
From: BARTY, Susan; [GRO]
Sent: Fri 12/06/2015 5:28:48 PM (UTC)
To: Rodric Williams; [GRO]; Reid, Tom; [GRO]
Subject: RE: BBC Panorama interview

Thanks Rodric. No problem - of course!

Although you will have received my out of office, I am checking emails pretty regularly.

Best wishes

Susan

Sent from my Windows Phone

From: [Rodric Williams](#)
Sent: 12/06/2015 18:08
To: [BARTY, Susan](#); [Reid, Tom](#)
Subject: FW: BBC Panorama interview

And the response.

Susan - I now see you are on Mark's copy list, but better to get it twice than not at all!

Sent from my Windows Phone

From: [Mark R Davies](#)
Sent: 12/06/2015 17:26
To: [Susan Barty](#); [Melanie Corfield](#); [Rodric Williams](#); [Patrick Bourke](#); [Mark Underwood](#)
Subject: Fwd: BBC Panorama interview

All
To see. Felt it important to respond quickly.

Mark

Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
Mobile: [GRO]

Begin forwarded message:

From: Mark R Davies; [GRO]
Date: 12 June 2015 17:24:50 BST
To: Conor Spackman; [GRO]
Cc: Matthew Bardo; [GRO]; Melanie Corfield
[GRO]
Subject: Re: BBC Panorama interview

Dear Conor

Many thanks for this.

We will of course come back to you in more detail next week but for the time being I make the following points:

- you make below some extremely serious allegations about the Post Office. I am gravely concerned that you make these three days after we sat with your team for two hours. I am at a loss to understand why these very specific and serious allegations could not have been raised at the briefing.
- you informed us earlier in the week that your programme schedule has changed and you plan to broadcast on June 29. Given that, diary pressures and the scale and seriousness of the allegations you are making, we will look to arrange the proposed interview in the week of the 22nd. This remains in line with your proposed schedule had your programme been due to broadcast on June 22.
- you quote evidence to suggest the Post Office may have unfairly used theft charges to put pressure on SubPostmasters. Please as a matter of urgency provide some evidence for that very serious allegation.

Best wishes

Mark

Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
Mobile: GRO

On 12 Jun 2015, at 16:56, Conor Spackman GRO wrote:

Dear Mark,

Firstly, I would like to thank you for the time you and your colleagues spent with Matthew Bardo and Tim Robinson on Tuesday. It was very helpful to be able to discuss this subject in detail with the relevant people.

Since we last wrote to the Post Office, our research has continued and I am now able to give you more information about the points that are likely to be raised in the programme.

Our evidence suggests that the Post Office may have unfairly used theft charges to put pressure on sub-postmasters to plead guilty to false accounting and/or repay apparent losses identified by the Horizon computer system. The evidence also suggests that the Post Office failed to consider or investigate the possibility that Horizon could be the cause of some of the losses. As you know, it has been suggested that these failings may have led to miscarriages of justice in some cases.

Having read reports written by Second Sight and Post Office responses to them, we wish to address the following question areas in an interview. They are broken down below under the subject matter to which they relate:

Jo Hamilton

- the decision to charge Jo Hamilton with theft
- why Ms Hamilton's office was £2000 down on the Horizon system and why this doubled to £4000 when she followed the instructions from the help desk
- her claim that she sought help and the Post Office failed to provide it
- her explanation that she subsequently felt trapped and did not know what to do other than sign off inaccurate accounts

Noel Thomas

- Mr Thomas's claim that that he told the helpline about his problems with the system and about the missing money
- the suggestion that it is no longer possible to know the results of important tests carried out on Mr Thomas' system because those records have now been lost or destroyed
- the suggestion that Mr Thomas was poorly treated after 42 years of loyal service
- that the Post Office now believes that the cause of the shortfall in Mr Thomas' branch is likely to have been mistakes by him or his staff

Seema Misra

- Ms Misra's claim that she and her staff were not provided with adequate help despite making more than 900 calls to the helpline
- the suggestion that the Post Office failed to disclose crucial information during Ms Misra's trial including technical information about Horizon to the defence's expert witness
- that the Post Office and Fujitsu had identified bugs in Horizon prior to Ms Misra's trial that were not disclosed to the defence
- the suggestion that this information could have helped Seema and other sub-postmasters stay out of prison

