
From: Ingrid Kelly [GRO]
Sent: Mon 15/12/2014 10:44:44 AM (UTC)
To: Mark R Davies [GRO]
Cc: Nick Wallis [GRO]; Jane French [GRO]; Melanie Corfield [GRO]; Ruth X Barker [GRO]
Subject: RE: Post Office interview

Dear Mark,

As I've said it is not practically possible for us to film beyond today. You are still more than welcome to come in and appear live on the programme as you originally requested.

Regards

Ingrid

From: Mark R Davies [GRO]
Sent: 15 December 2014 10:41
To: Ingrid Kelly
Cc: Nick Wallis; Jane French; Melanie Corfield; Ruth X Barker
Subject: Re: Post Office interview

Hi Ingrid

Far from unwilling. Indeed, very keen. It is the unwillingness of the BBC to be flexible across 2.5 days before broadcast which is the challenge here.

Best wishes
Mark
Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
Mobile: [GRO]

Sent from my iPhone
On 15 Dec 2014, at 10:38, "Ingrid Kelly" [GRO] wrote:

Dear Mark,

As your colleague is apparently unable/unwilling to be interviewed at the end of their working day today and as they apparently cannot brief you – or indeed anyone else - sufficiently to allow a colleague to do the interview – then I'm afraid we are indeed at an impasse. We will however as I've already said reflect the Post Office's position in the programme.

Regards

Ingrid

From: Mark R Davies [GRO]
Sent: 15 December 2014 10:27
To: Ingrid Kelly; Nick Wallis; Jane French; Melanie Corfield; Ruth X Barker
Subject: Re: Post Office interview

Hi Ingrid

I am aware of the complexities of making a programme. I remain perplexed, however, as to why you require a further 2.5 days after today to do so and are not prepared to incorporate a Post Office interview in that time.

Our spokesperson, as I have said, is involved in Mediation Scheme work all day today and tomorrow. I am not prepared to jeopardise that work to accommodate your unreasonable schedule.

Best wishes

Mark

Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
Mobile: [REDACTED] GRO

Sent from my iPad

On 15 Dec 2014, at 09:34, "Ingrid Kelly" [REDACTED] GRO wrote:

Dear Mark,

I am sure you are aware that making a programme involves far more than merely filming. As I have said it is not practically possible for the team to accommodate an interview after today.

As you maintain your designated interviewee cannot possibly accommodate an interview at any point today – despite our offer to be available either before or after their normal working day (though the former is clearly now redundant) then we too are in a difficult position.

If this person is the only person within the Post Office who is appropriate for interview, then I'd be grateful if you could ask them to consider being interviewed at the end of their working day today.

Failing that, then as I've said, we will fairly reflect the post office's position within the film whether or not you are on the sofa.

Regards

Ingrid

From: Mark R Davies [REDACTED] GRO
Sent: 15 December 2014 08:58
To: Ingrid Kelly
Cc: Nick Wallis; Jane French; Melanie Corfield; Ruth X Barker
Subject: Re: Post Office interview

Dear Ingrid

You have singularly failed to set out why you need two full days to prepare your film and why the interview you requested must happen today. This is not reasonable.

We stand ready to take part yet you refuse to budge from a self imposed deadline and are unable to explain why you require more than 48 hours to prepare a film, having presumably shot most of it, including several interviews designed to traduce the Post Office's position. I note from his Twitter feed that Nick was filming for 10 hours on Thursday.

While we would like to appear in your film we reserve the right to ensure that, given the range of issues you are raising, we make the most suitable person available. She is not available today due to work on the Scheme. I am therefore stuck - do I place the Scheme and the interests of applicants ahead of your request? The answer here is obvious.

We will send you a statement and a very full document setting out the answers to the questions posed by Mr Wallis. I would request that given your refusal to accommodate a full and proper Post Office interview the statement is used in full.

We did indeed suggest that we have a slot on your sofa. I didn't imagine for a moment this would mean a scenario where our points would not be reflected through interview in your film. It provides no real opportunity for the Post Office to respond to the serious and unfounded allegations you plan to make.

