1	Wednesday, 6 July 2022	1	the hearings won't impede the Inquiry's work in any way.
2	(10.30am)	2	With that introduction, I'm about to hand over to
3	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Good morning, everyone. By the reaction	3	Mr Beer QC who will open the proceedings.
4	of one or two people so far in the distance that I can	4	I do have one announcement. I was told in no
5	hardly see them, I guess you can hear me. Is that	5	uncertain terms that I should not make any cricketing
6	correct? Good. Thank you very much.	6	analogies. In fact, I can't avoid it. Because this
7	We're going to embark today on the first of two	7	evening there is a cricket match starting at the Oval
8	days of hearings, dealing with various compensation	8	and that may begin in terms of its preparation at around
9	issues.	9	about 3.30 to 4 o'clock. I am hopeful I am not
10	There's been some misreporting about the extent of	10	saying I am confident I am hopeful that by that time
11	what's going on in the next two days. So can I be clear	11	the submissions will be more or less complete. But if
12	that there are two days devoted to discussions about	12	they are not, we will have to compete with various
13	compensation issues, and I use the word discussions,	13	things going on around the cricket ground. Now, I'm
14	because essentially what we're going to have are oral	14	sorry I had to raise the word cricket but I do not think
15	submissions from lawyers about those issues. We won't	15	I can be criticised for so doing in all the
16	be hearing oral evidence.	16	circumstances.
17	With that introduction, I should just also explain	17	Mr Beer?
18	why the two days are split apart. As you'd imagine, to	18	Submission by MR BEER
19	get so many lawyers into the same room at the same time	19	MR BEER: Thanks very much, sir. As you said, this is the
20	is not an easy business. So to facilitate all the	20	hearing of submissions by all participants on the issues
21	lawyers who needed to be here over these hearings	21	arising from the payment or non-payment of compensation
22	I agreed that we would schedule them on a day when their	22	to subpostmasters at their families.
23	advocate of choice could come to present their	23	I appear as counsel along with Mr Blake today.
24	submissions, so that's why we're having a hearing this	24	You will hear oral submissions later today in accordance
25	week and a hearing next week. The short delay between	25	with the timetable that you have published from 2
			-
1	Ms Gallafent QC on behalf of Post Office Ltd, from	1	183, to what extent, if at all, has the creation
2	Mr Mertens on behalf of UK Government Investments and	2	and implementation of the Historic Shortfall Scheme and
3	from Mr Stein QC on behalf of those core participants	3	the interim compensation scheme provided an adequate
4	represented by Howe & Co solicitors.	4	means for affected subpostmasters, managers, and
5	Your terms of reference, sir, require you, amongst	5	assistants to obtain financial redress for wrongs which
6	other things, to assess whether the commitments made by	6	they have suffered.
7	Post Office Ltd within the mediation settlement,	7	However, phase 5 of the Inquiry is presently
8	including the Historical Shortfall Scheme, have been	8	scheduled to occur in February and March of next year.
9	properly delivered. The reference there to the	9	In the course of your human impact hearings in London
10	mediation settlement is a reference to the settlement	10	between 14 and 25 February, in Cardiff on 1 and 2 March,
11	deed of 10 December 2019.	11	in Leeds on 9 and 10 March, in Glasgow on 11 and 12 May,
12	You had originally planned to address this issue	12	and in Belfast on 18, 19 May, you heard from a number of
13	in phase 5 of your Inquiry, which is concerned with,	13	subpostmasters and members of their families about the
14	amongst other things, redress, access to justice, the	14	devastating financial consequences that the operation of
15	complaint review and mediation scheme, responding to the	15	the Horizon IT system had and is having on them, the
16	scandal and compensation schemes.	16	financial consequences that civil proceedings brought
17	In our concluded list of issues, we had isolated	17	against them by the Post Office had and is having on
18	the following issues in particular for consideration	18	them, and the financial consequences that wrongful
19	within phase 5 of the Inquiry: issue 182, to what	19	conviction for criminal offences (including in some
20	extent, if at all, has Post Office Ltd properly	20	cases resulting in imprisonment) had and is having on
21	delivered upon the commitments which it made in the	21	them. This included significant accounts of penury,
22	mediation settlement to make improvements in its	22	precarious financial arrangements, bankruptcies, debt
23	relationships with subpostmasters and to bring finality	23	management plans, loss of credit ratings, loans for
24	to all outstanding issues in respect of historic	24	significant sums of money, and second mortgages, many of
25	shortfalls via the Historic Shortfall Scheme. 3	25	which continue to this day. 4

1	The evidence also touched upon the operation,	1	Mr Alan Bates and 554 other claimants against Post
2	effectiveness and speed of past and present compensation	2	Office Ltd, which is known as the group litigation.
3	schemes offered by the Post Office.	3	That is because it proceeded under a group litigation or
4	In the light of that evidence, you decided that	4	a GLO.
5	you ought not to wait until early spring of next year to	5	In this litigation the claimants brought claims
6	hear the evidence about past and present compensation	6	for compensation for alleged losses consequent on
7	schemes. As you put it in a public announcement, some	7	breaches of contract and other wrongful acts arising out
8	of these issues, "needed to be addressed sooner rather	8	of decisions made by the Post Office in reliance upon
9	than later". So accordingly, on 9 May, you announced	9	information generated by the Horizon IT system.
10	that you would be conducting these hearings and	10	Those proceedings were brought to an end by a deed
11	thereafter gave directions for the making of written	11	of settlement dated 10 December 2019. During the course
12	submissions and a timetable for delivering oral	12	of the litigation the managing judge handed down six
13	submissions from the recognised legal representatives of	13	judgments, two of those judgments, the common issues
14	core participants.	14	judgment and the Horizon issues judgment, were it is
15	In terms of the factual background, although you,	15	reasonable to suppose critical to the decision made by
16	sir, know the steps in the long and tortuous chronology	16	the Post Office subsequently to offer terms of
17	which brings us to this point in mid-2022, addressing	17	settlement of the litigation.
18	issues about the payment of compensation, to wronged	18	The deed of settlement contains terms that are
19	subpostmasters, there may be those listening or watching	19	relevant to the issues that arise today, including by
20	the proceedings that do not. Therefore with your	20	clause 2.1 the Post Office agreed to make settlement
21	permission I should like to spend a little time	21	payments are they as called which in aggregate amounted
22	detailing some of the background which brings us to that	22	to £57.75 million. Of that sum £15 million was
23	point today.	23	earmarked for the legal costs of the solicitors and
24	For present purposes it is sufficient to begin	24	barristers who acted for the claimants in the group
25	with the litigation that commenced in 2017 between	25	litigation, 42 million was paid over by way of damages,
	5		6
1	litigation funding, ATE costs and other costs or other	1	substantially less than the alleged losses which they
2	relief claimed in the action. That was called the	2	had claimed in the group litigation.
3	settlement payment.	3	Pursuant to the deed the Historical Shortfall
4	By clause 3 it was provided that none of the terms	4	Scheme was established in 2020. It is a remediation
5	of the Settlement Deed were to be construed as an	5	scheme. Under its terms none of the claimants who had
6	admission of liability on the part of the Post Office in	6	been party to the Group litigation were eligible to seek
7	respect of any of the various claims made by the	7	compensation under the scheme. The HSS was and is
8	claimants which were the subject of the litigation.	8	intended to benefit all of those subpostmasters who
9	Clause 4.1 provided that the terms of the	9	suffered loss as a consequence of Horizon but who were
10	settlement set out in the deed were to be in full and	10	not a part to the group litigation.
11	final settlement of all claims made by the claimants,	11	The scheme secondly identifies a number of
12	save for the claims brought for malicious prosecution	12	principles upon which compensation under it must be
13	which were defined as being brought by "convicted	13	assessed.
14	claimants".	14	Thirdly, the scheme includes detailed provisions,
15	Clause 9.4 and schedule 6 of the deed laid the	15	dispute resolution procedures for resolving how claims
16	foundation for the establishment of what is now known as	16	should be determined in the event that an applicant and
17	the Historical Shortfall Scheme or the HSS.	17	the Post Office cannot agree upon the compensation which
18	Approximately £10.5 million of the £42 million set	18	should be awarded.
19	aside as the settlement payment were shared between the	19	The scheme finally closed on 20 November 2020.
20	GLO claimants as compensation for the losses which they	20	If you turn up in your bundle sir, tab 17, there
21	claimed in the litigation, a very substantial proportion	21	will be an update to these in a moment, you should see
22	of the settlement payment was therefore swallowed up in	22	figures published on 7 June 2020.
23	litigation funding and other costs.	23	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Sorry, Mr Beer. Is that occasional
24	Accordingly, most if not all of the claimants	24	banging disturbing you? Because if so I will try to get
25	received a sum by way of compensation which was 7	25	something done about it. 8
	•		-

1	MR BEER: Moderately.	1	reads:
2	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Somebody is going to try and suggest that	2	"For final compensation the Post Office is
3	they should bang when we're having a break.	3	proposing alternative dispute resolution arrangements
4	MR BEER: Thank you very much. I see somebody leaving from	4	which aim to facilitate the swift quantification and
5	the back. Very kind of you, sir.	5	resolution of compensation claims. However, interim
6	You will see that at the foot of page 302 as at	6	payments announced today do not prevent people from
7	7 June there were of the applications which had been	7	bringing civil claims through the courts."
8	made 2,368 assessed to be eligible, 155 assessed to be	8	So the HSS had been set up. Then in July 2021 an
9	non-eligible. Which means that by 7 June if one adds	9	announcement of the payment of up to £100,000 per person
10	those two figures together, some 2,523 applications had	10	for each postmaster by way of interim payments, and
11	been made, so the scheme closed 27 November 2020, by	11	a proposal by the Post Office it was said to set up
12	June 2022, 2,523 applications made.	12	alternative dispute resolution arrangements for
13	On 21 July 2021 the Secretary of State for	13	compensation to be paid finally to those whose
14	Business, Energy, and Industrial Strategy announced that	14	convictions had been overturned.
15	funds would be made available to the Post Office so that	15	As we understand it, in fact, no formal
16	interim payments of compensation of up to £100,000 per	16	remediation scheme was constituted thereafter, and
17	person could be paid to subpostmasters whose convictions	17	alternative dispute resolution has not occurred in
18	for dishonesty offences had been quashed. That	18	relation to those whose convictions have been quashed.
19	announcement was made in a statement in Parliament.	19	In practice, those whose convictions have been quashed
20	The announcement was followed up by a press	20	have applied to the Post Office for an interim payment
21	release the next day, which we have in your tab 8A of	21	and, in the main, the Post Office has made such a
22	the bundle. You will see it is dated 22 July 2021 and	22	payment within a very short time, i.e., promptly, often
23	is a press release on behalf of BEIS. It is the second	23	within weeks of the application being made. And the
24	page of that, page 217, to which I should draw attention	24	information that the Inquiry has received suggests that
25	under the heading "Additional information", and it	25	that interim scheme has operated well and effectively.
1	There remains the issue of final appointments for	1	the availability of compensation for three discrete
2	those whose convictions were quashed. On	2	subcategories of postmasters. I'm not going to outline
3	14 December 2021, the Minister, Paul Scully MP, made	3	them as matters have moved on more broadly since then.
4	a further statement which is relevant to the payment of	4	The next day, 22 March 2022, the Minister, Paul
5	compensation to subpostmasters whose convictions had by	5	Scully MP, made a further announcement in Parliament
6	then been quashed or would after then be quashed, and we	6	which we have in our tab 8C, the relevant part of which
7	have that behind tab 8B, the statement of 14	7	is in the second paragraph, where he said:
8	December 2021.	8	"The Government has long considered unfair the
9	The relevant parts are the last two paragraphs on	9	unequal treatment received by members of the GLO and
10	page 219 where the Minister said:	10	their non-GLO peers, I am therefore pleased to announce
11	"I am pleased to confirm that today the Government	11	that the Chancellor will make additional funding
12	is making funding available to facilitate Post Office to	12	available to give those in the GLO group compensation
13	make final compensation payments to postmasters whose	13	similar to that which is available to their non-GLO
14	convictions have been overturned. We are working with	14	peers."
15	Post Office to finalise the arrangements that will	15	You received submissions in response to your
16	enable the final settlement negotiations to begin as	16	request from the core participants represented by
17	soon as possible. By providing this funding, Government	17	Howe & Co and Hudgell solicitors and on 9 May 2022 you
18	is helping Post Office deliver the fair compensation	18	issued a preliminary view in relation to compensation
19	postmasters deserve. With the Secretary of State's	19	schemes for subpostmasters.
20	status as sole shareholder in the Post Office my	20	On 30 June 20202, so seven days ago, the Minister,
21	department continues to engage actively with Post Office	21	Mr Scully, made a further statement to the House and you
22	Ltd on this and will maintain strong oversight of the	22	have that behind your tab 8D. I'm not going to read it
23	compensation process."	23	all out. The main elements of it were, firstly, in
24	On 21 March 2022 you requested core participants	24	relation to the GLO claimants. He said, firstly, that
25	to respond to the Inquiry with written submissions on	25	the Government intended to make interim payments of
	11		12

