

---

**From:** Patrick Bourke[/O=MMS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=PATRICK BOURKBE7DB8D6-53EC-4534-922B-495877001727E11]  
**Sent:** Thur 07/05/2015 2:49:47 PM (UTC)  
**To:** Parsons, Andrew [mailto:[REDACTED]  
GRO]; Tom Wechsler [mailto:[REDACTED]  
GRO]; Jessica Barker [mailto:[REDACTED]  
GRO]  
**Cc:** Rodric Williams [mailto:[REDACTED]  
GRO]; Pheasant, Andrew [mailto:[REDACTED]  
GRO]  
**Subject:** RE: Offenders Report [BD-4A.FID25887093]

Andy

Thanks.

The document says that no evidence was found of FA or theft (albeit 'so far') – I think it fair to assume that will be made to be seriously embarrassing for POL.

We'll need to pick up tomorrow.

P

---

**From:** Parsons, Andrew [mailto:[REDACTED]  
GRO]  
**Sent:** 07 May 2015 12:43  
**To:** Patrick Bourke; Tom Wechsler; Jessica Barker  
**Cc:** Rodric Williams; Pheasant, Andrew  
**Subject:** RE: Offenders Report [BD-4A.FID25887093]

Patrick

Noted about getting a definitive number of cases – I'll look into this when I'm back in the office tomorrow.

I have however now had chance to review the Offenders Report for Hamilton.

There is nothing obviously embarrassing to POL in the Report – it is largely a factual document. There are a couple of points on which Hamilton might raise queries:

- Final Page – Numbered Point 1 – this states that the increasing cash levels in the branch were not spotted. It doesn't say who should have spotted this – POL or Hamilton. I think this meant POL. This could be used as an argument to say that POL should have intervened earlier.
- On the Final Page, the Report states that it has been sent to POL Legal for advice on the merits of prosecution. This gives rise to a couple of points:
  - First, Hamilton may ask to see that advice which is obviously privileged, opening up again the debate on POL suppressing documents.
  - Second, by releasing the Offenders Report, being itself a privileged document, you raise the risk of waiving privilege in other connected documents. To mitigate this risk, POL would need to expressly state that the release of the Offenders Report to Hamilton does not constitute a waiver of privilege in other documents.

Andy Pheasant is currently reviewing the Offenders Report against the POIR to make sure there are no factual inconsistencies.

If POL does consider releasing the Offenders Report, I would recommend first seeking advice from CK, particularly around the concept of waiving privilege in other documents as this may operate differently in a prosecution context.

Kind regards  
Andy

**Andrew Parsons**  
Managing Associate

*Bond Dickinson*

Direct: [REDACTED] **GRO**  
Mobile: [REDACTED]  
Fax: [REDACTED]

Follow Bond Dickinson:



[www.bonddickinson.com](http://www.bonddickinson.com)

---

**From:** Patrick Bourke [mailto:[REDACTED] **GRO**]  
**Sent:** 07 May 2015 09:25  
**To:** Parsons, Andrew; Tom Wechsler; Jessica Barker  
**Cc:** Rodric Williams  
**Subject:** RE: Offenders Report

Hi Andy

Many thanks for this.

I think we do need a definitive answer on total number of cases in which this has happened (unless 2 is that answer) and then which cases those are and what we ought to be doing about it.

It is really unfortunate that this should have happened at all (and in two of our most high profile cases to boot – Hamilton and Thomas).

Since Jo Hamilton is already on the case, the sooner we can set this record straight the better, self-evidently.

