

Message

From: Patrick Bourke
on behalf of Patrick Bourke
Sent: 24/05/2016 06:59:44
To: Jane MacLeod
Subject: FW: Post Office Limited - Update and Request for Further Advice
Attachments: Sealed claim form (defendant's copy).pdf

GRO

GRO

You obviously have the magic touch...

From: Rodric Williams
Sent: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 12:33 AM
To: Jonathan.Swift
Cc: Christopher Knight; Patrick Bourke; Jane MacLeod; Mark Underwood1; John.Davitt
Subject: Post Office Limited - Update and Request for Further Advice

GRO

GRO

Jonathan,

POL has been progressing the 8 recommendations you made in your January 2016 Chairman's report concerning the further steps that POL might reasonably take in respect of the SPMR cases. With respect to the recommendations concerning Horizon (recommendations 3, 4 and 5) and POL's suspense accounts (recommendation 8), Deloitte LLP has scoped work that could be taken to address the recommendations, and has provided to POL a range of procedures which could be performed.

POL is now considering the further instructions it could provide to Deloitte. Influencing these considerations is that on 11 April 2016, court proceedings were started against POL when 91 Claimants issued a Claim Form in the High Court of Justice, Queen's Bench Division (copy attached). The Claim Form has not been served (it was provided to us for information only), and is not currently supported by a Statement of Case. It has however been supplemented by a letter dated 28 April 2016 from the Claimants solicitors, Freeths LLP, purportedly sent pursuant to the Practice Direction on Pre-Action Conduct. The letter is long (53 pages) and references (among others) issues with Horizon and POL's suspense accounts which overlap your recommendations 3, 4, 5 and 8, as well as issues with Post Office's prosecution practices (overlapping your recommendation 1) and branch support systems (overlapping your recommendation 7).

When you first considered this matter for POL's Chairman, the SPMRs had been advancing their concerns through extrajudicial means, e.g. through MPs and in the media. Now that POL has been sued, is it reasonable for POL to address any further steps it might reasonably take in respect of the SPMR cases through the proceedings, rather than in response to your report and recommendations?

I appreciate you may not have given this matter much thought over the past few months, so we would be happy to discuss this with you further by telephone in the first instance. I have copied John Davitt to help with the arrangements if you would find that more convenient.

With thanks and kind regards,
Rodric



Rodric Williams
Solicitor, Corporate Services
Post Office Ltd
20 Finsbury Street, London EC2Y 9AQ

GRO