

Message

From: Rodric Williams [GRO]
Sent: 01/11/2019 19:32:30
To: Emanuel, Catherine [GRO]; Andrew Parsons [/o=Exchange-Org/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=ad9ed344815e47e4aaa3c0e7e1740919-Andrew Pars]; Lerner, Alex [GRO]; Watts, Alan [GRO]
CC: Jonathan Gribben [/o=Exchange-Org/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=ea64a893cedd463ea82d76a4b08032dd-Gribben, Jo]; Michael Wharton [/o=Exchange-Org/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=c5d1fba922c540cba78e94f1f8c75b15-Wharton, Mi]
Subject: RE: KEL Disclosure - response from Freeths [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]

All clear.....

From: Rodric Williams
Sent: 01 November 2019 18:42
To: Emanuel, Catherine [GRO]; andrew.parsons <[GRO]>; Lerner, Alex [GRO]; Watts, Alan <[GRO]>
Cc: Jonathan Gribben <[GRO]>; Michael Wharton <[GRO]>
Subject: RE: KEL Disclosure - response from Freeths [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]

Pls stand down on this, ie NO MORE EMAILS FOR THE NEXT HOUR PLEASE.
I'm trying to get something for Board and the debate's not helping.

From: Emanuel, Catherine [mailto:[GRO]]
Sent: 01 November 2019 18:40
To: andrew.parsons <[GRO]>; Ben Foat <[GRO]>; Lerner, Alex [GRO]; Rodric Williams <[GRO]>; Watts, Alan <[GRO]>
Cc: Jonathan Gribben <[GRO]>; Michael Wharton <[GRO]> [GRO]
Subject: RE: KEL Disclosure - response from Freeths [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]

Why don't the lawyers take this offline and discuss the right approach.

From: Andrew Parsons [GRO]
Sent: 01 November 2019 18:27
To: Ben Foat <[GRO]>; Lerner, Alex [GRO]; Rodric Williams [GRO]; Watts, Alan <[GRO]>; Emanuel, Catherine [GRO]
Cc: Jonathan Gribben <[GRO]>; Michael Wharton <[GRO]>
Subject: RE: KEL Disclosure - response from Freeths [HS-London_11.FID2085233] [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]

Ben

Agreed, that is the risk of waiting before saying something. However by Monday we should have a better idea if the audit is going to lead to further disclosures and that is the key driver of whether (and how) to break cover on this point or not. We should make a decision on whether (or not) to notify the Court of the audit by cob Monday at the very latest. That leaves Post Office with a risk between now and then that the Judge sends his draft judgment, but with the advantage of being able to make a better decision on Monday. On that basis, Tony's recommendation (which is a finely balanced call) is to take the risk and wait to Monday.

Kind regards
Andy

Andrew Parsons

Partner

Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP



[Sign up for legal updates, e-newsletters and event invitations](#)



womblebond Dickinson.com



From: Ben Foat <[GRO]>
Sent: 01 November 2019 17:21
To: Andrew Parsons <[GRO]>; Lerner, Alex <[GRO]>; Rodric Williams
[GRO]; Watts, Alan <[GRO]>; Emanuel, Catherine
Cc: Jonathan Gribben <[GRO]>; Michael Wharton <[GRO]>
Subject: RE: KEL Disclosure - response from Freeths [HS-London_11.FID2085233] [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]

Thanks Andy – the challenge is that Fraser J could give notice that he is handing down the judgment on Monday so the audit needs to quickly be finalised and an agreed position landed.

Thanks
Ben



Ben Foat

Group General Counsel
Ground Floor
20 Finsbury Street
LONDON
EC2Y 9AQ

Mobile: [GRO]

From: Andrew Parsons <[GRO]>
Sent: 01 November 2019 16:56
To: Ben Foat <[GRO]>; Lerner, Alex <[GRO]>; Rodric Williams
[GRO]; Watts, Alan <[GRO]>; Emanuel, Catherine
Cc: Jonathan Gribben <[GRO]>; Michael Wharton <[GRO]>
Subject: RE: KEL Disclosure - response from Freeths [HS-London_11.FID2085233] [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]

All

I was on the phone with Tony when these emails came in.

In short, we think the audit should be completed (because PO has a duty to ensure that disclosure is done properly in light of the doubts we have about FJ).

There is then a tactical question about whether to tell the Cs and the Court about the audit so to ensure that the judgment doesn't land before the audit is complete. Point 3 in Alex's email is an interesting idea along these lines. The other points, although valid, might re-open substantive debate on the KELs so we may wish to steer away from them.

A&M should have a preliminary view on the outcome of the audit on Monday at which point we will be in a better position to understand the risks of different options.

