

Message

From: Rodric Williams [REDACTED] **GRO**
Sent: 28/01/2019 11:29:25
To: Andrew Parsons [/o=Exchange-Org/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=ad9ed344815e47e4aaa3c0e7e1740919-Andrew Pars]
CC: Amy Prime [/o=Exchange-Org/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=ab7222dda3a9453eaed5751238a59562-Amy Prime]
Subject: RE: Post Office Group Litigation - Update on Mediation / Potential Mediators – CONFIDENTIAL & SUBJECT TO LEGAL PRIVILEGE - DO NOT FORWARD [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]

Thanks Andy.

Jane was going to send my email to Paula and Al, so we'll need that feedback from her before we go back to Freeths. We can clarify this with her this afternoon, but I suggest you pull together the reading list in the meantime, as that will be required whomever is ultimately appointed, or to give to someone (e.g. Pres of the Law Society) if we cannot agree the appointment and need someone to make it for us.

Rod

From: Andrew Parsons [REDACTED] **GRO**
Sent: 28 January 2019 10:18
To: Rodric Williams [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED]
Cc: Amy Prime [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Post Office Group Litigation - Update on Mediation / Potential Mediators – CONFIDENTIAL & SUBJECT TO LEGAL PRIVILEGE - DO NOT FORWARD [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]

Rod

I think that is everyone's agreement other than Jane. Did she speak to you about this?

If she agrees too, then we'll send a letter back to Freeths that confirms Charles Flint. The plan is to send a simple and unobjectionable reading list to Freeths for approval. We can then get CFQC (I think this is now the 7th QC instructed on this matter?!!!) read in and up to speed. After that, we will then think about how we can start using him as leverage against Freeths.

Kind regards
Andy

Andrew Parsons
Partner
Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP

d: [REDACTED]
m: [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED]
t:
e: andrew.parsons [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED]

[Stay informed: sign up to our e-alerts](#)



womblebonddickinson.com



From: Nick Bea GRO

Sent: 28 January 2019 09:40

To: Rodric Williams; Jane MacLeod; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; Mark R Davies; Stuart Nesbit; Patrick Bourke; Thomas P Moran; Melanie Corfield; Catherine Hamilton; Julie Thomas; Mark Underwood1

Cc: Andrew Parsons

Subject: RE: Post Office Group Litigation - Update on Mediation / Potential Mediators – CONFIDENTIAL & SUBJECT TO LEGAL PRIVILEGE - DO NOT FORWARD

Agreed by me

Thx



Nick Beal

Head of Agents' Development & Remuneration

Retail Business Unit
20 Finsbury Street,
London
EC2Y 9AQ

GRO

From: Rodric Williams

Sent: 28 January 2019 03:00

To: Jane MacLeod <GRO>; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd GRO

GRO Mark R Davies <GRO>; Stuart Nesbit

GRO >; Patrick Bourke <GRO>; Rodric Williams

GRO >; Thomas P Moran <GRO>; Melanie Corfield

GRO >; Nick Beal <GRO>; Catherine Hamilton

GRO >; Julie Thomas <GRO>; Mark Underwood1

Cc: Andrew Parsons GRO

Subject: Post Office Group Litigation - Update on Mediation / Potential Mediators – CONFIDENTIAL & SUBJECT TO LEGAL PRIVILEGE - DO NOT FORWARD

Post Office Group Litigation – CONFIDENTIAL & SUBJECT TO LEGAL PRIVILEGE - DO NOT FORWARD

All,

In February 2018 the Court ordered the parties to “use their reasonable endeavours to attend a mediation as soon as practicable after receipt and consideration of the Judgment on the Common Issues to attempt to resolve or at least narrow the dispute by way of mediation.”

The Claimants have to date rejected our proposals to mediate in accordance with the Court’s order, preferring to defer mediation until after we have the judgment on the Horizon Issues trial. In doing so, the Claimants rejected our proposed mediators (Bill Marsh and Phillip Howell-Richardson, whose CVs are attached), on the basis that they are not Queen’s Counsel. They instead propose Michel Kallipetis QC, William Wood QC, and Charles Flint QC (CVs also attached).



We do not agree with the Claimants' reason for debarring the well qualified candidates we proposed. However, a mediator can only be appointed if both parties agree, and although we could equally reject Claimants' proposed mediators, we recommend agreeing to Charles Flint being appointed as mediator, for the following reasons:

- He is well recognised in the top tier of commercial mediators.
- We have previous experience of using Michel Kallipetis, and question whether he will have the energy and drive required to resolve this complex and multi-faceted dispute.
- The feedback on William Wood is that he may not be sufficiently forceful or persuasive, compared to Charles Flint's more assertive approach.
- Agreeing one of the Claimants' proposed mediators for good, not solely pragmatic reasons resolves what could otherwise be a time consuming satellite dispute.
- There is no tactical benefit to rejecting the Claimants' proposals:
 - o the mediator is neutral, appointed equally by the parties to help them reach a consensual resolution of their dispute;
 - o the mediator is not a judge, and cannot compel any party to do something they do not want to do;
 - o mediation is "without prejudice", meaning the Court does not oversee how it is conducted.
- The risk of appointing the "wrong" mediator is typically confined to the time and expense wasted while they acted as mediator:
 - o Although a party will not interview potential mediators prior to appointment (it could be seen to compromise their neutrality), it can end a mediator's appointment if it so chooses, e.g. if they lose confidence in the mediator's abilities.

Please let us know if you have any objection to proceeding with our recommendation, or have any other questions or comments on the appointment of a mediator.

With thanks and kind regards, Rod



Rodric Williams
Head of Legal - Dispute Resolution & Brand
20 Finsbury Street
London EC2Y 9AQ
T: **GRO**
E: **rodric.williams** GRO

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.

"Post Office Limited is committed to protecting your privacy. Information about how we do this can be found on our website at www.postoffice.co.uk/privacy"

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. rodric.williams [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED] only is authorised to access this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not rodric.williams [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED] please notify andrew.parsons [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED] 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. Information about how we use personal data is in our [Privacy Policy](#) on our website.

Any files attached to this e-mail will have been checked by us with virus detection software before transmission. Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) 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 Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP, is neither given nor endorsed by it.

This email is sent by Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP which is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales under number OC317661. Our registered office is 4 More London Riverside, London, SE1 2AU, 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.

Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP is a member of Womble Bond Dickinson (International) Limited, which consists of independent and autonomous law firms providing services in the US, the UK, and elsewhere around the world. Each Womble Bond Dickinson entity is a separate legal entity and is not responsible for the acts or omissions of, nor can bind or obligate, another Womble Bond Dickinson entity. Womble Bond Dickinson (International) Limited does not practice law. Please see www.womblebonddickinson.com/legal for further details.

Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority.