

Ni 'a McSherry

From: Stephen Dilley
Sent: 05 September 2006 15:54
To: 'Pinder Brian'
Cc: 'graham.c.ward' [REDACTED] GRO [REDACTED]; 'rmorgan' [REDACTED] GRO [REDACTED]; 'mandy.talbot' [REDACTED] GRO [REDACTED]; Tom Beezer;
Subject: RE: PO request
Attachments: 6825.anal.doc; eCopy scan.pdf

Brian,

Thanks for your email of 4 September.

1. Gareth's analysis states:

"We are awaiting copies of the actual paper cash accounts for weeks 41 and 42 to confirm that the printed figures match those extracted from the audit data for this analysis."

However, I have sent the cash accounts for week 42 to Penny so Gareth has seen them. I attach to this email the cash accounts for weeks 41 (and, just in case Gareth wants it, week 43 as well). Please can Gareth amend his report to reflect that he has received and seen the reports for weeks 41, 42 and 43. I would then, with Gareth's permission, like to disclose the amended version of his analysis asap to Castleton's solicitors. If you can send it to me in a disclosable format with Fujitsu's heading on it, then that would be great. It sounds from what Gareth is saying that Castleton has got his figure for stock carried forward wrong and we need to point this out quickly because I understand Castleton's accountancy expert is being asked to repeat this exercise and may therefore repeat Castleton's erroneous assumption.

2. I confirm that Gareth does not now need to check the draft witness statement I sent to you earlier. We will get the independent IT expert to cover those points instead.

I look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible.

Kind regards.

Stephen Dilley
Solicitor
for and on behalf of Bond Pearce LLP
DDI: [REDACTED] GRO [REDACTED]
Main office phone: [REDACTED] GRO [REDACTED]
Fax: [REDACTED] GRO [REDACTED]
www.bondpearce.com

From: Pinder Brian [mailto:Brian.Pinder@bondpearce.com] GRO [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 September 2006 13:15
To: Stephen Dilley
Cc: graham.c.ward [REDACTED] GRO [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: PO request

Stephen

Managed to get a response back from Gareth (which I have reworded for ease) but he raises a couple of questions?

see : \w interleaved.....(my words).....

Regds Brian
PS I can arrange Gareth to ring you if you wish?

From: Stephen Dilley [mailto:Stephen.Dilley] **GRO**
Sent: 04 September 2006 12:31
To: Pinder Brian
Cc: graham.c.ward **GRO**
Subject: RE: PO request

Thanks Brian.

Therefore, we're not now planning on calling Gareth to give evidence hence he is not included on the invite list.

Does this mean he doesn't need to be available in December anymore? Presumably it also means that he doesn't have anything further to do with the witness statement that you tried writing for him?

However, what I would like him to do is to liaise with our IT expert, once appointed and also to complete the report he sent to me last week.

He is not sure what you are expecting in terms of "completion of the report". As far as he is concerned it is complete for the week 42 data. What else were you after?

I will send to him the cash accounts he referred to as not having (I had already sent them to Penny Thomas but apparently she didn't get them).

Penny passed him the Cash account for week 42, which you had sent her. It matched the figures that Anne and he produced.

Kind regards,

Stephen Dilley
Solicitor
for and on behalf of Bond Pearce LLP
DDI: **GRO**
Main office phone: **GRO**
Fax: **GRO**
www.bondpearce.com

From: Pinder Brian [mailto:Brian.Pinder] **GRO**
Sent: 04 September 2006 12:21
To: Stephen Dilley
Cc: graham.c.ward **GRO**
Subject: RE: PO request
Importance: High

Stephen ci Graham

Just a query, I'm aware of the meeting at Lincolns Inn.....(See below) ..but also aware that Gareth Jenkins has **not** been invited?

I presume that this is correct, but I mention it just in case. Also are you in receipt of all documentation, outstanding tasks /requests / statements etc ? I'm just concerned that we don't miss anything here or cause you any undue delay.

Grateful for a quick response.

Kings Brian

Counsel, Richard Morgan, would like a conference with all our potential witnesses before exchange is due. This is a good idea as it will enable you to ask any questions you may have about the trial process, get to meet Richard before the trial and enable us to drill down on the key issues. We have booked the conference to commence at 11am, on Monday 11 September 2006 at Maitland Chambers.

The information in this e-mail and any attachments are confidential and may be legally privileged and protected by law. The intended recipient only is authorised to access this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender as soon as possible and delete any copies. Unauthorised use, dissemination, distribution, publication or copying of this communication is prohibited.

Any files attached to this e-mail will have been checked by us with virus detection software before transmission. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening any attachment. Bond Pearce LLP accepts no liability for any loss or damage which may be caused by software viruses.

Bond Pearce LLP is a Limited Liability Partnership registered in England and Wales number OC311430.

Registered Office: 3 Temple Quay, Temple Back East, Bristol, BS1 6DZ.

A list of Members is available from our registered office. Any reference to a Partner in relation to Bond Pearce LLP means a Member of Bond Pearce LLP. Bond Pearce LLP is regulated by the Law Society.