

**From:** Hugh Flemington[[IMCEAEX-  
\_O=MMS\_OU=EXCHANGE+20ADMINISTRATIVE+20GROUP+20+28FYDIBOHF23SPDLT+29  
\_CN=RECIPIENTS\_CN=HUGH+2EFLEMINGTON14106A9A-9886-403D-BF5B-  
E08821F432B3@C72A47.ingest.local]  
**Sent:** Thur 04/07/2013 8:01:02 AM (UTC)  
**To:** 'martin.smith@[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]'; simon.clarke@[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED];  
**Cc:** Jarnail A Singh[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]; Susan  
Crichton[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]; Rodric Williams[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED];  
**Subject:** RE: Horizon Letters - Strictly Private & Confidential - Subject to Privilege - Do Not Forward

Urgent plse

Martin / Simon – does the updated Timeline info at Point 2 change your advice at all plse?

- It looks to me as though we may have only been able to view it as a repeating problem in Feb 2013 when we were first able to see it happened for a second time (does that make a difference? – see question 1 below)
  - It also looks like we then ask FJ to investigate in Feb 2013

SO my questions are:

1. Do you still have to look back to cases since it first happened in Jan 2012 (we will want you to anyway)
  2. Does it mean the only GJ statements that might give concern are ones since Feb 2013?

*Susan and I have to brief the CEO at 9.45*

Hugh Flemington | Head of Legal



148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ



**GRO** | Mobex: **GRO**



GRÖ



## Post Office stories



@postofficenews



**From:** Rodric Williams

**Sent:** 03 July 2013 20:50

**Cc:** Hugh Flemington; Jarnail A Singh

**Subject:** FW: Horizon Letters - Strictly Private & Confidential - Subject to Privilege - Do Not Forward

Simon, Martin,

Two issues following on from our conference today:

1. the letters to branches regarding the 14 Branch Anomaly ("B14") and its impact on the (purported) prosecution of an assistant at a "Costcutter" branch; and
2. the timing of when B14 came to the attention of Post Office Limited and Fujitsu

#### 1. Letters to Branches

I attach the letters we propose sending to the branches affected by B14. The "Merthyr Dyfan" letter concerns the Costcutter branch which might have involved a Police prosecution of a branch assistant. Unfortunately, we are still no clearer on the status of this investigation/prosecution.

During our con, you recommended sending information concerning B14 to defense counsel (assuming there is one). Please provide us with a draft letter for this purpose and an indication of the information which should be supplied with it. In case it assists, I attach the initial report Gareth Jenkins produced on B14 (the version I received was dated 10 May 2013, but I see from the attachment that it uses an auto-date).

During our con, you explained prosecuting counsel's duty of disclosure. Please also let us know whether we could satisfy our duty of disclosure (i.e. that we know of an issue which might be relevant to criminal proceedings) by notifying the Police/Costcutter prosecuting counsel of B14 so that they can take a view on whether they should disclose it to the defense in accordance their duty.

#### 2. B14 Timing

- Issue first surfaced at POL Finance Service Centre (FSC) on 6 February 2012, at the close of a Branch Trading period
- Issue concerned the £9799.88 discrepancy at Willen branch
- FSC might have proactively contacted SPM given the size of the discrepancy
- FSC investigated, saw that it looked wrong, and brought the account back to balance (i.e. £0) at no cost to the SPMR
- FSC would have monitored the Willen branch to see what happened the following month
- Over the next few weeks, as the rest of the Branch Trading data for the same period was processed, the other 13 branch anomalies were noted
- Those other branches' accounts were brought to balance, again at no cost to the subpostmaster
- This was not perceived to be a significant issue given the small number of branches affected and the small sums involved
- On 6 February 2013, the Willen SPMR contacted POL National Business Support Centre (NBSC) to report the same discrepancy in his Branch Trading as the previous year
- NBSC passed this on to Fujitsu between 6 and 8 February 2013
- Fujitsu then notified FSC of the problem on 28 February 2013
- Fujitsu resolved B14 on 25 April 2013

Does any of this change the advice given at the con?

