

From: Amy Prime <[REDACTED]>
To: Amy Prime <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: Horizon Issues Trial - KEL disclosure
Date: Tue, 1 Oct 2019 15:33:53 +0000
Importance: Normal
Inline-Images: imagef46a4d.PNG; image78a094.PNG; imaged0a4b7.PNG

Cannot delay in dealing with this –

Judgment imminent and this is potentially really damaging, even more damaging if comes out after judgment delivered.

Whole trial was about KE:s and if position is that a more accurate picture from time to time.

Latest version may capture progress and would be surprising if actually there was a lot of information being lost. If disclose out outset then separate exercise of comparing versions of KEL register and seeing what happened.

Do not sit on this and cannot possibly not disclose

How manage – in real world would get to bottom of this and confess. Reality is that we may not have luxury of time to do this as the story that will be told is where the suggestion that previous versions of KELs came from, how found way on to EDQ, whether any discussion about it (ie, wrong end of stick or positive rep), understand sign off process for EDQ, understand whether any correspondence in relation to this, linking into deprecated and deleted KEL.

Notify them very quickly of the fact – has been brought to our attention as a result of queries raised that under a misperception. Previously informed and believed that single version of KEL database and overwritten as stated in EDQ. Appears mistaken and previous versions exist.

Not mention EDQ? This is not going to be a minor issue which forget so would be upfront and straight forward. Simon's advice.

Judge hates us and mostly the whole disclosure thing. This plays into his world view and they know this.

Because judgment appeal at anytime, need to make an earlier admission and get to bottom of situation urgently. Confess to EDQ as need to take an approach as angry about this as Freeths are. Followed by detailed explanation.

Concern over wanting evidence from Coyne/Worden if this makes any difference and whether trial proceeded on a false basis.

Need to get TRQC involved.

Amy Prime
Associate
Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP

d: **GRO**
m: **GRO**
t: **GRO**
e: **GRO**

[Sign up for legal updates, e-newsletters and event invitations](#)



womblebonddickinson.com



From: Amy Prime
Sent: 01 October 2019 16:10
To: Simon Henderson **GRO**
Cc: Andrew Parsons **GRO**, Jonathan Gribben **GRO**, **GRO**, Lucy Bremner **GRO**
Subject: Horizon Issues Trial - KEL disclosure [WBDUK-AC.FID27103746]

Simon

Further to my voicemail, and following on from the discussions about the disclosure of the Horizon adverse documents, we have received the attached letter from Freeths. In the paragraph named "Previously disclosed KELs", on page 4/5, Freeths have raised a number of points about the disclosure of previous versions and amendments made to the KEL entries. In drafting a response to this letter we intended to rely upon Post Office's EDQ which stated:

*"The KEL only contains the current database entries and is constantly updated and so the current version will not necessarily reflect the version that was in place at the relevant time. **The previous entries / versions of the current entries are no longer available.**" (emphasis added)*

We have this morning learnt from FJ that this statement is incorrect and that when FJ revise the contents of an existing KEL they would not overwrite the KEL (and lose the previous version) but take a copy of the KEL, make the changes and save as a new document. The previous versions of the KEL would then be kept for version control and are still held in the KEL database.

There is some urgency to respond to the attached letter since Freeths are due to file at 4:30pm on Thursday, 3 October a document (a) identifying any challenges as to the source or basis of assertions made in the new 3 pages of submissions; and (b) in no more than 5 pages, identify any points arising in relation to the late disclosed documents (although there has been no response from Fraser J on this request to file submissions).

We are therefore proposing to respond to the remainder of the letter but include a holding response in relation to the disclosure of the previous versions of KELs. It would however be helpful to discuss with you how to best tackle the requirement/or not to disclose these documents and the approaches which could be adopted.

If you are free today, please could you give me a call to discuss?

Kind regards

Amy