Best wishes

Mark
Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
Mobile: GRO

Sent from my iPhone

On 14 Dec 2014, at 22:38, "Ingrid Kelly" [GRO] wrote:

As i have said unfortunately the team cannot accommodate a filmed interview beyond monday. Far from asking you to prioritise us over the scheme, we've said we can accommodate the interview as early or late tomorrow as necessary to suit your allotted person so as not to interfere with their working day. If neither you nor any other spokesperson can be available then, as ever, we can accept a written response. Appearing live in the studio on the sofa after the film was your suggestion which we were happy to accommodate. Should you no longer wish to do that then while it is disappointing, it is your decision. The offer remains open.

Regards

Ingrid

On 14 Dec 2014, at 21:19, "Mark R Davies"

[GRO] wrote:

Hi Ingrid

Thanks for this. I am struggling to understand why it "needs" to be on Monday, particularly as, for the reasons set out in my earlier emails, we are unable to provide a suitable spokesperson on Monday due to competing business priorities related to the Scheme and applicants. It would be ironic indeed if we were to relegate these responsibilities.

As I've also said, and as Nick has acknowledged, your sofa slot will not provide a suitable forum for the Post Office to respond to the very serious and unfounded allegations you plan to make in what will now inevitably be a film which does not present a full and rounded picture. It would be extremely unfair to suggest as you do now that a minute or two in the studio will provide suitable opportunity for the Post Office's position to be fairly reflected.

Given the circumstances therefore we could not appear in the studio.

I ask you again to please reconsider your refusal to accept a Post Office spokesperson for your film on a more reasonable deadline.

Many thanks

Mark

Mark Davies

Communications and Corporate Affairs Director

Mobile: [GRO]

Sent from my iPhone

On 14 Dec 2014, at 17:53, "Ingrid Kelly"

GRO

wrote:

Dear Mark,

As I've said if you or a colleague wish to be interviewed for the film then it needs to be on Monday. You may feel late Tuesday is reasonable but as i've made plain from the outset, beyond Monday is not possible for us.

As i've also said any monday interview can be as early or as late as you wish. Should neither you nor your colleague be available for a filmed interview tomorrow then we are content with a statement for the film as we had last week. As things stand, you yourself will be on the sofa on wednesday and able to reflect the Post Office's position.

Regards

Ingrid

On 14 Dec 2014, at 10:28, "Mark R Davies"

GRO

wrote:

Hi Ingrid

It isn't about your schedule disappointing us at all, it is about our reasonable offer, repeated again here, to provide an interview for your programme and your reluctance to accommodate us in a reasonable timescale.

It is a little baffling that you are not prepared to allow us reasonable time to respond with an interview. While I appreciate the demands of filming, editing and clearing at your end, we are able to offer an interview for your programme a full 24 hours before you broadcast. That seems eminently reasonable to me and I am sure it is logistically achievable.

Without Post Office input by interview into the film and the opportunity to respond to the detailed points and allegations made it will clearly be impossible, as Nick has accepted, to respond fully in the studio in a two or three minute slot. I do not think in those circumstances we could appear in the studio: the film will be very skewed without our voice in it.

Given the work my colleague must undertake on behalf of the Scheme and applicants this week, I will have to check with her, but I think it might be possible to conduct an interview in the late afternoon on Tuesday.

I think she will be out of London but I am sure this can be overcome. Do let me know what time would be suitable and I will confirm a location.

Best wishes
Mark
Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate
Affairs Director
Mobile: [GRO]

Sent from my iPhone
On 13 Dec 2014, at 17:40, "Ingrid
Kelly" [GRO]
wrote:

Hi Mark,

I'm sorry if our
schedule disappoints
and inconveniences
you or the post office
but we won't be
postponing. You
have the allegations
and our schedule. You
can respond within the
film by a statement if
no one appropriate is
available for interview
on monday - and of
course you yourself
will be responding on
the sofa after the item
airs.