1	companyation to aligible members of the CLO cobort who	1	Lyould propose to identify by reference to these
2	compensation to eligible members of the GLO cohort who were not already covered by another scheme totalling	2	I would propose to identify by reference to those three categories the issues that we have identified as
3	£19.5 million.	3	your counsel team as arising in the light of all of the
4	Secondly, he said that the Government was working	4	written material that has been lodged by the core
5	towards delivering a final compensation scheme for the	5	participants. I should state in that regard that we as
6	GLO claimants and would be appointing Freeths Solicitors	6	your counsel team will not be making positive
7	to assess the data and methodology that they had	7	submissions as to outcome on any of those issues.
8	developed in relation to the 2019 settlement.	8	So category 1 or category A, issues arising under
9	Third, that members of the GLO group would be able	9	the Historical Shortfall Scheme. You have in front of
10		10	you, sir, the core material in relation to the operation
11	also to claim reasonable legal fees as part of their participation in the final compensation scheme.	11	by design of the Historical Shortfall Scheme. So in tab
12	Then, secondly, in relation to those who	12	14 you have the Terms of Reference of the HSS; in tab 15
	•		•
13	convictions had been quashed, the Minister announced	13	you have the Terms of Reference for the Independent
14 15	that a number of subpostmasters had agreed to refer the	14 15	Advisory Panel to the Historical Shortfall Scheme; in
	issues of non-pecuniary damages to a process of early	15 16	tab 16 you have the eligibility criteria for the
16 17	neutral evaluation to be conducted by Lord Dyson.	16 17	Historical Shortfall Scheme; in tab 17 you have
17	So your request to core participants invited	17	a document called "Consequential loss principles and
18	submissions on 12 issues and they are set out in tab 2	18	guidance for the Historical Shortfall Scheme"; in tab 18
19	of your bundle, which I would invite you to turn up.	19	you have a questions and answers document published by
20	They are broadly divided into three categories: issues	20	the Post Office as to the operation of the Historical
21	arising from the existing Historical Shortfall Scheme;	21	Shortfall Scheme.
22	issues concerning the compensation to be paid to those	22	Then going back to tab 7A, please, you have two
23	subpostmasters whose convictions have been quashed; and	23	versions of application forms under the Historical
24	issues relating to the payment of fair compensation to	24	Shortfall Scheme, and so from page 188 to 194 you have
25	the Group litigation claimants. 13	25	the version that was extant from May 2020, and then from 14
1	195 to 202 you have the version that was extant from	1	payment of much wider classes of compensation is not
2	June 2020. So that's the underlying material.	2	clear from the Terms of Reference of the scheme at tab
3	It seems to us that the four issues which you had	3	14, which only refer to shortfalls, or the eligibility
4	previously identified in your document asking for	4	criteria at tab 16, which again only refer to
5	submissions remain fit for consideration by you along	5	shortfalls.
6	with an additional issue identified by core	6	However, it is clear from the Terms of Reference
7	participants. I will describe the four issues	7	of the HSS Independent Advisory Panel at tab 15 that the
8	previously identified and fill them out a little by		
9		8	
		8 9	scheme does permit the payment of consequential losses,
	reference to the submissions and then turn to the	9	scheme does permit the payment of consequential losses, and if I could invite you to turn that up please, tab 15
10	reference to the submissions and then turn to the additional issue, and do the same.	9	scheme does permit the payment of consequential losses, and if I could invite you to turn that up please, tab 15 at page 285.
10 11	reference to the submissions and then turn to the additional issue, and do the same. Issue 1 is the heads of loss which are recoverable	9 10 11	scheme does permit the payment of consequential losses, and if I could invite you to turn that up please, tab 15 at page 285. If one looks at paragraph 4A of the Terms of
10 11 12	reference to the submissions and then turn to the additional issue, and do the same. Issue 1 is the heads of loss which are recoverable under the HSS and the reasons for any exclusions. That	9 10 11 12	scheme does permit the payment of consequential losses, and if I could invite you to turn that up please, tab 15 at page 285. If one looks at paragraph 4A of the Terms of Reference for the Independent Advisory Panel
10 11 12 13	reference to the submissions and then turn to the additional issue, and do the same. Issue 1 is the heads of loss which are recoverable under the HSS and the reasons for any exclusions. That on its face raises two separate issues, the heads of	9 10 11 12 13	scheme does permit the payment of consequential losses, and if I could invite you to turn that up please, tab 15 at page 285. If one looks at paragraph 4A of the Terms of Reference for the Independent Advisory Panel consequential losses are defined to mean financial or
10 11 12 13 14	reference to the submissions and then turn to the additional issue, and do the same. Issue 1 is the heads of loss which are recoverable under the HSS and the reasons for any exclusions. That on its face raises two separate issues, the heads of recoverable loss and reasons for exclusions from the	9 10 11 12 13 14	scheme does permit the payment of consequential losses, and if I could invite you to turn that up please, tab 15 at page 285. If one looks at paragraph 4A of the Terms of Reference for the Independent Advisory Panel consequential losses are defined to mean financial or non-financial losses that are not shortfall losses,
10 11 12 13 14 15	reference to the submissions and then turn to the additional issue, and do the same. Issue 1 is the heads of loss which are recoverable under the HSS and the reasons for any exclusions. That on its face raises two separate issues, the heads of recoverable loss and reasons for exclusions from the scheme.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15	scheme does permit the payment of consequential losses, and if I could invite you to turn that up please, tab 15 at page 285. If one looks at paragraph 4A of the Terms of Reference for the Independent Advisory Panel consequential losses are defined to mean financial or non-financial losses that are not shortfall losses, shortfall losses being defined by paragraph 4D.
10 11 12 13 14 15	reference to the submissions and then turn to the additional issue, and do the same. Issue 1 is the heads of loss which are recoverable under the HSS and the reasons for any exclusions. That on its face raises two separate issues, the heads of recoverable loss and reasons for exclusions from the scheme. Dealing with heads of recoverable loss first, you	9 10 11 12 13 14 15	scheme does permit the payment of consequential losses, and if I could invite you to turn that up please, tab 15 at page 285. If one looks at paragraph 4A of the Terms of Reference for the Independent Advisory Panel consequential losses are defined to mean financial or non-financial losses that are not shortfall losses, shortfall losses being defined by paragraph 4D. Then perhaps more significantly, it's also clear
10 11 12 13 14 15 16	reference to the submissions and then turn to the additional issue, and do the same. Issue 1 is the heads of loss which are recoverable under the HSS and the reasons for any exclusions. That on its face raises two separate issues, the heads of recoverable loss and reasons for exclusions from the scheme. Dealing with heads of recoverable loss first, you will have seen that despite its name which suggests that	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	scheme does permit the payment of consequential losses, and if I could invite you to turn that up please, tab 15 at page 285. If one looks at paragraph 4A of the Terms of Reference for the Independent Advisory Panel consequential losses are defined to mean financial or non-financial losses that are not shortfall losses, shortfall losses being defined by paragraph 4D. Then perhaps more significantly, it's also clear from the consequential loss principles and guidance at
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	reference to the submissions and then turn to the additional issue, and do the same. Issue 1 is the heads of loss which are recoverable under the HSS and the reasons for any exclusions. That on its face raises two separate issues, the heads of recoverable loss and reasons for exclusions from the scheme. Dealing with heads of recoverable loss first, you will have seen that despite its name which suggests that the focus of attention is shortfalls, the HSS in fact	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	scheme does permit the payment of consequential losses, and if I could invite you to turn that up please, tab 15 at page 285. If one looks at paragraph 4A of the Terms of Reference for the Independent Advisory Panel consequential losses are defined to mean financial or non-financial losses that are not shortfall losses, shortfall losses being defined by paragraph 4D. Then perhaps more significantly, it's also clear from the consequential loss principles and guidance at tab 17 that such consequential losses are in principle
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	reference to the submissions and then turn to the additional issue, and do the same. Issue 1 is the heads of loss which are recoverable under the HSS and the reasons for any exclusions. That on its face raises two separate issues, the heads of recoverable loss and reasons for exclusions from the scheme. Dealing with heads of recoverable loss first, you will have seen that despite its name which suggests that the focus of attention is shortfalls, the HSS in fact allows in principle the payment by the Post Office of	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	scheme does permit the payment of consequential losses, and if I could invite you to turn that up please, tab 15 at page 285. If one looks at paragraph 4A of the Terms of Reference for the Independent Advisory Panel consequential losses are defined to mean financial or non-financial losses that are not shortfall losses, shortfall losses being defined by paragraph 4D. Then perhaps more significantly, it's also clear from the consequential loss principles and guidance at tab 17 that such consequential losses are in principle recoverable. One can see that from paragraph 1.3 but
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	reference to the submissions and then turn to the additional issue, and do the same. Issue 1 is the heads of loss which are recoverable under the HSS and the reasons for any exclusions. That on its face raises two separate issues, the heads of recoverable loss and reasons for exclusions from the scheme. Dealing with heads of recoverable loss first, you will have seen that despite its name which suggests that the focus of attention is shortfalls, the HSS in fact allows in principle the payment by the Post Office of much wider classes of compensation than the simple	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	scheme does permit the payment of consequential losses, and if I could invite you to turn that up please, tab 15 at page 285. If one looks at paragraph 4A of the Terms of Reference for the Independent Advisory Panel consequential losses are defined to mean financial or non-financial losses that are not shortfall losses, shortfall losses being defined by paragraph 4D. Then perhaps more significantly, it's also clear from the consequential loss principles and guidance at tab 17 that such consequential losses are in principle recoverable. One can see that from paragraph 1.3 but more significantly, from paragraphs 5.1 to 5.10 between
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	reference to the submissions and then turn to the additional issue, and do the same. Issue 1 is the heads of loss which are recoverable under the HSS and the reasons for any exclusions. That on its face raises two separate issues, the heads of recoverable loss and reasons for exclusions from the scheme. Dealing with heads of recoverable loss first, you will have seen that despite its name which suggests that the focus of attention is shortfalls, the HSS in fact allows in principle the payment by the Post Office of much wider classes of compensation than the simple repayment of sums of money wrongfully taken by the Post	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	scheme does permit the payment of consequential losses, and if I could invite you to turn that up please, tab 15 at page 285. If one looks at paragraph 4A of the Terms of Reference for the Independent Advisory Panel consequential losses are defined to mean financial or non-financial losses that are not shortfall losses, shortfall losses being defined by paragraph 4D. Then perhaps more significantly, it's also clear from the consequential loss principles and guidance at tab 17 that such consequential losses are in principle recoverable. One can see that from paragraph 1.3 but more significantly, from paragraphs 5.1 to 5.10 between pages 291 to 295, one can just scan the headings there
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	reference to the submissions and then turn to the additional issue, and do the same. Issue 1 is the heads of loss which are recoverable under the HSS and the reasons for any exclusions. That on its face raises two separate issues, the heads of recoverable loss and reasons for exclusions from the scheme. Dealing with heads of recoverable loss first, you will have seen that despite its name which suggests that the focus of attention is shortfalls, the HSS in fact allows in principle the payment by the Post Office of much wider classes of compensation than the simple repayment of sums of money wrongfully taken by the Post Office from subpostmasters, or wrongly paid by	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	scheme does permit the payment of consequential losses, and if I could invite you to turn that up please, tab 15 at page 285. If one looks at paragraph 4A of the Terms of Reference for the Independent Advisory Panel consequential losses are defined to mean financial or non-financial losses that are not shortfall losses, shortfall losses being defined by paragraph 4D. Then perhaps more significantly, it's also clear from the consequential loss principles and guidance at tab 17 that such consequential losses are in principle recoverable. One can see that from paragraph 1.3 but more significantly, from paragraphs 5.1 to 5.10 between pages 291 to 295, one can just scan the headings there which include claims for loss of earnings, loss of
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	reference to the submissions and then turn to the additional issue, and do the same. Issue 1 is the heads of loss which are recoverable under the HSS and the reasons for any exclusions. That on its face raises two separate issues, the heads of recoverable loss and reasons for exclusions from the scheme. Dealing with heads of recoverable loss first, you will have seen that despite its name which suggests that the focus of attention is shortfalls, the HSS in fact allows in principle the payment by the Post Office of much wider classes of compensation than the simple repayment of sums of money wrongfully taken by the Post Office from subpostmasters, or wrongly paid by subpostmasters to the Post Office, or sums of money	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	scheme does permit the payment of consequential losses, and if I could invite you to turn that up please, tab 15 at page 285. If one looks at paragraph 4A of the Terms of Reference for the Independent Advisory Panel consequential losses are defined to mean financial or non-financial losses that are not shortfall losses, shortfall losses being defined by paragraph 4D. Then perhaps more significantly, it's also clear from the consequential loss principles and guidance at tab 17 that such consequential losses are in principle recoverable. One can see that from paragraph 1.3 but more significantly, from paragraphs 5.1 to 5.10 between pages 291 to 295, one can just scan the headings there which include claims for loss of earnings, loss of profit, loss of property, loss of opportunity or loss of
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	reference to the submissions and then turn to the additional issue, and do the same. Issue 1 is the heads of loss which are recoverable under the HSS and the reasons for any exclusions. That on its face raises two separate issues, the heads of recoverable loss and reasons for exclusions from the scheme. Dealing with heads of recoverable loss first, you will have seen that despite its name which suggests that the focus of attention is shortfalls, the HSS in fact allows in principle the payment by the Post Office of much wider classes of compensation than the simple repayment of sums of money wrongfully taken by the Post Office from subpostmasters, or wrongly paid by subpostmasters to the Post Office, or sums of money wrongly treated by the Post Office as owing by	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	scheme does permit the payment of consequential losses, and if I could invite you to turn that up please, tab 15 at page 285. If one looks at paragraph 4A of the Terms of Reference for the Independent Advisory Panel consequential losses are defined to mean financial or non-financial losses that are not shortfall losses, shortfall losses being defined by paragraph 4D. Then perhaps more significantly, it's also clear from the consequential loss principles and guidance at tab 17 that such consequential losses are in principle recoverable. One can see that from paragraph 1.3 but more significantly, from paragraphs 5.1 to 5.10 between pages 291 to 295, one can just scan the headings there which include claims for loss of earnings, loss of profit, loss of property, loss of opportunity or loss of chance, penalties, and increased costs of financing,
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	reference to the submissions and then turn to the additional issue, and do the same. Issue 1 is the heads of loss which are recoverable under the HSS and the reasons for any exclusions. That on its face raises two separate issues, the heads of recoverable loss and reasons for exclusions from the scheme. Dealing with heads of recoverable loss first, you will have seen that despite its name which suggests that the focus of attention is shortfalls, the HSS in fact allows in principle the payment by the Post Office of much wider classes of compensation than the simple repayment of sums of money wrongfully taken by the Post Office from subpostmasters, or wrongly paid by subpostmasters to the Post Office, or sums of money	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	scheme does permit the payment of consequential losses, and if I could invite you to turn that up please, tab 15 at page 285. If one looks at paragraph 4A of the Terms of Reference for the Independent Advisory Panel consequential losses are defined to mean financial or non-financial losses that are not shortfall losses, shortfall losses being defined by paragraph 4D. Then perhaps more significantly, it's also clear from the consequential loss principles and guidance at tab 17 that such consequential losses are in principle recoverable. One can see that from paragraph 1.3 but more significantly, from paragraphs 5.1 to 5.10 between pages 291 to 295, one can just scan the headings there which include claims for loss of earnings, loss of profit, loss of property, loss of opportunity or loss of

1	stigma and damage to reputation, and personal injury or	1	If that is right, you may wish to consider what it
2	harassment. That a wide range, a very broad spectrum of	2	is about the way in which the scheme is operated that
3	losses are in principle recoverable, providing that they	3	has caused such a result.
4	have been caused as a direct consequence of the Horizon	4	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: When you say it is missed out, if that's
5	shortfall loss that is claimed.	5	the phrase you used, you mean it was never included in
6	So it seems from those documents that the issues	6	the application form?
7	which may arise are not ones of principle or theory, or	7	MR BEER: Yes.
8	drafting in relation to the terms of the HSS, but at	8	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Fine.
9	a more practical level, as to whether the operation of	9	MR BEER: One point that is made, firstly, is whether the
10	the scheme on the ground is such that subpostmasters are	10	application form itself was designed in a way which
11	put in the best position possible to recover such	11	actively encouraged subpostmasters to pursue these
12	consequential losses under the HSS.	12	claims for consequential losses or whether, like the
13	Aside from the provision of legal assistance, to	13	Terms of Reference and the eligibility criteria, the
14	make and pursue claims under the HSS, an issue that	14	focus is too on shortfalls.
15	I will address in a moment, the other issues which	15	The Post Office say in their submissions at tab 7
16	appear to arise include the following: both Howe & Co	16	at page 172 to 173, it's the last line on 172:
17	and Hudgell Solicitors who represent the vast majority	17	"The HSS application form accordingly invited
18	of subpostmasters in this Inquiry, state in their	18	postmasters to identify any such shortfall that the
19	submissions that in their experience when applications	19	applicant has repaid or is regarded by Post Office as
20	have been made under the HSS by subpostmasters	20	still owing [shortfall losses] as well as 'any other
21	themselves, heads of loss, especially these	21	losses claimed by Horizon shortfall', namely
22	consequential losses, have been routinely missed from	22	consequential losses", and a cross-reference in
23	the applications, often meaning that significant sums of	23	footnote 7 is given to the consequential loss principles
24	money to which the subpostmasters are in principle	24	and guidance document.
25	entitled have been left out.	25	It is said, continuing, consequential loss is
	17		18
1	defined to mean financial or non-financial loss that is	1	directly related to the alleged shortfalls in respect of
2	not a shortfall loss, which we have seen is obviously	2	which you would like to claim. If yes, please provide
3	correct by looking at the consequential loss and	3	the following details for each alleged loss: the nature
4	guidance document sorry, consequential loss	4	of the alleged loss, the dates of the alleged loss, how
5	principles and guidance document.	5	the loss arose as a direct result of the alleged
6	If we turn up the application form, which is the	6	shortfall, and the value/size of the loss."
7	next tab, using the May 2020 version, there is no	7	Then there is a little box for a person to include
8	material difference between the May and the June version	8	that information.
9	in this regard, you will see from page 190 a series of	9	You may wish to consider whether that single
10	boxes for an applicant to complete, and on the second	10	question, not mentioning consequential losses, not
11	page, on page 191, under the heading "Shortfalls", the	11	mentioning the consequential loss principles and
12	applicant is presented with the following statement:	12	guidance, has led to the issue that both Howe & Co and
13	"For each shortfall in respect of which you are	13	Hudgell Solicitors have raised. And, if so, what is to
14	applying please specify", and then there are six	14	be done about it?
15	subparagraphs setting out the information that is to be	15	The second issue is whether the facility within
16	given in relation to the shortfall.	16	the scheme for a payment to a subpostmaster in the
17	Then question 19 sorry, question 20, also	17	interests of fairness, even though they cannot discharge
18	relates to shortfalls. Question 21 is about whether	18	the burden of proving on the balance of probabilities
19	there had been an audit into the relevant branch.	19	that they have suffered a loss, is in fact operating in
20	Question 22 concerns whether there was any other	20	practice as a sufficient mechanism to ensure that
21	investigation into the shortfall. Question 23 is	21	subpostmasters are properly compensated.
22	whether action was taken by the Post Office as a result	22	We can see the operation of that facility, the
23	of the alleged shortfall. Then question 24 does ask the	23	fairness principle, written into the scheme in a number
24	broad question:	24	of places. Can I invite you to turn up tab 17 please,
25	"Have you experienced any other losses that are 19	25	which is the consequential loss principles and guidance 20

The Post Office Horizon IT Inquiry

1	document.	1	burden is on postmasters to provide sufficient evidence
2	Under paragraph 3.1 at the foot of page 289 under	2	to demonstrate their claim for consequential loss, the
3	the heading "Key principles", paragraph 3.1 is headed	3	scheme will also consider any relevant evidence Post
4	"Burden of proof in relation to consequential losses",	4	Office holds when assessing the claim. Any key
5	and reads:	5	supporting documentation relied upon will be shared with
6	"3.1.1 The burden of proof is on the postmaster	6	postmasters when they receive the outcome of their
7	to provide sufficient evidence in support of their claim	7	claims to enable them to consider whether they wish to
8	to demonstrate that on the balance of probabilities,	8	accept the offers made to them."
9	i.e. a greater than 50 per cent likelihood, (a) such	9	I will come back to that in a moment.
10	losses have been suffered, and (b) as a consequence of	10	The second place in which we can see the fairness
11	a Horizon shortfall as such are found in the common	11	principle described is in tab 15, of your bundle which
12	issues judgment or the Horizon issues judgment. This	12	is the terms of reference for the Independent Advisory
13	means evidencing the fact that a loss was incurred, the	13	Panel to the HSS. It is at page 287 and clause 30, this
14	amount of that loss, and that the cause of the loss was	14	reads:
15	due to Horizon shortfall.	15	"In formulating its recommended offer the Panel
16	"3.1.2 where the subpostmaster is unable to	16	may recommend the making of an offer to the postmaster
17	satisfy the burden of proof in relation to their claim,	17	if, guided by broad considerations of fairness, the
18	their claim may nonetheless be accepted in whole or in	18	Panel considers that doing so would produce a fair
19	part if the scheme considers it to be fair in all the	19	result in all the circumstances of the particular case.
20	circumstances."	20	For the avoidance of doubt, in doing so the Panel's
21	Then under 3.2.3, which is under a cross heading	21	discretion will not be confined solely to the specific
22	of "Evidence", the guidance document states:	22	heads of consequential loss claimed by the postmaster
23	"The need to provide evidence is particularly	23	but will take into account at any facts and matters
24	important where a postmaster's claim relates to matters	24	which the Panel considers will produce a fair result on
25	which are known only to the postmaster. While the	25	the facts of a particular case."
	21		22
1	So in those two places one can see that the scheme	1	than the application of the legal principles of
2	and, in particular, the Panel are to be guided by broad	2	remoteness, causation, mitigation, and quantum.
3	considerations of fairness, that the Panel's discretion	3	So the question which arises is whether this
4	is not confined solely to heads of loss claimed, and	4	fairness facility is operating in practice in
5	that the Panel may take into account any facts and	5	circumstances where for the reasons described by the
6	matters which it considers will produce a fair result in	6	subpostmasters it's very likely that a high number of
7	the circumstances of a particular case.	7	them have not retained records from a decade or two
8	In terms of the operation of the scheme in	8	decades ago that are necessary to prove to the relevant
9	practice, there is no information that we have seen as	9	standard the losses that they have suffered. That's an
10	the Inquiry, no data in particular, and no explanation	10	issue that you may wish to explore in particular with
11	as to the approach that's been taken, as to the	11	the Post Office.
12	frequency with which this facility has been used, i.e.	12	Turning then to the reasons for exclusion. The
13	the fairness principle applied even though	13	reasons for exclusion of certain classes of applicant
14	a subpostmaster on evidence grounds has fallen short of	14	have been broadly explained in all of the submissions of
15	proving a loss on the balance of probabilities, nor	15	the core participants and I'm not going to rehearse
16	whether there are any examples of the initiative in fact	16	them. But an outstanding issue is the exclusion of
17	having come from the Panel to award a sum outside	17	applicants who did not apply within the relatively short
18	a class of loss, a consequential loss claimed by the	18	window during which the scheme was open for
19	subpostmaster, i.e. where the Panel has taken the	19	applications, which relatively short window was at the
20	initiative and suggested to a subpostmaster it appears	20	height of the pandemic, and the approach that the Post
21		21	Office has taken after that closure of the window to
22	on the facts that you have presented that there is a category of loss or there are broader categories of	22	
22	loss that you aught to have claimed. You should do so	22	applications made out of time.
22	loss that you aught to have plaimed. You should do so	22	Vauvilless in tab 7 at page 176

23

24

25

say:

loss that you ought to have claimed. You should do so.

