direct: **GRO**  
Mobile:

Follow Bond Dickinson:



[www.bonddickinson.com](http://www.bonddickinson.com)

Please consider the environment! Do you need to print this email?

The information in this e-mail and any attachments is confidential and may be legally privileged and protected by law. baltman[REDACTED] only is authorised to access this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not baltman[REDACTED] please notify [andrew.parsons@baltman\[REDACTED\]](#) as soon as possible and delete any copies. Unauthorised use, dissemination, distribution, publication or copying of this communication or attachments is prohibited and may be unlawful.

Any files attached to this e-mail will have been checked by us with virus detection software before transmission. Bond Dickinson LLP accepts no liability for any loss or damage which may be caused by software viruses and you should carry out your own virus checks before opening any attachment.

Content of this email which does not relate to the official business of Bond Dickinson LLP, is neither given nor endorsed by it.

This email is sent by Bond Dickinson LLP which is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales under number OC317661. Our registered office is 4 More London Riverside, London, SE1 2AU, where a list of members' names is open to inspection. We use the term partner to refer to a member of the LLP, or an employee or consultant who is of equivalent standing. Our VAT registration number is GB123393627.

Bond Dickinson LLP is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority.