

Message

From: Mark R Davies [GRO]
on behalf of Mark R Davies [GRO] [GRO]
Sent: 22/06/2015 17:41:21
To: Rodric Williams [GRO]
CC: BARTY, Susan [GRO]; Patrick Bourke [GRO]; Mark Underwood1 [GRO]; Melanie Corfield [GRO]; Reid, Tom [GRO]
Subject: Re: BBC Panorama interview [CMCK-UK.FID8673510]
Attachments: image002.jpg; image002.jpg

I'm content

Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
Post Office Ltd

Mobile: [GRO]

On 22 Jun 2015, at 18:39, Rodric Williams <rodric.williams@[GRO]> wrote:

All – please see attached draft follow up letter to Sandip Patel QC.

Any comments? (The reference to “the special position” is a nod to the Bar Standards Board Guidance on Media Comment....)

<image001.png>

Rodric Williams

Solicitor, Corporate Services

Post Office Ltd
20 Finsbury Street, London EC2Y 9AQ

[GRO]
rodric.williams@[GRO]

From: BARTY, Susan [GRO]
Sent: 22 June 2015 14:36
To: Mark R Davies; Rodric Williams; Patrick Bourke; Mark Underwood1; Melanie Corfield
Cc: Reid, Tom
Subject: RE: BBC Panorama interview [CMCK-UK.FID8673510]

Mark

I agree – I think that is a good idea – saying we do not seem to have received a reply from him, but now asking him for the response.

Best wishes

Susan

Susan Barty
Partner

GRO

C/M/S/

Law, Tax

CMS Cameron McKenna LLP | Mitre House, 160 Aldersgate Street | London EC1A 4DD | United Kingdom

www.cms-cmck.com
www.cms-lawnow.com

From 1 July we are moving to Cannon Place, 78 Cannon Street, London EC4N 6AF.

From: Mark R Davies **GRO**
Sent: 22 June 2015 13:16
To: Rodric Williams; BARTY, Susan; Patrick Bourke; Mark Underwood1; Melanie Corfield
Cc: Reid, Tom
Subject: RE: BBC Panorama interview

Perhaps we should send him a letter saying that we have been told a 'legal expert' is appearing on Panorama. If it is him, we remind him of our earlier letter?

From: Rodric Williams
Sent: 22 June 2015 12:15
To: BARTY, Susan; Mark R Davies; Patrick Bourke; Mark Underwood1; Melanie Corfield
Cc: Reid, Tom
Subject: RE: BBC Panorama interview

If it is the same legal expert (Sandip Patel QC), please note that we wrote to him after the One Show in Feb 2015 asking him to produce the information/evidence which supports his concern about possible miscarriages of justice (see attached).

I have not received any sort of response to that letter.

<image001.png>

Rodric Williams
Solicitor, Corporate Services

Post Office Ltd
20 Finsbury Street, London EC2Y 9AQ

GRO

From: BARTY, Susan **GRO**
Sent: 22 June 2015 12:08
To: Mark R Davies; Patrick Bourke; Mark Underwood1; Rodric Williams; Melanie Corfield
Cc: Reid, Tom
Subject: RE: BBC Panorama interview

Thanks, Mark.

I note they are referring to a legal expert – that wasn't mentioned in the 17 June email. I wonder if it is the same "legal expert" they used before who gave such an extraordinarily


qualified comment. But we should be ready to address those issues as well, even if we don't get any or much more information.

They have also not told us the name of the programme.

Best wishes

Susan

Susan Barty
Partner



CMS Cameron McKenna LLP | Mitre House, 160 Aldersgate Street | London EC1A 4DD | United Kingdom

www.cms-cmck.com
www.cms-lawnow.com

From 1 July we are moving to Cannon Place, 78 Cannon Street, London EC4N 6AF.

From: Mark R Davies <[redacted]>
Sent: 22 June 2015 10:13
To: BARTY, Susan; Patrick Bourke; Mark Underwood1; Rodric Williams; Melanie Corfield
Subject: Fwd: BBC Panorama interview

Hi

My response to BBC's latest below.

Mark

Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
Post Office Ltd

Mobile: [redacted]

Begin forwarded message:

From: Mark R Davies <[redacted]>
Date: 19 June 2015 20:31:21 BST
To: Matthew Bardo <[redacted]>, Conor Spackman
<[redacted]>
Cc: Melanie Corfield <[redacted]>
Subject: RE: BBC Panorama interview

Hi Matt

I can confirm we will get back to you in line with your deadline and I will be in touch on Monday. I disagree by the way that we are not entitled to question your editorial decisions, as you seem to suggest. And as you know, all these issues have been covered in some detail by other BBC journalists.

