
From: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd[redacted GRO]
Sent: Fri 05/09/2014 3:13:07 PM (UTC)
To: Jane Hill[redacted GRO]; Parsons, Andrew[redacted GRO];
Belinda Crowe[redacted GRO]; Rodric
Williams[redacted GRO]; Mark R Davies[redacted GRO]
Subject: RE: Confidential and Legally Privileged - Hope Farm Road Post Office
Attachment: Lauren Griffiths response. clean.docx
Attachment: Mrs Gina Griffiths 5th Sept 2014.pdf
Attachment: FW: Hope Farm Road Post Office

Hi All,

I attach a clean version of the draft response to Lauren's e-mail and her original e-mail. I also attach the letter I have sent to Gina this afternoon.

I am keen to send this response to Lauren today so would be grateful for your comments. Especially **Mark** – from a comms perspective and **Andy** or **Rod** from a legal perspective.

Thanks,
Angela

Angela Van Den Bogerd | Head of Partnerships



148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ



[redacted GRO]



[angela.van-den-bogerd@\[redacted GRO\]](mailto:angela.van-den-bogerd@[redacted GRO])



[Post Office stories](#)



[@postofficenews](#)



Confidential Information:

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorised review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient please contact me by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

From: Jane Hill
Sent: 03 September 2014 14:44
To: Parsons, Andrew; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; Belinda Crowe
Cc: Rodric Williams; Mark R Davies
Subject: RE: Confidential and Legally Privileged - Hope Farm Road Post Office

Hi Angela

Please find attached a draft response to Lauren Griffiths for others' comments. I've suggested we don't respond to her point about the Post Office being a large corporate organisation. It implies that we would be more generous if we weren't publically-owned and taxpayer-funded.

On a broader point, is there any way they can sell the branch – and we pay them - outside the NT process, particularly if the current sale falls through?

I've copied Mark as I think he should review before it's sent.

Best wishes

Jane

Jane Hill | Head of Public Affairs

1st Floor, Banner Wing, 148 Old Street, London, EC1V 9HQ

[GRO]
jane.hill [GRO]



From: Parsons, Andrew [GRO]
Sent: 03 September 2014 08:30
To: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; Belinda Crowe; Jane Hill
Cc: Rodric Williams
Subject: Re: Confidential and Legally Privileged - Hope Farm Road Post Office

I agree that we can't have Deloitte talking to Lauren but I suspect they have a shared database for storing docs which means that Lauren could potentially access POL files without Deloitte even knowing about it. However, I would expect Deloitte to be able to put IT blocks on Lauren's access without her even knowing.

Rodric - given the sensitivity, this may be one for you to discuss with Deloitte if everyone else agrees?

A

Andrew Parsons
Senior Associate
for and on behalf of Bond Dickinson LLP
Sent by blackberry
Mobile: [GRO]

From: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd [GRO]
Sent: Wednesday, September 03, 2014 08:22 AM
To: Belinda Crowe [GRO]; Jane Hill [GRO]
Cc: Parsons, Andrew; Rodric Williams [GRO]
Subject: Re: Confidential and Legally Privileged - Hope Farm Road Post Office

Hi Belinda

Gina has previously given her consent to Lauren communicating on her behalf.

Lauren has previously sent me correspondence from her Deloitte e-mail address and I did ask her at the time whether her employer was comfortable with her doing so. Her response was that this was acceptable.

Angela

GRO

From: Belinda Crowe

Sent: Wednesday, September 03, 2014 08:11 AM

To: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; Jane Hill

Cc: Parsons, Andrew (GRO) <(GRO)>; Rodric Williams; Belinda Crowe

Subject: RE: Confidential and Legally Privileged - Hope Farm Road Post Office

Thanks Angela

A couple of techie points from me which Andy/Rod will have a view on:

1. I agree that setting out all the support we have provided on this would be helpful but even though Gina is copied in, should we provide this information to Lauren without Gina's consent?
2. I see Lauren has emailed from a Deloitte email account. We have a call off contract with Deloitte and I am not sure whether this is a problem but they have done work for us on Horizon. I am not suggesting in any way that we notify Deloitte and Lauren will know whether Deloitte have HR rules about using email for personal use but I just wanted to flag it in case there's a propriety issue.

Otherwise see some comments in the text below in red.

Best wishes

Belinda Crowe

Belinda Crowe

148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ

GRO

GRO

belinda.crowe@ (GRO)

From: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd

Sent: 02 September 2014 20:09

To: Jane Hill

Cc: Belinda Crowe; Parsons, Andrew (GRO); Rodric Williams

Subject: Confidential and Legally Privileged - Hope Farm Road Post Office

Hi Jane,

Further to our discussion earlier I have inserted my comments into the original e-mail below. I appreciate that this is not an easy task in getting the balance right but if you could draft me a response that would be really helpful.

Belinda, Andy, Rod - grateful for any comments that will assist this process.