basis of a broad consideration of what is fair, rather

Or examples of where the Panel has made an award on the

23

24

25

You will see in tab 7, at page 176, at paragraph

23, this is the Post Office submissions, the Post Office

1	"The cohome was initially open to applications	1	year as these are figures 10 months often the electro
1 2	"The scheme was initially open to applications from 1 May to 14 August 2020. This deadline was	1 2	year, so these are figures 19 months after the closure of the scheme, it shows that settlement offers of the
3	subsequently extended by 15 weeks until 27 November 2020	3	eligible claims have been made in 1,483 cases, i.e.
4	in order to enable further applicants to apply following	4	63 per cent, and payments have been made in 1,135 cases,
5	an amendment to the scheme's eligibility criteria, as	5	i.e. 48 per cent, so less than half.
6	well as to accommodate difficulties in making	6	Last night the Post Office filed some additional
7	applications due to the Covid 19 pandemic."	7	submissions to update these figures amongst other
8	Then this:	8	things. The 63 per cent has gone up to 65 per cent,
9	"Since closure of the scheme to applications, Post	9	i.e. the number of eligible claims in which offers made,
10	Office has received in excess of 170 applications to	10	and payments have been made in sorry, that's 67 per
11	date, all of which Post Office is actively considering	11	cent, not 65. Payments have been made in 52 per cent of
12	how best to address", so you may wish to consider the	12	eligible cases as opposed to the previous figure of
13	approach that the Post Office is taking to applications	13	48 per cent. So still at around the half figure, and
14	made out of time and whether that statement, which is	14	we're 19 months after the closure of the scheme.
15	"We're still thinking about it", is adequate in the	15	Now, those numbers, those figures, obscure perhaps
16	circumstances.	16	the human stories that sit behind them. You may recall
17	Issue 2, sir, under this first category is whether	17	Mr Baljit Sethi who I asked questions of in the human
18	there has been delay and, if so, the causes of delay in	18	impact hearings. He told you, sir, that although he had
19	processing applications under the HSS. As we said,	19	received standard form acknowledgements from the Post
20	after the 15-week extension period to 27 November 2020	20	Office after he had made the claim, he waited for just
21	the scheme was closed.	21	under two years before he received any substantive
22	In terms of the number of applications made and	22	reply. That was a couple of days before he gave
23	the awards made, if we can go back to tab 19, please,	23	evidence to you.
24	which we looked at earlier, this time look at the second	24	There were other accounts of delays in any contact
25	page, page 303. Again, these are figures to 7 June this	25	at all from the Post Office in the HSS. So, sir, the
	25		26
1	issue that may arise for your consideration is what is	1	contemporaneous and other documentary material, material
2	the cause of the delay that 19 months on only 50 per	2	which a lay person may not be used to collecting,
3	cent of eligible claimants have had payments made to	3	organizing and presenting; where, thirdly, the scheme
4	them.	4	self evidently applies legal concepts such as
5	Sir, issue 3 is the provision which has been made	5	remoteness, causation, mitigation, and quantum that may
6	for applicants to obtain independent legal advice in	6	be unfamiliar to people; where, fourthly, further
7	respect of their claims under the HSS and whether it has	7	difficult issues may arise in claims that arise
8	been adequate. Sir, you know that the scheme makes	8	following bankruptcy, where the trustee-in-bankruptcy
9	provision for the payment of a figure of either £400 or	9	must be involved and the consequential losses that are
10	£1,200 in respect of legal fees. That figure is	10	properly recoverable may be complex; where, fifthly, tax
11	dependent on whether the Post Office offers to pay the	11	advice it's likely to be necessary in relation to
12	claim in full, in which case the former figure is paid,	12	different elements of payments made under the scheme.
13	or whether it does not, in which case the latter figure	13	No provision is made for the payment of legal
14	may be paid.	14	costs when the dispute resolution procedure within the
15	The scheme makes no provision for any other forms	15	scheme is triggered, including where a good faith
16	of assistance, for example, fees for medical evidence to	16	meeting is required or if the case goes to mediation.
17	be obtained to support a claim for consequential losses,	17	The point has been made by the subpostmasters that by
18	or forensic accountancy services, again, to prove on the	18	contrast the Post Office has appointed a law firm to
19	balance of probabilities that losses which are	19	operate the scheme on its behalf and to prepare the
20	consequential on a shortfall have been suffered.	20	analysis which is then passed to the Independent
21	You may wish to consider whether this approach is	21	Advisory Panel, i.e. which appears to form the basis of
22	adequate in circumstances where, firstly, the nature of	22	the material on which the Independent Advisory Panel
23	the consequential losses claimed are in many instances	23	makes its decisions.
24	likely to be complex; where the scheme, secondly,	24	In its submissions of last night, the Post Office
25	requires losses to be evidenced by a range of	25	stated that it has contributed to the legal costs of 45
	27		28

1	applicants. If that is correct that means that it has	1	not to be seen as controversial or novel, but instead
2	made a contribution in 45 out of 1,242 cases in which	2	the norm.
3	the payments have been made, a tiny proportion. It	3	You may wish to consider whether this approach of
4	follows that no appointments have been made in some	4	generally not making interim payments under the HSS has
5	1,100 or so of the cases sorry, 1,200 of the cases in	5	placed pressure on subpostmasters to accept early
6	which compensation payments have been made.	6	payments at undervalues or instead hold out for the
7	In the same submissions the Post Office says that	7	possibility of a higher payment.
8	it's currently considering whether contributions to	8	If we go to tab 7 again, the Post Office
9	legal fees or other professional costs can be made	9	submissions, at page 182, at the foot 182 and on to 183,
10	available and that it will update the inquiry in due	10	it is said, as noted in some previous submissions,
11	course.	11	payments have been made on an interim basis prior to
12	You may wish to consider whether that is	12	a final offer of compensation, so those applicants to
13	satisfactory in circumstances where the scheme has been	13	the HSS whom Post Office understood to be in difficult
14	operating for 2 years and according to the Post Office	14	circumstances, who could be irredeemably impacted by the
15	figures, half of the eligible applicants have already	15	time necessary fully to assess their claim and make
16	been paid a sum of money and only 45 of them have had	16	a fair offer. To date Post Office has made payments on
17	their legal fees paid.	17	an interim basis to 25 applicants, including of
18	Issue 4, is the provision which has been made for	18	circumstances of severe financial hardship, terminal
19	interim payments pending completion of the procedures	19	illness, risk of personal hardship and old age.
20	under the HSS. You will have seen that Hudgell & Co	20	So interim payments made in 25 cases, and you will
21	suggest that the Post Office has refused to make interim	21	recall that as of 7 June 1,482 offers of settlement have
22	payments under the HSS in respect of losses which are	22	been made, so interim payments in about 1.6/1.7 per cent
23	agreed whilst other species of loss are investigated,	23	of cases. There appears to be a difference of desire or
24	and that Howe & Co have suggested that the making of an	24	of approach here. You may wish to consider whether
25	interim payment under the scheme, such as the HSS ought	25	interim payments ought to be made irrespective of
	29		30
1	showing for example, a terminal illness or old age, but	1	and 3 or B and C. Category 2, back to tab 2, sir, final
2	instead where some losses have been agreed and payment	2	compensation for subpostmasters with quashed
3	of that sum should be effected, whilst argument	3	convictions. Issue 5 was the principles which are being
4	continues over other losses.	4	applied to the calculation of final compensation
5	Sir, those are the four issues that arise under	5	schemes sorry, final compensation payments; issue 6,
6	the first category.	6	the mechanism which by which final compensation payments
7	Howe & Co have raised an additional issue over the	7	are being calculated; issue 7, the provision, if any,
8	operation of paragraph 3.2 of the consequential loss and	8	which is made for applicants to obtain independent legal
9	principles guidance. That is tab 17 at page 290.	9	advise in relation to their claims; issue 8, the
10	I mentioned it to you earlier. Tab 17, page 290, and	10	procedures which are being adopted to resolve the
11	it's 3.2.3 which I read out earlier. The point made on	11	disputes about the value of compensation payments.
12	behalf of Howe & Co is that subpostmasters are provided	12	These are all about subpostmasters who have had their
13	under this scheme with the evidence that the Post Office	13	convictions quashed.
14	possesses at the stage and only at the stage when "they	14	These issues do not address the question of
15	received the outcome of their claim", i.e. they received	15	interim payments and that's deliberately so. That's
16	evidence from the Post Office after they had formulated	16	because, as I mentioned already, the payment of sums of
17	a claim and after receipt of an offer.	17	money to subpostmasters in this category of claim appear
18	So the burden is on the postmaster to prove his or	18	on the information received by the Inquiry largely to
19	her claim without the material that the Post Office	19	have worked well, with such payments generally being
20	itself possesses. It's suggested by Howe & Co that such	20	made promptly.
21	material as to the Post Office possesses as is relevant	21	In their May submissions the Post Office noted
22	to the claim that is made, ought to be disclosed at the	22	that of the 73 men and women whose convictions have been
23	outset or at least in the course of the process and not	23	quashed, 69 had applied for interim payments and such
24	at ita and	24	neumanta had been made by the Doot Office in CC of them

25

24

25

at its end.

Can I turn more briefly to consider categories 2

payments had been made by the Post Office in 66 of them.

The questions that we have instead raised relate to

1	final payments. That's what questions five to eight	1	non-binding view, on the likely outcome were the matter
2	relate to.	2	before him or her to proceed to court, and it is has
3	The collective answer to all of those questions is	3	been announced by the Minister, Mr Scully, and in the
4	that there is no formal mechanism or scheme to value	4	BEIS submissions of last night that Lord Dyson has
5	claims or to administer claims. Instead, the claims are	5	agreed to act as the evaluator.
6	being pursued through pre-action correspondence in the	6	So rather than looking individually at issues
7	hope that they will be resolved without recourse to yet	7	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Sorry, Mr Beer. Did you say BEIS
8	further litigation.	8	submissions of last night?
9	It's been said in the submissions both by BEIS and	9	MR BEER: No, I meant Post Office of submissions of last
10	the Post Office that the absence of a formal mechanism	10	night.
11	or scheme was at the express request of the	11	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I thought you were in advance of me
12	subpostmasters themselves. Certainly in the submissions	12	that's all.
13	of Hudgell & Co there is no request for such a scheme to	13	MR BEER: No, the Post Office submissions of 8.59pm last
14	be set up. Instead, the Hudgell & Co submissions to you	14	night.
15	focus on the merits of their clients' claims for certain	15	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I know we all work late but I was
16	losses, a matter which I anticipate you will not wish to	16	thinking when could they have come.
17	address, the individual substantive merits of the claims	17	MR BEER: Yes. So the issue rather than individually
18	made.	18	looking at points 5, 6, 7 and 8 that you may wish to
19	However, there has been a further development in	19	explore, in particular with counsel for the Hudgell & Co
20	that a number of subpostmasters represented by	20	core participants, who represent it seems 62 of these
21	Hudgell & Co have agreed that the issue of non-pecuniary	21	claimants, i.e. the vast majority of them, is whether
22	losses, which it is said was causing a particularly	22	they are content for the current approach to continue.
23	difficulty to assess and to agree, should be referred to	23	That's a polite way of saying whether they, in
24	early neutral evaluation, a process which by a valuer	24	fact, ask you to butt out. Whether they wish you to
25	who is respected expresses a non-binding conclusion,	25	stand back and not interfere in arrangements that are
	33		34
1	proceeding satisfactorily.	1	and understood in the course of and at the conclusion of
2	Can I turn then to category 3, fair compensation	2	the litigation the extent to which any sums paid by the
3	for the group litigation claimants. This raises issues	3	Post Office would be lost in legal and other
4	9 to 12 on your list, sir. These issues have been	4	professional fees, and issues as to the extent to which
5	overtaken by events. In particular, the announcement by	5	their interests were represented in a structured and
6	the Minister seven days ago about the payments by way of	6	transparent way by the JFSA.
7	interim payments to the GLO claimants with a fund of	7	The inquiry has not of course been a party to and
8	£19.5 million set aside for that purpose and his	8	knows nothing about the negotiations which it seems have
9	announcement that a new scheme for the payment of final	9	taken place between BEIS on the one hand, the JFSA on
10	compensation was being developed. There are no details	10	the other, and Freeths on the third part as to the sums
11	yet available as to that scheme for the payment of final	11	of money to be paid by BEIS, the scheme by which such
12	compensation to the Group litigation claimants.	12	payments will be made on an interim and on a final
13	It seems to us that the issues which may arise	13	basis, or the principles that will apply under that
14	include whether the voice of all of the GLO claimants is	14	scheme to ensure fair and reasonable compensation for
15	being heard and fairly represented in the development of	15	all of the 555 GLO claimants.
16	a scheme to administer payments, both interim and final,	16	In that regard, I would end by asking you look at
17	for the group litigation claimants.	17	a letter written by Freeths Solicitors, which is in
18	You will have seen that the Minister announced	18	tab 3 at page 21, a letter to the solicitor to the
19	seven days ago that the Government had engaged Freeths	19	Inquiry. It's the final paragraph about half way
20	Solicitors in the way that I have described and they	20	through, where Freeths say:
21	were of course the firm that represented the 555 GLO	21	"On behalf of individual GLO claimants who choose
22	claimants in the group litigation. It's fair to say	22	to instruct us, we are consulting with BEIS and JFSA in
23	that the papers that the inquiry has received and some	23	order to collaborate on developing a scheme and
24	of the evidence that it has seen, raise some issues as	24	associated arrangements that work in the interests of
25	to the extent to which all of the 555 GLO claimants knew 35	25	those of the GLO claimants who will instruct us, so 36