Please in the meantime could you answer the questions in my email below, and at the same time provide some actual evidence to support the allegations you plan to broadcast? Specifically, for fairness and balance:

- who is taking part or contributing in your programme?
- what is their expertise?
- what are the opinions or views they are providing?
- in particular, who is the "computer expert" to whom you refer?
- what is his/her experience of the Horizon system?
- what is the substance of the opinion he/she is providing?
- who is the "forensic accountant" to whom you refer?
- what is his/her area of expertise?
- what is the substance of his/her contribution?
- who are the other interviewees to whom you refer?

I don't wish to repeat myself at length, but insofar as the CCRC is concerned, your email suggests the fact that cases have been referred to the CCRC constitutes "new evidence" of wrongdoing on the Post Office's part. Anyone who has been convicted of a criminal offence in England, Wales or Northern Ireland can apply to the CCRC, so such applications are not actually evidence of any wrongdoing or of any miscarriage of justice. Similarly, any criticism of POL by Second Sight does not constitute actual evidence of wrongdoing unless, of course, such criticism is substantiated.

As we said in our response to Second Sight's "Part Two" report, provided by us to the BBC in April, we will properly engage with the appropriate independent bodies in the review of any alleged miscarriage of justice. It is however clearly inappropriate for us to comment on those cases being reviewed by the CCRC until those reviews have been completed.

I would also reiterate, for the record: you are selectively quoting from a partial record of a prosecution file over which Post Office continues to assert legal professional privilege. You will appreciate that it can be seriously misleading to take a quote out of context. Further, you should be aware that Ms Hamilton has asked the CCRC to review her case, and it is therefore clearly inappropriate for us to comment on those cases being reviewed by the CCRC until that review has been completed.

Best wishes

Mark

From: Matthew Bardo [Matthew.Bardo@postoffice.co.uk]
Sent: 19 June 2015 17:28

GRO

To: Mark R Davies; Conor Spackman
Cc: Melanie Corfield
Subject: RE: BBC Panorama interview

Dear Mark

Thanks for getting back to me and for sending over some of the facts and figures that you offered to provide to us when we met for the briefing. Thank you also for the response to my request for information under the Freedom of Information Act.

Since our initial email of 19 May we have exchanged numerous emails and have taken the opportunity to meet you for a briefing and to read all the reports that you have drawn to our attention that lay out the Post Office's position.

We feel we have provided plenty of information to give the Post Office the opportunity to respond in an interview and indeed have taken the unusual step of sending over quotations from documentary evidence that support our allegations. We believe it is clear that you have been afforded a very fair and reasonable opportunity to respond. We now need to receive your final response by the close of play on Tuesday 23 June. We hope this will be in the form of the promised interview, but if that is not possible then please provide a written statement so that we can consider it for inclusion in the programme.

The list of interviewees that we have given you is correct. They are the people that we have interviewed and expect to include in the programme. We are still talking to other potential interviewees and we will let you know in due course if they are to be included. I do not think you need to know the identity of our legal expert, our computer expert or the former Fujitsu employee in order to respond to the matters we have raised.

I disagree with your suggestion that we have not brought anything new to the story and I would point out that editorial decisions about the novelty and importance of information are ours to make and not yours. Nonetheless, I am happy to explain in a bit more detail why we disagree with your points.

The Criminal Cases Review Commission has accepted applications from twenty subpostmasters and is investigating them. Six of those cases involve subpostmasters who have been jailed. This information is a few months old and while it does not, of course, equate to proof of a miscarriage of justice, it is a development that warrants further investigation. Since it often takes several months to make a Panorama programme, that is a recent development that falls well within the normal time-frame of a current affairs investigation.

This is the first time that a team of BBC investigative journalists have scrutinised Second Sight's final report in detail. The questions that we are raising about its contents have not been covered before. So, for example, while you are correct to say that the information about the extracts of the minuted meeting between Fujitsu and Post Office were contained in the Second Sight report, it is not information that has been reported in the context of the Seema Misra trial. That context raises important issues about a potential miscarriage of justice that are in the public interest for us to investigate.

The evidence that we have provided about Jo Hamilton's case is entirely new. We note that to date you have failed to address the substance of what is contained in the quoted extracts of Jo Hamilton's prosecution files.

These are, as you recognise, serious allegations about the actions of a publicly owned company and how it has conducted itself at the highest levels. That is why we would prefer an interview with the Chief Executive because she is the person with clear responsibility for all of the areas that we wish to discuss. While you have suggested that we interview another senior figure, you have not ruled out an interview with Paula Vennells and we now need to know how you will provide your final response. If that will be by way of interview, I would be grateful if you would confirm who the interviewee will be.

Please let us know today about Tuesday so that we can make the necessary arrangements.

All the best

Matt

-----Original Message-----

From: Mark R Davies [mailto:**GRO**]
Sent: 18 June 2015 19:35
To: Matthew Bardo; Conor Spackman
Cc: Melanie Corfield
Subject: RE: BBC Panorama interview

Dear Matt

Thanks for your email.