Kind regards
Andy

Andrew Parsons

Partner

Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP



[Sign up for legal updates, e-newsletters and event invitations](#)



womblebond Dickinson.com



From: Ben Foat <GRO>
Sent: 01 November 2019 16:25
To: Lerner, Alex <GRO>; Andrew Parsons <GRO>; Rodric Williams <GRO>; Watts, Alan <GRO>; Emanuel, Catherine <GRO>
Cc: Jonathan Gribben <GRO>; Michael Wharton <GRO>
Subject: RE: KEL Disclosure - response from Freeths [WBDUK-AC.FID27103678] [HS-London_11.FID2085233]

Thanks Alex – these are reasonable points which I would support.



Ben Foat

Group General Counsel
Ground Floor
20 Finsbury Street
LONDON
EC2Y 9AQ

Mobile: GRO

From: Lerner, Alex <GRO>
Sent: 01 November 2019 16:21
To: andrew.parsons <GRO>; Ben Foat <GRO>; Rodric Williams <GRO>; Watts, Alan <GRO>; Emanuel, Catherine <GRO>

GRO

Cc: Jonathan Gribben { GRO } Michael Wharton { GRO }
Subject: RE: KEL Disclosure - response from Freeths [WBDUK-AC.FID27103678] [HS-London_11.FID2085233]

Thanks, Andy.

Have you spoken to Tony already? If not, our initial thoughts are that we should respond, copying the Court, setting out our position i.e.

- that there is nothing in the material disclosed
- the Claimants never asked for the other 14k
- we were in the process of doing an audit of the extraction of the KELs so the C's could be satisfied that we have complied with our obligations, but if they would prefer that the work in question stop to enable the judgment to be handed down, we are ok with that. (We have considered whether or not it is now necessary to flag the audit at all and the pros and cons of doing so, but our initial view is that we should do so)
- in those circumstances we don't think it is right for the Court to note any more than that late disclosure was given. If the Court is minded to comment substantively on the issue, we would like the opportunity to address the position
- we should also point out that it is disingenuous to present PO as drip feeding KELs to the Claimants, rather than acknowledging that the 386 were the ones referred to at trial and the others were versions of the ones no one sought to rely on

Please can you loop me in when you discuss with Tony?

Thanks

Alex

Alexander Lerner
Senior Associate, Dispute Resolution
Herbert Smith Freehills LLP

T { GRO } M { GRO }
www.herbertsmithfreehills.com

From: Andrew Parsons < { GRO } >
Sent: 01 November 2019 13:48
To: Ben Foat < { GRO } >; Rodric Williams { GRO } Watts, Alan
{ GRO }; Emanuel, Catherine { GRO } Lerner, Alex < { GRO } >
Cc: Jonathan Gribben < { GRO } >; Michael Wharton { GRO }
Subject: KEL Disclosure - response from Freeths [WBDUK-AC.FID27103678]

All

Please find attached two letters from Freeths to us and the Court. They have decided not to make any further submissions on the KEL disclosure. They seem to be prioritising getting the Horizon judgment asap which makes me think that they want it for the PTA hearing.

I've asked Counsel what we now do about the A&M audit that is underway and whether it should be stopped.

Kind regards
Andy

Andrew Parsons
Partner
Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP



[Sign up for legal updates, e-newsletters and event invitations](#)



womblebond dickinson.com



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. [alex.lerner](#) **GRO** only is authorised to access this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not [alex.lerner](#) **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. 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.womblebond dickinson.com/legal notices for further details.

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

Herbert Smith Freehills LLP and its subsidiaries and Herbert Smith Freehills, an Australian Partnership, are separate member firms of the international legal practice known as Herbert Smith Freehills.

This message is confidential and may be covered by legal professional privilege. If you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose or use the information contained in it. If you have received this email in error please notify us immediately by return email or by calling our main switchboard on +44 20 7374 8000 and delete the email.

Further information is available from www.herbertsmithfreehills.com, including our Privacy Policy which describes how we handle personal information.

Herbert Smith Freehills LLP is a Limited Liability Partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC310989. It is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors' Regulation Authority of England and Wales whose rules can be accessed via www.sra.org.uk/code-of-conduct.page. A list of the members and their professional qualifications is open to inspection at the registered office, Exchange House, Primrose Street, London EC2A 2EG. We use the word partner of Herbert Smith Freehills LLP to refer to a member of Herbert Smith Freehills LLP, or an employee or consultant with equivalent standing and qualifications. Herbert Smith Freehills LLP's registration number for Value Added Tax in the United Kingdom is GB 927 1996 83.

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”