1	naturally Freeths Solicitors will only be acting in the	1	I'm not quite sure how the past and the present
2	interests of those of the GLO claimants who instruct	2	fits together there.
3	us."	3	MR BEER: Yes, in particular where the
4	It is apparent that a number of the GLO claimants	4	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I am not asking you to answer. I am
5	are represented in the Inquiry by Howe & Co and so the	5	throwing it out so that that puzzle in my mind can be
6	issue that you may wish to consider with representatives	6	pondered on by those who may know the answer.
7	of both BEIS and the Howe & Co core participants is what	7	MR BEER: That's why I focused on that sentence in
8	mechanisms have been put in place to ensure that the	8	particular, sir. Because, as I said, putting it mildly,
9	arrangements work in the interests of all of the GLO	9	it may cause concerns that the issues that unfolded in
10	claimants and not those simply represented by Freeths in	10	December 2019 have the potential to repeat themselves
11	circumstances where issues have arisen in the past as to	11	once again.
12	the openness, transparency and organisation of decision	12	Sir, those are the only points that I raise for
13	making in the group litigation itself.	13	your consideration.
14	In short, this scheme, it is presumed, is designed	14	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you very much.
15	to put right what went wrong at the conclusion of the	15	Ms Gallafent, I think you are next up but I take
16	Group litigation. It will be unfortunate putting it	16	it we'd all like a morning break so is this a convenient
17	mildly if something similar was to happen again.	17	moment to have it?
18	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Can I say now, Mr Beer, so that there is	18	MS GALLAFENT: In your hands, sir.
19	no misunderstanding about what's in my mind, that that	19	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: All right then, 10 minutes and then we
20	sentence that you just focused on "on behalf of	20	will start again.
21	individual GLO claimants who chose to instruct us [past	21	(11.42 am)
22	tense]. We are consulting with BEIS and JFSA in order	22	(A short break)
23	to collaborate on developing a scheme and associated	23	(11.56 am)
24	arrangements that work in the interests of those of the	24	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Before I ask Ms Gallafent to make her
25	GLO claimants who will instruct us."	25	submissions, I appreciate that there is a large number
20	37	20	38
1	of people here and when we have our break it's very	1	particular we have not treated today's hearing as the
2	tempting to have a chat with people. Let me tell you a	2	appropriate point for Post Office to make its opening
	templing to have a chat with people. Let me tell you a	2	appropriate point for 1 ost office to make its opening
3	story about a crusty old judge who used to walk into	3	statement generally, which we look forward to making at
3 4			
	story about a crusty old judge who used to walk into	3	statement generally, which we look forward to making at
4	story about a crusty old judge who used to walk into court dead on the appointed time regardless of who was	3 4	statement generally, which we look forward to making at the beginning of phase 2 in September.
4 5	story about a crusty old judge who used to walk into court dead on the appointed time regardless of who was there. On one occasion I wasn't there and got a rocket.	3 4 5	statement generally, which we look forward to making at the beginning of phase 2 in September. So far as the content of our submissions today are
4 5 6	story about a crusty old judge who used to walk into court dead on the appointed time regardless of who was there. On one occasion I wasn't there and got a rocket. So from now on, if you want to have a chat outside	3 4 5 6	statement generally, which we look forward to making at the beginning of phase 2 in September. So far as the content of our submissions today are concerned could I make three preliminary points. First,
4 5 6 7	story about a crusty old judge who used to walk into court dead on the appointed time regardless of who was there. On one occasion I wasn't there and got a rocket. So from now on, if you want to have a chat outside please do but I'm going carry on without you. All	3 4 5 6 7	statement generally, which we look forward to making at the beginning of phase 2 in September. So far as the content of our submissions today are concerned could I make three preliminary points. First, in line with the position adopted in our written
4 5 6 7 8	story about a crusty old judge who used to walk into court dead on the appointed time regardless of who was there. On one occasion I wasn't there and got a rocket. So from now on, if you want to have a chat outside please do but I'm going carry on without you. All right.	3 4 5 6 7 8	statement generally, which we look forward to making at the beginning of phase 2 in September. So far as the content of our submissions today are concerned could I make three preliminary points. First, in line with the position adopted in our written submissions we will primarily be focusing on the
4 5 6 7 8 9	story about a crusty old judge who used to walk into court dead on the appointed time regardless of who was there. On one occasion I wasn't there and got a rocket. So from now on, if you want to have a chat outside please do but I'm going carry on without you. All right. Ms Gallafent.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	statement generally, which we look forward to making at the beginning of phase 2 in September. So far as the content of our submissions today are concerned could I make three preliminary points. First, in line with the position adopted in our written submissions we will primarily be focusing on the specific questions asked by you rather than other issues
4 5 6 7 8 9	story about a crusty old judge who used to walk into court dead on the appointed time regardless of who was there. On one occasion I wasn't there and got a rocket. So from now on, if you want to have a chat outside please do but I'm going carry on without you. All right. Ms Gallafent. Submission by MS GALLAFENT	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	statement generally, which we look forward to making at the beginning of phase 2 in September. So far as the content of our submissions today are concerned could I make three preliminary points. First, in line with the position adopted in our written submissions we will primarily be focusing on the specific questions asked by you rather than other issues which may be raised in due course.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10	story about a crusty old judge who used to walk into court dead on the appointed time regardless of who was there. On one occasion I wasn't there and got a rocket. So from now on, if you want to have a chat outside please do but I'm going carry on without you. All right. Ms Gallafent. Submission by MS GALLAFENT MS GALLAFENT: Sir, thank you. I would like to state at the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	statement generally, which we look forward to making at the beginning of phase 2 in September. So far as the content of our submissions today are concerned could I make three preliminary points. First, in line with the position adopted in our written submissions we will primarily be focusing on the specific questions asked by you rather than other issues which may be raised in due course. Secondly, in line with the indication in your
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	story about a crusty old judge who used to walk into court dead on the appointed time regardless of who was there. On one occasion I wasn't there and got a rocket. So from now on, if you want to have a chat outside please do but I'm going carry on without you. All right. Ms Gallafent. Submission by MS GALLAFENT MS GALLAFENT: Sir, thank you. I would like to state at the outset that Post Office is grateful for the opportunity	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	statement generally, which we look forward to making at the beginning of phase 2 in September. So far as the content of our submissions today are concerned could I make three preliminary points. First, in line with the position adopted in our written submissions we will primarily be focusing on the specific questions asked by you rather than other issues which may be raised in due course. Secondly, in line with the indication in your statement of 30 June of this year, we will be taking the
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	story about a crusty old judge who used to walk into court dead on the appointed time regardless of who was there. On one occasion I wasn't there and got a rocket. So from now on, if you want to have a chat outside please do but I'm going carry on without you. All right. Ms Gallafent. Submission by MS GALLAFENT MS GALLAFENT: Sir, thank you. I would like to state at the outset that Post Office is grateful for the opportunity to make both written and oral submissions on the issues	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	statement generally, which we look forward to making at the beginning of phase 2 in September. So far as the content of our submissions today are concerned could I make three preliminary points. First, in line with the position adopted in our written submissions we will primarily be focusing on the specific questions asked by you rather than other issues which may be raised in due course. Secondly, in line with the indication in your statement of 30 June of this year, we will be taking the opportunity to highlight the aspects of the written
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	story about a crusty old judge who used to walk into court dead on the appointed time regardless of who was there. On one occasion I wasn't there and got a rocket. So from now on, if you want to have a chat outside please do but I'm going carry on without you. All right. Ms Gallafent. Submission by MS GALLAFENT MS GALLAFENT: Sir, thank you. I would like to state at the outset that Post Office is grateful for the opportunity to make both written and oral submissions on the issues you identified in your invitation of 10 May as well as	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	statement generally, which we look forward to making at the beginning of phase 2 in September. So far as the content of our submissions today are concerned could I make three preliminary points. First, in line with the position adopted in our written submissions we will primarily be focusing on the specific questions asked by you rather than other issues which may be raised in due course. Secondly, in line with the indication in your statement of 30 June of this year, we will be taking the opportunity to highlight the aspects of the written submissions made on behalf of other organisations and
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	story about a crusty old judge who used to walk into court dead on the appointed time regardless of who was there. On one occasion I wasn't there and got a rocket. So from now on, if you want to have a chat outside please do but I'm going carry on without you. All right. Ms Gallafent. Submission by MS GALLAFENT MS GALLAFENT: Sir, thank you. I would like to state at the outset that Post Office is grateful for the opportunity to make both written and oral submissions on the issues you identified in your invitation of 10 May as well as oral submissions on the matters set out in your	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	statement generally, which we look forward to making at the beginning of phase 2 in September. So far as the content of our submissions today are concerned could I make three preliminary points. First, in line with the position adopted in our written submissions we will primarily be focusing on the specific questions asked by you rather than other issues which may be raised in due course. Secondly, in line with the indication in your statement of 30 June of this year, we will be taking the opportunity to highlight the aspects of the written submissions made on behalf of other organisations and persons with which we agree or disagree, and seeking to
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	story about a crusty old judge who used to walk into court dead on the appointed time regardless of who was there. On one occasion I wasn't there and got a rocket. So from now on, if you want to have a chat outside please do but I'm going carry on without you. All right. Ms Gallafent. Submission by MS GALLAFENT MS GALLAFENT: Sir, thank you. I would like to state at the outset that Post Office is grateful for the opportunity to make both written and oral submissions on the issues you identified in your invitation of 10 May as well as oral submissions on the matters set out in your provisional view on compensation issues relating to	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	statement generally, which we look forward to making at the beginning of phase 2 in September. So far as the content of our submissions today are concerned could I make three preliminary points. First, in line with the position adopted in our written submissions we will primarily be focusing on the specific questions asked by you rather than other issues which may be raised in due course. Secondly, in line with the indication in your statement of 30 June of this year, we will be taking the opportunity to highlight the aspects of the written submissions made on behalf of other organisations and persons with which we agree or disagree, and seeking to explain the reasons for any disagreement.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	story about a crusty old judge who used to walk into court dead on the appointed time regardless of who was there. On one occasion I wasn't there and got a rocket. So from now on, if you want to have a chat outside please do but I'm going carry on without you. All right. Ms Gallafent. Submission by MS GALLAFENT MS GALLAFENT: Sir, thank you. I would like to state at the outset that Post Office is grateful for the opportunity to make both written and oral submissions on the issues you identified in your invitation of 10 May as well as oral submissions on the matters set out in your provisional view on compensation issues relating to prosecuted subpostmasters of 9 May of this year.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	statement generally, which we look forward to making at the beginning of phase 2 in September. So far as the content of our submissions today are concerned could I make three preliminary points. First, in line with the position adopted in our written submissions we will primarily be focusing on the specific questions asked by you rather than other issues which may be raised in due course. Secondly, in line with the indication in your statement of 30 June of this year, we will be taking the opportunity to highlight the aspects of the written submissions made on behalf of other organisations and persons with which we agree or disagree, and seeking to explain the reasons for any disagreement. Thirdly as, sir, we expect you will have
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	story about a crusty old judge who used to walk into court dead on the appointed time regardless of who was there. On one occasion I wasn't there and got a rocket. So from now on, if you want to have a chat outside please do but I'm going carry on without you. All right. Ms Gallafent. Submission by MS GALLAFENT MS GALLAFENT: Sir, thank you. I would like to state at the outset that Post Office is grateful for the opportunity to make both written and oral submissions on the issues you identified in your invitation of 10 May as well as oral submissions on the matters set out in your provisional view on compensation issues relating to prosecuted subpostmasters of 9 May of this year. We are conscious that so far as your invitation of	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	statement generally, which we look forward to making at the beginning of phase 2 in September. So far as the content of our submissions today are concerned could I make three preliminary points. First, in line with the position adopted in our written submissions we will primarily be focusing on the specific questions asked by you rather than other issues which may be raised in due course. Secondly, in line with the indication in your statement of 30 June of this year, we will be taking the opportunity to highlight the aspects of the written submissions made on behalf of other organisations and persons with which we agree or disagree, and seeking to explain the reasons for any disagreement. Thirdly as, sir, we expect you will have anticipated from our own written submissions, we intend
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	story about a crusty old judge who used to walk into court dead on the appointed time regardless of who was there. On one occasion I wasn't there and got a rocket. So from now on, if you want to have a chat outside please do but I'm going carry on without you. All right. Ms Gallafent. Submission by MS GALLAFENT MS GALLAFENT: Sir, thank you. I would like to state at the outset that Post Office is grateful for the opportunity to make both written and oral submissions on the issues you identified in your invitation of 10 May as well as oral submissions on the matters set out in your provisional view on compensation issues relating to prosecuted subpostmasters of 9 May of this year. We are conscious that so far as your invitation of 10 May is concerned, these hearings are only intended to	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	statement generally, which we look forward to making at the beginning of phase 2 in September. So far as the content of our submissions today are concerned could I make three preliminary points. First, in line with the position adopted in our written submissions we will primarily be focusing on the specific questions asked by you rather than other issues which may be raised in due course. Secondly, in line with the indication in your statement of 30 June of this year, we will be taking the opportunity to highlight the aspects of the written submissions made on behalf of other organisations and persons with which we agree or disagree, and seeking to explain the reasons for any disagreement. Thirdly as, sir, we expect you will have anticipated from our own written submissions, we intend to focus on sections of A and B of your invitation and
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	story about a crusty old judge who used to walk into court dead on the appointed time regardless of who was there. On one occasion I wasn't there and got a rocket. So from now on, if you want to have a chat outside please do but I'm going carry on without you. All right. Ms Gallafent. Submission by MS GALLAFENT MS GALLAFENT: Sir, thank you. I would like to state at the outset that Post Office is grateful for the opportunity to make both written and oral submissions on the issues you identified in your invitation of 10 May as well as oral submissions on the matters set out in your provisional view on compensation issues relating to prosecuted subpostmasters of 9 May of this year. We are conscious that so far as your invitation of 10 May is concerned, these hearings are only intended to cover points that you consider should be addressed	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	statement generally, which we look forward to making at the beginning of phase 2 in September. So far as the content of our submissions today are concerned could I make three preliminary points. First, in line with the position adopted in our written submissions we will primarily be focusing on the specific questions asked by you rather than other issues which may be raised in due course. Secondly, in line with the indication in your statement of 30 June of this year, we will be taking the opportunity to highlight the aspects of the written submissions made on behalf of other organisations and persons with which we agree or disagree, and seeking to explain the reasons for any disagreement. Thirdly as, sir, we expect you will have anticipated from our own written submissions, we intend to focus on sections of A and B of your invitation and that is questions 1 to 8 and leave section C to the
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	story about a crusty old judge who used to walk into court dead on the appointed time regardless of who was there. On one occasion I wasn't there and got a rocket. So from now on, if you want to have a chat outside please do but I'm going carry on without you. All right. Ms Gallafent. Submission by MS GALLAFENT MS GALLAFENT: Sir, thank you. I would like to state at the outset that Post Office is grateful for the opportunity to make both written and oral submissions on the issues you identified in your invitation of 10 May as well as oral submissions on the matters set out in your provisional view on compensation issues relating to prosecuted subpostmasters of 9 May of this year. We are conscious that so far as your invitation of 10 May is concerned, these hearings are only intended to cover points that you consider should be addressed sooner rather than later and are not intended as	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	statement generally, which we look forward to making at the beginning of phase 2 in September. So far as the content of our submissions today are concerned could I make three preliminary points. First, in line with the position adopted in our written submissions we will primarily be focusing on the specific questions asked by you rather than other issues which may be raised in due course. Secondly, in line with the indication in your statement of 30 June of this year, we will be taking the opportunity to highlight the aspects of the written submissions made on behalf of other organisations and persons with which we agree or disagree, and seeking to explain the reasons for any disagreement. Thirdly as, sir, we expect you will have anticipated from our own written submissions, we intend to focus on sections of A and B of your invitation and that is questions 1 to 8 and leave section C to the Secretary of State for BEIS to address in due course.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	story about a crusty old judge who used to walk into court dead on the appointed time regardless of who was there. On one occasion I wasn't there and got a rocket. So from now on, if you want to have a chat outside please do but I'm going carry on without you. All right. Ms Gallafent. Submission by MS GALLAFENT MS GALLAFENT: Sir, thank you. I would like to state at the outset that Post Office is grateful for the opportunity to make both written and oral submissions on the issues you identified in your invitation of 10 May as well as oral submissions on the matters set out in your provisional view on compensation issues relating to prosecuted subpostmasters of 9 May of this year. We are conscious that so far as your invitation of 10 May is concerned, these hearings are only intended to cover points that you consider should be addressed sooner rather than later and are not intended as a substitute for the full hearing on the issues of	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	statement generally, which we look forward to making at the beginning of phase 2 in September. So far as the content of our submissions today are concerned could I make three preliminary points. First, in line with the position adopted in our written submissions we will primarily be focusing on the specific questions asked by you rather than other issues which may be raised in due course. Secondly, in line with the indication in your statement of 30 June of this year, we will be taking the opportunity to highlight the aspects of the written submissions made on behalf of other organisations and persons with which we agree or disagree, and seeking to explain the reasons for any disagreement. Thirdly as, sir, we expect you will have anticipated from our own written submissions, we intend to focus on sections of A and B of your invitation and that is questions 1 to 8 and leave section C to the Secretary of State for BEIS to address in due course. Can I start then with section A and Historical
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	story about a crusty old judge who used to walk into court dead on the appointed time regardless of who was there. On one occasion I wasn't there and got a rocket. So from now on, if you want to have a chat outside please do but I'm going carry on without you. All right. Ms Gallafent. Submission by MS GALLAFENT MS GALLAFENT: Sir, thank you. I would like to state at the outset that Post Office is grateful for the opportunity to make both written and oral submissions on the issues you identified in your invitation of 10 May as well as oral submissions on the matters set out in your provisional view on compensation issues relating to prosecuted subpostmasters of 9 May of this year. We are conscious that so far as your invitation of 10 May is concerned, these hearings are only intended to cover points that you consider should be addressed sooner rather than later and are not intended as a substitute for the full hearing on the issues of financial and other sorts of redress which fall within	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	statement generally, which we look forward to making at the beginning of phase 2 in September. So far as the content of our submissions today are concerned could I make three preliminary points. First, in line with the position adopted in our written submissions we will primarily be focusing on the specific questions asked by you rather than other issues which may be raised in due course. Secondly, in line with the indication in your statement of 30 June of this year, we will be taking the opportunity to highlight the aspects of the written submissions made on behalf of other organisations and persons with which we agree or disagree, and seeking to explain the reasons for any disagreement. Thirdly as, sir, we expect you will have anticipated from our own written submissions, we intend to focus on sections of A and B of your invitation and that is questions 1 to 8 and leave section C to the Secretary of State for BEIS to address in due course. Can I start then with section A and Historical Shortfall Scheme. Before I address the particular

The Post Office Horizon IT Inquiry

1	question concerning heads of loss, and which were	1	loss principles and guidance and went through at
2	recoverable or not recoverable, would be read and	2	section 5 the non-exhaustive list of the types of loss
3	regarded as covering the rather wider question of the	3	that can be claimed, assuming they meet the applicable
4	functioning and application of the fairness principle	4	legal tests and noting there they must be linked clearly
5	under the scheme and, in particular, the use of the	5	back to Horizon shortfall.
6	provisions under the Terms of Reference of the	6	It is suggested by Mr Beer that effectively the
7	Independent Advisory Panel when it comes to its	7	question as to what is or is not recoverable by way of
8	recommendations. We make no criticism in this respect	8	a consequential head of loss is pretty much settled,
9	but we emphasise that is why, sir, you haven't to date	9	that nothing is ruled out. At the risk of perhaps
10	received data or analysis on the use of that fairness	10	raising questions that no longer arise can I just
11	principle.	11	address a couple of points that are made in the written
12	Now, I can confirm that it is used regularly, and	12	submissions of other core participants.
13	we are happy to assist the Inquiry by providing some	13	The first one is in relation to expert advice, and
14	data and analysis on that issue should it be of	14	it is suggested by Howe & Co that the heads of loss
15	assistance. But that is why we haven't done it so far	15	under the guidance are deficient in that there is no
16	because we hadn't interpreted that issue in the way that	16	provision to obtain expert guidance to support or
17	Mr Beer has indicated it may be read this morning.	17	quantify claims under the heads set out in the guidance.
18	Can I move on to then the particular question	18	We'd make four points in response. This is a point
19	which is asked about recoverable heads of loss. We're	19	raised in relation to heads of loss.
20	grateful to Mr Beer for introducing in particular the	20	The first is that the guidance itself, and we say
21	Terms of Reference of the Independent Advisory Panel and	21	rightly, expressly delineates sir, for your note
22	the definition of shortfall loss and consequential loss,	22	that's paragraph 5.8.1, of course, the guidance itself
23	consequential loss being there defined as financial or	23	is tab 17, I do not suggest you need to turn it up
24	non-financial loss that is not a shortfall loss.	24	but it delineates between a claim for legal or
25	Mr Beer also took you to, sir, the consequential	25	professional fees incurred in relation to dealing with
	41		42
1	a Horizon shortfall at the time which may be recoverable	1	Panel agrees then it can recommend it's obtained at no
2	as loss under the terms of the scheme, and any legal and	2	cost to the applicant. So it would be unnecessary for
3	professional fees incurred by a postmaster in bringing	3	such an applicant in those circumstances themselves to
4	an application to the scheme. We say that simply	4	bring any claim or seek any reimbursement of any such
5	reflects the position in line with civil proceedings	5	expenses. It would be Post Office who would be footing
6	generally, which is that the costs associated with the	6	the bill in that case.
7	bringing or making of an application or claim are	7	Sir, you might like to note that the Panel in the
8	treated separately to actual losses flowing from	8	past has asked Post Office to obtain expert evidence on
9	a relevant breach of contract or breach of duty that's	9	generic issues, including cardiac and mental health
10	relied upon on which the claim is founded.	10	issues to assist it in adopting an approach to claims
11	The second point we make in this context in	11	generally.
12	relation to expert advice, is that every case will be	12	The fourth point I make in this context is that
13	assessed by three members of the Independent Advisory	13	the Panel's Terms of Reference also provide and, sir,
14	Panel, comprising one legal specialist, one forensic	14	you have already been taken to this provision at Section
15	accounting specialist, and one retail specialist. There	15	35, in relation to personal injury claims, where
16	is therefore a very significant degree of expertise	16	insufficient evidence has been provided for a claim to
17	already built into the process.	17	succeed, without further medical and/or expert evidence,
18	Thirdly, where a panel considers that it requires	18	the Panel may nevertheless recommend the making of an
19	expert assistance in order to make a recommendation, it	19	offer to the postmaster which the Panel considers fair.
20	may recommend to Post Office that such assistance be	20	Now, this provision is designed to be advantageous
21	obtained at Post Office's cost. That's paragraph 27 of	21	to an applicant. It enables an applicant who is not
22	the Independent Advisory Panel's terms of reference.	22	potentially able to obtain expert evidence to prove and
23	That's, sir, for your note page 286 in the bundle for	23	support their claim, nevertheless to obtain
24	taday. Ca it's anon to any condigent to raise the	24	a recommendation from the Danel on the basis of

24

25

24

25

today. So it's open to any applicant to raise the

question of expert assistance being required and if the

fairness.