On your first point, you say:

"I am afraid I do not agree that there is nothing new in the story that we are covering. In the past few months there have been a number of significant developments. Among them are the release of Second Sight's final report that includes criticism of the Post Office by its own investigators, the acceptance of twenty cases for consideration by the Criminal Cases Review Commission and the information obtained as a result of our investigation. I think we are scrutinising new evidence that raises important questions about the way the Post Office has behaved."

Most of the points raised above have been covered by the BBC, most recently on the Today programme and BBC Breakfast, but also at length by your colleagues at Inside Out and the One Show. The CCRC point has also been covered by other media.

Insofar as the CCRC is concerned, your email suggests the fact that cases have been referred to the CCRC constitutes "new evidence" of wrongdoing on the Post Office's part. Anyone who has been convicted of a criminal offence in England, Wales or Northern Ireland can apply to the CCRC, so such applications are not

actually evidence of any wrongdoing or of any miscarriage of justice. Similarly, any criticism of POL by Second Sight does not constitute actual evidence of wrongdoing unless, of course, such criticism is substantiated.

As we said in our response to Second Sight's "Part Two" report, provided by us to the BBC in April, we will properly engage with the appropriate independent bodies in the review of any alleged miscarriage of justice. It is however clearly inappropriate for us to comment on those cases being reviewed by the CCRC until those reviews have been completed.

In respect of your suggestion that the "new evidence" also comprises "information obtained as a result of our investigation", we would again request that you provide us with details of such evidence so that we may be given a fair and reasonable opportunity to consider and respond to the evidence which is being used in support of some very serious allegations.

Turning to your other three substantive points, I quote below your comments and our response.

1. 'We have read extracts of minutes of a joint Fujitsu/Post Office meeting at which a bug was discussed. We obtained these extracts from the Second Sight final report and we understand that this meeting took place in autumn 2010. The minutes of the meeting state that this bug could impact "ongoing legal cases where branches are disputing the integrity of Horizon Data."

As you say, this is in the Second Sight report which we shared with media who had shown an interest in the story. This is not a new point, nor does it constitute "new evidence". Indeed, it is exactly this point which we disclosed ourselves to Second Sight, which was considered in their 2013 report and which has been covered in detail by the BBC in the past. We would refer you to the following link: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-23233573> As you acknowledged yourself, no computer system is infallible. This issue does not change the underlying position: Horizon works as it should to record branch transactions accurately and no-one, including Second Sight, has provided any actual evidence that suggests it did not in the cases examined.

2. 'We have interviewed a former employee at Fujitsu, who worked in "third line support" for the Horizon system. He says it was possible to remotely access data held on branch terminals and to amend that data. He also alleges that system errors were more widespread than has previously been reported."

We explained in detail the circumstances whereby a balancing transaction can be added. It has happened once since Horizon OnLine, during its pilot, and with the full knowledge of the postmaster. In relation to system errors, as stated before, no system is infallible. However, you have not provided any actual evidence to demonstrate that any system error has resulted in a miscarriage of justice. To the extent that you believe that you have any actual evidence to substantiate this serious allegation, we would ask that you disclose it. If you are proposing to make this allegation, please consider that some 70,000 people have continued to use this system every day throughout the period of Second Sight's investigation without major incident, processing six million transactions everyday: if there were systemic problems with branch accounting, it is reasonable to expect them to have

been more widely experienced across the Post Office network than the 136 individual complaints considered by Second Sight, which arose over a more than 10 year period during which there were some 500,000 Horizon users (i.e. the complaints come from 0.0003% of users). However, if you have actual evidence of the Horizon system causing losses, it is very important that you produce it: the system is relied upon by millions of customers and thousands of small businesses. Any unsubstantiated allegation that the system is deficient is a serious allegation that would be extremely harmful to our business.

3. "We have also obtained extracts from Jo Hamilton's prosecution files. One extract includes comments made on 16th November 2007 by the Principal Lawyer of the Criminal Law Division of Royal Mail working on Jo Hamilton's case. The lawyer wrote that when it comes to asset recovery, "the theft charge makes life so much easier". Another extract is from the Post Office investigator's report into Ms Hamilton's case. On 17 May 2006 the Post Office Investigator reported "I was unable to find any evidence of theft or that the cash figures had been deliberately inflated".

You are selectively quoting from a partial record of a prosecution file over which Post Office continues to assert legal professional privilege. You will appreciate that it can be seriously misleading to take a quote out of context. Further, you should be aware that Ms Hamilton has asked the CCRC to review her case, and it is therefore clearly inappropriate for us to comment on those cases being reviewed by the CCRC until that review has been completed.

I would also like to cover with you the information that you asked for in the briefing last week that we did not have immediately to hand.

Number of criminal cases: There were 150 applications to the scheme, of which 37 involve the conviction of a postmaster. As we stressed, each and every one of such cases is considered on all the available facts and circumstances before a decision is taken regarding whether or not it should be put forward to mediation (which, it must be remembered, cannot reverse or overturn any criminal conviction - only the Criminal Courts have that power).

