

**From:** "CN=Andrew Winn/OU=e/O=POSTOFFICE" <CN=Andrew Winn/OU=e/O=POSTOFFICE>

**To:** "alan.lushe" [GRO] <[GRO]>

**Subject:** Re: Rivenhall

**Date:** Thu, 23 Oct 2008 12:46:45 +0100

**Importance:** Normal

---

Alan

Responses to the specific questions:-

1. The only way POL can impact branch accounts remotely is via the transaction correction process. These have to be accepted by the branch in the same way that in/out remittances are i guess. If we were able to do this, the integrity of the system would be flawed. Fujitsu have the ability to impact branch records via the message store but have extremely rigorous procedures in place to prevent adjustments being made without prior authorisation - within POL and Fujitsu

These controls form the core of our court defence if we get to that stage. He makes a casual accusation that is extremely serious to the business. As usual he should either produce the evidence for this or withdraw the accusation. Cheques can be carried across branch trading periods. This is necessary for branches who have accepted cheques after the last collection has been made. If they were forced to rem out they would be producing a legally binding trading statement that states there are no cheques in the branch when there is - and we would then suspend them!

2. What "the abnormal nature of these entries" means, i assume no one knows. The implication is that he acknowledges that when he "made good" at branch trading he did not and falsified his branch trading statement and rolled the loss forward. So for example, at period end his derived Horizon cash position was £20K but he only physically has £10K. He rolls over by telling Horizon he has put an extra £10K into the till - so the derived position is still £20K carried forward into the next trading period (even though there is only £10K in the till).

His claim is that if he then ran a snapshot report immediately after roll the derived cash position would be £30K - still only £10K in the till but the carried forward cash position has increased thus doubling the cash shortage. This would be clearly evidenced by a discrepancy being shown between the carried forward and opening cash positions in subsequent branch trading statements.

If that does not satisfy him he would need to establish that his trial balance actually balances. If it does (and it will) he would need to demonstrate where the balancing £10k element of the loss is.

These are all things for him to prove. If he can support any of his allegations we will investigate - and be extremely worried whilst doing so.

Hope this helps

Andy

[GRO]

Alan Lusher  
15/10/2008 10:51  
To: Andrew Winn/e/POSTOFFICE [GRO]  
cc:  
Subject: Rivenhall

Hi Andrew,

I spoke to you a few days ago about a suspension at Rivenhall. From our conversation, I believe that you had a good understanding of the problem and I would be grateful for further guidance. Rivenhall is a one position rural branch - the only abnormal product being an ATM

I have attached notes of the interview should you want to refer to them, although they are rather long. There are two issues which the suspended subpostmaster, Mr Graham Ward, raised:

1. He claims that on a number of occasions figures have appeared in the cheques line of his account. He suspects these have been input to his account electronically without his knowledge or consent. He is certain that he has cleared and remmed out cheques in the correct way and tells me that cheques must be properly cleared on the system to progress to a new account.
2. He has made good about £10,000 and not made good about £11,000 of the shortages which arise from these figures. He claims that because of the abnormal nature of these entries, the shortages have not just rolled over from one branch trading statement to the next, but have accumulated - each being added to the last. ( e.g if the account in period one showed a shortage of £100 which was not made good, then the shortage shown in period 2 would be £200).

The subpostmaster's contract remain suspended. I would be very grateful for your expert comment and advice.

Regards

---

Alan Lusher  
Contracts Advisor - Network Support Team  
Post Office Ltd  
13-17 Thorpe Road, Norwich, NR1 1AA

( [GRO] or [GRO]  
E [GRO] or [GRO]  
[GRO]

Confidential Information: This e-mail 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 e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.

---

>>>> Rivenhall - 3 - Interview Notes - 02-10-08 - AL.doc attachment was removed

from this email <<<<