a recommendation from the Panel on the basis of

1	We're conscious also that an applicant may wish to	1	identified as such on the face of any decision as
2	avoid the inconvenience and potential distress of	2	aggravated damages. It would most likely be taken into
3	obtaining a report which may be a particularly acute and	3	account when the Panel considers the issue of distress
4	sensitive concern in cases involving mental health	4	and inconvenience.
5	issues, but that the Panel has the power nevertheless in	5	The Panel's role of course is with a view to
6	the absence of such evidence to recommend an offer which	6	recommending an offer which is fair overall, hence why
7	it considers to be fair.	7	it isn't specifically identified as such necessarily.
8	In these circumstances we wouldn't agree that	8	So although applicants may not have expressly
9	there is any deficiency in the Historical Shortfall	9	characterised their claim as including a claim for
10	Scheme in this respect.	10	aggravated damages, a number of offers have included an
11	The second head of loss that's flagged up again by	11	element reflecting just such a claim where it is
12	Howe & Co as potentially not being recoverable under	12	justified on the facts of the case.
13	this scheme, is the question of aggravated and exemplary	13	The position for exemplary damages is potentially
14	damages, and what is said is that no reference to them	14	slightly different in principle. Were any claim to be
15	or provision for them in the guidance and the heads of	15	made it would be carefully considered along with all the
16	loss are therefore deficient.	16	other claims that have been made. That said, POL's
17	Now, Post Office's response so far as aggravated	17	initial view is that as a legal matter a claim for
18	damages are concerned is that where an applicant has	18	exemplary damages does not naturally sit within the
19	identified aggravation or stress that Post Office caused	19	scheme. It can't, strictly speaking, be said to be
20	when having to deal with shortfall issues, however that	20	a loss incurred by an applicant, or a type of damage
21	claim is described by the postmaster, that is something	21	that's typically available for a breach of contract
22	that would be fully taken into account when assessing,	22	claim. However, the Panel can and does consider overall
23	recommending and making offers in that particular case.	23	fairness when recommending offers to applicants and, as
24	Compensation for aggravation would be taken into	24	I have said, any such claim would be carefully
25	account in the round rather than being characterised or 45	25	considered. We therefore do not agree there is 46
1	a deficiency in respect of the question of aggravated or	1	if a particular claim was made in which, as a matter of
2	exemplary damages either.	2	legal principle, exemplary damages was not to be
3	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, Ms Gallafent, you put it very	3	awarded, it wouldn't be carefully considered. It would
4	elegantly but I think the reality is that you take	4	be rejected.
5	a great deal of persuading, POL I mean, not you	5	MS GALLAFENT: Well, the claim itself would be carefully
6	personally of course, that a claim for exemplary damages	6	considered in either of those events to work out
7	should be entertained.	7	whether, as a matter of legal principle, it was
8	MS GALLAFENT: Under the	8	recoverable or not. So that's my starting point. It
9	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Because you say there is a problem with	9	wouldn't be rejected out of hand at all.
10	the legal principles which underpin the award of	10	Of course, were then the Panel to reach
11	exemplary damages.	11	a conclusion and a recommendation based on saying, well,
12	MS GALLIFANT: We wouldn't say it's a problem with the legal	12	exemplary damages are not recoverable in the
13	principles. We'd say they are the legal principles that	13	circumstances of this particular case, then of course
14	apply. That is what the Terms of Reference provide for	14	that could be a matter which is taken further in dispute
15	but of course we would carefully consider it were it to	15	resolution process. I'm not seeking to rule out the
16	be made. But I emphasised that the vast majority of	16	award of those damages, but I'm simply flagging up what
17	claims brought under the HSS by far are brought on the	17	we perceive to be the potential issues going forward,
18	basis of contractual obligations, so the question may	18	and perhaps just to anticipate we do not take the view
19	arise but not necessarily in claims that have been	19	that, as it were, exemplary damages have been missed in
20	brought so far.	20	previous cases because we do note that those are
21	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So is this a fair representation of what	21	primarily brought on a basis of a contractual obligation
22	you are telling me: that if, as a matter of principle,	22	and exemplary damages are not generally available for
23	legal principle, a particular claim was made in which an	23	a breach of contact.
24	award of exemplary damages was possible as a matter of	24	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: And I should make clear, lest people
25	legal principle, it would be carefully considered. But 47	25	misunderstand what I am doing, I am simply seeking to 48

1	understand what you are saying. I recognise the limits	1	and inconvenience or personal injury for corporate
2	of my Terms of Reference. Everyone should understand	2	entities that are stress and inconvenience or personal
3	that.	3	injury suffered by directors or shareholders.
4	MS GALLAFENT: Thank you. Thank you, sir.	4	Going back to my point which we do not consider it
5	Sir, can I move on to another category of loss	5	to be technically recoverable, I will emphasise again
6	which it is suggested is not covered, which is third	6	that it does not follow from the fact that claims may
7	party losses. Again, Howe & Co have suggested that the	7	not fall directly within the scheme that a claimant is
8	heads of loss should reflect suffering caused to	8	precluded from bringing a claim because of course it
9	children and family members and others in caring roles.	9	remains open to a potential claimant to bring
10	Can I emphasise that the Panel has throughout sort	10	proceedings in which the legal basis for any such claim
11	to take an applicant-friendly approach to compensation,	11	could be fully considered. Again, we therefore wouldn't
12	including for this issue. Whilst a family member's	12	agree that there is a deficiency in the scheme in this
13	distress and inconvenience is not technically	13	respect.
14	recoverable from Post Office for a breach of contact	14	Those three points are, in our view, as it were,
15	claim, such as in the scheme, in a number of cases the	15	the core points raised by other core participants on the
16	Panel has nevertheless taken distress and inconvenience	16	question of heads of loss themselves and what is or is
17	of family members or others into account by considering	17	not recoverable. We do recognise that the submissions
18	and having regard to the indirect impact of that on the	18	from other core participants went rather more widely
19		19	
	applicant when they are making recommendations. In		than that and, in particular, the question of the
20	other words, when they feel it is fair to do so, so	20	application form and question 24.
21	practically speaking it will be taken into account where	21	It's common ground that what was asked was, of an
22	it is justified to do so, despite the fact that our	22	applicant, whether they had experienced any losses that
23	position is it is not technically recoverable.	23	were directly related to the alleged shortfalls in
24	For completeness, I would note that the Panel has	24	respect of which they would like to claim and asked for
25	also made recommendations for compensation for distress 49	25	details of each such loss to be provided if so. 50
			•
1	Mr Beer noted that it doesn't there refer to	1	in not sign posting the guidance in the application
2	consequential losses. Indeed it doesn't, and we say	2	form. Sir, as you have heard from Mr Beer, the
3	that the reason for that is simply because this form was	3	application forms, of course, predate the guidance. But
4	designed and anticipated to be completed by lay persons	4	POL took all reasonable and appropriate steps to flag up
5	rather than having to require explanation or advice from	5	the existence of the guidance to applicants and
6	a lawyer in order to understand the meaning of	6	potential applicants.
7	consequential losses. So the description of losses	7	Moreover, of course, and you have been taken to
8	directly related to the alleged shortfalls we say is	8	this part of the terms of the reference of the Panel as
9	adequate in all the circumstances.	9	well, they provide that the discretion of the Panel
10	A suggestion is made by Hudgells that this	10	making a recommendation is not confined solely to
11	question was, as they put it, potentially misleading	11	specific heads of consequential loss claimed by the
12	because it didn't signpost applicants to any of the	12	postmaster but will take into account any facts and
13	examples set out in the guidance. We do not accept the	13	matters which the Panel considers will produce a fair
14	form was misleading on this or any basis. It was	14	result on the facts of a particular case. That's
15	designed to strike a balance between being comprehensive	15	paragraph 30. Sir, you have it that tab 15, page 287.
16	and being capable of being used by lay persons.	16	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I just wanted to check that I had marked
17	Now, the guidance was introduced on 1 October 2020	17	it. I had.
18	at which point Post Office wrote to all applicants to	18	MS GALLAFENT: I am grateful, thank you. We've already set
19	the scheme at that stage to communicate that update and	19	out in our submissions that we put in in May for the
20	the availability of the guidance. Post Office also	20	purpose of these hearings the proactive approach that is
21	published a press release about the guidance. And	21	being taken to assessing consequential loss. That
22	published it on the scheme website so any applicants who	22	includes not just a proactive approach by the Panel, but
23	hadn't applied by that point would be made aware of it	23	a proactive approach by those, as it were, the case
23 24	from the website itself.	23 24	managers by virtue of the very detailed bespoke process
	HOLL HE WEDGIE HOEH.	44	managera by virtue of the very detailed beabove blocess
25			
25	So we do not say there is any fault or deficiency 51	25	for requesting further information.

1	We emphasise that the bespoke request for further	1	received an offer credibly says they did not appreciate
2	information is designed to identify and ask further	2	that they needed provide information earlier, which
3	questions of an applicant only when they arise from the	3	would include matters of consequential loss, this would
4	key facts of the individual case, provided on the	4	be taken into account in the post offer process. So the
5	application form, so the case manager will be prompted	5	door is not closed in those circumstances to raising
6	by the application form to identify potential further	6	a matter of consequential loss even after the offer has
7	questions and those questions will be asked, and	7	been made.
8	sometimes there will be number of them asked. But that	8	Another point that is raised, this time by
9	is all aimed to elicit information which may assist with	9	Hudgell, is that the guidance itself, the consequential
10	a claim for consequential loss.	10	guidance, should be supplemented to ensure greater
11	Now, were such questions to have been asked as	11	clarity and consistency in decision making. We don't
12	a matter of course on the application form, which seems	12	accept that's necessary, not least as it's very clear
13 14	to us the logical consequence of what's being suggested,	13	that every case will turn on its own facts, but it might
	then inevitably many of them would have been irrelevant	14	help to assuage concerns for me to address directly the
15	to any particular applicant for asking, for example,	15	three examples given by Hudgell who obviously represent
16	saying do you think there are any stigma damages, do you	16	a large number of the applicants that is suggested to
17	have any personal injury, and so forth.	17	give rise to inconsistent decision making.
18	Far from being of assistance we say that to have	18	First, its alleged that there is a difference
19	effectively built in guidance or something akin to it	19	between the level of reduction applied to shortfall
20	into the application form itself would have been	20	losses where there is an absence of paperwork. Hudgell
21	perceived as overly burdensome and a barrier to making	21	identify that as being between 10 and 30 per cent. We
22	an application. We repeat, the guidance was available	22	don't say that reflects something requiring greater
23	and flagged up to applicants and potential applicants,	23	guidance. The fact that is that a change or a
24	the form itself is not deficient in this respect.	24	difference of the level of reduction simply reflects on
25	We also note that where an applicant having 53	25	the particular facts of that case the Panel feels are 54
	••		Ų.
1	relevant and a higher or lower reduction is appropriate.	1	answer to that is each offer letter explains the factors
2	That's likely to depend on its view of there being a	2	taken into account, for distress and inconvenience.
3	greater or lesser degree of uncertainty on the question	3	There is not a separate loss to be quantified but it's
4	of a particular element of consequential loss.	4	a matter that goes into fairness of the offer overall.
5	We say it is not just unnecessary but it would be	5	So, again, we say so far as the suggestion that greater
6	inappropriate to constrain the Panel's discretion in	6	guidance is required, we say that that is not the case
7	this context, i.e. to say you must only ever reduce	7	and there is not a deficiency in that respect.
8	shortfall losses by 10 per cent rather than 20 or 30 per	8	Can I move to other points that are not directly
9	cent, or whatever it might be. That would inevitably	9	linked to the first question but are raised in this
10	lead to unfair outcomes in some cases and overly complex	10	context. The first, and Mr Beer lagged flagged it up,
11	rules, we say, to attempt to deal with every potential	11	is in relation to late applications to the scheme. That
12	permutations of circumstances.	12	is after the closing date from November 2020.
13	The second suggestion made is that credit has been	13	In our May submissions we noted that the Post
14	given in some cases for heads of loss which haven't been	14	Office was actively considering how best to address
15	claimed, such at the time taken to deal with Horizon	15	those applications. At the time in 2020 the Post Office
16	shortfalls. I would again emphasise that the Panel does	16	went to very considerable lengths to bring the deadline
17	not seek to hold applicants to and strict legal pleading	17	to the attention of all potentially eligible
18	requirement. It will recommend an offer where it feels	18	postmasters. It extended the initial 10-week period for
19	it is fair to do so and in those cases where credit has		·
		19	applications by a further 15 weeks, which took it to
20	been given, that is because, on those cases, the Panel	20	November 2020, to take into account both the numbers of
21	feel on the facts its appropriate to do so, even though	21	applications that had already been made and the Covid 19
22	it hasn't been claimed.	22	situation pertaining at the time.
23	There is also, finally, a suggestion that there is	23	Nevertheless it is common ground that, for
24	an absence of a consistent explanation as to how loss	24	whatever reason, a number of postmasters didn't apply at

