

Message

From: Paula Vennells [GRO]
on behalf of Paula Vennells [GRO]
Sent: 12/02/2015 18:29:18
To: Tom Wechsler [GRO]
CC: Chris Aujard [GRO]; Jane MacLeod [GRO]; Belinda Crowe [GRO]; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd [GRO]
Subject: Re: Lines to take for tomorrow morning's Working Group

Ok.

I have a supplementary question but am about to take a conference call. I can either call you tonight anytime after 7pm Tom, or tomorrow at 7.45am?

Thx Paula

Sent from my iPhone

On 12 Feb 2015, at 18:00, Tom Wechsler [GRO] wrote:

Paula

Second Sight have asked for the issue of the provision of Prosecution Documents to them by POL to go on the agenda for tomorrow's Working Group (starting at 10 am). Given the lengthy exchanges in the Select Committee we wanted to clear our lines with you.

Second Sight continue to press for access to all prosecution documents, including legally privileged information and relating to cases where the Working Group has considered the case (and consequently completed its work).

Our proposed line to take is (said in the nicest possible way):

- <!--[if !supportLists]--><![endif]-->Post Office continues to provide publicly available documents relating to prosecutions along with other documents that may be relevant to Second Sight for cases that remain in the Scheme, as agreed by the Working Group.
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><![endif]-->It is not clear why Second Sight continue to ask for documents relating to cases where the final CRR has been completed and considered by the Working Group – the work of Second Sight and the Working Group is complete at that point.
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><![endif]-->As previously discussed – and endorsed by the Chair – Second Sight are not entitled to see legally privileged material.
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><![endif]-->Post Office will not release it without a very clear rationale for doing so, so please set that out in writing for us to consider.

Since the Select Committee, Second Sight have been increasingly bold in their assertions within Case Reviews relating to Post Office's approach to prosecutions. Only if very heavily pressed would we wish to go further in saying (again, as nicely as possible):

- <!--[if !supportLists]--><![endif]-->We do not see how this information would assist your review of individual cases.
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><![endif]-->Post Office's approach to prosecutions is out of scope of the Scheme.
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><![endif]-->We note that in recent CRRs, Second Sight have made a number of comments relating to prosecutions that they are not qualified nor competent to make.

- <!--[if !supportLists]--><![endif]-->*We are not prepared to share legally privileged information at a time when JFSA have instructed a legal firm in preparation of action against the Post Office.*

On a related note, we may also get pressed on the provision of emails from staff based in Bracknell. This also came up at the Select Committee and we would propose to take the following line:

- <!--[if !supportLists]--><![endif]-->*We continue to work with colleagues to access the email files requested – however, this is a very big job*
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><![endif]-->*We remain unclear as to the question that Second Sight are seeking to address*
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><![endif]-->*If greater clarity could be provided on that issue we may be able to address their question more quickly*

These were the issues that Chris was calling about earlier. If you are content with the lines we propose an “ok” by email will be fine. Alternatively we are available to speak if that would be more helpful.

Thanks

Tom

Tom Wechsler
Complaint Review and Mediation Scheme
148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ

GRO