
From: Mark Underwood1[/O=MMS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=MARK UNDERWOOD222A42EC-51A8-4DFA-A353-DCEA512679657B4]
Sent: Thur 06/08/2015 9:57:21 AM (UTC)
To: Mark R Davies [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED]
Cc: Melanie Corfield [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: POIRs

Fantastic – thanks.

Mark Underwood
Complaint Review and Mediation Scheme

[REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED]

From: Mark R Davies
Sent: 06 August 2015 10:57
To: Mark Underwood1
Cc: Melanie Corfield
Subject: Re: POIRs

Letter I think.

It was ok. She was relatively calm and Jane and Paula did a v good job. SS have been emailing her and Bridgen. She is unconvinced by our rebuttal to the SS report.

No terrible outcomes and general agreement that holding the line is the right approach.

M

Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
Post Office Ltd

Mobile [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED]
On 6 Aug 2015, at 10:53, Mark Underwood1 [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED] wrote:

Are you out from the meeting Mark - it go ok?

I am in a meeting from 11 but will take a look at the below are that. Is this for a letter of telephone call?

Mark Underwood
Complaint Review and Mediation Scheme
[REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED]

From: Mark R Davies
Sent: 06 August 2015 10:52
To: Melanie Corfield
Cc: Mark Underwood1
Subject: Re: POIRs

I'm happy if legal are?

Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
Post Office Ltd

Mobile: **GRO**

On 6 Aug 2015, at 08:26, Melanie Corfield **GRO** wrote:

Like you Mark, I am cooling off completely on doing much more editorially but:

- On the Hamilton case we should (a) knock down the docs they have completely. By more explicitly 'standing by' our documents , Karen might feel slightly more uneasy and curb the misconduct laims (b) address the POR issue.
We must do this because Karen thinks it is a killer fact. I've played around with some lines - I have no idea if they are correct in criminal law! Let me know if they even make sense.

Mel

-
Operational errors can be innocent mistakes or they can be dishonest. As we have said before, in cases where an audit discloses a loss in circumstances where there is evidence of false accounting, the fact of the loss together with the false entries will often be regarded as sufficient evidence on which to **base** a charge of theft.

But the Code for Crown Prosecutors' test for 'sufficient evidence for a reasonable prospect of conviction' could, naturally, require more evidence than that for bringing a charge. It can involve many months of investigation and obtaining further evidence before it is met. **Further evidence can be entirely unrelated to Horizon and use of the system. This would not form part of the mediation scheme review or documentation - it was not a criminal cases review.**

- Panorama is intending to include extracts from documents in the programme. None of the documents you have raised with us, support any allegation of insufficiency of evidence for the charge or prosecution that was brought, financial motive on the part of the Post Office in doing so, or indeed any of the other allegations being made.
- The two privileged legal documents Panorama has extracted from are part of the comprehensive privileged material from a legal file which contains all the available prosecution documents, including those for the prosecution's preparation for going to trial on the charge and unused evidence for trial.