

Message

From: Jarnail A Singh [/o=MMS/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=jarnail.a.singh6ceadabd-67e9-4eca-94f2-005716658847]
on behalf of Jarnail A Singh
Sent: 04 Oct 2012 10:34:04
To: John M Scott [/o=MMS/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=john.m.scott976db244-9f5b-4d59-a593-f563c9b5535d]
CC: Hugh Flemington [/o=MMS/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=hugh.flemington14106a9a-9886-403d-bf5b-e08821f432b3]
Subject: RE: Post Office ltd v [REDACTED] **GRO**

John

Thank you for your email. I take on board what you say and rest assured will adopt the approach you have suggested. I have not been in a position where I have had to manage agents before but please however note that I look and consider each and every single agents advice and try to take a objective view in line with our prosecution policy. In the past advices in the criminal Team in relation to cautions were invariably brief on the basis that we were working with experienced members of your team who understood the issues. I will however in future provide you with more detailed advice addressing all relevant matters.

Jarnail

From: John M Scott
Sent: 03 October 2012 16:30
To: Jarnail A Singh
Cc: Hugh Flemington; John M Scott
Subject: RE: Post Office ltd v [REDACTED] **GRO**

Jarnail.

The case papers for this investigation has now reached me.

Points to note:

- £8179.70 shortage was found by the auditors.
- [REDACTED] **GRO** attempted when the auditors arrived to enter into Horizon a personal cheque against her Post Office business account to a rough value to the shortfall. The auditors declined this as the transaction had not been completed.
- [REDACTED] **GRO** admitted that she has used £560 of Post Office money to pay for car repairs.
- [REDACTED] **GRO** admitted buying premium bonds the previous night after closure for her daughter without a transaction payment – hence the cheque against her Post Office business account being there and her attempting to enter onto Horizon as the auditors entered – the transaction of the cheque had not been completed the night before (please see next comment).
- [REDACTED] **GRO** admitted that she would have had to transfer funds to the Post Office business account for it to have cleared (namely it would have bounced as is).
- [REDACTED] **GRO** admitted to selling postage on credit.
- [REDACTED] **GRO** admitted sharing her Horizon log on details with her husband.
- [REDACTED] **GRO** admitted inflating her cash, but not to theft.
- [REDACTED] **GRO** stated in mitigation (not defence) that she was [REDACTED] **GRO**

Your comment below and also in your report is that you have taken account of the circumstances, relates to one account and the loss repaid, therefore recommend a caution.

I raised a number of matters below and that there needs to be a higher standard of assessment which is also consistent with Cartwright Kings. When we met yesterday you stated they were over playing the write up, however I challenged

that they clearly summarise and outline the potential success and also challenges in defence and a more detailed rationale in why to prosecute or not for each particular charge, basically a higher bench mark than yourself. You also stated that you have not been reviewing CK's advise which I am extremely surprised as you are the Criminal Lawyer who manages them both as a supplier and also as the lead criminal expert for the business (feels like you've abdicated accountability). I also showed you the report from CK of exactly the same offence and circumstances including value and yet through their debate and rationale have recommended prosecution (2 pages only). Your advice is somewhat stark and lacks substance bearing in mind the circumstances detailed above and some of the more questionable actions by [GRO] For example you have not raised, debated or positioned the issue of [GRO] using Post Office money to pay for personal bills (car repairs) – is that potential theft bearing in mind the audit shortage and the business cheque lacking funds (immaterial for this debate whether it is or isn't – the point being you did not discuss it)?

When we discussed this yesterday (before I saw the papers), you were critical of CK of over playing their write up (I acknowledge they are commercial and would wish to increase their opportunity). You was defensive of your position, failed to listen and struggled to take on board learning improvements. I keep with my statement below that CK are the benchmark and you've failed to meet it (whether or not this suitable for caution/prosecution or vice versa and with CK)

I now have concerns in the overall management of this part of the process.

Hugh – it would be good to discuss at an early stage.

Cheers.

John.

From: Jarnail A Singh
Sent: 01 October 2012 12:58
To: John M Scott
Cc: Hugh Flemington
Subject: RE: Post Office ltd v [GRO]

John

The case file has gone to Maureen moors as per process. The point is this. she admitted the offence ,in line with prosecution guideline I have taken into account the circumstances, nature of the offence in proven period of the false accounting relates to one account only and loss has been repaid.in all the circumstances if she is prosecuted she will receive a nominal penalty of fine or conditional discharge. Although there is sufficient evidence to afford a realistic prospect of conviction is it in the public or business interest to prosecute? In my opinion this case is suitable for a caution.

Jarnail

From: John M Scott
Sent: 01 October 2012 12:32
To: Jarnail A Singh
Cc: Hugh Flemington; John M Scott
Subject: FW: Post Office ltd v [GRO]

Jarnail.

Thanks. Can you send your report with the whole file please as I like to see the full officers report, the taped interview notes and other supporting evidence if I'm to make a decision on whether to prosecute or not.

Your report is also very brief advising a caution and has not sufficiently outlined the case, supporting evidence, discussion around defence options and the rationale of why to prosecute or not or a caution in this particular instance.

From the little that has been written, I appreciate all monies have been paid back, however this was a significant amount of money involved. A caution does not seem consistent with previous cases that have passed my desk over the past few months, therefore please give rationale why this would be treated differently in regards to a caution and not prosecution.

Cartwright Kings Solicitors have set a benchmark in terms of reporting and substance of advice and for consistency purposes to ensure decision making is robust, fair and consistent, this level needs to be maintained.

Can you please re draft your advice and then forward with the case papers.

Many thanks.

John.

From: Jarnail A Singh
Sent: 01 October 2012 11:30
To: John M Scott
Subject: FW: Post Office Ltd v [GRO]

John I understand you are the DMA.
Regards
Jarnail

From: Jarnail A Singh
Sent: 28 September 2012 11:50
To: 'post.office.security'([GRO]; [GRO])
Cc: Glyn Burrows
Subject: Post Office Ltd v [GRO]

Maureen
Please find my advice in the above case. I am return the green file by post today
Regards
Jarnail