



Financial Investigation Policy Log

Case Number: POLTD/0809/000

Date	Text
21/08/08	<p>An Investigation has commenced into Susan RUDKIN She is under investigation for the suspected theft of £43,700.00 from IBSTOCK Post Office® branch 223/217 This investigation is for the purpose of confiscation. The investigation will be proportionate, have a legal framework, accountable and necessary.</p> <p>It will follow the legal requirements of the Proceeds of Crime Act The Police &amp; Criminal Evidence Act, Criminal Procedures &amp; Investigations Act and the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act. It will also be European Convention on Human Rights Compliant. Mr D Pardoe is my supervising officer and he will be kept aware of the investigation and where necessary direct the investigation in accordance with the above legislation.</p>
	<p><b>Case Summary:</b></p> <p>Audit Deficiency. Sub-postmaster (Michael Rudkin) is Chairman of the Negotiating Panel for the National Federation of Sub-postmasters. Branch is managed by his wife Susan Rudkin, who has admitted to the theft of £40k. Mrs Rudkin when interviewed stated that since February 2007 she covered losses and paid funds into her bank account to pay bills.</p> <p>Mrs Rudkin said that she had let things get out of control as she was running the private business, the PO counter and the sorting office staff (14 postmen). She admitted to taking PO money and paying into Lloyds Bank business accounts to meet bills. Also the inflating the cash to cover up weekly losses in the PO. It was not possible to establish a firm date when this started but she says it is since the robbery at the office some two years ago. Paperwork from office shows that the figure was around £24k short in September (2007?). Total difference in cash on audit was £43700. She confirmed that no staff were aware of what she was doing and her husband had not worked in the PO for over a year and he was unaware of the shortage until today as he played no part in running the office.</p> <p>Postmaster suspended 20/8/08</p>
09/09/08	<p>Some suspicions about the robbery in January 2006. this arose from statement by suspect in interview. It was not followed up by the investigator, however as S Rudkin has confessed to the theft of money I believe that this should be looked at again. Details from the security advisor at the time of the robbery suggests that there were some suspicions at the time about the details given by S Rudkin</p>
11/09/08	<p>I believe that POLTD should protect itself against this loss by restraint. The suspect is distancing her husband from the offence even though the money was paid into a joint bank account. There are outstanding debts of 37000 and an intention to raise capital against the property when I am currently unsure of the benefit obtained in the crime.</p>

	Spoke with Dave Pardoe about Restraint and although he agreed he asked that I submit to him the details by Email
<b>18/09/08</b>	Email from Dave agreeing to restraint and further investigation Have discussed with John S and advised on our potential courses of action; please continue on both points - restraint and consideration of revisit of previous incidence. The allocated Fraud Advisor <b>must</b> apprise the appropriate stakeholder of the planned activity.
<b>18/09/08</b>	TC to Juliet. Explained current position and she agrees restraint
<b>22/09/08</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Attended Court</li><li>• Orders signed</li></ul>

**Financial Investigation Policy Log**

**Case Number:**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Text</b>