Post Office investigations and prosecutions

- the suggestion that the Post Office has a financial interest in prosecuting sub-postmasters because it helps with the recovery of missing money
- particularly in that context, the suggestion that miscarriages of justice are more likely because the Post Office exercises both the power of investigation and prosecution
- the suggestion that the Post Office has unfairly pursued theft charges to pressure people into paying up
- the claim by numerous sub-postmasters that they were told by Post Office investigators they were the only ones having problems with the Horizon system

Horizon system

- the suggestion that the complexity of the Horizon system adds to the likelihood of errors
- the suggestion that the lack of an automatic paper record from the Horizon system adds to the likelihood of errors

- the suggestion that Post Office prosecutions relied on the belief that the computer system was robust, when in fact computer errors may call this into question
- the suggestion that bugs in Horizon were more widespread than Second Sight have found
- the suggestion that there were around 30 people working in "third line support" at Fujitsu and that they fixed dozens of system errors
- the suggestion that errors were fixed by a team who could access transaction data, add transactions or make changes to transactions that would affect the balance in branch, without the sub-postmasters knowledge

Second Sight investigation and select committee in parliament

- Second Sight's claim that their work has been hampered by an increasing lack of co-operation
- Second Sight's understanding that this is the result of legal advice
- Second Sight's claim that the Post Office has failed to provide full access to legal and prosecution files
- The apparent failure of the Post Office to provide Second Sight with emails relating to the eyewitness account of an incident in Bracknell in 2008
- Second Sight's evidence that remote access to branch data is possible in spite of Post Office denials

Please could you let us know the time that you have scheduled on Wednesday 17 June for the interview? I would be grateful if we could arrive about an hour before the interview begins in order to set up. It usually takes about half an hour to pack the kit away again after we have finished filming.

Thanks for your help.

Conor

<http://www.bbc.co.uk>

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of the BBC unless specifically stated.

If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system.

Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it and notify the sender immediately.

Please note that the BBC monitors e-mails sent or received.

Further communication will signify your consent to this.

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.

CMS has 59 offices around the world, located in Aberdeen, Algiers, Amsterdam, Antwerp, Barcelona, Beijing, Belgrade, Berlin, Bratislava, Bristol, Brussels, Bucharest, Budapest, Casablanca, Cologne, Dubai, Duesseldorf, Edinburgh, Frankfurt, Geneva, Glasgow, Hamburg, Istanbul, Kyiv, Leipzig, Lisbon, Ljubljana, London, Luxembourg, Lyon, Madrid, Mexico City, Milan, Moscow, Munich, Muscat, Paris, Podgorica, Prague, Rio de Janeiro, Rome, Sarajevo, Seville, Shanghai, Sofia, Strasbourg, Stuttgart, Tirana, Utrecht, Vienna, Warsaw, Zagreb and Zurich.

CMS Cameron McKenna LLP is a member of CMS Legal Services EEIG (CMS EEIG), a European Economic Interest Grouping that coordinates an organisation of independent law firms. CMS EEIG provides no client services. Such services are solely provided by CMS EEIG's member firms in their respective jurisdictions. CMS EEIG and each of its member firms are separate and legally distinct entities, and no such entity has any authority to bind any other. CMS EEIG and each member firm are liable only for their own acts or omissions and not those of each other. The brand name "CMS" and the term "firm" are used to refer to some or all of the member firms or their offices. Further information can be found at www.cmslegal.com

CMS Cameron McKenna LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registration number OC310335. It is a body corporate which uses the word "partner" to refer to a member, or an employee or consultant with equivalent standing and qualifications. It is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority of England and Wales with SRA number 423370 and by the Law Society of Scotland with registered number 47313. A list of members and their professional qualifications is open to inspection at the registered office, Mitre House, 160 Aldersgate Street, London EC1A 4DD. Members are either solicitors or registered foreign lawyers. VAT registration number: 974 899 925. Further information about the firm can be found at www.cms-cmck.com

The contents of this e-mail (including any attachments) are confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of its contents is strictly prohibited, and you should please notify the sender immediately and then delete it (including any attachments) from your system. Notice: the firm does not accept service by e-mail of court proceedings, other processes or formal notices of any kind without specific prior written agreement.