Regards

Ingrid
On 13 Dec 2014, at
17:07, "Mark R
Davies"

GRO
GRO wrote:

Hi Ingrid
That is
very
disappoin
ting. To
stress we
would
like to
offer a
spokespe
rson for
your
program
me's pre-
recorded
film and
are able
to but not
in the
timetable
you
suggest.

Our

position
is very
reasonabl
e. I
assume
the
program
me will
return
after
Christmas
. What is
the
urgent
reason
for being
unable to
give us
the time
we need?

You plan
to make a
series of
complex
and very
serious
allegation
s about
Post
Office
Ltd, all of
which can
be
answered
in detail.
I do not
understan
d why
your
timescale
s are such
that you
cannot
accommo
date an
interview
for a film
24 hours
before
broadcast
. You are

asking for
48 hours
for your
own
internal
processes

.

Nick has
himself
suggested
that a
sofa slot
would
not really
give us
the
opportuni
ty to
answer
the very
complex
range of
allegation
s he is
making.
We agree
and
clearly
would be
unable to
take part
in the
studio if
our
position
is not
reflected
in the pre-
recorded
film.

It cannot
be fair to
feature a
series of
other
interview
s in the
film, all
of which
were

presumably
filmed
last week
in good
time for
your
deadlines,
without
giving
Post
Office,
which is
very firm
in its
position,
the
opportunity to
respond.
There are
two sides
to every
story, as
you
know.

I would
like to
ask you
to
reconsider
your
position
please.

Best
wishes
Mark
Mark
Davies
Communications
and
Corporate
Affairs
Director
Mobile:

GRO

Sent from
my

iPhone
On 13
Dec
2014, at
12:24,
"Ingrid
Kelly"

GRO

wrote:

I'm afraid not. The programme is off air for a fortnight and will run on weds. If you really can't do an pre recorded interview on monday then as you'll be on the sofa on weds, you'll be able to respond then.

Regards

Ingrid
On 13 Dec 2014, at 12:15, "Mark R Davies"

GRO

wrote:

Hi Ingrid

Many thanks for this.

In that case please can I formally request that the item is held until it is possible for the Post Office to respond on film? There is no urgency or need to broadcast this item on Wednesday, especially as the Mediation Scheme is continuing. Due to pressing and competing business priorities related to the mediation scheme and involving applicants to it, we cannot provide suitable representation until late Tuesday afternoon at the earliest.

I appreciate your own legal and other processes - you will appreciate our own.

I am formally offering you this interview with a

senior manager who leads on the issues you are discussing and think it is reasonable for the Post Office to have the opportunity to put forward its position in a reasonable timescale.

We also stand ready to put a spokesperson up live in the studio.

Best wishes

Mark

Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
Mobile: [GRO]

Sent from my iPhone
On 13 Dec 2014, at 09:48, "Ingrid Kelly"
[GRO] wrote:

Hi Mark,
I'm afraid the practicalities mean a filmed interview wd need to be done on monday to be incorporated into the piece. The lawyers and editorial advisory teams all need to take their time checking the Item so it's a rather cumbersome process. The interview can be as early or as late as suits but it does need to be monday i'm afraid.

best

ingrid
On 13 Dec 2014, at 09:29, "Mark R Davies"
[GRO] wrote:

Hi Nick

Many thanks for your email.

As you will appreciate you have raised a broad range of issues which range across legal, IT and network support. We are very keen to be able to respond to all these issues in detail, particularly as there are some really fundamental points raised in your questions.

To that end we are working to ensure that we can provide you with the best possible response. As mentioned in my previous email, as well as input from the suppliers of our IT system and a legal view on the serious points you raise, we need (and I think this is reasonable) to provide you with a spokesperson who can speak across this range of issues.

We are dealing however on Monday and Tuesday with mediation scheme matters which relate to applicants. So we can absolutely be available later on Tuesday or on Wednesday morning.

I do appreciate the challenges you have around filming and editing of course but I am sure you will appreciate the challenges from our side as well.

