

Postmaster Litigation Subcommittee Board



2

Strictly Confidential and subject to legal privilege

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE POSTMASTER LITIGATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF POST OFFICE LIMITED HELD ON WEDNESDAY 22 JANUARY 2020 AT 20 FINSBURY STREET, LONDON EC2Y 9AQ AT 16.00 HRS

Present:	Tim Parker	Chairman (TP)
	Ken McCall	Senior Independent Director (KM) (by phone)
	Tom Cooper	Non-Executive Director (TC)
In attendance:	Veronica Branton	Company Secretary (VB)
	Nick Read	Group Chief Executive Officer (NR)
	Alisdair Cameron	Group Chief Financial Officer (AC)
	Ben Foat	General Counsel (BF)
	Andrew Parsons	Womble Bond Dickinson (AP)
	Rodric Williams	Head of Legal – Dispute Resolution & Brand (RW)
	Richard Watson	General Counsel – UKGI (RWa)
	Alan Watts	Herbert Smith Freehills (AW)
	Catherine Emanuel	Herbert Smith Freehills (CE)

Agenda Item	Action
1. Welcome and Conflicts of Interest	
A quorum being present, the Chairman opened the meeting. The Directors declared that they had no conflicts of interest in the matters to be considered at the meeting in accordance with the requirements of section 177 of the Companies Act 2006 and the Company's Articles of Association.	
2. Minutes and Matters Arising	
The Postmaster Litigation Subcommittee APPROVED the minutes of the meeting held on 10 December 2019.	
3. Group Litigation Order: Post-settlement Report	
Ben Foat introduced the report which set out the broad approach to the post settlement stage of the litigation, the structure of programme, the actions required and the decisions sought. Disclosure obligations in relation to convicted claimants BF noted that the team was working through the disclosure obligations in relation to convicted claimants. A number of points were raised, including: - Brian Altman QC had provided advice for Post Office Limited on the Group Litigation in 2013. We wanted to demonstrate a fresh approach and using a QC previously engaged was therefore unhelpful. It was noted that Brian Altman had been giving advice based on the position known at the time, that the claimants and their solicitors knew about his appointment and were comfortable with this. BF noted that he had received advice on the appointment from the legal team as he had raised the potential conflict of interest but had been advised that Brian Altman's ability to provide objective and independent advice was not tainted. Notwithstanding these points, Subcommittee Members thought that the use of any QC previously involved in the litigation to advise on the process for disclosure review might not appear satisfactory to an outside observer - What would Herbert Smith Freehills (HSF) and Peters & Peters approach be on this work? It was noted that HSF were not experts in criminal law and so experts in this field needed	

[illegible]