Many thanks

Patrick

---

**From:** Parsons, Andrew [mailto:[REDACTED] **GRO**]  
**Sent:** 06 May 2015 17:06  
**To:** Tom Wechsler; Patrick Bourke; Jessica Barker  
**Cc:** Rodric Williams  
**Subject:** Offenders Report

All

Summary of the position on Offenders Reports

- Offenders Reports (which also go by a number of different names) are a summary of POL Security Team findings into suspected criminal activity. They form the basis for the decision on whether to prosecute.
- In early 2014, POL had prepared a small number of POIRs. Tony then asked POL to redraft the POIRs using a new format / with a slightly different focus.
- Between the first and second versions of the POIRs, CK identified that the first versions of the POIRs had been annexing Offenders Reports that were privileged documents (see email chain attached).
- This matter was discussed at POL. The decision was taken not to disclose Offenders Reports and that any resulting issues should be escalated to Chris Aujard – see email below from Rodric.
- As a result, the Offenders Reports were removed from the revised versions of the POIRs. I can only find reference to this happening in two cases: M035 and M029.
- In Jo Hamilton's case (M035), the Offenders Report, being document 12 was removed, and the subsequent documents renumbered (hence why Jo believes that Doc 16 is now missing because it has become document 15).

As discussed, I'll re-review the M035 Offenders Report and also give some thought to the consequences of now disclosing it.

Kind regards  
Andy

**Andrew Parsons**  
Managing Associate

*Bond Dickinson*

Direct: [REDACTED]  
Mobile: [REDACTED]  
Fax: [REDACTED] **GRO**

Follow Bond Dickinson:



[www.bonddickinson.com](http://www.bonddickinson.com)

---

**From:** Rodric Williams [mailto:[REDACTED]]  
**Sent:** 08 May 2014 21:59  
**To:** Jarnail Singh; Parsons, Andrew  
**Cc:** Chris Aujard; Jessica Madron  
**Subject:** Re: M029 [BD-4A.FID25887033]

All,

Having discussed this with Chris and Jessica, the protocol for the use of "Officer Reports" (or as otherwise described) by Project Sparrow investigators when responding to individual complaints is:

1. The report is NOT to be exhibited OR expressly referenced in Post Office's formal response to a complaint.
2. It can be used by the investigator to help them understand what happened in a particular case, and to identify other documents relevant to the case (e.g. transcripts of interviews, branch account records etc).
3. If the report is the ONLY source document still available, the investigator can repeat material from the report (provided it is not legally privileged), but CANNOT cite the report as a reference.
4. Any challenge received about the source of a Post Office statement made from the report must be referred to

Chris.

I hope that is clear and reflects the decision made. Please let me know if not.

Kind regards, Rod

---

**From:** Jarnail Singh  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 08, 2014 01:08 PM  
**To:** Parsons, Andrew [mailto:[GRO](mailto:)]  
**Cc:** Rodric Williams; Chris Aujard; Jessica Madron  
**Subject:** RE: M029 [BD-4A.FID25887033]

Andy

I anticipate Chris is the best person to make a decision on this point on behalf of POL.

Are allegations POL has NOT properly investigated being made generally or in specific cases?. One of the dangers of investigation officers report being disclosed is that it will always be easy for the applicant to think of something not specifically referred to in the report and allege that POL investigation has not been sufficiently thorough or adequate. Of course it is highly unlikely that the investigation will have been deficient, but in the absence of full set of papers it may become impossible for POL to rebut such new allegations.

Regards  
Jarnail

Jarnail Singh | Criminal Lawyer



148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ



**GRO**

Postline: [mailto:[GRO](mailto:GRO)]



**GRO**

Mobex:



**GRO**



[Post Office stories](#)



[@postofficenews](#)



---

**From:** Parsons, Andrew [mailto:[GRO](mailto:)]  
**Sent:** 08 May 2014 12:23  
**To:** Jarnail Singh; Chris Aujard; Jessica Madron  
**Cc:** Rodric Williams  
**Subject:** RE: M029 [BD-4A.FID25887033]

Thanks Jarnail - There are two cases that are currently affected by this issue. They both urgently need to be cleared and sent to Second Sight so how would you like to take this forward to a decision?

Kind regards  
Andy

**Andrew Parsons**  
Senior Associate  
for and on behalf of Bond Dickinson LLP

*Bond Dickinson*

Direct:   
Mobile:   
Fax:

**GRO**

Follow Bond Dickinson:



[www.bonddickinson.com](http://www.bonddickinson.com)

---

**From:** Jarnail Singh [mailto:] **GRO**  
**Sent:** 08 May 2014 11:09  
**To:** Chris Aujard; Jessica Madron  
**Cc:** Rodric Williams; Parsons, Andrew  
**Subject:** RE: M029 [BD-4A.FID25887033]

Chris/ Jessica

As I understand it, POL has been advised by senior counsel that investigation and offender report should not be disclosed. It is of course matter for POL to make a decision whether to accept this advice or not and of course it would be open for POL to decide to discourse such documents. I personally would be unhappy for such documents to be disclosure for reasons set out in counsel Harry Bowyers advice note.