I suggest we speak first thing Monday morning and hopefully you will be able to come back to me on the timescale above and I will be able to update you too on where we are - please be assured we will do everything we can to ensure we give you the opportunity to interview the Post Office on these important matters.

Best wishes

Mark

Mark Davies

Communications and Corporate
Affairs Director
Mobile: GRO

Sent from my iPhone
On 12 Dec 2014, at 20:43, "Nick
Wallis" GRO
wrote:

Hi Mark

Thanks for your email. I am
delighted you are inclined to
offer studio live *and* pre-
recorded filmed interviews.

As Ingrid (cc'd) has confirmed
the planned transmission date
for both would be Wed 17 Dec,
to coincide with the planned
Westminster Hall adjournment
debate on the Post Office called
by James Arbuthnot MP.

As Jane (cc'd) explained to you
on the phone and as I am sure
you understand, we need to set
a time for the pre-recorded
interview well in advance of the
planned transmission date as
the interview will have to be
edited and go through all the
usual processes before being
delivered to the One Show for
broadcast. It is in no one's
interest to rush this.

As Ingrid may have mentioned
(and I defer to her on exactly
how things may be happening
on Wednesday), any studio
guest you nominate will most
likely be allotted around three
minutes interview time, but with
Victoria Wood, Michael Ball, a
children's choir already booked
on Wednesday and the
unpredictability of a live studio
environment, the interview
might get curtailed, or the
discussion itself might veer off
topic, despite everyone's best
efforts.

Could I therefore urge you to fix
up a date and time as soon as
possible to film a pre-recorded

interview where we can ask you, and give you the opportunity to answer, a series of questions on the subjects raised below in a calm and controlled environment.

The interview will, of course, be edited, but we will be scrupulous in our duty of fairness towards the interviewee and the answers they give. Furthermore, whether either, both or no proposed interviews end up being broadcast, we will be taking all reasonable steps to ensure the Post Office's perspective on the serious matters below is properly represented.

I hope all that makes sense. Just to ensure you are clear on the internal division of labour surrounding the two proposed interview opportunities, Ingrid will deal with you re the arrangements re the possible live interview on the One Show sofa, whilst Jane and I can work with you to arrange a pre-recorded interview at a location of your convenience.

I hope to hear from you soon re a proposed pre-recorded interview location/date/time and interviewee. I am happy to liaise with you over the weekend to book it in in good time.

Yours,

Nick

From: Mark R Davies

GRO

Sent: 12 December 2014 18:47

To: Ingrid Kelly

Cc: Jane French; Nick Wallis; Melanie Corfield; Ruth X Barker

Subject: Re: Post Office interview

Ah - thanks Ingrid. That does give us more time. Many

thanks for clarifying.

Best wishes
Mark
Mark Davies
Communications and
Corporate Affairs Director
Mobile: [GRO]

Sent from my iPhone
On 12 Dec 2014, at 18:34,
"Ingrid Kelly"
[GRO]
wrote:

No Mark that's my
mistake in the
voicemail. as per my
text - it is weds!
Apologies all. Ingrid
On 12 Dec 2014, at
18:32, "Mark R
Davies"
[GRO]
[GRO] wrote:

Dear Jane,

Thank you for
your time today.
Just to follow up
my previous
email, I can
confirm that the
Post Office
would welcome
the opportunity
to respond in
your film and in
the studio to the
very serious and
detailed
allegations being
made in the email
we received from
Nick Wallis
(copied below
for ease of
reference).

I understand
from Ingrid Kelly

that you are now
planning to air
this item on
Monday evening.
This comes as a
surprise as you
indicated
Tuesday or
Wednesday when
we spoke earlier.

Either way, given
the very serious
nature of the
allegations being
made, and the
requirement to
give us
reasonable time
to respond, we
do not believe
we can meet
your deadline
of noon on
Monday for an
interview to be
conducted.

We are inclined
to offer an
interview but our
spokesperson,
who is leading
the investigations
process on the
matters you
reference, is
involved in
mediation
scheme work on
Monday and
Tuesday. I am
sure you will
recognise that
this work,
which involves
scheme
applicants, is
very important.