for distress and inconvenience is quantified. The \$55>

25

the time and I can confirm that Post Office has now \$56>

1	received as at today's date a total of 186 applications	1	The second is should POL be the final arbiter of
2	made after the deadline passed.	2	this in any event? In effect, it's akin to a limitation
3	Post Office remains keen to ensure and wishes to	3	provision, though I accept that there are differences,
4	ensure that compensation is delivered to everyone	4	I am not going to press that. But in most scenarios in
5	affected and it is sympathetic to those who could not,	5	which a time limit is applied in one way or another, it
6		6	might surprise someone to hear that the alleged
7	for justifiable reasons, apply to the scheme in time.	7	
8	It remains the case that it is considering how best to	8	wrongdoer is the final arbiter of whether a time limit
9	deal with such applications.		should apply. MS GALLAFENT: Could I put it like this, sir: the terms of
	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: You can see that I'm pondering that,	9	
10	Ms Gallafent.	10	reference for the scheme provided for a deadline which
11 12	MS GALLAFENT: I can indeed, sir.	11	was, of course, subsequently extended. That principle
13	Sir, may it assist if I put it in this context: in	12	was one of the principles that had been discussed and
	our May submissions we made very clear that we do not	13	agreed as part of the deed of settlement with
14	act alone, that Post Office is part of a wider mechanism	14	representatives of postmasters. So in principle the
15	of governance and one of the reasons for the delay in	15 16	provision of a deadline was common ground.
16	relation to the HSS scheme itself more generally are	16	We are not acting unilaterally in saying we will
17	questions of funding, so we cannot act unilaterally, if	17	not take in to account late applications. We are
18	I can put it that like. So the position remains that we	18	considering and continue to consider how to ensure that
19	are carefully considering the position and remain	19	compensation is delivered to everyone affected.
20	committed to ensuring that compensation is delivered to	20	It is not that we have shut the door on those late
21	everyone affected.	21	applicants. Can I assure you, sir, of that. We
22	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, there are two aspects to that that	22	continue to aim to ensure that those applicants are
23	I'll just float my thoughts about. One, the governance	23	treated fairly.
24	aspect. It surprises me that an issue of this kind	24	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I think we can leave this with my
25	would take quite so long. 57	25	observation that the door is moving either to open or 58
,	de la completa del completa de la completa de la completa del completa de la completa del completa de la completa de la completa del completa de la completa del la completa della complet		F
1	close at a pretty slow pace.	1	For the same reason we reject the suggestion that
2	MS GALLAFENT: Sir, I hear what you say.	2	the current scheme is not independent in the light of
2 3	MS GALLAFENT: Sir, I hear what you say. Can I pick up then, before I move off from	2	the current scheme is not independent in the light of the clear independence of the Panel and the procedure
2 3 4	MS GALLAFENT: Sir, I hear what you say. Can I pick up then, before I move off from question 1, can I pick up three further points not	2 3 4	the current scheme is not independent in the light of the clear independence of the Panel and the procedure followed thereafter, and I emphasise again no
2 3 4 5	MS GALLAFENT: Sir, I hear what you say. Can I pick up then, before I move off from question 1, can I pick up three further points not directly related but relevant we say.	2 3 4 5	the current scheme is not independent in the light of the clear independence of the Panel and the procedure followed thereafter, and I emphasise again no recommendation has been rejected by the Panel and
2 3 4 5 6	MS GALLAFENT: Sir, I hear what you say. Can I pick up then, before I move off from question 1, can I pick up three further points not directly related but relevant we say. The first is an issue raised by Hudgell in	2 3 4 5 6	the current scheme is not independent in the light of the clear independence of the Panel and the procedure followed thereafter, and I emphasise again no recommendation has been rejected by the Panel and a lower offer made, and some offers have been higher.
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS GALLAFENT: Sir, I hear what you say. Can I pick up then, before I move off from question 1, can I pick up three further points not directly related but relevant we say. The first is an issue raised by Hudgell in relation to independent legal advice. That is whether	2 3 4 5 6 7	the current scheme is not independent in the light of the clear independence of the Panel and the procedure followed thereafter, and I emphasise again no recommendation has been rejected by the Panel and a lower offer made, and some offers have been higher. The second of the indirectly related issues to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS GALLAFENT: Sir, I hear what you say. Can I pick up then, before I move off from question 1, can I pick up three further points not directly related but relevant we say. The first is an issue raised by Hudgell in relation to independent legal advice. That is whether it be more appropriate for the Independent Advisory	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the current scheme is not independent in the light of the clear independence of the Panel and the procedure followed thereafter, and I emphasise again no recommendation has been rejected by the Panel and a lower offer made, and some offers have been higher. The second of the indirectly related issues to question 1 is the evidential question. The way it was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS GALLAFENT: Sir, I hear what you say. Can I pick up then, before I move off from question 1, can I pick up three further points not directly related but relevant we say. The first is an issue raised by Hudgell in relation to independent legal advice. That is whether it be more appropriate for the Independent Advisory Panel to have its own independent legal advice rather	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the current scheme is not independent in the light of the clear independence of the Panel and the procedure followed thereafter, and I emphasise again no recommendation has been rejected by the Panel and a lower offer made, and some offers have been higher. The second of the indirectly related issues to question 1 is the evidential question. The way it was put in the written submission of Howe & Co was that it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS GALLAFENT: Sir, I hear what you say. Can I pick up then, before I move off from question 1, can I pick up three further points not directly related but relevant we say. The first is an issue raised by Hudgell in relation to independent legal advice. That is whether it be more appropriate for the Independent Advisory Panel to have its own independent legal advice rather than offers being made on the basis of legal advice and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the current scheme is not independent in the light of the clear independence of the Panel and the procedure followed thereafter, and I emphasise again no recommendation has been rejected by the Panel and a lower offer made, and some offers have been higher. The second of the indirectly related issues to question 1 is the evidential question. The way it was put in the written submission of Howe & Co was that it's unreasonable for the scheme to require contemporaneous
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS GALLAFENT: Sir, I hear what you say. Can I pick up then, before I move off from question 1, can I pick up three further points not directly related but relevant we say. The first is an issue raised by Hudgell in relation to independent legal advice. That is whether it be more appropriate for the Independent Advisory Panel to have its own independent legal advice rather than offers being made on the basis of legal advice and analysis prepared by Herbert Smith Freehills.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the current scheme is not independent in the light of the clear independence of the Panel and the procedure followed thereafter, and I emphasise again no recommendation has been rejected by the Panel and a lower offer made, and some offers have been higher. The second of the indirectly related issues to question 1 is the evidential question. The way it was put in the written submission of Howe & Co was that it's unreasonable for the scheme to require contemporaneous evidence of events from up to 20 years ago, particularly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS GALLAFENT: Sir, I hear what you say. Can I pick up then, before I move off from question 1, can I pick up three further points not directly related but relevant we say. The first is an issue raised by Hudgell in relation to independent legal advice. That is whether it be more appropriate for the Independent Advisory Panel to have its own independent legal advice rather than offers being made on the basis of legal advice and analysis prepared by Herbert Smith Freehills. Post Office doesn't consider this would be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the current scheme is not independent in the light of the clear independence of the Panel and the procedure followed thereafter, and I emphasise again no recommendation has been rejected by the Panel and a lower offer made, and some offers have been higher. The second of the indirectly related issues to question 1 is the evidential question. The way it was put in the written submission of Howe & Co was that it's unreasonable for the scheme to require contemporaneous evidence of events from up to 20 years ago, particularly in circumstances where postmasters may have been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Can I pick up then, before I move off from question 1, can I pick up three further points not directly related but relevant we say. The first is an issue raised by Hudgell in relation to independent legal advice. That is whether it be more appropriate for the Independent Advisory Panel to have its own independent legal advice rather than offers being made on the basis of legal advice and analysis prepared by Herbert Smith Freehills. Post Office doesn't consider this would be necessary. There are five Queen's Counsel on the Panel.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the current scheme is not independent in the light of the clear independence of the Panel and the procedure followed thereafter, and I emphasise again no recommendation has been rejected by the Panel and a lower offer made, and some offers have been higher. The second of the indirectly related issues to question 1 is the evidential question. The way it was put in the written submission of Howe & Co was that it's unreasonable for the scheme to require contemporaneous evidence of events from up to 20 years ago, particularly in circumstances where postmasters may have been deprived of access to their records at the point of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS GALLAFENT: Sir, I hear what you say. Can I pick up then, before I move off from question 1, can I pick up three further points not directly related but relevant we say. The first is an issue raised by Hudgell in relation to independent legal advice. That is whether it be more appropriate for the Independent Advisory Panel to have its own independent legal advice rather than offers being made on the basis of legal advice and analysis prepared by Herbert Smith Freehills. Post Office doesn't consider this would be necessary. There are five Queen's Counsel on the Panel. The Panel is free to accept or reject the analysis and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the current scheme is not independent in the light of the clear independence of the Panel and the procedure followed thereafter, and I emphasise again no recommendation has been rejected by the Panel and a lower offer made, and some offers have been higher. The second of the indirectly related issues to question 1 is the evidential question. The way it was put in the written submission of Howe & Co was that it's unreasonable for the scheme to require contemporaneous evidence of events from up to 20 years ago, particularly in circumstances where postmasters may have been deprived of access to their records at the point of suspension and they may have been destroyed by Post
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Can I pick up then, before I move off from question 1, can I pick up three further points not directly related but relevant we say. The first is an issue raised by Hudgell in relation to independent legal advice. That is whether it be more appropriate for the Independent Advisory Panel to have its own independent legal advice rather than offers being made on the basis of legal advice and analysis prepared by Herbert Smith Freehills. Post Office doesn't consider this would be necessary. There are five Queen's Counsel on the Panel. The Panel is free to accept or reject the analysis and advice given by Herbert Smith Freehills. As we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the current scheme is not independent in the light of the clear independence of the Panel and the procedure followed thereafter, and I emphasise again no recommendation has been rejected by the Panel and a lower offer made, and some offers have been higher. The second of the indirectly related issues to question 1 is the evidential question. The way it was put in the written submission of Howe & Co was that it's unreasonable for the scheme to require contemporaneous evidence of events from up to 20 years ago, particularly in circumstances where postmasters may have been deprived of access to their records at the point of suspension and they may have been destroyed by Post Office.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS GALLAFENT: Sir, I hear what you say. Can I pick up then, before I move off from question 1, can I pick up three further points not directly related but relevant we say. The first is an issue raised by Hudgell in relation to independent legal advice. That is whether it be more appropriate for the Independent Advisory Panel to have its own independent legal advice rather than offers being made on the basis of legal advice and analysis prepared by Herbert Smith Freehills. Post Office doesn't consider this would be necessary. There are five Queen's Counsel on the Panel. The Panel is free to accept or reject the analysis and advice given by Herbert Smith Freehills. As we previously indicated in the May submissions, there have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the current scheme is not independent in the light of the clear independence of the Panel and the procedure followed thereafter, and I emphasise again no recommendation has been rejected by the Panel and a lower offer made, and some offers have been higher. The second of the indirectly related issues to question 1 is the evidential question. The way it was put in the written submission of Howe & Co was that it's unreasonable for the scheme to require contemporaneous evidence of events from up to 20 years ago, particularly in circumstances where postmasters may have been deprived of access to their records at the point of suspension and they may have been destroyed by Post Office. But we emphasise and, sir, as you have seen and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS GALLAFENT: Sir, I hear what you say. Can I pick up then, before I move off from question 1, can I pick up three further points not directly related but relevant we say. The first is an issue raised by Hudgell in relation to independent legal advice. That is whether it be more appropriate for the Independent Advisory Panel to have its own independent legal advice rather than offers being made on the basis of legal advice and analysis prepared by Herbert Smith Freehills. Post Office doesn't consider this would be necessary. There are five Queen's Counsel on the Panel. The Panel is free to accept or reject the analysis and advice given by Herbert Smith Freehills. As we previously indicated in the May submissions, there have been no cases where Post Office has offered an applicant	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the current scheme is not independent in the light of the clear independence of the Panel and the procedure followed thereafter, and I emphasise again no recommendation has been rejected by the Panel and a lower offer made, and some offers have been higher. The second of the indirectly related issues to question 1 is the evidential question. The way it was put in the written submission of Howe & Co was that it's unreasonable for the scheme to require contemporaneous evidence of events from up to 20 years ago, particularly in circumstances where postmasters may have been deprived of access to their records at the point of suspension and they may have been destroyed by Post Office. But we emphasise and, sir, as you have seen and been taken to, the guidance on consequential loss makes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Can I pick up then, before I move off from question 1, can I pick up three further points not directly related but relevant we say. The first is an issue raised by Hudgell in relation to independent legal advice. That is whether it be more appropriate for the Independent Advisory Panel to have its own independent legal advice rather than offers being made on the basis of legal advice and analysis prepared by Herbert Smith Freehills. Post Office doesn't consider this would be necessary. There are five Queen's Counsel on the Panel. The Panel is free to accept or reject the analysis and advice given by Herbert Smith Freehills. As we previously indicated in the May submissions, there have been no cases where Post Office has offered an applicant less than the Panel has recommended. That remains the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the current scheme is not independent in the light of the clear independence of the Panel and the procedure followed thereafter, and I emphasise again no recommendation has been rejected by the Panel and a lower offer made, and some offers have been higher. The second of the indirectly related issues to question 1 is the evidential question. The way it was put in the written submission of Howe & Co was that it's unreasonable for the scheme to require contemporaneous evidence of events from up to 20 years ago, particularly in circumstances where postmasters may have been deprived of access to their records at the point of suspension and they may have been destroyed by Post Office. But we emphasise and, sir, as you have seen and been taken to, the guidance on consequential loss makes it clear that contemporaneous evidence is not required,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Can I pick up then, before I move off from question 1, can I pick up three further points not directly related but relevant we say. The first is an issue raised by Hudgell in relation to independent legal advice. That is whether it be more appropriate for the Independent Advisory Panel to have its own independent legal advice rather than offers being made on the basis of legal advice and analysis prepared by Herbert Smith Freehills. Post Office doesn't consider this would be necessary. There are five Queen's Counsel on the Panel. The Panel is free to accept or reject the analysis and advice given by Herbert Smith Freehills. As we previously indicated in the May submissions, there have been no cases where Post Office has offered an applicant less than the Panel has recommended. That remains the position to date.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the current scheme is not independent in the light of the clear independence of the Panel and the procedure followed thereafter, and I emphasise again no recommendation has been rejected by the Panel and a lower offer made, and some offers have been higher. The second of the indirectly related issues to question 1 is the evidential question. The way it was put in the written submission of Howe & Co was that it's unreasonable for the scheme to require contemporaneous evidence of events from up to 20 years ago, particularly in circumstances where postmasters may have been deprived of access to their records at the point of suspension and they may have been destroyed by Post Office. But we emphasise and, sir, as you have seen and been taken to, the guidance on consequential loss makes it clear that contemporaneous evidence is not required, it is not a bar not to have it, but greater weight may
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Can I pick up then, before I move off from question 1, can I pick up three further points not directly related but relevant we say. The first is an issue raised by Hudgell in relation to independent legal advice. That is whether it be more appropriate for the Independent Advisory Panel to have its own independent legal advice rather than offers being made on the basis of legal advice and analysis prepared by Herbert Smith Freehills. Post Office doesn't consider this would be necessary. There are five Queen's Counsel on the Panel. The Panel is free to accept or reject the analysis and advice given by Herbert Smith Freehills. As we previously indicated in the May submissions, there have been no cases where Post Office has offered an applicant less than the Panel has recommended. That remains the position to date. Moreover, were the Panel itself to consider that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the current scheme is not independent in the light of the clear independence of the Panel and the procedure followed thereafter, and I emphasise again no recommendation has been rejected by the Panel and a lower offer made, and some offers have been higher. The second of the indirectly related issues to question 1 is the evidential question. The way it was put in the written submission of Howe & Co was that it's unreasonable for the scheme to require contemporaneous evidence of events from up to 20 years ago, particularly in circumstances where postmasters may have been deprived of access to their records at the point of suspension and they may have been destroyed by Post Office. But we emphasise and, sir, as you have seen and been taken to, the guidance on consequential loss makes it clear that contemporaneous evidence is not required, it is not a bar not to have it, but greater weight may be placed on it as well as the factual evidence that is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Can I pick up then, before I move off from question 1, can I pick up three further points not directly related but relevant we say. The first is an issue raised by Hudgell in relation to independent legal advice. That is whether it be more appropriate for the Independent Advisory Panel to have its own independent legal advice rather than offers being made on the basis of legal advice and analysis prepared by Herbert Smith Freehills. Post Office doesn't consider this would be necessary. There are five Queen's Counsel on the Panel. The Panel is free to accept or reject the analysis and advice given by Herbert Smith Freehills. As we previously indicated in the May submissions, there have been no cases where Post Office has offered an applicant less than the Panel has recommended. That remains the position to date. Moreover, were the Panel itself to consider that it wished to take independent legal advice, then it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the current scheme is not independent in the light of the clear independence of the Panel and the procedure followed thereafter, and I emphasise again no recommendation has been rejected by the Panel and a lower offer made, and some offers have been higher. The second of the indirectly related issues to question 1 is the evidential question. The way it was put in the written submission of Howe & Co was that it's unreasonable for the scheme to require contemporaneous evidence of events from up to 20 years ago, particularly in circumstances where postmasters may have been deprived of access to their records at the point of suspension and they may have been destroyed by Post Office. But we emphasise and, sir, as you have seen and been taken to, the guidance on consequential loss makes it clear that contemporaneous evidence is not required, it is not a bar not to have it, but greater weight may be placed on it as well as the factual evidence that is undisputed or verifiable. That's what the guidance
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS GALLAFENT: Sir, I hear what you say. Can I pick up then, before I move off from question 1, can I pick up three further points not directly related but relevant we say. The first is an issue raised by Hudgell in relation to independent legal advice. That is whether it be more appropriate for the Independent Advisory Panel to have its own independent legal advice rather than offers being made on the basis of legal advice and analysis prepared by Herbert Smith Freehills. Post Office doesn't consider this would be necessary. There are five Queen's Counsel on the Panel. The Panel is free to accept or reject the analysis and advice given by Herbert Smith Freehills. As we previously indicated in the May submissions, there have been no cases where Post Office has offered an applicant less than the Panel has recommended. That remains the position to date. Moreover, were the Panel itself to consider that it wished to take independent legal advice, then it would be open to it, to recommend to Post Office that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the current scheme is not independent in the light of the clear independence of the Panel and the procedure followed thereafter, and I emphasise again no recommendation has been rejected by the Panel and a lower offer made, and some offers have been higher. The second of the indirectly related issues to question 1 is the evidential question. The way it was put in the written submission of Howe & Co was that it's unreasonable for the scheme to require contemporaneous evidence of events from up to 20 years ago, particularly in circumstances where postmasters may have been deprived of access to their records at the point of suspension and they may have been destroyed by Post Office. But we emphasise and, sir, as you have seen and been taken to, the guidance on consequential loss makes it clear that contemporaneous evidence is not required, it is not a bar not to have it, but greater weight may be placed on it as well as the factual evidence that is undisputed or verifiable. That's what the guidance says. Of course, where an application is concerned
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Can I pick up then, before I move off from question 1, can I pick up three further points not directly related but relevant we say. The first is an issue raised by Hudgell in relation to independent legal advice. That is whether it be more appropriate for the Independent Advisory Panel to have its own independent legal advice rather than offers being made on the basis of legal advice and analysis prepared by Herbert Smith Freehills. Post Office doesn't consider this would be necessary. There are five Queen's Counsel on the Panel. The Panel is free to accept or reject the analysis and advice given by Herbert Smith Freehills. As we previously indicated in the May submissions, there have been no cases where Post Office has offered an applicant less than the Panel has recommended. That remains the position to date. Moreover, were the Panel itself to consider that it wished to take independent legal advice, then it would be open to it, to recommend to Post Office that such advice be obtained at Post Office's cost. Just as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the current scheme is not independent in the light of the clear independence of the Panel and the procedure followed thereafter, and I emphasise again no recommendation has been rejected by the Panel and a lower offer made, and some offers have been higher. The second of the indirectly related issues to question 1 is the evidential question. The way it was put in the written submission of Howe & Co was that it's unreasonable for the scheme to require contemporaneous evidence of events from up to 20 years ago, particularly in circumstances where postmasters may have been deprived of access to their records at the point of suspension and they may have been destroyed by Post Office. But we emphasise and, sir, as you have seen and been taken to, the guidance on consequential loss makes it clear that contemporaneous evidence is not required, it is not a bar not to have it, but greater weight may be placed on it as well as the factual evidence that is undisputed or verifiable. That's what the guidance says. Of course, where an application is concerned about the Panel's approach to an alleged lack of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Can I pick up then, before I move off from question 1, can I pick up three further points not directly related but relevant we say. The first is an issue raised by Hudgell in relation to independent legal advice. That is whether it be more appropriate for the Independent Advisory Panel to have its own independent legal advice rather than offers being made on the basis of legal advice and analysis prepared by Herbert Smith Freehills. Post Office doesn't consider this would be necessary. There are five Queen's Counsel on the Panel. The Panel is free to accept or reject the analysis and advice given by Herbert Smith Freehills. As we previously indicated in the May submissions, there have been no cases where Post Office has offered an applicant less than the Panel has recommended. That remains the position to date. Moreover, were the Panel itself to consider that it wished to take independent legal advice, then it would be open to it, to recommend to Post Office that such advice be obtained at Post Office's cost. Just as it is under section or paragraph 27 of the Panel's terms	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the current scheme is not independent in the light of the clear independence of the Panel and the procedure followed thereafter, and I emphasise again no recommendation has been rejected by the Panel and a lower offer made, and some offers have been higher. The second of the indirectly related issues to question 1 is the evidential question. The way it was put in the written submission of Howe & Co was that it's unreasonable for the scheme to require contemporaneous evidence of events from up to 20 years ago, particularly in circumstances where postmasters may have been deprived of access to their records at the point of suspension and they may have been destroyed by Post Office. But we emphasise and, sir, as you have seen and been taken to, the guidance on consequential loss makes it clear that contemporaneous evidence is not required, it is not a bar not to have it, but greater weight may be placed on it as well as the factual evidence that is undisputed or verifiable. That's what the guidance says. Of course, where an application is concerned about the Panel's approach to an alleged lack of contemporaneous evidence, that's a matter that can be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Can I pick up then, before I move off from question 1, can I pick up three further points not directly related but relevant we say. The first is an issue raised by Hudgell in relation to independent legal advice. That is whether it be more appropriate for the Independent Advisory Panel to have its own independent legal advice rather than offers being made on the basis of legal advice and analysis prepared by Herbert Smith Freehills. Post Office doesn't consider this would be necessary. There are five Queen's Counsel on the Panel. The Panel is free to accept or reject the analysis and advice given by Herbert Smith Freehills. As we previously indicated in the May submissions, there have been no cases where Post Office has offered an applicant less than the Panel has recommended. That remains the position to date. Moreover, were the Panel itself to consider that it wished to take independent legal advice, then it would be open to it, to recommend to Post Office that such advice be obtained at Post Office's cost. Just as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the current scheme is not independent in the light of the clear independence of the Panel and the procedure followed thereafter, and I emphasise again no recommendation has been rejected by the Panel and a lower offer made, and some offers have been higher. The second of the indirectly related issues to question 1 is the evidential question. The way it was put in the written submission of Howe & Co was that it's unreasonable for the scheme to require contemporaneous evidence of events from up to 20 years ago, particularly in circumstances where postmasters may have been deprived of access to their records at the point of suspension and they may have been destroyed by Post Office. But we emphasise and, sir, as you have seen and been taken to, the guidance on consequential loss makes it clear that contemporaneous evidence is not required, it is not a bar not to have it, but greater weight may be placed on it as well as the factual evidence that is undisputed or verifiable. That's what the guidance says. Of course, where an application is concerned about the Panel's approach to an alleged lack of

