

---

**From:** Jarnail A Singh[IMCEAEX-  
\_O=MMS\_OU=EXCHANGE+20ADMINISTRATIVE+20GROUP+20+28FYDIBOHF23SPDLT+29  
\_CN=RECIPIENTS\_CN=JARNAIL+2EA+2ESINGH6CEADABD-67E9-4ECA-94F2-  
005716658847@C72A47.ingest.local]  
**Sent:** Mon 16/12/2013 4:15:53 PM (UTC)  
**To:** Belinda Crowe [GRO]  
**Cc:** Chris Aujard [GRO] Rodric  
Williams [GRO] Hugh Flemington [GRO]  
David Oliver [GRO]  
**Subject:** RE: Board Paper  
**Attachment:** CLARIFICATION.PDF

Belinda

After much thought I asked our Senior Counsel to provide clarification to the number of points you raised below with regards to Para.4 of his advice copy attached.

Jarnail Singh | Criminal Lawyer



148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ



**GRO**

Postline: [GRO]



Mobex:



[GRO]



[Post Office stories](#)



[@postofficenews](#)



---

**From:** Belinda Crowe  
**Sent:** 14 December 2013 11:23  
**To:** Jarnail A Singh  
**Cc:** Chris Aujard; Rodric Williams; Hugh Flemington; David Oliver  
**Subject:** Re: Board Paper

Thanks Jarnail

This is very helpful and does, I think, clarify the position very helpfully.

Just one question of further clarification from me:

In para 4 iii the note says?

iii. That protection would not be available to an organisation which conducted its prosecutions „in-house“, that is, in POL’s case, using lawyers employed directly by POL.

Am I right in interpreting this as meaning that as Post Office does not conduct its prosecutions in house - that is, it uses Cartwright King rather than directly employed lawyers - any claim for malicious prosecution would properly

stand against Cartwright King and not POL, provided we follow our normal processes as described in the advice.

I realise the danger of trying to paraphrase the advice for the purpose of clarification but I found the wording in 4 iii (that is, couching the point in terms of the protection 'not' being available) left me grappling with negatives so I want make sure I am absolutely clear.

I am copying David Oliver who actually drafted the Board paper for Chris and will also copy him the note from Cartwright King, pointing out that it is subject to LPP.

Best wishes

Belinda

On 13 Dec 2013, at 12:13, "Jarnail A Singh" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Chris

Having read Bond Dickinsons note about potential civil risks to POL ,I was concerned that the likely hood of action being brought had not been assessed.

Accordingly I asked Cartwright King to review Bond Dickinson note. I attach senior Counsel Simon Clarkes response which clarifys the issues.

Regards

Jarnail Singh | Criminal Lawyer

<image017.jpg>

<image018.png> 148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ

<image019.png> [REDACTED] Postline: [REDACTED]

<image020.png> [REDACTED] Mobex:

<image021.png> [REDACTED]

<image022.jpg> [Post Office stories](#)

<image023.jpg> [@postofficenews](#)

<image024.jpg>

---

**From:** David Oliver [mailto:[REDACTED]]

**Sent:** 06 December 2013 18:30

**To:** Belinda Crowe; Chris Aujard; Rodric Williams; Jarnail A Singh

**Subject:** Board Paper

---

PA Consulting Services Limited is registered in England & Wales with Registered Number: 414220, having its registered office at 123 Buckingham Palace Road, London SW1W 9SR, United Kingdom.

If you are not the intended recipient of this email, please notify the sender as soon as possible, delete it from your systems and do not disclose its contents to anyone else.

<CIVIL CLAIMS RISK - RESPONSE.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 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.

\*\*\*\*\*