Evidence required to bring false accounting and/ or theft charges:

Whether there is sufficient evidence to bring a charge is, naturally, determined by the particular facts in issue in each specific case. In deciding whether a specific case is suitable for prosecution, the Post Office considers (among other factors) whether it meets the tests set out in the Code for Crown Prosecutors. The Code requires prosecutors to be satisfied that there is sufficient evidence for a realistic prospect of conviction and that the prosecution is in the public interest. The Code is issued by the Director of Public Prosecutions and followed by Crown Prosecutors. Like the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS), the Post Office keeps cases under continuous review all the way up to and during any trial.

A charge will not therefore be brought if the prosecutor does not believe there is sufficient evidence for a realistic prospect of conviction on that charge. In cases where an audit discloses a loss in circumstances where there is evidence of false accounting, the fact of the loss together with the false entries will often be regarded as sufficient evidence on which to base a charge of theft.

The sufficiency of the evidence to support a charge is also scrutinised by the defendant's lawyers.

Once a decision has been made to prosecute - i.e. the Post Office is satisfied as a prosecutor that there is sufficient evidence for a realistic prospect of conviction on each charge and that the prosecution is in the public interest - and a defendant is charged, he or she is entitled to receive private and confidential legal advice. Should the defendant wish to dispute the charges, the Post Office has a duty to disclose to the defendant and his or her lawyers, any material that could assist the defence or undermine the prosecution. The defendant's lawyers can also ask the Post Office to produce any material which they believe the Post Office may hold which could assist the defence or undermine the prosecution

The Post Office is duty bound to communicate with a defendant's lawyers, and any decision by a defendant to plead guilty is made after he or she has had the opportunity to consider the evidence and take private and confidential legal advice from lawyers.

Every person charged with a criminal offence is entitled to independent legal advice and representation. Further, Legal Aid may be available to any defendant where the offence carries a risk of imprisonment (as do the charges typically levelled by the Post Office):

- Any decision to plead guilty is always one for the defendant only, having taken advice from his or her own lawyer.
- When deciding to plead guilty, the defendant will have been advised by his or her own lawyer that a guilty plea represents a complete admission to having committed the offence (which the defendant can qualify by a written 'basis of plea') and, where the offence is one of dishonesty (theft, false accounting, fraud), to that dishonest act. This is advice a defence lawyer is duty bound to give.
- The initial suggestion that a defendant pleads guilty will come from the defendant's lawyers, usually motivated by the defendant's instructions that they are guilty of that offence.

Finally, it is the duty of a defence lawyer to identify to the Court where there is insufficient evidence to sustain a charge, or to seek further information from the Post Office which might assist a defendant's case.

Review of criminal cases:

The Post Office takes seriously its continuing duty of disclosure in criminal law proceedings. Accordingly, material generated by Second Sight and through the Mediation Scheme has been (and continues to be) provided to an external firm of specialist criminal law solicitors to review to enable the Post Office to continue to comply with that duty.

'Issues' log:

As you would expect for any large computer system, there are logs for Horizon

that monitor, track and capture issues for the entire system. These are part of many ways of ensuring the robustness of the Horizon system and that it meets or exceeds the standards necessary for industry accreditations and independent audits.

The Horizon system, and the Core Audit Process in particular, is designed to capture transaction data and store it in a secure audit database, with a unique reference identifier, so that it provides a master record of what transactions occurred. It is this master record that is used to definitively determine whether an issue with the system has arisen. It is these processes, alongside the Issues logs, that are used to closely monitor and record any issues with the system. This all then ensures that Horizon works as it should to accurately record all branch transactions, as it has been found to do in the cases examined through the mediation scheme.

Mediation numbers and outcomes: I understand that Mel has sent you the letter from CEDR that we published as part of our March 2015 report. As we explained, we cannot discuss outcomes because these are subject to confidentiality, which is a core principle common to all mediations.

I would again make the point that the allegations you are putting to us have been repeatedly made previously and, where we have been able to do so without breaching the confidentiality of people, we have answered them extensively. We have also, throughout, offered individual meetings, in confidence, with any person in the mediation scheme and their MP to discuss their cases with them. This has not been widely taken up, whilst unsubstantiated claims continue to be made to the media.

You have referred in your email to other contributors to the programme but without giving further details which, for fairness and balance, I would expect you to do so that we understand the views that will be represented in a programme to which we are significantly contributing. I would therefore ask that you let me know precisely who is taking part or contributing, what their expertise is and the opinions or views they are providing. In particular, who is the "computer expert" to whom you refer, what is his/her experience of the Horizon system and what is the substance of the opinion he/she is providing? Similarly, who is the "forensic accountant" to whom you refer, what is his/her area of expertise and what is the substance of his/her contribution?

I hope this helps.