1	That point is connected to the third point, which	1	maters and documents", so that's the starting point.
2	is the sharing of supporting information held by Post	2	The second point is that number of postmasters
3	Office. This was an issue flagged up by Mr Beer as	3	have made data subject access requests prior to or
4	well.	4	during the course of making an application and, of
5	Howe & Co have suggested that a procedural flaw in	5	course, there they will be provided with all data that
6	the scheme is that the sharing of supporting information	6	falls within that access request.
7	held by Post Office won't be until the point of	7	Turning then to the outcome letter, the outcome
8	receiving the offer. They say that's a substantial	8	letter lists all contemporaneous evidence which the
9	procedural flaw.	9	Panel assessed to make the recommendation and it
10	Can I just highlight first, the terms of reference	10	expressly explains that the applicant can request a copy
11	that you have for the scheme at tab 14. I don't	11	of any or all of those documents and pieces of evidence.
12	believe, sir, you were taken this particular element of	12	Applicants can also request a copy of the Post Office
13	it, at paragraph 6, so it's page 283 internally,	13	investigation report, the Herbert Smith Freehills legal
14	paragraph 6 provides:	14	case assessment, and a record of the Panel assessment
15	"Once an application has been made either party	15	and recommendation.
16	may write to the other to request relevant information.	16	All of this data is provided in order to support
17	The parties shall cooperate with each other in providing	17	the applicant's consideration of the offer and, of
18	any other information which the other party may	18	course, having considered it the applicant is free to
19	reasonably request. Information obtained and provided	19	accept or reject the offer, following which a good faith
20	in relation to each application should be proportionate	20	meeting can be held and, if necessary, disputes can be
21	to the circumstances of that application."	21	escalated thereafter.
22	So there is express anticipation that an applicant	22	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Sorry, this is my fault, but this
23	saying to Post Office, "I need this. Please provide me	23	information about the documentation which an applicant
24	with this", and Post Office can equally say of an	24	can obtain.
25	applicant, "Could you please provide the following	25	MS GALLAFENT: Is set out in the outcome letter.
	61		62
1	SID WYN WILLIAMS: It in the outcome letter	1	hit of analysis and data collection on the question
1	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: It in the outcome letter.	1	bit of analysis and data collection on the question
2	MS GALLAFENT: Yes.	2	of
2 3	MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: It is not in any prior guidance.	2 3	of SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I think I will say now that rather
2 3 4	MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: It is not in any prior guidance. MS GALLIFANT: No.	2 3 4	of SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I think I will say now that rather than going along trying to listen to you and formulate,
2 3 4 5	MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: It is not in any prior guidance. MS GALLIFANT: No. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So it's at that point.	2 3 4 5	of SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I think I will say now that rather than going along trying to listen to you and formulate, in inverted commas, rules and requests at the same time,
2 3 4 5 6	MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: It is not in any prior guidance. MS GALLIFANT: No. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So it's at that point. MS GALLAFENT: Exactly, so taking different stages, at the	2 3 4 5 6	of SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I think I will say now that rather than going along trying to listen to you and formulate, in inverted commas, rules and requests at the same time, what may happen and I stress may is that if there
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: It is not in any prior guidance. MS GALLIFANT: No. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So it's at that point. MS GALLAFENT: Exactly, so taking different stages, at the point of the application paragraph 6 of the terms of	2 3 4 5 6 7	of SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I think I will say now that rather than going along trying to listen to you and formulate, in inverted commas, rules and requests at the same time, what may happen and I stress may is that if there is any data that I require from any party before I make
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: It is not in any prior guidance. MS GALLIFANT: No. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So it's at that point. MS GALLAFENT: Exactly, so taking different stages, at the point of the application paragraph 6 of the terms of reference emphasises the opportunity for the parties to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I think I will say now that rather than going along trying to listen to you and formulate, in inverted commas, rules and requests at the same time, what may happen and I stress may is that if there is any data that I require from any party before I make a written report in whatever form it is following these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: It is not in any prior guidance. MS GALLIFANT: No. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So it's at that point. MS GALLAFENT: Exactly, so taking different stages, at the point of the application paragraph 6 of the terms of reference emphasises the opportunity for the parties to ask for information from each other. Then you get to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I think I will say now that rather than going along trying to listen to you and formulate, in inverted commas, rules and requests at the same time, what may happen and I stress may is that if there is any data that I require from any party before I make a written report in whatever form it is following these hearings I will do it in writing after the hearings
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: It is not in any prior guidance. MS GALLIFANT: No. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So it's at that point. MS GALLAFENT: Exactly, so taking different stages, at the point of the application paragraph 6 of the terms of reference emphasises the opportunity for the parties to ask for information from each other. Then you get to the point of the outcome letter and that is where the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I think I will say now that rather than going along trying to listen to you and formulate, in inverted commas, rules and requests at the same time, what may happen and I stress may is that if there is any data that I require from any party before I make a written report in whatever form it is following these hearings I will do it in writing after the hearings rather than trying to do it as we are going along.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: It is not in any prior guidance. MS GALLIFANT: No. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So it's at that point. MS GALLAFENT: Exactly, so taking different stages, at the point of the application paragraph 6 of the terms of reference emphasises the opportunity for the parties to ask for information from each other. Then you get to the point of the outcome letter and that is where the applicant is expressly told there is a list of all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	of SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I think I will say now that rather than going along trying to listen to you and formulate, in inverted commas, rules and requests at the same time, what may happen and I stress may is that if there is any data that I require from any party before I make a written report in whatever form it is following these hearings I will do it in writing after the hearings rather than trying to do it as we are going along. MS GALLAFENT: I certainly wasn't suggesting that, sir. If
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: It is not in any prior guidance. MS GALLIFANT: No. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So it's at that point. MS GALLAFENT: Exactly, so taking different stages, at the point of the application paragraph 6 of the terms of reference emphasises the opportunity for the parties to ask for information from each other. Then you get to the point of the outcome letter and that is where the applicant is expressly told there is a list of all the contemporaneous evidence that Panel assessed and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	of SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I think I will say now that rather than going along trying to listen to you and formulate, in inverted commas, rules and requests at the same time, what may happen and I stress may is that if there is any data that I require from any party before I make a written report in whatever form it is following these hearings I will do it in writing after the hearings rather than trying to do it as we are going along. MS GALLAFENT: I certainly wasn't suggesting that, sir. If you were to indicate that you would be open to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: It is not in any prior guidance. MS GALLIFANT: No. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So it's at that point. MS GALLAFENT: Exactly, so taking different stages, at the point of the application paragraph 6 of the terms of reference emphasises the opportunity for the parties to ask for information from each other. Then you get to the point of the outcome letter and that is where the applicant is expressly told there is a list of all the contemporaneous evidence that Panel assessed and it's told that it can the applicant is told what they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I think I will say now that rather than going along trying to listen to you and formulate, in inverted commas, rules and requests at the same time, what may happen and I stress may is that if there is any data that I require from any party before I make a written report in whatever form it is following these hearings I will do it in writing after the hearings rather than trying to do it as we are going along. MS GALLAFENT: I certainly wasn't suggesting that, sir. If you were to indicate that you would be open to the provision of such data then we will crack on with that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: It is not in any prior guidance. MS GALLIFANT: No. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So it's at that point. MS GALLAFENT: Exactly, so taking different stages, at the point of the application paragraph 6 of the terms of reference emphasises the opportunity for the parties to ask for information from each other. Then you get to the point of the outcome letter and that is where the applicant is expressly told there is a list of all the contemporaneous evidence that Panel assessed and it's told that it can the applicant is told what they can ask for and obtain.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I think I will say now that rather than going along trying to listen to you and formulate, in inverted commas, rules and requests at the same time, what may happen and I stress may is that if there is any data that I require from any party before I make a written report in whatever form it is following these hearings I will do it in writing after the hearings rather than trying to do it as we are going along. MS GALLAFENT: I certainly wasn't suggesting that, sir. If you were to indicate that you would be open to the provision of such data then we will crack on with that and get that ready. But I'm certainly not anticipating
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: It is not in any prior guidance. MS GALLIFANT: No. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So it's at that point. MS GALLAFENT: Exactly, so taking different stages, at the point of the application paragraph 6 of the terms of reference emphasises the opportunity for the parties to ask for information from each other. Then you get to the point of the outcome letter and that is where the applicant is expressly told there is a list of all the contemporaneous evidence that Panel assessed and it's told that it can the applicant is told what they can ask for and obtain. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	of SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I think I will say now that rather than going along trying to listen to you and formulate, in inverted commas, rules and requests at the same time, what may happen and I stress may is that if there is any data that I require from any party before I make a written report in whatever form it is following these hearings I will do it in writing after the hearings rather than trying to do it as we are going along. MS GALLAFENT: I certainly wasn't suggesting that, sir. If you were to indicate that you would be open to the provision of such data then we will crack on with that and get that ready. But I'm certainly not anticipating that you need to, as it were, tell me precisely what you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: It is not in any prior guidance. MS GALLIFANT: No. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So it's at that point. MS GALLAFENT: Exactly, so taking different stages, at the point of the application paragraph 6 of the terms of reference emphasises the opportunity for the parties to ask for information from each other. Then you get to the point of the outcome letter and that is where the applicant is expressly told there is a list of all the contemporaneous evidence that Panel assessed and it's told that it can the applicant is told what they can ask for and obtain. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. MS GALLAFENT: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I think I will say now that rather than going along trying to listen to you and formulate, in inverted commas, rules and requests at the same time, what may happen and I stress may is that if there is any data that I require from any party before I make a written report in whatever form it is following these hearings I will do it in writing after the hearings rather than trying to do it as we are going along. MS GALLAFENT: I certainly wasn't suggesting that, sir. If you were to indicate that you would be open to the provision of such data then we will crack on with that and get that ready. But I'm certainly not anticipating that you need to, as it were, tell me precisely what you would like at this stage. It might be more helpful,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: It is not in any prior guidance. MS GALLIFANT: No. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So it's at that point. MS GALLAFENT: Exactly, so taking different stages, at the point of the application paragraph 6 of the terms of reference emphasises the opportunity for the parties to ask for information from each other. Then you get to the point of the outcome letter and that is where the applicant is expressly told there is a list of all the contemporaneous evidence that Panel assessed and it's told that it can the applicant is told what they can ask for and obtain. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. I am with you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I think I will say now that rather than going along trying to listen to you and formulate, in inverted commas, rules and requests at the same time, what may happen and I stress may is that if there is any data that I require from any party before I make a written report in whatever form it is following these hearings I will do it in writing after the hearings rather than trying to do it as we are going along. MS GALLAFENT: I certainly wasn't suggesting that, sir. If you were to indicate that you would be open to the provision of such data then we will crack on with that and get that ready. But I'm certainly not anticipating that you need to, as it were, tell me precisely what you would like at this stage. It might be more helpful, frankly, for us to provide you with an indication and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: It is not in any prior guidance. MS GALLIFANT: No. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So it's at that point. MS GALLAFENT: Exactly, so taking different stages, at the point of the application paragraph 6 of the terms of reference emphasises the opportunity for the parties to ask for information from each other. Then you get to the point of the outcome letter and that is where the applicant is expressly told there is a list of all the contemporaneous evidence that Panel assessed and it's told that it can the applicant is told what they can ask for and obtain. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. I am with you. MS GALLAFENT: Thank you. We say there is not any prejudice	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I think I will say now that rather than going along trying to listen to you and formulate, in inverted commas, rules and requests at the same time, what may happen and I stress may is that if there is any data that I require from any party before I make a written report in whatever form it is following these hearings I will do it in writing after the hearings rather than trying to do it as we are going along. MS GALLAFENT: I certainly wasn't suggesting that, sir. If you were to indicate that you would be open to the provision of such data then we will crack on with that and get that ready. But I'm certainly not anticipating that you need to, as it were, tell me precisely what you would like at this stage. It might be more helpful, frankly, for us to provide you with an indication and then it might assist you in understanding what more or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: It is not in any prior guidance. MS GALLIFANT: No. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So it's at that point. MS GALLAFENT: Exactly, so taking different stages, at the point of the application paragraph 6 of the terms of reference emphasises the opportunity for the parties to ask for information from each other. Then you get to the point of the outcome letter and that is where the applicant is expressly told there is a list of all the contemporaneous evidence that Panel assessed and it's told that it can the applicant is told what they can ask for and obtain. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. I am with you. MS GALLAFENT: Thank you. We say there is not any prejudice to an applicant as a result of disclosure not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	of SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I think I will say now that rather than going along trying to listen to you and formulate, in inverted commas, rules and requests at the same time, what may happen and I stress may is that if there is any data that I require from any party before I make a written report in whatever form it is following these hearings I will do it in writing after the hearings rather than trying to do it as we are going along. MS GALLAFENT: I certainly wasn't suggesting that, sir. If you were to indicate that you would be open to the provision of such data then we will crack on with that and get that ready. But I'm certainly not anticipating that you need to, as it were, tell me precisely what you would like at this stage. It might be more helpful, frankly, for us to provide you with an indication and then it might assist you in understanding what more or less you would want from us.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: It is not in any prior guidance. MS GALLIFANT: No. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So it's at that point. MS GALLAFENT: Exactly, so taking different stages, at the point of the application paragraph 6 of the terms of reference emphasises the opportunity for the parties to ask for information from each other. Then you get to the point of the outcome letter and that is where the applicant is expressly told there is a list of all the contemporaneous evidence that Panel assessed and it's told that it can the applicant is told what they can ask for and obtain. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. I am with you. MS GALLAFENT: Thank you. We say there is not any prejudice to an applicant as a result of disclosure not necessarily having been made earlier, if it has not been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I think I will say now that rather than going along trying to listen to you and formulate, in inverted commas, rules and requests at the same time, what may happen and I stress may is that if there is any data that I require from any party before I make a written report in whatever form it is following these hearings I will do it in writing after the hearings rather than trying to do it as we are going along. MS GALLAFENT: I certainly wasn't suggesting that, sir. If you were to indicate that you would be open to the provision of such data then we will crack on with that and get that ready. But I'm certainly not anticipating that you need to, as it were, tell me precisely what you would like at this stage. It might be more helpful, frankly, for us to provide you with an indication and then it might assist you in understanding what more or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: It is not in any prior guidance. MS GALLIFANT: No. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So it's at that point. MS GALLAFENT: Exactly, so taking different stages, at the point of the application paragraph 6 of the terms of reference emphasises the opportunity for the parties to ask for information from each other. Then you get to the point of the outcome letter and that is where the applicant is expressly told there is a list of all the contemporaneous evidence that Panel assessed and it's told that it can the applicant is told what they can ask for and obtain. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. I am with you. MS GALLAFENT: Thank you. We say there is not any prejudice to an applicant as a result of disclosure not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I think I will say now that rather than going along trying to listen to you and formulate, in inverted commas, rules and requests at the same time, what may happen and I stress may is that if there is any data that I require from any party before I make a written report in whatever form it is following these hearings I will do it in writing after the hearings rather than trying to do it as we are going along. MS GALLAFENT: I certainly wasn't suggesting that, sir. If you were to indicate that you would be open to the provision of such data then we will crack on with that and get that ready. But I'm certainly not anticipating that you need to, as it were, tell me precisely what you would like at this stage. It might be more helpful, frankly, for us to provide you with an indication and then it might assist you in understanding what more or less you would want from us. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, as you know, Ms Gallafent, people
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: It is not in any prior guidance. MS GALLIFANT: No. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So it's at that point. MS GALLAFENT: Exactly, so taking different stages, at the point of the application paragraph 6 of the terms of reference emphasises the opportunity for the parties to ask for information from each other. Then you get to the point of the outcome letter and that is where the applicant is expressly told there is a list of all the contemporaneous evidence that Panel assessed and it's told that it can the applicant is told what they can ask for and obtain. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. I am with you. MS GALLAFENT: Thank you. We say there is not any prejudice to an applicant as a result of disclosure not necessarily having been made earlier, if it has not been requested. Again, if the applicant feels that the material has been misunderstood or is incomplete that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I think I will say now that rather than going along trying to listen to you and formulate, in inverted commas, rules and requests at the same time, what may happen and I stress may is that if there is any data that I require from any party before I make a written report in whatever form it is following these hearings I will do it in writing after the hearings rather than trying to do it as we are going along. MS GALLAFENT: I certainly wasn't suggesting that, sir. If you were to indicate that you would be open to the provision of such data then we will crack on with that and get that ready. But I'm certainly not anticipating that you need to, as it were, tell me precisely what you would like at this stage. It might be more helpful, frankly, for us to provide you with an indication and then it might assist you in understanding what more or less you would want from us. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, as you know, Ms Gallafent, people write to me at all times of the day or night in this Inquiry providing me with information. Far be it for me
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: It is not in any prior guidance. MS GALLIFANT: No. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So it's at that point. MS GALLAFENT: Exactly, so taking different stages, at the point of the application paragraph 6 of the terms of reference emphasises the opportunity for the parties to ask for information from each other. Then you get to the point of the outcome letter and that is where the applicant is expressly told there is a list of all the contemporaneous evidence that Panel assessed and it's told that it can the applicant is told what they can ask for and obtain. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. I am with you. MS GALLAFENT: Thank you. We say there is not any prejudice to an applicant as a result of disclosure not necessarily having been made earlier, if it has not been requested. Again, if the applicant feels that the material has been misunderstood or is incomplete that can be raised at the good faith meeting.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	of SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I think I will say now that rather than going along trying to listen to you and formulate, in inverted commas, rules and requests at the same time, what may happen and I stress may is that if there is any data that I require from any party before I make a written report in whatever form it is following these hearings I will do it in writing after the hearings rather than trying to do it as we are going along. MS GALLAFENT: I certainly wasn't suggesting that, sir. If you were to indicate that you would be open to the provision of such data then we will crack on with that and get that ready. But I'm certainly not anticipating that you need to, as it were, tell me precisely what you would like at this stage. It might be more helpful, frankly, for us to provide you with an indication and then it might assist you in understanding what more or less you would want from us. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, as you know, Ms Gallafent, people write to me at all times of the day or night in this Inquiry providing me with information. Far be it for me to stop you from doing the same.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: It is not in any prior guidance. MS GALLIFANT: No. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So it's at that point. MS GALLAFENT: Exactly, so taking different stages, at the point of the application paragraph 6 of the terms of reference emphasises the opportunity for the parties to ask for information from each other. Then you get to the point of the outcome letter and that is where the applicant is expressly told there is a list of all the contemporaneous evidence that Panel assessed and it's told that it can the applicant is told what they can ask for and obtain. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. MS GALLAFENT: Yes. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. I am with you. MS GALLAFENT: Thank you. We say there is not any prejudice to an applicant as a result of disclosure not necessarily having been made earlier, if it has not been requested. Again, if the applicant feels that the material has been misunderstood or is incomplete that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I think I will say now that rather than going along trying to listen to you and formulate, in inverted commas, rules and requests at the same time, what may happen and I stress may is that if there is any data that I require from any party before I make a written report in whatever form it is following these hearings I will do it in writing after the hearings rather than trying to do it as we are going along. MS GALLAFENT: I certainly wasn't suggesting that, sir. If you were to indicate that you would be open to the provision of such data then we will crack on with that and get that ready. But I'm certainly not anticipating that you need to, as it were, tell me precisely what you would like at this stage. It might be more helpful, frankly, for us to provide you with an indication and then it might assist you in understanding what more or less you would want from us. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, as you know, Ms Gallafent, people write to me at all times of the day or night in this Inquiry providing me with information. Far be it for me