Thanks,


Angela


Angela Van Den Bogerd | Head of Partnerships

 148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ

 **GRO**

 angela.van-den-bogerd@postoffice.co.uk **GRO**

 [Post Office stories](#)

 [@postofficenews](#)



Confidential Information:

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorised review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient please contact me by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

From: Griffiths, Lauren (UK - London) **GRO**
Sent: 02 September 2014 14:43
To: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd
Cc: **GRO**
Subject: FW: Hope Farm Road Post Office

Angela

After speaking with my mum yesterday I am emailing to let you know how disgusted we are with the treatment our family has received from the Post Office.

As you are well aware it has now been almost a year since we lost our Dad. We hold the Post Office solely and wholly responsible for what happened to him. As I am sure you can imagine, our family has had an extremely tough year, with what I consider no support from the Post Office. I appreciate that this would have been an extremely difficult year for the family given the circumstances. On learning that Martin was in hospital as a result of the accident we have offered the family support through a number of ways. Firstly we funded a temporary Spmr whilst Martin was in hospital whilst continuing to pay Martin the office remuneration. We also at this point and after Martin's death extended our offer of support to Gina his wife and Martin's mother who has been running the shop whilst the temp Spmr has been in place. I met with Gina and Martin's mother in November last year to discuss what their preference was in terms of Hope Farm Rd Post Office. They advised they wanted it sold as quickly as possible. I have since this time been trying to facilitate the transfer to a new agent via the NT process. To help financially I agreed as rental amount the figure they believed was what was required to cover the running costs of the post office (this was above market rent but in the circumstances I accepted at face value).

My Dad was the main income earner for our family, without this income my family has been struggling to get by financially. My mum cannot work in the shop of the Post Office due to the severe ill feeling she holds for it, and my **GRO** **GRO** Grandma is becoming increasingly ill with the stress and workload of keeping the shop open. I appreciate that the transfer of the post office has taken longer than we first anticipated but this has been due to the applicants

withdrawing their interest in the post office. We have continued to fast-track the application process where we can. An applicant has now been offered the position and is awaiting our confirmation to progress with the transfer.

Considering the financial size of a business such as the Post Office Ltd, I cannot comprehend how our family has not been supported or compensated this past year. I firmly believe that we would not have received this kind of treatment from any other large corporate organisation. We need a form of words that's explains why Post Office is different to other large corporate organisations i.e. Govt is shareholder; taxpayers money etc. I'll leave comms to come up with wording but I would base this on the contract and taxpayers money. I wouldn't try to be too defensive as we will not win this. I suspect that another large corporate would be even tougher.

I understand that you are putting what you discussed with my Mum yesterday in writing to her. It appears from what I have heard that you are offering the £140k "compensation payment" on the condition that we drop any action or legal recourse with the Post Office Ltd for any further compensation for its wrongdoing. I explained that the NT Leavers payment agreement includes a standard full and final settlement clause and that this is how all NT Leavers payments have progressed/are progressing. I also explained that whilst Martin was not entitled to the NT Leavers payment as POL had served him 3 months' notice on his contract, POL was offering a NT Leavers payment as a discretionary payment given the circumstances of the situation. However as a NT Leavers payment albeit discretionary this agreement includes the full and final settlement clause. We need to try and explain that until Post Office has concluded its investigation of the Scheme application there is no immediate evidence of wrongdoing on POL's part. The Inquest into Mr G's death did not find POL at fault for Mr G's death - it ruled that he committed suicide. However, we have not seen Mr G's suicide note that could reference Post Office (although if the note did refer to POL, we would have expected POL to have been called in front of the coroner to answer questions). I would gently make the point that we've only just started investigating the application as it has only recently been submitted. We would be happy to wait until the investigation is complete but that would delay the payment of the NT payment and we have responded to Gina's pressing for an answer and resolution on that.

No amount of financial compensation could replace the fact that the Post Office has taken our Dad away from our family but simply put, £140k "compensation" for our Dad's life is simply disgusting. We have not attempted to put a value on Martin Griffith's life we have explained that the timing of the NT Leavers payment offer and the investigation into Mr G's Scheme application are misaligned in that the NT transfer is running ahead of the Scheme investigation findings.


I request that you escalate this matter and you forward this email on to the relevant parties within the Post Office. As stated above, this has now dragged on for almost a year; the way in which the Post office has dealt with this matter has been inadequate and incompetent. If Lauren is referring to the transfer of the post office to a new operator then the progress of this has been determined by the applicants withdrawing their interest. Post Office has not influenced this.

We will get back to you once we have received your response in writing. I would also appreciate a response to this email.

Regards
Lauren

Lauren Griffiths

Deloitte LLP

Tel/Direct:  **GRO**

www.deloitte.co.uk

growth and a prosperous society.
www.deloitte.co.uk/impact

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.

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. jane.hill@bond-dickinson.com only is authorised to access this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not jane.hill@bond-dickinson.com, please notify andrew.parsons@bond-dickinson.com 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.
