

From: David Oliver [mailto: [redacted] GRO]
Sent: 07 March 2014 09:02
To: Swil, Jonathan
Cc: Belinda Crowe
Subject: FW: [redacted] GRO
Sensitivity: Private

Jonathan,

I thought for your assessment of the legal risk it would be useful to see the engagement of Second Sight with the Professional Advisors before a CQR is submitted. The email at the bottom is from Ron to Bill Cleghorn who is one of the two advisors at Aver.

Regards

David

David Oliver
Programme Manager
Initial Complaint and Mediation Scheme

[redacted] GRO
Mobile [redacted] GRO

From: Ron Warmington [redacted] GRO
Date: 6 March 2014 23:45:33 GMT
To: 'Belinda Crowe' [redacted] GRO
Subject: FW: [redacted] GRO
Reply-To: <rjw@ [redacted] GRO>

Belinda:

I'm pushing ahead now with the CQRs that are in my Work-in-Progress 'Hopper'!

This is to give you some idea of the dialogue that goes on prior to our release of a CQR to POL. As it happens (and as we've come to expect) the CQRs produced by Bill and Emma at Aver are pretty good and don't generate many questions.

Best regards, Ron.

From: Ron Warmington [mailto:GRO]
Sent: Thursday, March 06, 2014 11:42 PM
To: 'irh' GRO
Cc: 'mediation' GRO
Subject: FW: GRO
Sensitivity: Private

Ian: We could also release the GRO CQR. The questions I've raised with Bill (see below email) won't alter the CQR I reckon.

GRO's App raised the following Thematic Issues:

Th 4 Power & Telecomms
Th 11 Hardware
Th 12 Failure to follow/misadvice
Th 13 T&S

His CQR (prepared by Bill) raised the following additional 4 Thematic Issues, making 8 in all:

Th 14 Audit Trail
Th 15 eo TP
Th 16 Contract
Th 17 Investigations

I have 12 more CQRs 'in the hopper' as it were and will aim to clear those by the end of the weekend so we'll be up to date by the time we get to the March 13th WG Call.

Cheers, Ron.

From: Ron Warmington [mailto:GRO]
Sent: Thursday, March 06, 2014 11:31 PM
To: 'Bill Cleghorn'
Cc: 'mediation' GRO
Subject: GRO
Sensitivity: Private

Bill:

One small question arises out of my initial review of your very full and clear report:

On page 20... right at the bottom of the page... you refer to "have his conviction for False Accounting overturned" Am I right in understanding that (as very commonly happened), the Theft charge was dropped in return for an agreement that [GRO] would plead guilty to False Accounting? From my reading of all the material, it looks to me as though [GRO] did plead guilty to False Accounting and, on that understanding, the THEFT charge was dropped. Is that correct?

It might be worth us having a chat about [GRO]'s apparent admission of using some of the Post Office Funds to cover the excessive and un-needed shop stock purchases under his contract with his shop supply company (1st Choice).

I also find the fact that (prior to the 23rd October 2006 surprise visit and cash count by Jane Bailey) [GRO] himself drew attention to his Post Office's diminishing and inadequate cash (see your Tab 18) seems to seriously undermine the Post Office's initial accusation of THEFT. It seems to me most unlikely that a person stealing (or even improperly 'borrowing') funds from his own Post Office would call his Business Development Manager to *complain* about a shortage of working cash!

So... I would like to better understand that situation so as to determine whether my thinking is correct. In any event Bill, I see no reference to that attention-drawing call by POL's Investigators. Was any mention made of it in the Prosecution (or Defence) papers do you think? Was that Document available to the Defence (one would presume so because it is contained in his 'Prepared Statement' but perhaps, if he pleaded Guilty to False Accounting, maybe that Prepared Statement never reached the Judge.

I am also somewhat concerned about the sentence, in [GRO]'s Prepared Statement, where he says: "*and it has always been my intention to repay the money to Post Office Ltd*". Seems to me that that it can reasonably be inferred from that remark that he HAD, as it were, 'borrowed' some working capital from his Post Office's Cash. I've seen the argument that he was, to some extent, 'borrowing back' money he'd already paid in to cover prior

shortages... but that's a weak argument. I'd very much appreciate your help Bill in making sure I've got all the facts on this straight.

If there's any need to alter the CQR (which I doubt), please just re-send an updated version. No need to re-send any of the Attachments of course.

Very best regards, Ron.

Ron Warmington CFE, FCA

Director

Second Sight Support Services Ltd

Tythe Farm

Maugersbury

Cheltenham

Gloucestershire

GL54 1HR

Phone:

Mobile:

Email:

Website: <http://www.2ndsight.eu>

GRO

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: 148 OLD STREET, LONDON EC1V 9HQ.
