



Work chit

Client: Royal Mail Group PLC Sub Postmaster Litigation

Matter: Mr Lee Castleton

Matter no: 348035.134

Attending:

Name: Stephen Dilley

Location: N/A

Date: 24 November 2005

Start time:

Units:

I reviewed all of the exchange of correspondence between Bond Pearce and Rowe Cohen Solicitors to check what they had been sent in relation to documents. The chronology appears to be as follows:

1. 16 February 2005 – Bond Pearce write to Rowe Cohen with weeks 39 to 52 cash accounts, weeks 39-50 declared cash/cash on hand receipts and weeks 39-50 giro deposit/withdrawal receipt.
2. 11 April 2005 Rowe Cohen ask for more information including automated payment system daily reports, daily tv licence payment listings, weekly green giro reports (*these were attached to the cash accounts including with our 16 February letter*), postal order weekly reports, inland revenue weekly reports, pensions and allowances weekly reports, full audit trail itemising every transaction at the post office, balance snapshots of the following weeks:
 - a. 18-20, 22-23, 27, 29-31 December
 - b. 2-3, 5-10, 12-13, 15-17, 19-20, 22-24, 26-27, 29-31 January
 - c. 2-3, 5-7, 9, 19-21, 23-25 February
 - d. 4-6, 8 March and Weeks 51-52
3. 21 April 2005, Bond Pearce write to Rowe Cohen and state that we have given them copies of all correspondence that were removed from the Post Office.
4. 26 April 2005, Rowe Cohen write to Bond Pearce and say that the daily balance snapshots were removed by Cath Oglesby and the final balances.
5. 25 April 2005, Bond Pearce write to Rowe Cohen sending them a copy of the final audit and state that the daily snapshots contain the same info as the weekly snapshots and were therefore superfluous.
6. 7 June 2005, Rowe Cohen write to Bond Pearce and state that the daily snapshots were removed by Ms Oglesby and they need the snapshots for each day before there were alleged shortfalls and that they were not superfluous and that a full audit trail is required.
7. 8 June 2005, Bond Pearce send to Rowe Cohen final cash accounts for weeks 51 and 52.
8. 22 June 2005, Rowe Cohen tell Bond Pearce that they didn't get weeks 51-52.

9. 4 July 2005, Bond Pearce enclose a further copy of our 8 June letter and the final cash accounts for weeks 51-52.
10. 26 July 2005, Rowe Cohen write to Bond Pearce and invite to admit other documents exist.
11. 3 August 2005, Bond Pearce say that issue of disclosure is to be dealt with after completing our investigations, we are trying to find the documents they have requested. We don't actually state that the document exist but it could be implied from our letter.
12. In Bentley Jenessons expert report dated 23 September 2005, he states that he has seen the inter parties correspondence, daily snapshots from 26 February 2004 to 3 March 2004, a letter dated 18 August 2005 from the first expert to Lee Castleton's solicitors, the final audit dated 25 March 2004, the horizon cash account for week 49, the statement of claim and the Defence and Counterclaim. Bizarrely, Rowe Cohen have not sent to their experts the cash accounts for weeks 39-52, the declared cash/cash on hand receipts for weeks 39-50 and crucially the giro receipts for weeks 39-50. Why not? Why not give your expert all the information so that he can make a more informed report? Their expert asked for more information so why did they not provide it initially? Instead what they have done is give their expert very limited information, unsurprisingly he has asked for me and they have then asked us to provide this further information. They could have given their expert more information in the first place. They have only given him a tiny fraction of what they given them.

Emailed Tom Beezer about this as clearly it is very important.

We need to pick this up with Rowe Cohen in correspondence when the Post Office clarify to us precisely what documents they have and what they don't.

8 units