

23 August 2006

Penny Thomas
Customer Services
Post Office Account - Security
Fujitsu Services
Lovelace Road
Bracknell
Berks, RG12 8SN

Bond Pearce LLP
Ballard House
West Hoe Road
Plymouth PL1 3AE

Tel: **GRO**
Fax: **GRO**
DX 8251 Plymouth

stephen.dilley@bondpearce.com **GRO**
Direct: **GRO**

Our ref:
SJD3/KAK2/348035.134
Your ref:

URGENT

Dear Ms Thomas

Post Office Limited -v- Lee Castleton

I understand that you are going to analyse the figures recorded on the transaction logs supplied by Fujitsu against the figures on the completed cash account for CAP 42 (8 January 2004 to 14 January 2004).

Mr Castleton's solicitors state that according to the final cash account generated at Marine Drive Post Office for week 42, total receipts of £176,291.15 were paid in during the course of that week and that the end figure carried over from week 41 was £54,170.49. They state that as a consequence, £122,120.66 was received during week 42. However, they state that a manual reconciliation of the figures contained in the Horizon transaction log this week gives a figure for monies received of £125,013.90, an apparent difference of £2,893.24.

They also state that an analysis of the figures relating to payments (i.e. monies leaving the Marine Drive Post Office during week 42) shows a discrepancy. The figure for stock carried over for week 41 was, according to them, £92,374.74. They state that if this is deducted from the receipts of £176,291.15, this leaves a balance of £83,916.41 in respect of payments made (I am not sure whether they are right about that figure because if you add the payments on the CAP at page 5, they seem to come to £82,673.51). In any event, they state that a manual reconciliation of all the transactions showing in the transaction logs gives a figure of £83,707.07 and state that the difference was not allocated in the week 42 cash accounts.

They then go on to assert that there is £1,706.64 in unallocated cash as being paid out of the Marine Drive branch. They think the computer system during the end of week balancing offsets this unallocated cash against the figure of £2,893.24 and produce an apparent cash shortfall of £1,103.13, which Mr Castleton was required to make good.

I enclose the cash account for week 42 for your attention and would be grateful if you could complete the analysis and deal formally to the points raised by Mr Castleton's solicitor's letter. However, please can you reply to me and I will review before responding to Mr Castleton's solicitors. Your analysis will need deal with all the points they have raised (see enclosed letter dated 25 July) and be capable of being understood by the Court who will not know anything about Horizon or P.O systems.

I look forward to hearing from you as a matter of urgency.

Yours sincerely

Stephen Dilley
Solicitor
for and on behalf of Bond Pearce LLP

Enc