Given the email correspondence between Bond Dickinson and cartwright King, I would be grateful if I could be informed whether POL has made a decision or Bond Dickinson are proceeding along the disclosure route without POL having made a decision.

P.S I will forward Andrew Parsons email to CK sent on 6/5/14 at 15.38.

Thanks

Jarnail

Jarnail Singh | Criminal Lawyer



148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ



GRO  Postline  GRO



GRO  Mobex:



GRO



[Post Office stories](#)



[@postofficenews](#)

POST  
OFFICE

---

**From:** Parsons, Andrew [mailto:[GRO](#)]  
**Sent:** 07 May 2014 16:24  
**To:** Martin Smith  
**Cc:** Rodric Williams; Jarnail Singh  
**Subject:** RE: M029 [BD-4A.FID25887033]

Martin

Thanks – if you could mark on the docs any bits that you would prefer to be redacted that would be great.

Kind regards  
Andy

**Andrew Parsons**  
Senior Associate  
for and on behalf of Bond Dickinson LLP

*Bond Dickinson*

Direct:   
Mobile:   
Fax:   
**GRO**

Follow Bond Dickinson:



[www.bonddickinson.com](http://www.bonddickinson.com)

---

**From:** Martin Smith [mailto:[GRO](#)]  
**Sent:** 07 May 2014 16:17  
**To:** Parsons, Andrew  
**Cc:** Rodric Williams; Jarnail A Singh  **GRO**   
**Subject:** M029

Hi Andy,

Thank you for your e-mail; It would appear that Harry Bowyer looked at an earlier version of the proposed response sometime ago and before we were asked to suggest amendments on draft responses using Track Changes. In those circumstances I have added comment to the latest version of the proposed response which I have attached hereto.

Whilst we have advised that as a matter of principle investigation and offender type reports should not be disclosed, I understand that there will be cases in which it is felt that there is no

alternative other than to disclose these. In such circumstances they should be appropriately redacted. If you would like me to deal with that, please let me know.

The disclosure of redacted reports may lead to requests for the disclosure of such reports in other cases.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you wish to discuss.

Kind regards,

Martin.

Martin Smith

martin.smith@ GRO

martin.smith@ GRO

Tel:  GRO



Birmingham | Derby | Leeds | Leicester | London | Newcastle | Nottingham | Sheffield | Tyneside

[www.cartwrightking.co.uk](http://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.

**Please consider the environment! Do you need to print this email?**

The information in this e-mail and any attachments is confidential and may be legally privileged and protected by law. [jarnail.a.singh@ GRO](#) only is authorised to access this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not [jarnail.a.singh@ GRO](#) please notify [andrew.parsons@ GRO](#) as soon as possible and delete any copies. Unauthorised use, dissemination, distribution, publication or copying of this communication or attachments is prohibited and may be unlawful.

Any files attached to this e-mail will have been checked by us with virus detection software before transmission. Bond Dickinson LLP accepts no liability for any loss or damage which may be caused by software viruses and you should carry out your own virus checks before opening any attachment.

Content of this email which does not relate to the official business of Bond Dickinson LLP, is neither given nor endorsed by it.

This email is sent for and on behalf of Bond Dickinson LLP which is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales under number OC317661. Our registered office is St Ann's Wharf, 112 Quayside, Newcastle Upon Tyne, NE1 3DX, where a list of members' names is open to inspection. We use the term partner to refer to a member of the LLP, or an employee or consultant who is of equivalent standing. Our VAT registration number is GB123393627.

Bond Dickinson LLP is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority.

\*\*\*\*\*

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: Finsbury Dials, 20  
Finsbury Street, London EC2Y 9AQ.

\*\*\*\*\*