
From: Jarnail A Singh[o=MMS/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=jarnail.a.singh6ceadabd-67e9-4eca-94f2-005716658847]
Sent: Mon 16/07/2012 11:39:21 AM (UTC)
To: Hugh Flemington[GRO]; Susan Crichton[GRO]
Subject: RE: CASE NO 21392 - Prosecution v K Wylie

Hugh –please see my two emails send to you on Friday 11.26 and 11.37.

Precisely how do we resolve myths/untrue reporting in the media about 2nd sights remit? Agree we need to be clear why pol decided to instruct 2nd sight? Second sight

need to start and complete its finding within weeks not months as courts will not entertain delays. Courts would want term of reference and time scales etc.

All this will mean we have to provide extra evidence as defence would put us to proof as to the systems integrity.

Also increase in vast disclosure requests, cases being transformed ,

from general deficiency trials into a boundless enquiry into the Horizon system. This would mean Vast scope of disclosure requests, task would be close to overwhelming, only way to fully comply with prosecution

Disclosure obligations would be to instruct an expert at fujitsu.sticking points in disclosure process would be costs of obtain Horizon data. Transaction logs would be obtained from fujitsu that show the details of every single transaction at a post office. For example defence request could be for logs from 6months prior to the defendants tenure to the present time and cost of obtaining that data would frankly be astronomical.

It is expensive to obtain this material because expense simply results from post offices contractual obligations to fujitsu.for example to obtain 6 months data would cost £20,000 and mountain of information covering more than 5 years would cost???

I hope this helps.

Jarnail.

From: Hugh Flemington

Sent: 16 July 2012 11:33

To: Jarnail A Singh; Susan Crichton

Subject: RE: CASE NO 21392 - Prosecution v K Wylie

Read it.

I assume they are a lawyer at Cartwright King rather than an independent barrister?

It also sounds as though there may be some urban myths flying about re what the 2nd Sight people have been asked to investigate etc. And other comments regarding the manufacturer are unhelpful and may also be incorrect.

Jarnail – won't the statement being prepped by us be helpful to resolve a common approach to be taken by POL and its advisers? I think it needs to make it clear what its terms of reference are, when it is due to report etc.

I also assume you will be the single point of contact that they refer to in para 6(1). In fact I think we have already been doing some of the things they suggest.

From: Jarnail A Singh

Sent: 16 July 2012 11:24

To: Hugh Flemington; Susan Crichton

Subject: FW: CASE NO 21392 - Prosecution v K Wylie

This is H.M.M.Boyer advice being referred to. jarnail

From: Andy Cash [REDACTED] **GRO**
Sent: 11 July 2012 12:22
To: Jarnail A Singh
Subject: CASE NO 21392 - Prosecution v K Wylie

Dear Jarnail,

I enclose advice from Harry Bowyer. I know it will be unpalatable, but for what it may be worth I share his view. In the instant case, our response must be dependant on time scales for completion of the inspection. We are only just beginning to see these issues raised by defence solicitors and the sooner we grasp the problem the better. If you want any more do call, otherwise I will await the outcome of your consultations before responding to the defence.

sincerely,

Andy Cash

[REDACTED] **GRO**

[REDACTED] **GRO**

CartwrightKing
SOLICITORS

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

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

www.cartwrightking.co.uk

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.