Best wishes

Mark

From: Matthew Bardo [mailto:matthew.bardo@gro.com]
Sent: 17 June 2015 19:41
To: Mark R Davies; Conor Spackman
Cc: Melanie Corfield
Subject: RE: BBC Panorama interview

Hi Mark

Thank you for getting back to me.

I am afraid I do not agree that there is nothing new in the story that we are covering. In the past few months there have been a number of significant developments. Among them are the release of Second Sight's final report that includes criticism of the Post Office by its own investigators, the acceptance of twenty cases for consideration by the Criminal Cases Review Commission and the information obtained as a result of our investigation. I think we are scrutinising new evidence that raises important questions about the way the Post Office has behaved.

The purpose of the briefing that you kindly arranged was for you to brief us on the background to our key lines of enquiry. It was made clear beforehand that we would not be briefing you about our research. The briefing has informed the allegations that we emailed to you on Friday and it will help us to report your position fairly and accurately on the areas that will be covered by the programme. It is now the purpose of the interview for us to put our questions and allegations to the Post Office in order to obtain a filmed response for broadcast.

As a former BBC journalist, you may remember that we do not tell people in advance what questions will be asked in an interview. This helps maintain our editorial independence. We normally provide interviewees with question areas and sufficient information to enable them to understand any allegations that might be put to them. In this case, I believe we have done that.

We do not normally share the evidence that supports our allegations. However, I accept that in this case there are a lot of detailed and complex points. We want the interviewee to have a full and fair opportunity to answer questions that relate to decision-making at the highest level of the organisation.

Therefore, we are willing to share the following key pieces of evidence so that you are in a better position to respond:

We have read extracts of minutes of a joint Fujitsu/Post Office meeting at which a bug was discussed. We obtained these extracts from the Second Sight final report and we understand that this meeting took place in autumn 2010. The minutes of the meeting state that this bug could impact "ongoing legal cases where branches are disputing the integrity of Horizon Data."

We have interviewed a former employee at Fujitsu, who worked in "third line support" for the Horizon system. He says it was possible to remotely access data held on branch terminals and to amend that data. He also alleges that system errors were more widespread than has previously been reported.

We have also obtained extracts from Jo Hamilton's prosecution files. One extract includes comments made on 16th November 2007 by the Principal Lawyer of the Criminal Law Division of Royal Mail working on Jo Hamilton's case. The lawyer wrote that when it comes to asset recovery, "the theft charge makes life so much easier". Another extract is from the Post Office investigator's report into Ms Hamilton's case. On 17 May 2006 the Post Office Investigator reported "I was unable to find any evidence of theft or that the cash figures had been deliberately

inflated".

We can also tell you that in the programme we currently expect to include interviews with Jo Hamilton, Seema Misra, Noel Thomas, James Arbuthnot, a computer expert, a forensic accountant and a former Fujitsu employee.

I am keen to confirm a date on which we can film the interview. You have mentioned that diary pressures mean that next week is now the earliest that this could be done. If we could make it early in the week, that will help us to consider the points raised and ensure that they are reflected fairly throughout the programme. We have to finish the edit by next Friday in order to have the programme ready for broadcast.

Please do also send over the information that you said you would provide to Tim and me when we attended the briefing.

Thanks for your help.

Matt

From: Mark R Davies [GRO]
Sent: 16 June 2015 10:34
To: Matthew Bardo; Conor Spackman
Cc: Melanie Corfield
Subject: RE: BBC Panorama interview

Dear Conor and Matt

Many thanks for your email of late Friday afternoon and for the further detail it provides in terms of the ground you appear to wish to cover in your programme, and for Matt's follow up. My apologies for getting back to you slightly later than I had planned.

As you know, I remain puzzled and concerned that the BBC did not see fit to raise the majority of these issues and the very serious allegations within them with us when we met your colleagues at our offices last Tuesday.

In your email, you say that you have evidence for the propositions you advance but, to date, no-one engaged in the making of the programme (nor, indeed, of other BBC programmes featuring this issue) has actually provided that evidence to us. Accordingly, and once again, I would ask that you provide us with any evidence you have to support the allegations you make, the list of contributors, what they are saying and what they have been asked to comment on, so that we might be in a position to respond to it appropriately as we are entitled to do.

The general thrust of what you say is not new. Claims of a similar nature have been levelled at us before but no one has ever been able to provide us with any actual evidence to support them. For the avoidance of doubt, the Post Office has been guided in all that it has done in relation to the cases you cite, and indeed all complaints made of a similar nature, by the individual circumstances which each presents and the actual evidence of what, in fact, took place. You will understand that it would be entirely inappropriate for the Post Office, or indeed any other organisation, to be guided in its actions by anything which does not carry this essential quality of substantiation, particularly when the allegations being raised with us are so serious.

