
From: Rodric Williams [GRO]
Sent: 24/06/2015 11:02:33
To: Reid, Tom [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=First Administrative Group/cn=Recipients/cn=thre15154353]
CC: BARTY, Susan [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=First Administrative Group/cn=Recipients/cn=SCB]
Subject: RE: another throw of the dice at Ceri Thomas? [CMCK-UK.FID8673510]

Gold! Have fwded to Mark et al, but no comment from me.

Thanks indeed.

Sent from my Windows Phone

From: Reid, Tom
Sent: 24/06/2015 11:58
To: Rodric Williams
Cc: BARTY, Susan
Subject: Re: another throw of the dice at Ceri Thomas? [CMCK-UK.FID8673510]

Rodric,

Further to our call, we have put together some suggested wording for an email from Mark to Ceri.

Please do let us know if you have any comments.

Kind regards,

Tom

Draft Email to Ceri Thomas

Dear Ceri,

Following our correspondence yesterday, I wanted to follow up on the issue of the contributors.

As you will appreciate, we have made repeated requests for details of the other contributors to the programme. Now, with less than 24 hours before your proposed interview and a mere three days before what we are told is the last date for the editing of the programme, we have been provided with the identity of the "legal expert" and "computer expert". However, we have still not been provided with the (or any) detail of what they are going to say or any allegations that they are going to make.

As you will be aware Charles McLachlan was an expert witness for the Defence in Seema Misra's trial. Again, as we have repeatedly made clear, we do not intend to comment on individual cases, but in this case his evidence was dealt with in detail at the trial and fully explored in front of the jury. As a result, there is a wealth of information in the public domain regarding Mr McLachlan's evidence (transcripts of the proceedings, the judge's summing up etc). We trust that in researching for the programme, and in discharging your duty to check and verify information, facts and documents you have reviewed all of this material in detail and that the context in which Mr McLachlan provides his opinion will be made clear in your programme.

In respect of Professor Mark Button, we are unaware of his involvement or expertise in respect of this matter. In its role as prosecutor, Post Office Limited has an ongoing duty of disclosure in respect of any criminal case. This is a duty that we take extremely seriously. We wanted to let you know that we are therefore writing to Professor Button to ask him to provide any evidence he has to support any statement that he may be making in the context of your programme such that we can ensure that we continue to comply with our duty of disclosure.

Kind regards,

From: Rodric Williams [GRO]
Sent: 24 June 2015 09:57
To: Reid, Tom; BARTY, Susan
Subject: FW: another throw of the dice at Ceri Thomas?

Hi – pls see below.

I'll give you a call in a minute in the hope of discussing...



Rodric Williams
Solicitor, Corporate Services

Post Office Ltd
20 Finsbury Street, London EC2Y 9AQ

[GRO]

[GRO]

From: Mark R Davies
Sent: 24 June 2015 07:28
To: Melanie Corfield
Cc: Rodric Williams; Mark Underwood [GRO]; Patrick Bourke
Subject: Re: another throw of the dice at Ceri Thomas?

Hi all

I rather like Rod's version - could we add to it: "if you have not seen these public record documents for some reason we can provide them"

Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
Post Office Ltd

Mobile: [GRO]

On 24 Jun 2015, at 01:36, Melanie Corfield [GRO] wrote:

Thanks Rod - understand. I guess my point (badly articulated probably) is that the programme is nagging ...we've given you x weeks re interview blah. They gave us the name of Charles M **yesterday** and (although we always secretly knew it was probably him) it is a game-changer for the reasons you say and more. So it is another opportunity.

Sleep now.

Mel

From: Rodric Williams
Sent: 23 June 2015 23:35
To: Melanie Corfield; Mark Underwood [GRO]; Mark R Davies
Cc: Patrick Bourke
Subject: RE: another throw of the dice at Ceri Thomas?

All – I want to think about this overnight, but I'm not inclined to offer anything directly because of the CCRC (sorry, but we've learned a lot more about the programme since I sent my last email on this!).

Instead, we could use as a hook the BBC Guidelines in and around relying on people who are not impartial (which McLaclan patently is), esp. if they have an axe to grind, e.g.:

"We note you intend including contribution from Prof McL as an IT expert. In case you are not aware, Prof McL provided evidence for Seema Misra during her trial. We assume therefore that you will have satisfied your obligation to check and verify the information, facts and documents connected to his contribution in order to achieve due accuracy (e.g. by reference to matters in the public domain such as the trial records, judge's summing up etc). This is especially important in this particular case given Prof McL cannot be described as impartial, and we trust this will be made clear in any contribution he makes."

As I say, I want to sleep on it.....

<image001.png>

Rodric Williams

Solicitor, Corporate Services

Post Office Ltd
20 Finsbury Street, London EC2Y 9AQ

GRO

GRO

From: Melanie Corfield
Sent: 23 June 2015 22:09
To: Mark Underwood; Mark R Davies
Cc: Patrick Bourke; Rodric Williams
Subject: RE: another throw of the dice at Ceri Thomas?

I expect they do have witness statements (Charles and Gareth) and not suggesting we include those. I am proposing the prosecution, defence and Judge summing up (Rod will advise right term for what that is!) That is so important because it reflects both defence and prosecution positions on ALL of the evidence. It is justifiable to provide this because it is not 'selective' - it sums up both sides, so it is fair, it sums up what was put before the jury (as well as being a reasonably quick read for Ceri).

Mel

From: Mark Underwood 
Sent: 23 June 2015 19:41
To: Mark R Davies; Melanie Corfield
Cc: Patrick Bourke; Rodric Williams
Subject: RE: another throw of the dice at Ceri Thomas?

100% think we should provide these documents to them. I think this is something we all agree on (see attached chain).

The only thing I would consider holding back are the witness statements?

Mark

Mark Underwood
Complaint Review and Mediation Scheme


From: Mark R Davies
Sent: 23 June 2015 20:26
To: Melanie Corfield

Cc: Patrick Bourke; Mark Underwood; Rodric Williams
Subject: Re: another throw of the dice at Ceri Thomas?

Worth thinking about - team?

Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
Post Office Ltd

Mobile: GRO

On 23 Jun 2015, at 20:08, Melanie Corfield GRO wrote:

Hi
Now that they have finally revealed the names of interviewee 'experts', including Charles Mclaughlan, expert defence witness in the Misra case, I think we should use this go back to Ceri (pointing out we might have done this before if we had known the name):

- Panorama has only just revealed the name of this interviewee. But as they have now done so, we think it is extremely important that there is context regarding matters of public record
- we attach the prosecution, defence and judge summing up (I have these transcripts for some random reason and I honestly suspect they might not; they are not huge docs but give essence and it is fair given it is both sides). We don't have to make any comment at all but the transcripts make it abundantly clear that Charles M's reservations about information he had asked for and needed - and did not get - were explored in front of the jury. The judge's summing up also includes, of course, other facts and evidence.
- we then repeat what we have said before about continuing duty of disclosure in the hope he takes the hint

I think this is worth a try. If he comes back and says they have it all etc then we have lost nothing (I note he never confirmed this and bet they only have the expert witness' and maybe FJ's - not, for example, the temp postmaster who said the losses virtually stopped when he took over and he had no problems etc, all in judge's summing up).

But we can land again point about balance and context and the fact that the CCRC are best placed to look at ALL material. Sorry - possibly more work, but I can draft a short note for Mark to send him.

Mel

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.

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.
