

Witness Statement

Post Office Ltd

Criminal Justice Act 1967, Section 9; Magistrates Court Act 1980, sub section, 5A(3)(a) and 5B;
Criminal Procedure Rules 2005, Rule 27.1

Statement of Stephen BRADSHAW

Age if under 18 Over 18 (If over 18 insert 'over 18')

This statement (consisting of pages each signed by me) is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything, which I know to be false or do not believe true.

Dated the 10 day of April 2013

Signature

Further to my statement dated 21st March 2012, 20 September 2012 and 20 December 2012.

From my position in Post Office Ltd I have access to Post Office records including any audits have taken place at Post Office branches. I can say that where I refer to and or produce Post Office records that these records have been completed in the ordinary course of Post Office business by persons who had or may reasonably supposed to have had personal knowledge of that matter or the matters dealt with in the information supplied. The person or persons who created and or complied such records cannot reasonably be expected to have any recollection of the matter dealt with in the information supplied.

I can say from Business records that an audit took place at Fazakerley Post Office branch on 6 October 2005. The reason for the audit was that cash on hand had been misreported. The overall result of the audit was a shortage of £26.67. The Post Office had a previous discrepancy of £33.80 that they had not adjusted, the stock was short by £17.34 but this was due to missing European Air packs and a check of the cash on hand revealed a surplus of £24.47.

I now produce a copy of the audit report dated 6 October 2005 as SB/58.

In response to the letter from Laurence Lee & Co it can be seen on SB/52 that the National Business Support Centre was contacted on 4 August 2005 concerning a loss of £592.21, on this initial call the caller stated they had a surplus but had also made a lottery

Signature

Signature witnessed by

Witness Statement

Criminal Justice Act 1967, Section 9; Magistrates Court Act 1980, sub section. 5A(3)(a) and 5B; criminal Procedure Rules 2005, Rule 27.1

Continuation of statement of Stephen BRADSHAW

declaration. There was a follow up call on 11 August 2005 stating the loss has been carried forward and believes it is due to the lottery. A further telephone call was received by the NBSC on 25 August 2005 concerning this loss and the caller stated that she believed it was due to an upgrade in the Horizon system.

The matter was resolved on the 14 September 2005 by Branch Development Manager Kevin RYAN.

To the best of my knowledge no audit or any investigation into any £4,000 shortfall at Fazakerley Post Office branch took place and no file or any other documentation exists.

I can also say from business records that prior to the audit on 6 January 2012 the following checks also took place:

Date	Type of Audit	Reason for Audit
14 January 2010	Transfer – Full check of all cash and stock but no recorded audit report.	The sub postmaster was reinstated.
16 September 2010	Post Transfer Visit	A follow up audit after the reinstatement of the sub postmaster on 14 January 2010.
05 November 2010	Financial Assurance Audit	This audit is put on as a result of the Branch Performance Profile. All Post Offices are entered onto the Risk Model and the top 100 branches receive a visit. During these types of audits the cash and High value stock would be checked but a full check of all the stock is not done.
13 May 2011	Financial Assurance Audit	As above
02 December 2011	Special Audit	This audit was requested as the business

Signature

Signature witnessed by

POL011A

Version April 2012

Witness Statement

Criminal Justice Act 1967, Section 9; Magistrates Court Act 1980, sub section. 5A(3)(a) and 5B; criminal Procedure Rules 2005, Rule 27.1

Continuation of statement of Stephen BRADSHAW

		identified that £20,000 could be at risk as the Overnight Cash Declared between February 2011 and September 2011 had increased and then decreased during this period.
--	--	---

In addition to the above checks Fazakerley Post Office branch was upgraded to Horizon on Line on 8 July 2010. Prior to the migration the cash on hand in the branch would be physically counted and checked.

A further Audit took place on 20 July 2012. This audit was in response to the sub postmaster accepting the Transaction Corrections for the Animal in Needs deposits of £34,115.50 for the period of September 2011 to December 2011 that had not been credited when they were presented at Fazakerley Post Office.

I can also say from business records that a visit was made to the branch on 6 September 2005 by Kevin RYAN regarding the reported loss of £592.21 were the Officer in Charge states that it is something to do with the upgrade onto Horizon on Line and no errors could be found. When Mr RYAN attended the loss had cleared and there was no explanation.

A visit was also made by Kevin RYAN on 6 February 2006 regarding a shortage of £3959 in January 2006 and all documents, transaction and event logs were checked and there was no indication what had caused the loss.

On 18 July 2006 Tina MELLOR visited SEAFORTH Post Office (the branch run by Mr ASKER's wife) to discuss with Mr and Mrs ASKER issues at Fazakerley. During these discussions Mr ASKER stated that he would speak with Chesterfield regarding the money he owes and that he trusts his staff and that it is a mistake that has been made and said he knew the money had not been stolen.

Signature

POL011A

Signature witnessed by

Version April 2012

Witness Statement

Criminal Justice Act 1967, Section 9; Magistrates Court Act 1980, sub section. 5A(3)(a) and 5B; criminal Procedure Rules 2005, Rule 27.1

Continuation of statement of Stephen BRADSHAW

CAN

Signature

POL011A

Signature witnessed by

Version April 2012