Please let me know if you wish to discuss.

Kind regards, Rodric

Rodric Williams | Litigation Lawyer





**GRO**

Postline: **GRO**



**GRO**



Post Office stories



@postofficenews



**From:** Parsons, Andrew [mailto:**GRO**]  
**Sent:** 02 July 2013 16:25  
**To:** Rodric Williams  
**Subject:** RE: Horizon Letters - Strictly Private & Confidential - Subject to Privilege - Do Not Forward

Rodric

As discussed, revised letters attached.

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:** Parsons, Andrew  
**Sent:** 02 July 2013 15:37  
**To:** Rodric Williams  
**Subject:** RE: Horizon Letters - Strictly Private & Confidential - Subject to Privilege - Do Not Forward

Rodric

Please find attached the Merthyr Dyffod letter which I've amended in the same way as the previous 9.

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:** Andrew Winn [mailto:] **GRO**  
**Sent:** 02 July 2013 15:10  
**To:** Rodric Williams  
**Cc:** Parsons, Andrew  
**Subject:** RE: Horizon Letters - Strictly Private & Confidential - Subject to Privilege - Do Not Forward

Hi Rodric

Yes they are the ones I sent to Andy.

Andy

---

**From:** Rodric Williams  
**Sent:** 02 July 2013 14:40  
**To:** Andrew Winn;  **GRO**  
**Cc:** Rod Ismay  
**Subject:** RE: Horizon Letters - Strictly Private & Confidential - Subject to Privilege - Do Not Forward

Thanks all.

Andy Winn – can you please confirm that letters in the zip file are those emailed by Andy Parsons at 1432, plus the one for Merthyr Dyfdd.

I need to check the position on the Merthyr Dyfdd one because of a criminal prosecution taken against a staff member of that branch, before sending them all to Lesley Sewell and Alwen Lyons for approval.

Thanks, Rodric

Rodric Williams | Litigation Lawyer

---



148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ



**GRO**

Postline:  **GRO**





**GRO**



[Post Office stories](#)



[@postofficenews](#)



---

**From:** Andrew Winn  
**Sent:** 02 July 2013 14:32  
**To:** [andrew.parsons](#) **GRO**  
**Cc:** Rod Ismay; Rodric Williams  
**Subject:** FW: Horizon Letters - Strictly Private & Confidential - Subject to Privilege - Do Not Forward

Hopefully this zip file will have all 10 in!

---

**From:** Andrew Winn  
**Sent:** 02 July 2013 13:16  
**To:** 'Parsons, Andrew'  
**Cc:** Rod Ismay ( **GRO** ); Rodric Williams  
**Subject:** RE: Horizon Letters - Strictly Private & Confidential - Subject to Privilege - Do Not Forward

Hi Andy

Amended versions.

On Rosyth Terminus I've altered the end of the 5<sup>th</sup> para "Errors made by yourself" as Alan does not work in branches. The same would be said of all the letters going to a head office rather than a branch. In the scheme of things not a big issue.

Cheers

Andy

**GRO**

---

**From:** Parsons, Andrew [mailto: **GRO**] **GRO**  
**Sent:** 01 July 2013 19:24  
**To:** Rodric Williams; Rod Ismay  
**Cc:** Matthews, Gavin; Andrew Winn  
**Subject:** RE: Horizon Letters - Strictly Private & Confidential - Subject to Privilege - Do Not Forward

Rodric, Rod

Please find attached the 10 letters to SPMRs for your review.

I've based these on the template letter however each has needed to be customised depending on each branch's specific circumstances. My amendments are as follows:

- Amendments in **yellow** are where there is a variable in the template that needs to be changed in each letter and I have updated the variable.
- Track change amendments are where I have changed/deleted sections of the template letter to meet specific circumstances.

In general, my amendments have been to:

- Adjust for whether a branch suffered a gain or a loss.
- Adjust the loss/gain figures.
- Adjust the final paragraph as to how the gains/losses will be settled (this depends on whether there is a loss / gain and whether there is a SPMR or multiple branches)
- Adjust dates to reflect trading periods. For example, I believe that a loss incurred in TP10 will actually be in January. Hence the date of the loss needs to be 2012 rather than 2011 or 2013 rather than 2012.