She could be
available later in

the week and as she is best placed to speak for the business on the complex range of issues you have raised, I believe it is reasonable to ask you to hold off on broadcasting your item until such time as we are able to respond properly.

Moreover, our spokesperson is able to respond to the specific issues you raise in a way no other colleague in our business can given her role and first hand knowledge of the specifics Nick has referred to. I would also stress again, however, that Post Office cannot comment on individual cases.

The Ofcom guidelines on matters like this make clear that we should be given reasonable time to consider and make our response to requests such as this. What constitutes a reasonable time must surely take the urgency of a

situation into account. There is no urgency here, especially in the light of your broadcast last week and the ongoing nature of the mediation scheme, not to mention the point I raised on the phone about potential compromise of cases going through the scheme. Given that the programme is broadcast every evening it seems reasonable to me to ask for the timescales to be extended so that we can respond properly.

I look forward to hearing from you. I am also copying this to Ingrid Kelly who kindly left me a voicemail this afternoon confirming that we could indeed have a slot in the studio to answer questions on your film. I also copy Nick Wallis, and Mel Corfield and Ruth Barker from the Post Office press office.

I am happy to

discuss this over
the weekend.

Best wishes

Mark

Mark Davies
Communications
and Corporate
Affairs Director
Mobile: **GRO**
GRO

From: Nick
Wallis

GRO

Sent: 12
December 2014
11:53
To: Melanie
Corfield
Subject:
Interview request

Dear Melanie,

1) Thank you for
your help with
The One Show
item transmitted
on Tuesday
9thDecember.
We are now
preparing a
second film
which is due to
go out on The
One Show on
BBC1 at around
the same time
next week. We
would be most
grateful if the
Post Office
would be
prepared to offer
an interview
expressing its
point of view in
the continuing

dispute with
some
Subpostmasters
over Horizon and
associated issues.
This would need
to be recorded
by noon on
Monday but we
would be able to
meet you at your
location of
choice and we
can do it over the
weekend if that is
the only option.

2) The film we
are broadcasting
once again refers
to concerns over
Horizon. This
time it features
the story of
Steve Phillips
from Nelson in
South Wales
who is having
problems with
the system, as
well as
interviews from a
group of former
subpostmasters
including Noel
Thomas, Jo
Hamilton, Julian
Wilson, who say
they felt under
pressure to sign
off incorrect
accounts even
though they did
not understand
how sums could
be missing.

Mr Phillips says
he and other
Subpostmasters
live in fear of
being told to pay

back losses
neither you or
they can explain,
and he adds that
he and other
Subpostmasters
do not trust
Horizon. This
latter point of
trust in Horizon
by
Subpostmasters
is one which has
come up many
times with other
former
Subpostmasters
we have spoken
to.

3) In our film
former
Postmasters say
it is difficult to
investigate the
causes of
shortfalls for
which they are
held liable,
because of the
way Horizon and
associated POL
processes and
policy function.
They say in order
to open for
business the day
after the close of
a trading period
they had to agree
to pay back
alleged shortfalls
(either by settling
to cash or
settling centrally,
which implies
payment later).
They say this put
them in a very
difficult position.

4) We ask one

former
Subpostmaster
why she pleaded
guilty to false
accounting in
court when she
believed herself
to be innocent.
She tell us she
felt she couldn't
defend herself
because she
didn't have
proper records,
that the Post
Office had taken
some potentially
useful items and
paperwork away
during their
investigation and
she felt she
would be
prosecuted for
theft as well as
false accounting
if she had not
pleaded guilty to
the latter.

5) We
understand from
the
Subpostmaster
contract and
from speaking to
former
Subpostmasters
who have been
through the
process that
Subpostmasters
are not allowed a
legal
representative
when they are
interviewed
under caution by
Post Office
investigators.
Instead they are
allowed one

companion who must be a Post Office employee, who is not allowed to speak. Does this still happen? If so, why does the Post Office think it is fair? Also, we are aware that Post Office conducts PACE interviews at which Subpostmasters are allowed legal representation. Could you explain in what circumstances you think it appropriate to interview someone under caution but with legal representation, and why this is not available to Subpostmasters in the interviews which usually precede them?

