

Date: Fri, 27 Feb 2004 15:33:51 +0000

From: 'jcoyne' [GRO] <jcoyne [GRO]>

Subject: re: Post Office Limited -v- Mrs J Wolstenholme

To: Susanne Helliwell (Weightmans Solicitors <susanne.helliwell [GRO]>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Organization: Best Practice Group

X-Mailer: GoldMine [5.70.20404]

Best Practice Group PLC

TO: Weightman Vizards

India Buildings Water Street Liverpool, L2 0GA

27/02/04

Dear Ms Helliwell,

to briefly summarise our discussion regard the letter from Fujitsu services:-

Horizon System Helpdesk.

I think this is a matter for the Post Office and Fujitsu rather than requiring any comment from me, for the avoidance of doubt nothing contained within this section of the letter alters my current opinion.

Transaction Handling on Reboot.

Whilst this section is helpful and assists my understanding of the process of transaction handling it would not be proper of me to alter my opinion based on this explanation, the supporting evidence of which has been destroyed. Should further supporting evidence come to light, I am more that happy to consider it, if it is material to either of the parties case.

Reasonableness of calls.

It has always been my expressed position that direct comparisons of calls to HSH are required and your clients position that they have been destroyed, barring direct comparison, and that I should give opinion on the surviving material that is available to me.

Now it seems that your client has located data that they believe enables comparison. Although the raw data has not been made available to me they say that it displays that Cleveleys is 'broadly comparable'. As I do not have the raw data I am unable to say if my opinion is effected or not.

From the sample presented the mean for software issues is 20 although Cleveleys had 35, for Network a mean of 1 against 5 from Cleveleys, Software 20 against 35 and hardware 4 against 6. So all of these issue factors are significantly higher for Cleveleys than the respective mean which is inconsistent with the statement broadly comparable when considering these measurements.

Although I must stress that no raw data has been presented so I am disadvantaged, is it your clients intention to relied upon this data sample referred to in this letter?

Operator advice to 'Reboot'

The issue of further work being conducted behind the scenes has not yet been a matter for expert determination, If you would like me to comment on this, again I would be more that happy and would require the findings from the "crashdumps" as referenced in the blue screen error messages which the second line support at the HSH will have.

Defective Equipment

I am confident in my statement considering that this technology is a business tool and the level of acceptance of flaws in operation is considerably lower than for mainstream computing.

Worrying Discrepancies.

I'm unsure how this can be resolved as the documentation suggests the PM reported discrepancies that seem to fall after a reported upgrade, without further information this seems to be only resolvable by witnesses of fact.

In short to answer the question posed in your letter, No my opinion, currently, remains as stated in my original note.

Best Regards,

Jason Coyne

> Please find attached letters.

>

> Kathy Hopkins
> Secretary to Susanne Helliwell
> Commercial Litigation Department
> Weightman Vizards

> **GRO**

> Address: 41 Spring Gardens Manchester M2 2BG
> Email: kathy.hopkins@**GRO**
> Website www.weightmanvizards.com

> > The content of this message and attached file are confidential and/or
> > privileged and are for the intended recipient only. If you are not the
> > intended recipient, any unauthorised review, use, re-transmission,
> > dissemination, copying, disclosure or other use of, or taking of any
> > action in reliance upon this information is strictly prohibited. If you
> > receive this message in error, please contact the sender immediately and
> > then delete the e-mail from your system. Copyright in this e-mail and
> > attachments created by us belongs to Weightman Vizards. Any attachment
> > with this message should be checked for viruses before it is opened.
> > Weightman Vizards cannot be held responsible for any failure by the
> > recipient to test for viruses before opening any attachments. Should you
> > communicate with anyone at Weightman Vizards by e-mail, you consent to us
> > monitoring and reading any such correspondence.

> > Weightman Vizards does not accept service of documents by e-mail unless
> > express prior approval has been given in writing. If an attempt at
> > service meets with a standard Out of Office Assistance reply, consent to
> > e-mail service is revoked because the intended recipient will see your
> > message not earlier than the time set in the Out of Office reply."

> > A list of partners is available for inspection from the above office.

> >
> >
> >

> -- NextPart --

> Attached File: \\bestpractice\goldmine\MailBox\Attach\Coyne - 270204.doc

> -- NextPart --

> Attached File: \\bestpractice\goldmine\MailBox\Attach\Cleveleys letter1.doc

Confidentiality Notice:

The information in this document may be confidential. It is intended only for the use of the named recipient. Internet communications are not secure and therefore Best Practice Group does not accept legal responsibility for the contents of this message. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify us immediately and then delete this document. Do not disclose the contents of this document to any other person, nor take any copies. Violation of this notice may be unlawful.