
From: David Oliver [GRO]
Sent: Thur 01/05/2014 8:29:56 AM (UTC)
To: Chris Aujard [GRO], Belinda Crowe [GRO], Angela Van-Den-Bogerd [GRO]
[GRO]
Subject: FW: Meeting May 1

Soft copy of the email we will be discussing

D

David Oliver
Programme Manager
Initial Complaint and Mediation Scheme

[GRO]
Mobile [GRO]

From: Anthony Hooper [GRO]
Sent: 30 April 2014 16:17
To: David Oliver [GRO]
Subject: FW: Meeting May 1

Please bring copies of this thread (4 messages) to meeting tomorrow- there is enough on Huddle already. T

From: Ron Warmington [GRO]
Sent: 30 April 2014 16:13
To: Anthony Hooper
Subject: RE: Meeting May 1

Of course Tony. Perfectly happy with that.

Best regards, Ron.

From: Anthony Hooper [GRO]
Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2014 4:03 PM
To: rjw@ [GRO]
Subject: RE: Meeting May 1

Dear Ron

Thank you- I would like, if you agree, to put a copy of this email before the WG- it raises issues as to the duty of POL in conducting their investigation.

Tony

From: Ron Warmington [GRO]
Sent: 29 April 2014 19:00
To: Anthony Hooper; 'Ian Henderson'
Cc: mediation@ [GRO]
Subject: RE: Meeting May 1

Tony:

Much as we understand the need to move on, and also that in some circumstances we may need to produce a Report for the Mediator even when significant matters remain unresolved, we cannot agree to so rushing the process that we fail to discharge our primary and much publicised responsibility to carry out an independent investigation into the matters raised in each case. This is even more important now that we can see that POL is failing to deliver the detailed investigative work that it had previously committed to.

In order to make this completely clear, I'll highlight some of the outstanding matters in cases **GRO**:

GRO In this case, there were two important matters that were left inadequately answered in POL's incoming 'Preliminary Investigation Report' ('PIR'). Those were the £2,000 cheque-related entry that seemed to have been entered during the Applicant's training on the new Horizon system (HOL), where Post Office's PIR suggested that Tracey Merritt entered that in order to cover up a shortage; and the £9,500 cheque that Tracey had (she said) "put in the basket" the night before the Auditors turned up, where POL's stance is that she somehow slipped in a cheque, that would anyway bounce, by a sort of sleight of hand under the auditor's nose on the morning of the audit.

On 22nd April we sent 51 questions (that POL ought already to have asked and had the Applicant answer) to Tracey's just-appointed Professional Advisor (you'll recall she had not appointed a PA to help her prepare her CQR). We only this morning received the answers to those questions and we will be putting both those questions and answers up on Huddle. As you will see when you read through them, this puts the ball squarely back into POL's court in that, among other things, Tracey says that the POL Trainer entered the £2,000 transaction. This is a rather critical conflict of evidence (that only emerged today) that our report needs to deal with. It won't take long but we cannot issue even a draft report that does not deal with this critical issue. This regrettable delay is a direct consequence of POL failing to conduct a proper investigation, either at the time, or when preparing its PIR.

GRO POL only released its Report on this case last Thursday. That Report contains lots of brand new material and much of it poses new questions, some of

which, as it happens, we had already put to the Applicant but there may need to be other questions that will need to be answered. Our 22 questions to the Applicant were sent on April 25 and the Applicant (Dionne Andre) sent us emails yesterday (April 28) saying that she is going through her old documents (those that POL did not take away) in order to find the critically important ATM-produced print-outs that we need (and that POL's Auditors ought to have captured and copied when they found out about the shortages in the first place) in order to be able to answer the questions: Was there really a Loss? and if so: Where did the Money Go?

The records that she thinks she still has are needed now (and should have been copied and submitted to us by POL as attachments to its PIR) for both her case as well as for case [GRO]. As yet, we have no answers from the Applicant to those 22 questions. It follows that we simply cannot deliver an incomplete report in the knowledge that the applicant is urgently investigating these key matters. Once again, this regrettable delay is a direct consequence of POL failing to conduct a proper investigation, either at the time, or when preparing its PIR.

Like you Tony, we really want to get these reports in for Mediation, and it is not for lack of our investigative effort that we cannot do so at the moment. We are in effect the last link in the process immediately prior to mediation and are totally dependent on both the applicant and POL addressing the critical issues in a thorough and prompt manner prior to our investigation and report. This has not happened in these two cases.

Turning now to what we have produced for the 1st May meeting. We have already loaded onto Huddle the draft 31 page 'Part 1' Report that will no doubt be the subject of a detailed discussion by the Working Group. We will also be uploading our report on [GRO], along with the other documents mentioned above. We feel that these documents should form the basis of a discussion as to what improvements can be made to the current arrangements in order to speed up the delivery of all reports and to ensure that mediation occurs as quickly as possible.

Best regards,

Ron

Ron Warmington CFE, FCA

Director

Second Sight Support Services Ltd

Tythe Farm
Maugersbury
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire
GL54 1HR

Phone:

GRO

Mobile:

Email:

Website: <http://www.2ndsight.eu>

From: Anthony Hooper [GRO]
Sent: Tuesday, April 29, 2014 3:47 PM
To: Ian Henderson [GRO]; 'Ron Warmington' [GRO]
Subject: Meeting May 1

Dear Ron and Ian,

Thank you for putting up the "Branch Operating Procedures" document. I see you are putting up [GRO] later today. I would be very grateful if you could also put reports of [GRO] albeit that changes may need to be made in the light of questions being asked. As I have said before, if you are dissatisfied with a PO Report then you should explain in your report why you are dissatisfied in some detail and leave it to the mediator. In a number of cases it may be impossible to get to the bottom of what happened. In any individual case it is your responsibility to report, if you can, your opinion on the balance of probabilities as to whether the claimed loss was in part or in whole the fault of the PO.

I know how hard you are working but I am very anxious to move to the next stage at least in these three cases.

Best wishes

Tony

This email (including attachments) is confidential and may be privileged. If you have received this email in error, please notify Matrix immediately. You may not copy, forward, disclose or otherwise use any part of it. It is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure that this email is virus free and no responsibility is accepted by Matrix for any loss or damage arising in any way from receipt or use of it. Emails are susceptible to interference. The contents of this email may not have originated from Matrix, or be accurately reproduced. If verification is required, please request a hard-copy version.