I've taken my information from the original letters produced by Andy Winn.

I've inserted the address for WHSmith and updated the "typo" to refer to 14 branches rather than 5 SPMRs.

There is only one letter where the SPMR knew of this issue (Willen). However, I had understood that POL had received two complaints. Was this second complaint from a Crown branch?

I'll be on my direct dial below for the next 30 mins and then on the BB if you need me.

Kind regards  
Andy

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

*Bond Dickinson*

Direct: [redacted]  
Mobile: [redacted]  
Fax: [redacted]

**GRO**

Follow Bond Dickinson:



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

---

**From:** Rodric Williams [mailto:[rodrick.williams@bonddickinson.com](mailto:rodrick.williams@bonddickinson.com)] **GRO**  
**Sent:** 01 July 2013 14:50  
**To:** Parsons, Andrew  
**Cc:** Matthews, Gavin  
**Subject:** FW: Horizon Letters - Strictly Private & Confidential - Subject to Privilege - Do Not Forward

Andy – here's the latest draft letter to branches re: the 14 Branch Anomaly.

Can you please produce the individual letters to the branches based on this template, then email them all back to me in draft.

Thanks for your assistance.

Kind regards, Rodric

Rodric Williams | Litigation Lawyer

---



148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ



**GRO** Postline: **GRO**



**GRO**



**GRO**



Post Office stories



@postofficenews



**From:** Rod Ismay  
**Sent:** 01 July 2013 14:44  
**To:** Rodric Williams; Simon Baker; Lesley J Sewell; Andrew Winn; Joanna Jacobson  
**Subject:** Horizon Letters - Strictly Private & Confidential - Subject to Privilege - Do Not Forward

Hi, further to my conversations with Joanna in Communications and with Rodric in Legal I attach the latest redrafted letter. Suggested actions:

1. Simon / Lesley – consideration of whether need to run the letter past Fujitsu
2. To consider briefing NFSP (George and Marilyn)
3. Rodric to liaise with Bond Dickinson as per the remainder of my note below

I have made one change from the v2 version which I sent round at 17:22 on Friday. That change is to expand the introductory section for branches who have not previously had any communication about this issue. This is the bit in smaller font at the start of the letter

Rodric has advised that Bond Dickinson are on standby to populate individual tailored letters from a master template.

The plan is therefore that Bond Dickinson will produce the 10 individual letters as variants to the attached example. These should then be recirculated with myself and Andy as prime sign offs in terms of checking that the variants do properly reflect the chain of events. We appreciate that this is not a straightforward situation.

I think there are a number of paragraphs requiring tailoring of wording or values or dates etc. These should include the following areas:

Has there already been comms with this branch about it?

Gain or loss?

Does a previous branch owner need mentioning?

Is it right to refer to TP9 only?

Was the loss / gain made good locally or settled centrally?

If settled centrally, was it blocked or was payment made?

Are there other losses & gains to refer to?

How will it be resolved (pay run, or something else)

In terms of addressees, we believe that the addressees on the original draft of 10 letters produced by Andy are right to use. The addressees are either the current subpostmaster or the nominee / multiple retailer head office contact for branches which are owned by multiple partners.

There is one branch under separate review where a different agent was in tenure at the time when the original loss or gain arose in the first place in 2010 (Bowness 266418)

The one missing address in the earlier 10 drafts was WHS (for the Houndslow branch). We will send that on shortly.

Thanks, Rod

Rod Ismay | Head of Finance Service Centre

2<sup>nd</sup> Floor West Block, No 1 Future Walk, West Bars, Chesterfield, S49 1PF

**GRO** Postline **GRO**  
Mobex **GRO**  
**GRO**

POST  
OFFICE

\*\*\*\*\*

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. andrew.winn@**GRO** only is authorised to access this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not andrew.winn@**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.

\*\*\*\*\*