What you have so far presented us with is, in essence, a repetition of various assertions and allegations made to us in the course of this process, each of which has been thoroughly re-investigated by both ourselves and Second Sight and repeatedly addressed over a period now stretching back some 3 years. As you are aware, the Criminal Cases Review Commission (CCRC) is also examining a number of cases (they having been referred to them) and the Post Office is co-operating fully with the Commission in that process. In the circumstances, the Post Office believes that where there has been any critical finding such an investigation by the CCRC is the appropriate route to determine many of the issues raised.

As we made clear in the lengthy session we had with your colleagues last Tuesday, we are not prepared to engage in a public debate about individual cases. We gave each applicant to the scheme an assurance that we would afford them absolute confidentiality in the handling of their complaint. This was also the agreement reached with the Justice for Subpostmasters Alliance, Second Sight and others involved in the establishment of the scheme, and was appropriate given that the cases often raise matters of a highly sensitive personal nature for Applicants; and we have responded to each of the points raised in full: we have done so directly with each individual with a case in the scheme and with Second Sight.

It follows that I will not be addressing each and every point raised in your email. However, I am happy to respond more thematically as follows:

Prosecutions

* The Post Office does not prosecute subpostmasters for making mistakes - on the contrary, it has on occasion done so when there is sufficient evidence for a

realistic prospect of conviction and where it is in the public interest to take that prosecution forward

* Post Office complies with the Prosecutors' Code of Practice which sets out this requirement

* Decisions as to how to plead to a charge are taken by those individuals and their independent legal advisers only, informed by their own independent legal advisers

* It is a matter of public record that none of the individuals whose cases you have chosen to highlight with us has appealed their conviction - an option which remains open to them

* The Post Office as prosecutor has a continuing duty to disclose any information which may assist the defence even if it undermines the prosecution case; the Post Office has complied and continues to comply with that duty

Horizon

* Over the last 3 years, and across all the complaints we have received and comprehensively re-investigated, there is no evidence to show that Horizon was responsible for the losses incurred in the relevant branches

* Post Office cannot edit, amend or otherwise alter branch data remotely; it can add a transaction to a branch account - this is, naturally, subject to rigorous authorisation protocols and carries a unique identifier code rendering it immediately distinguishable from any other transaction

* Post Office volunteered this information to Second Sight in 2013 and again made it clear in its response to Second Sight's final report in April of this year

* This process has only been used in this way on one single occasion since the introduction of Horizon OnLine, during pilot testing work and this was done with the full knowledge and indeed co-operation with the relevant subpostmaster

Second Sight

* We have provided Second Sight (which has acknowledged it is not expert in matters of criminal law or procedure) with a very significant amount of information over the course of the last 3 years including all non-legally privileged materials relating to prosecutions. It is a basic tenet of our justice system that discussions between a client and his or her lawyer are privileged from disclosure, even to a Court, and this applies equally to the advice a defendant receives, e.g. as to how to plead guilty to a charge and with what consequence

* A number of applications to the CCRC have been made by individuals with cases in the scheme (note these should not be confused with appeals) and the CCRC will review all the relevant material including all legally privileged material

* This provides an absolute assurance to those individuals that all aspects of their prosecution and conviction will be looked at by an independent body

As I hope to have made clear, whatever theories have been advanced in relation to the Horizon system, no one has shown it to be responsible for any of the losses incurred in the relevant branches. Even Second Sight acknowledged that human actions are the most common explanation. I would again stress the importance we attach to seeing the evidence which supports any allegations that you are proposing to make and I look forward to receiving your reply in this regard. I also look forward to receiving the list of contributors, what they are saying and what they have been asked to comment on.

We will of course continue to engage with you on any subject or question. I am concerned, however, at the direction the programme appears to be taking [outlined very clearly in Conor's email]. Given the BBC's previous coverage of this issue and the apparent direction of the Panorama programme [which does not appear to be taking the issue forward] I wanted to inform you that I will be making representations more widely within the BBC.

In relation to the timing of an interview, any interview would need to take place next week because of diary pressures and the rescheduling of your broadcast to 29 June. In the meantime, I am sending Matt Bardo and Tim Robinson the information which we did not have immediately to hand when they came to see us last week.

Best wishes

Mark

From: Matthew Bardo [GRO]
Sent: 12 June 2015 20:06
To: Mark R Davies; Conor Spackman
Cc: Melanie Corfield
Subject: RE: BBC Panorama interview

Hi Mark

Thanks for coming back to us so swiftly.

On the issue of theft charges being used to pressure sub-postmasters to plead guilty, you will be aware that this allegation is repeatedly raised in Second Sight's reports and our evidence is drawn from their written investigative findings.

We made clear ahead of the briefing that its purpose was for the Post Office to brief us and not for us to brief the Post Office about our research. The contents of the briefing were very helpful and will help us to represent fairly and accurately the Post Office's position on the things we discussed.

On the subject of the date of the interview, we are very keen to record it next week as that will give us sufficient time to consider the points raised and to ensure that they are reflected fairly throughout the programme. Would it help if we were to move the interview to Thursday or Friday of next week instead?

