

## Stephen Dilley

---

**From:** cath.oglesby [GRO]  
**Sent:** 17 November 2005 21:24  
**To:** david.mellows-facer [GRO]; lesley.joyce [GRO]  
**Cc:** john.h.jones [GRO]  
**Subject:** FW: Urgent The Post Office -v- Lee Castleton (Marine Drive Post Office, Bridlington)

**Attachments:** Ecopy Scan.pdf



Ecopy Scan.pdf  
(566 KB)

David, Lesley,

Stephen Dilley contacted me today regarding the court case between Mr Castleton and the Post Office. Have you got all the files relating to the case that we put together for the appeal? I phoned John Jones today and he returned all the paper work after the appeal.

Lesley,

Could you contact Mr Dilley? and answer his questions ?

----- Forwarded by Cath Oglesby/e/POSTOFFICE on 17/11/2005 21:10 -----

"Stephen Dilley"

<Stephen.Dilley [GRO]>

To: <cath.oglesby [GRO]>

[GRO]

cc:

Subject: FW: Urgent The Post Office -v- Lee Castleton (Marine Drive Post Office, Bridlington)

17/11/2005 16:56

Dear Ms Oglesby,

I refer to my earlier email and to our telephone conversation today.

I attach to this email your letter to Mr Castleton dated 26 April 2004, the interview minutes of 10 May 2004 and your subsequent notes.

In addition to the queries raised below, it would be helpful if you could please explain in detail precisely what happens when a person goes into a post office to buy something. Precisely how is it recorded? Is it manually inputted into Horizon at the same time or later in the day? Is the cash register linked to Horizon? How does the Horizon system work?

Could Mr Castleton be correct that the daily snapshots will not match the I will need to explain this to the judge who will know nothing at all about Horizon, so it would be helpful if you could be as thorough as possible.

I look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible.

Kind regards.

Stephen Dilley  
Solicitor  
for and on behalf of Bond Pearce LLP  
DDI: [GRO]  
Main office phone: [GRO]  
Fax: [GRO]  
www.bondpearce.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Stephen Dilley  
Sent: 17 November 2005 11:50  
To: cath.oglesby [GRO]

Cc: 'cheryl.woodward' [GRO]; 'mandy.talbot' [GRO]  
Subject: Urgent The Post Office -v- Lee Castleton (Marine Drive Post Office, Bridlington)

Dear Ms Oglesby,

I have tried unsuccessfully to speak to you today.

Mr Castleton's solicitors are seeking the return of documents that they say you removed from the Marine Drive Post Office when you did an audit. I understand that not all those can be found.

I attach copies of the following:-

- (a) A without prejudice letter dated 30 September from Mr Castleton's solicitors to Bond Pearce;
- (b) Bentley Jennison's Report dated 23 September and attachments; and
- (c) White & Hoggard's report dated 18 August.

Bentley Jennison state that the deficiencies have probably been brought forward despite the fact that they have been entered onto the suspense account entry. They suspect this is because the Horizon system, despite the suspense account entry, has failed to recognise the entry on the daily snapshot. They have drawn this conclusion through looking at the discrepancy of £3,509.18 on Thursday 26 February 2004. They then suggest that this double accounting could have continued over a number of weeks and that as such, Mr Castleton's Defence, "appears to hold potential merit based on the limited documentation" they have so far reviewed. White & Hoggard reach a similar conclusion in their report.

Bentley Jennison seek:

- (i) A full list of all the transactions carried out within the Post Office (he says that it is not good enough that management information is not available simply because the "month end has been closed down".
- (ii) The actual audit report you prepared. He says that the actual report would have been a manuscript writing document rather than a typed document.
- (iii) P and A Reports for weeks 39-52.
- (iv) Cash and stock counts for when Mr Castleton began trading and when he stopped being a Post Office Sub-Postmaster.
- (vi) The events log for weeks 39 to 52.
- (vii) Transaction log.
- (viii) The daily snapshots.

Mr Castleton believes that if he can get these documents, he will be able to undertake a manual reconciliation of the cash account in order to substantiate his belief that the losses are not real but attributable to computer error.

1. Do you believe the suggestion put forward by the experts could (at least in theory) be correct? If not, why not?
2. Do you have a list of what documents you removed to do the audit? Is it normal for sub post office masters to do daily snapshots?
3. Would it be possible to regenerate the above missing records from computer records at the Post Office? If computer records are not kept centrally, would they be stored on the hard drives of the computers at the Marine Post Office? If so, could you obtain them?
4. In an email from Fujitsu to Richard Benton dated 5 May 2004, Fujitsu stated "It is possible that they are not accurately recording all transactions on the system. " If there have been human errors in recording the transactions, could an explanation be that:

- (a) there was nothing wrong with Horizon, because it simply reflected the information entered on to it; but
- (b) if staff punched in the wrong numbers into Horizon, there may have been no real loss (even though Horizon would show a loss) - it is simply an error in accurately recording transactions.

I look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible.

Kind regards.

Stephen Dilley  
Solicitor  
for and on behalf of Bond Pearce LLP  
DDI: + [REDACTED] GRO  
Main office phone: [REDACTED] GRO  
Fax: [REDACTED] GRO  
www.bondpearce.com

-----Original Message-----

From: cheryl.woodward [REDACTED] GRO  
[mailto:cheryl.woodward@ [REDACTED] GRO]  
Sent: 17 November 2005 08:49  
To: cath.oglesby [REDACTED] GRO  
Cc: Stephen Dilley  
Subject: Urgent Re: FW: The Post Office -v- Lee Castleton

Hi Cath

Could you please contact Stephen Dilley at Bond Pearce Solicitors in relation to Lee Castleton formally of Marine Drive Po. They need to know what documentation was removed from the office.  
Stephen [REDACTED] GRO

Hi Stephen

As you can see I have asked Cath to contact you but here is her number anyway [REDACTED] GRO

Thanks Cheryl.

\*\*\*\*\*

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 and then delete this email from your system.

\*\*\*\*\*

The information in this e-mail and any attachments are confidential and may be legally privileged and protected by law. The intended recipient only is authorised to access this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender as soon as possible and delete any copies. Unauthorised use, dissemination, distribution, publication or copying of this communication is prohibited.

Any files attached to this e-mail will have been checked by us with virus detection software before transmission. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening any attachment. Bond Pearce LLP accepts no liability for any loss or damage which may be caused by software viruses.

Bond Pearce LLP is a Limited Liability Partnership registered in England and Wales number OC311430.  
Registered Office: Bristol Bridge House, 138-141 Redcliff Street, Bristol,  
BS1 6BJ.

A list of Members is available from our registered office. Any reference to a Partner in relation to Bond Pearce LLP means a Member of Bond Pearce LLP.

Bond Pearce LLP is regulated by the Law Society. (See attached file: Ecopy Scan.pdf)

\*\*\*\*\*

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 and then delete this email from your system.

\*\*\*\*\*