6) We would also like to put to you some opinion about the Post Office's approach to investigating and prosecuting subpostmasters. We are in possession of expert opinion from a professor in criminal justice which implies the Post Office's dual function as

investigator and prosecutor, and its 300 year cultural history of using it against its agents is unique. That's not to say he thinks you are the only organisation with prosecuting powers, but that you have a unique culture of prosecuting your agents. He implies this approach lacks the checks and balances of a typical prosecution by the CPS. In his opinion this creates a situation where miscarriages of justice are more likely to occur.

The Post Office has assured us in a Freedom of Information Act request that it uses the Crown Code for Prosecutors. Can you please explain how this code was applied in the following cases: Jackie McDonald, Damian Owen and Tom Brown. In these cases the Post Office pursued its own prosecution despite no

prosecution
having been
brought by the
CPS after police
investigations. If
you are unable to
comment on
individual cases,
please comment
on cases like this
in general.

7) There is also a
point raised by
Geoffrey
Sturgess, a
business contract
expert. He
believes
Subpostmasters
should be told
about the history
of known
problems with
Horizon (such as
the Calender
Square issue and
others raised in
Second Sight's
Interim Report)
which have led to
shortfalls in
Subpostmaster
accounts and the
history of other
allegations
against Horizon
before they are
allowed to sign
the
Subpostmaster
contract.

8) We will also
include opinion
from Sandip
Patel QC who
specialises in
areas including
business fraud
and cyber crime.

He will say he believes that innocent people might have been wrongly convicted. He will also say there may be grounds for arguing that the Horizon system (incorporating the business processes around it) is not as reliable as the Post Office believed it to be. He goes on to say that if the PO had failed to carry out a proper inquiry in circumstances when they should have, then some of the convictions of some of the Postmasters in the mediation scheme might be unsafe.

9) With more than a hundred MPs now saying they have no confidence in the mediation scheme we would like to ask the Post Office what it thinks is the correct way to move forward and find an equitable resolution to the concerns of subPostmasters up and down the

country.

10) In summary, we have found a number of experts in their field who have concerns about the Horizon system, the PO's investigations and prosecutions function and the fairness of the Subpostmaster contract. It suggests there is the possibility that the way the Post Office goes about its business or did go about its business needs some proper explanation. One MP described the nature of the relationship between the Post Office and SPMRs as "feudal", yet you call them your "life blood".

The content of the proposed programme is not set in stone. This is an opportunity for the Post Office to respond to the widespread criticism it is currently facing. I am seeking a senior member of staff from the Post Office who can explain everything from

the Post Office's
perspective so
that we can get
to the bottom of
what has
happened to
these people. If
you will not
appear on
camera then we
ask that you
provide a
substantive
response to the
issues raised
above by noon
this
coming Monday
15 Dec.

Thank you

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:
148 OLD
STREET,
LONDON EC1V
9HQ.

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: 148 OLD STREET,
LONDON EC1V 9HQ.

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: 148 OLD STREET,
LONDON EC1V 9HQ.

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: 148 OLD
STREET, LONDON EC1V 9HQ.

This email
and any
attachmen
ts are
confidenti
al 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
communic
ation. 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
specificall
y stated.

POST
OFFICE
LIMITED
is
registered
in England
and Wales
no
2154540.
Registere
d Office:
148 OLD
STREET,
LONDON
EC1V
9HQ.

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: 148 OLD STREET, LONDON EC1V 9HQ.

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: 148 OLD STREET, LONDON EC1V 9HQ.

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: 148 OLD STREET, LONDON EC1V 9HQ.

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: 148 OLD STREET, LONDON EC1V 9HQ.

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: 148 OLD STREET, LONDON EC1V 9HQ.