All the best

Matt

From: Mark R Davies [GRO]
Sent: 12 June 2015 17:25
To: Conor Spackman
Cc: Matthew Bardo; Melanie Corfield
Subject: Re: BBC Panorama interview

Dear Conor

Many thanks for this.

We will of course come back to you in more detail next week but for the time being I make the following points:

- you make below some extremely serious allegations about the Post Office. I am gravely concerned that you make these three days after we sat with your team for two hours. I am at a loss to understand why these very specific and serious allegations could not have been raised at the briefing.

- you informed us earlier in the week that your programme schedule has changed and you plan to broadcast on June 29. Given that, diary pressures and the scale and seriousness of the allegations you are making, we will look to arrange the proposed interview in the week of the 22nd. This remains in line with your proposed schedule had your programme been due to broadcast on June 22.

- you quote evidence to suggest the Post Office may have unfairly used theft charges to put pressure on SubPostmasters. Please as a matter of urgency provide some evidence for that very serious allegation.

Best wishes

Mark

Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
Mobile: GRO

On 12 Jun 2015, at 16:56, Conor Spackman
<conor.spackman@GRO>mailto:conor.spackman@GRO wrote:

Dear Mark,

Firstly, I would like to thank you for the time you and your colleagues spent with Matthew Bardo and Tim Robinson on Tuesday. It was very helpful to be able to discuss this subject in detail with the relevant people.

Since we last wrote to the Post Office, our research has continued and I am now able to give you more information about the points that are likely to be raised in the programme.

Our evidence suggests that the Post Office may have unfairly used theft charges to put pressure on sub-postmasters to plead guilty to false accounting and/or repay apparent losses identified by the Horizon computer system. The evidence also suggests that the Post Office failed to consider or investigate the possibility that Horizon could be the cause of some of the losses. As you know, it has been suggested that these failings may have led to miscarriages of justice in some cases.

Having read reports written by Second Sight and Post Office responses to them, we wish to address the following question areas in an interview. They are broken down below under the subject matter to which they relate:

Jo Hamilton

- the decision to charge Jo Hamilton with theft
- why Ms Hamilton's office was ?2000 down on the Horizon system and why this doubled to ?4000 when she followed the instructions from the help desk
- her claim that she sought help and the Post Office failed to provide it
- her explanation that she subsequently felt trapped and did not know what to do other than sign off inaccurate accounts

Noel Thomas

- Mr Thomas's claim that that he told the helpline about his problems with the system and about the missing money

- the suggestion that it is no longer possible to know the results of important tests carried out on Mr Thomas' system because those records have now been lost or destroyed
- the suggestion that Mr Thomas was poorly treated after 42 years of loyal service
- that the Post Office now believes that the cause of the shortfall in Mr Thomas' branch is likely to have been mistakes by him or his staff
Seema Misra
- Ms Misra's claim that she and her staff were not provided with adequate help despite making more than 900 calls to the helpline
- the suggestion that the Post Office failed to disclose crucial information during Ms Misra's trial including technical information about Horizon to the defence's expert witness
- that the Post Office and Fujitsu had identified bugs in Horizon prior to Ms Misra's trial that were not disclosed to the defence
- the suggestion that this information could have helped Seema and other sub-postmasters stay out of prison
Post Office investigations and prosecutions
- the suggestion that the Post Office has a financial interest in prosecuting sub-postmasters because it helps with the recovery of missing money
- particularly in that context, the suggestion that miscarriages of justice are more likely because the Post Office exercises both the power of investigation and prosecution
- the suggestion that the Post Office has unfairly pursued theft charges to pressure people into paying up
- the claim by numerous sub-postmasters that they were told by Post Office investigators they were the only ones having problems with the Horizon system
Horizon system
- the suggestion that the complexity of the Horizon system adds to the likelihood of errors
- the suggestion that the lack of an automatic paper record from the Horizon system adds to the likelihood of errors
- the suggestion that Post Office prosecutions relied on the belief that the computer system was robust, when in fact computer errors may call this into question
- the suggestion that bugs in Horizon were more widespread than Second Sight have found

- the suggestion that there were around 30 people working in "third line support" at Fujitsu and that they fixed dozens of system errors
- the suggestion that errors were fixed by a team who could access transaction data, add transactions or make changes to transactions that would affect the balance in branch, without the sub-postmasters knowledge
- Second Sight investigation and select committee in parliament
- Second Sight's claim that their work has been hampered by an increasing lack of co-operation
- Second Sight's understanding that this is the result of legal advice
- Second Sight's claim that the Post Office has failed to provide full access to legal and prosecution files
- The apparent failure of the Post Office to provide Second Sight with emails relating to the eyewitness account of an incident in Bracknell in 2008
- Second Sight's evidence that remote access to branch data is possible in spite of Post Office denials

Please could you let us know the time that you have scheduled on Wednesday 17 June for the interview? I would be grateful if we could arrive about an hour before the interview begins in order to set up. It usually takes about half an hour to pack the kit away again after we have finished filming.

