

Message

To: mark.ford [REDACTED]
Subject: Post Office Ltd - 24676 - Prosecution of Ishaq
Attachments: Scan of Ishaq.GIJ Witness Statement 15 Jan 2013.pdf; Scan of Ishaq.GIJ1 - ARCGENREP0004.HorizonDataIntegrity.doc.pdf; Scan of Ishaq.GIJ2 - HorizonOnlineDataIntegrity_POL.doc.pdf

Hi Mark,

I thought I would send through to you in advance of the conference next week a statement of Gareth Jenkins. He is currently the man of the moment and has made almost identical statements in a number of other cases in which there has been a suggestion that the Horizon system has been working incorrectly. I propose to serve this with a NAE when I receive the hard copy.

I have also had an opportunity to speak to Steve Bradshaw, the OIC, about the letter of 14/1/13 from Musa Patels. I will deal with the points in order:

Particularised case summary. This will need to be dealt with. (At the present time Steve Bradshaw is in the process of collating further evidence - see advice of Rachael Panter of 6/11/12)

The second point purports to quote a passage in the DCS - The passage does not actually appear in the copy of the DCS we have on file - but Steven Bradshaw is contacting Mr. Liaquat whom, it is understood, still works at the branch to double check the position.

Updated Schedule of Unused Material in response to DCS. Please see Attendance Note of Sarah Porter of Counsel of 4th Sept and the correspondence between ourselves and Musa Patels about the provision of a more particularised DCS.

Tapes of Interviews. Not with Steve Bradshaw. Possibly in London - Trying to get hold of copies.

We do not propose to serve the sensitive schedule.

We have no objection to a counsel to counsel conference taking place.

With regard to the requests in a different font, these have not previously been received/communicated to us.

Identical Discs were served on the court and defence on 26th October 2012. Steve Bradshaw tells me that the discs may have covered a period of up to a year. He disagrees with the suggestion that the data had been restricted prior to copying.

Exhibit SB23 is not a branch trading statement. The Horizon data from July 2008 would serve no useful purpose. It would say what has been recorded onto the Horizon system i.e. if there has been a reversal of stamps into stock, but not whether those stamps existed and the transaction was genuine. The BTS from that period should have been kept in the branch by the spm.

It is clear that there were three terminals.

The records SB/5/ and SB/6 were created on the day of the audit by the auditor.

Stock received records are arguably irrelevant and thus red herring. We are looking at the shortage of stamps discovered on audit with large scale reversals into stock.

If further information such as this is to be disclosed, it is highly unlikely that it could be done before 25th Feb.

I look forward to meeting you on Tuesday at the conference. Please do not hesitate to contact me in the meantime if there are any questions.

Kind regards,

Martin.

Martin Smith

[REDACTED]

Direct: [REDACTED]

CartwrightKing
SOLICITORS

Nottingham | Birmingham | Derby | Leicester | Sheffield | Newcastle Gateshead

Majority House, 51 Lodge Lane, Derby, DE1 3HB

www.cartwrightking.co.uk

 @CartwrightKing

This message is confidential and may contain legally privileged information. If you have received this in error please delete this message and let us know by email or telephone. A list of directors is available at each office. Authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority No: 312459. VAT Registration No: 737837295.