Thanks for your help.

Conor

<http://www.bbc.co.uk>

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of the BBC unless specifically stated.

If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system.

Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it and notify the sender immediately.

Please note that the BBC monitors e-mails sent or received.

Further communication will signify your consent to this.

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended for the addressee only. If you are not the named recipient, you must not use, disclose, reproduce, copy or distribute the contents of this communication. If you have received this in error, please contact the sender by reply email and then delete this email from your system. Any views or opinions expressed within this email are solely those

of the sender, unless otherwise specifically stated.

POST OFFICE LIMITED is registered in England and Wales no 2154540.
Registered Office: Finsbury Dials, 20 Finsbury Street, London EC2Y 9AQ.

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended for the addressee only. If you are not the named recipient, you must not use, disclose, reproduce, copy or distribute the contents of this communication. If you have received this in error, please contact the sender by reply email and then delete this email from your system. Any views or opinions expressed within this email are solely those of the sender, unless otherwise specifically stated.

POST OFFICE LIMITED is registered in England and Wales no 2154540.
Registered Office: Finsbury Dials, 20 Finsbury Street, London EC2Y 9AQ.

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended for the addressee only. If you are not the named recipient, you must not use, disclose, reproduce, copy or distribute the contents of this communication. If you have received this in error, please contact the sender by reply email and then delete this email from your system. Any views or opinions expressed within this email are solely those of the sender, unless otherwise specifically stated.

POST OFFICE LIMITED is registered in England and Wales no 2154540.
Registered Office: Finsbury Dials, 20 Finsbury Street, London EC2Y 9AQ.

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended for the addressee only. If you are not the named recipient, you must not use, disclose, reproduce, copy or distribute the contents of this communication. If you have received this in error, please contact the sender by reply email and then delete this email from your system. Any views or opinions expressed within this email are solely those of the sender, unless otherwise specifically stated.

POST OFFICE LIMITED is registered in England and Wales no 2154540. Registered Office: Finsbury Dials, 20 Finsbury Street, London EC2Y 9AQ.

CMS has 59 offices around the world, located in Aberdeen, Algiers, Amsterdam, Antwerp, Barcelona, Beijing, Belgrade, Berlin, Bratislava, Bristol, Brussels, Bucharest, Budapest, Casablanca, Cologne, Dubai, Duesseldorf, Edinburgh, Frankfurt, Geneva, Glasgow, Hamburg, Istanbul, Kyiv, Leipzig, Lisbon, Ljubljana, London, Luxembourg, Lyon, Madrid, Mexico City, Milan, Moscow, Munich, Muscat, Paris, Podgorica, Prague, Rio de Janeiro, Rome, Sarajevo, Seville, Shanghai, Sofia, Strasbourg, Stuttgart, Tirana, Utrecht, Vienna, Warsaw, Zagreb and Zurich.

CMS Cameron McKenna LLP is a member of CMS Legal Services EEIG (CMS EEIG), a European Economic Interest Grouping that coordinates an organisation of independent law firms. CMS EEIG provides no client services. Such services are solely provided by CMS EEIG's member firms in their respective jurisdictions. CMS EEIG and each of its member firms are separate and legally distinct entities, and no such entity has any authority to bind any other. CMS EEIG and each member firm are liable only for their own acts or omissions and not those of each other. The brand name "CMS" and the term "firm" are used to refer to some or all of the member firms or their offices. Further information can be found at www.cmslegal.com

CMS Cameron McKenna LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registration number OC310335. It is a body corporate which uses the word "partner" to refer to a member, or an employee or consultant with equivalent standing and qualifications. It is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority of England and Wales with SRA number 423370 and by the Law Society of Scotland with registered number 47313. A list of members and their professional qualifications is open to inspection at the registered office, Mitre House, 160 Aldersgate Street, London EC1A 4DD. Members are either solicitors or registered foreign lawyers. VAT registration number: 974 899 925. Further information about the firm can be found at www.cms-cmck.com

The contents of this e-mail (including any attachments) are confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of its contents is strictly prohibited, and you should please notify the sender immediately and then delete it (including any attachments) from your system. Notice: the firm does not accept service by e-mail of court proceedings, other processes or formal notices of any kind without specific prior written agreement.

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended for the addressee only. If you are not the named recipient, you must not use, disclose, reproduce, copy or distribute the contents of this communication. If you have received this in error, please contact the sender by reply email and then delete this email from your system. Any views or opinions expressed within this email are solely those of the sender, unless otherwise specifically stated.

POST OFFICE LIMITED is registered in England and Wales no 2154540. Registered Office: Finsbury Dials, 20 Finsbury Street, London EC2Y 9AQ.

<Letter to S Patel QC re evidence 23.06.15.docx>

<image001.png>

<image002.jpg>