1	for your patience with us.	1	figures based upon what your statement said last night.
2	Can I move then to the second of the questions	2	MS GALLAFENT: Yes, that was at the end of June.
3	posed, sir, in relation to delay. I'm not going to seek	3	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Now we're getting up to midnight on
4	to repeat the explanation set out in the May submissions	4	July 5 or 6, whichever you prefer. Is that it?
5	about the process between setting up the scheme and the	5	MS GALLAFENT: That's exactly it.
6	position reached by the time of those submissions.	6	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Fine, right, so if you tell me that
7	You have our submissions on delay and I'm again	7	I will make a note on this document.
8	conscious, sir, of your indication in the note of	8	MS GALLAFENT: 1,659, which takes the percentage of offers
9	30 June that you have those well in mind and don't	9	to eligible applicants to come to 70 per cent.
10	require us to go through them again.	10	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: All right.
11	I do though want to flag up the continuing	11	The figure that Mr Beer gave me, obviously, for
12	progress being made since those submissions which	12	payments made is the same today as it was last night, so
13	demonstrates, we say, a clear and continuing positive	13	I don't need to worry about that.
14	trajectory towards resolving all current applications.	14	MS GALLAFENT: Yes.
15	Now, we provided an update in the late night note, as it	15	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right.
16	may become referred to, yesterday but in fact as of	16	MS GALLAFENT: They would have been very speedy indeed if
17	midnight yesterday I can confirm that further letters	17	they'd accepted it. Exactly.
18	have been sent out during the course of yesterday, which	18	You may note, just going back to page 302, of
19	take the number of eligible applicants who have been	19	course the information on progress and the anticipated
20	sent offer letters up to 1,659 out of 2,370, which takes	20	rate of progress to get us to 95 per cent by
21	us to us a 70 per cent rate of offers from applications.	21	December 2022 provides that the target was to reach 70
22	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So I'm trying to make a note on the	22	per cent by the end of July. We have actually reached
23	relevant pages of my bundle, so this all starts on	23	it on 5 July which is why I emphasise a clear and
24	page 302 and then goes over to page 303. That was as at	24	continuing positive trajectory, and Post Office remains
25	7 June I think it was. Then Mr Beer gave me further	25	on course to provide at least 95 per cent of eligible
	65		66
1	applicants with offer letters by the end of this	1	assist the Inquiry. That then resulted in
1 2	applicants with offer letters by the end of this calendar year. You will see that again on page 302.	1 2	assist the Inquiry. That then resulted in Mr Racaldin(?) becoming Historical Matters Director in
2	calendar year. You will see that again on page 302.	2	Mr Racaldin(?) becoming Historical Matters Director in
	calendar year. You will see that again on page 302. To date 115 applicants have formally engaged the		Mr Racaldin(?) becoming Historical Matters Director in January 2022.
2 3 4	calendar year. You will see that again on page 302. To date 115 applicants have formally engaged the dispute resolution process. 31 of those, 27 per cent,	2 3 4	Mr Racaldin(?) becoming Historical Matters Director in January 2022. However, in that period during which there was no
2	calendar year. You will see that again on page 302. To date 115 applicants have formally engaged the dispute resolution process. 31 of those, 27 per cent, have now reached agreement on the amount of	2	Mr Racaldin(?) becoming Historical Matters Director in January 2022. However, in that period during which there was no longer a head of historical matters before Mr Recaldin
2 3 4 5	calendar year. You will see that again on page 302. To date 115 applicants have formally engaged the dispute resolution process. 31 of those, 27 per cent,	2 3 4 5	Mr Racaldin(?) becoming Historical Matters Director in January 2022. However, in that period during which there was no longer a head of historical matters before Mr Recaldin took up his post the historical matters team continued
2 3 4 5 6 7	calendar year. You will see that again on page 302. To date 115 applicants have formally engaged the dispute resolution process. 31 of those, 27 per cent, have now reached agreement on the amount of compensation. Good faith meetings have taken place with 47 applicants, escalation meetings with seven	2 3 4 5 6 7	Mr Racaldin(?) becoming Historical Matters Director in January 2022. However, in that period during which there was no longer a head of historical matters before Mr Recaldin took up his post the historical matters team continued throughout to focus on matters arising from the group
2 3 4 5 6	calendar year. You will see that again on page 302. To date 115 applicants have formally engaged the dispute resolution process. 31 of those, 27 per cent, have now reached agreement on the amount of compensation. Good faith meetings have taken place with 47 applicants, escalation meetings with seven applicants, are there are a further 11 good faith	2 3 4 5 6	Mr Racaldin(?) becoming Historical Matters Director in January 2022. However, in that period during which there was no longer a head of historical matters before Mr Recaldin took up his post the historical matters team continued throughout to focus on matters arising from the group litigation including the Historical Scheme.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	calendar year. You will see that again on page 302. To date 115 applicants have formally engaged the dispute resolution process. 31 of those, 27 per cent, have now reached agreement on the amount of compensation. Good faith meetings have taken place with 47 applicants, escalation meetings with seven	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Mr Racaldin(?) becoming Historical Matters Director in January 2022. However, in that period during which there was no longer a head of historical matters before Mr Recaldin took up his post the historical matters team continued throughout to focus on matters arising from the group
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	calendar year. You will see that again on page 302. To date 115 applicants have formally engaged the dispute resolution process. 31 of those, 27 per cent, have now reached agreement on the amount of compensation. Good faith meetings have taken place with 47 applicants, escalation meetings with seven applicants, are there are a further 11 good faith meetings scheduled for the coming weeks. On delay there are a couple of particular points	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Mr Racaldin(?) becoming Historical Matters Director in January 2022. However, in that period during which there was no longer a head of historical matters before Mr Recaldin took up his post the historical matters team continued throughout to focus on matters arising from the group litigation including the Historical Scheme. We wouldn't accept that any delay arose as a result of the reinstructing of Historical Matters
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	calendar year. You will see that again on page 302. To date 115 applicants have formally engaged the dispute resolution process. 31 of those, 27 per cent, have now reached agreement on the amount of compensation. Good faith meetings have taken place with 47 applicants, escalation meetings with seven applicants, are there are a further 11 good faith meetings scheduled for the coming weeks.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Mr Racaldin(?) becoming Historical Matters Director in January 2022. However, in that period during which there was no longer a head of historical matters before Mr Recaldin took up his post the historical matters team continued throughout to focus on matters arising from the group litigation including the Historical Scheme. We wouldn't accept that any delay arose as a result of the reinstructing of Historical Matters Scheme which was considered necessary and appropriate to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	calendar year. You will see that again on page 302. To date 115 applicants have formally engaged the dispute resolution process. 31 of those, 27 per cent, have now reached agreement on the amount of compensation. Good faith meetings have taken place with 47 applicants, escalation meetings with seven applicants, are there are a further 11 good faith meetings scheduled for the coming weeks. On delay there are a couple of particular points raised by other core participants. The first is raised by the National Federation of Subpostmasters who have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Mr Racaldin(?) becoming Historical Matters Director in January 2022. However, in that period during which there was no longer a head of historical matters before Mr Recaldin took up his post the historical matters team continued throughout to focus on matters arising from the group litigation including the Historical Scheme. We wouldn't accept that any delay arose as a result of the reinstructing of Historical Matters Scheme which was considered necessary and appropriate to anticipate the needs of this Inquiry.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	calendar year. You will see that again on page 302. To date 115 applicants have formally engaged the dispute resolution process. 31 of those, 27 per cent, have now reached agreement on the amount of compensation. Good faith meetings have taken place with 47 applicants, escalation meetings with seven applicants, are there are a further 11 good faith meetings scheduled for the coming weeks. On delay there are a couple of particular points raised by other core participants. The first is raised by the National Federation of Subpostmasters who have suggested it would be justifiable, sir, for you to ask	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Mr Racaldin(?) becoming Historical Matters Director in January 2022. However, in that period during which there was no longer a head of historical matters before Mr Recaldin took up his post the historical matters team continued throughout to focus on matters arising from the group litigation including the Historical Scheme. We wouldn't accept that any delay arose as a result of the reinstructing of Historical Matters Scheme which was considered necessary and appropriate to anticipate the needs of this Inquiry. As I say, we've set out the reasons for the delay
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	calendar year. You will see that again on page 302. To date 115 applicants have formally engaged the dispute resolution process. 31 of those, 27 per cent, have now reached agreement on the amount of compensation. Good faith meetings have taken place with 47 applicants, escalation meetings with seven applicants, are there are a further 11 good faith meetings scheduled for the coming weeks. On delay there are a couple of particular points raised by other core participants. The first is raised by the National Federation of Subpostmasters who have suggested it would be justifiable, sir, for you to ask whether the non-renewal of a contract of the previous	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Mr Racaldin(?) becoming Historical Matters Director in January 2022. However, in that period during which there was no longer a head of historical matters before Mr Recaldin took up his post the historical matters team continued throughout to focus on matters arising from the group litigation including the Historical Scheme. We wouldn't accept that any delay arose as a result of the reinstructing of Historical Matters Scheme which was considered necessary and appropriate to anticipate the needs of this Inquiry. As I say, we've set out the reasons for the delay in our May submissions and I don't repeat them here.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	calendar year. You will see that again on page 302. To date 115 applicants have formally engaged the dispute resolution process. 31 of those, 27 per cent, have now reached agreement on the amount of compensation. Good faith meetings have taken place with 47 applicants, escalation meetings with seven applicants, are there are a further 11 good faith meetings scheduled for the coming weeks. On delay there are a couple of particular points raised by other core participants. The first is raised by the National Federation of Subpostmasters who have suggested it would be justifiable, sir, for you to ask whether the non-renewal of a contract of the previous head of historical matters resulted in there being	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Mr Racaldin(?) becoming Historical Matters Director in January 2022. However, in that period during which there was no longer a head of historical matters before Mr Recaldin took up his post the historical matters team continued throughout to focus on matters arising from the group litigation including the Historical Scheme. We wouldn't accept that any delay arose as a result of the reinstructing of Historical Matters Scheme which was considered necessary and appropriate to anticipate the needs of this Inquiry. As I say, we've set out the reasons for the delay in our May submissions and I don't repeat them here. Hudgell also flags up the issue of bankruptcy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	calendar year. You will see that again on page 302. To date 115 applicants have formally engaged the dispute resolution process. 31 of those, 27 per cent, have now reached agreement on the amount of compensation. Good faith meetings have taken place with 47 applicants, escalation meetings with seven applicants, are there are a further 11 good faith meetings scheduled for the coming weeks. On delay there are a couple of particular points raised by other core participants. The first is raised by the National Federation of Subpostmasters who have suggested it would be justifiable, sir, for you to ask whether the non-renewal of a contract of the previous head of historical matters resulted in there being a significant period of time during which no individual	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Mr Racaldin(?) becoming Historical Matters Director in January 2022. However, in that period during which there was no longer a head of historical matters before Mr Recaldin took up his post the historical matters team continued throughout to focus on matters arising from the group litigation including the Historical Scheme. We wouldn't accept that any delay arose as a result of the reinstructing of Historical Matters Scheme which was considered necessary and appropriate to anticipate the needs of this Inquiry. As I say, we've set out the reasons for the delay in our May submissions and I don't repeat them here. Hudgell also flags up the issue of bankruptcy cases. We recognise and agree that bankruptcy cases are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	calendar year. You will see that again on page 302. To date 115 applicants have formally engaged the dispute resolution process. 31 of those, 27 per cent, have now reached agreement on the amount of compensation. Good faith meetings have taken place with 47 applicants, escalation meetings with seven applicants, are there are a further 11 good faith meetings scheduled for the coming weeks. On delay there are a couple of particular points raised by other core participants. The first is raised by the National Federation of Subpostmasters who have suggested it would be justifiable, sir, for you to ask whether the non-renewal of a contract of the previous head of historical matters resulted in there being a significant period of time during which no individual was responsible for driving the scheme forward.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Mr Racaldin(?) becoming Historical Matters Director in January 2022. However, in that period during which there was no longer a head of historical matters before Mr Recaldin took up his post the historical matters team continued throughout to focus on matters arising from the group litigation including the Historical Scheme. We wouldn't accept that any delay arose as a result of the reinstructing of Historical Matters Scheme which was considered necessary and appropriate to anticipate the needs of this Inquiry. As I say, we've set out the reasons for the delay in our May submissions and I don't repeat them here. Hudgell also flags up the issue of bankruptcy cases. We recognise and agree that bankruptcy cases are extremely complicated and may well take longer to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	calendar year. You will see that again on page 302. To date 115 applicants have formally engaged the dispute resolution process. 31 of those, 27 per cent, have now reached agreement on the amount of compensation. Good faith meetings have taken place with 47 applicants, escalation meetings with seven applicants, are there are a further 11 good faith meetings scheduled for the coming weeks. On delay there are a couple of particular points raised by other core participants. The first is raised by the National Federation of Subpostmasters who have suggested it would be justifiable, sir, for you to ask whether the non-renewal of a contract of the previous head of historical matters resulted in there being a significant period of time during which no individual was responsible for driving the scheme forward. The position is that the fixed term contract for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Mr Racaldin(?) becoming Historical Matters Director in January 2022. However, in that period during which there was no longer a head of historical matters before Mr Recaldin took up his post the historical matters team continued throughout to focus on matters arising from the group litigation including the Historical Scheme. We wouldn't accept that any delay arose as a result of the reinstructing of Historical Matters Scheme which was considered necessary and appropriate to anticipate the needs of this Inquiry. As I say, we've set out the reasons for the delay in our May submissions and I don't repeat them here. Hudgell also flags up the issue of bankruptcy cases. We recognise and agree that bankruptcy cases are extremely complicated and may well take longer to resolve. We are actively working to resolve the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	calendar year. You will see that again on page 302. To date 115 applicants have formally engaged the dispute resolution process. 31 of those, 27 per cent, have now reached agreement on the amount of compensation. Good faith meetings have taken place with 47 applicants, escalation meetings with seven applicants, are there are a further 11 good faith meetings scheduled for the coming weeks. On delay there are a couple of particular points raised by other core participants. The first is raised by the National Federation of Subpostmasters who have suggested it would be justifiable, sir, for you to ask whether the non-renewal of a contract of the previous head of historical matters resulted in there being a significant period of time during which no individual was responsible for driving the scheme forward.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Mr Racaldin(?) becoming Historical Matters Director in January 2022. However, in that period during which there was no longer a head of historical matters before Mr Recaldin took up his post the historical matters team continued throughout to focus on matters arising from the group litigation including the Historical Scheme. We wouldn't accept that any delay arose as a result of the reinstructing of Historical Matters Scheme which was considered necessary and appropriate to anticipate the needs of this Inquiry. As I say, we've set out the reasons for the delay in our May submissions and I don't repeat them here. Hudgell also flags up the issue of bankruptcy cases. We recognise and agree that bankruptcy cases are extremely complicated and may well take longer to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	calendar year. You will see that again on page 302. To date 115 applicants have formally engaged the dispute resolution process. 31 of those, 27 per cent, have now reached agreement on the amount of compensation. Good faith meetings have taken place with 47 applicants, escalation meetings with seven applicants, are there are a further 11 good faith meetings scheduled for the coming weeks. On delay there are a couple of particular points raised by other core participants. The first is raised by the National Federation of Subpostmasters who have suggested it would be justifiable, sir, for you to ask whether the non-renewal of a contract of the previous head of historical matters resulted in there being a significant period of time during which no individual was responsible for driving the scheme forward. The position is that the fixed term contract for the previous head of historical matters ended on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Mr Racaldin(?) becoming Historical Matters Director in January 2022. However, in that period during which there was no longer a head of historical matters before Mr Recaldin took up his post the historical matters team continued throughout to focus on matters arising from the group litigation including the Historical Scheme. We wouldn't accept that any delay arose as a result of the reinstructing of Historical Matters Scheme which was considered necessary and appropriate to anticipate the needs of this Inquiry. As I say, we've set out the reasons for the delay in our May submissions and I don't repeat them here. Hudgell also flags up the issue of bankruptcy cases. We recognise and agree that bankruptcy cases are extremely complicated and may well take longer to resolve. We are actively working to resolve the challenges posed by such cases, including the issue of the costs of the Official Receiver or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	calendar year. You will see that again on page 302. To date 115 applicants have formally engaged the dispute resolution process. 31 of those, 27 per cent, have now reached agreement on the amount of compensation. Good faith meetings have taken place with 47 applicants, escalation meetings with seven applicants, are there are a further 11 good faith meetings scheduled for the coming weeks. On delay there are a couple of particular points raised by other core participants. The first is raised by the National Federation of Subpostmasters who have suggested it would be justifiable, sir, for you to ask whether the non-renewal of a contract of the previous head of historical matters resulted in there being a significant period of time during which no individual was responsible for driving the scheme forward. The position is that the fixed term contract for the previous head of historical matters ended on 23 July 2021. Prior to that, in May 2021, the Government had announced that this Inquiry would be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Mr Racaldin(?) becoming Historical Matters Director in January 2022. However, in that period during which there was no longer a head of historical matters before Mr Recaldin took up his post the historical matters team continued throughout to focus on matters arising from the group litigation including the Historical Scheme. We wouldn't accept that any delay arose as a result of the reinstructing of Historical Matters Scheme which was considered necessary and appropriate to anticipate the needs of this Inquiry. As I say, we've set out the reasons for the delay in our May submissions and I don't repeat them here. Hudgell also flags up the issue of bankruptcy cases. We recognise and agree that bankruptcy cases are extremely complicated and may well take longer to resolve. We are actively working to resolve the challenges posed by such cases, including the issue of the costs of the Official Receiver or Trustee-in-Bankruptcy. In the meantime, Post Office
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	calendar year. You will see that again on page 302. To date 115 applicants have formally engaged the dispute resolution process. 31 of those, 27 per cent, have now reached agreement on the amount of compensation. Good faith meetings have taken place with 47 applicants, escalation meetings with seven applicants, are there are a further 11 good faith meetings scheduled for the coming weeks. On delay there are a couple of particular points raised by other core participants. The first is raised by the National Federation of Subpostmasters who have suggested it would be justifiable, sir, for you to ask whether the non-renewal of a contract of the previous head of historical matters resulted in there being a significant period of time during which no individual was responsible for driving the scheme forward. The position is that the fixed term contract for the previous head of historical matters ended on 23 July 2021. Prior to that, in May 2021, the Government had announced that this Inquiry would be moved on to a statutory footing. As a result, the Chief	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Mr Racaldin(?) becoming Historical Matters Director in January 2022. However, in that period during which there was no longer a head of historical matters before Mr Recaldin took up his post the historical matters team continued throughout to focus on matters arising from the group litigation including the Historical Scheme. We wouldn't accept that any delay arose as a result of the reinstructing of Historical Matters Scheme which was considered necessary and appropriate to anticipate the needs of this Inquiry. As I say, we've set out the reasons for the delay in our May submissions and I don't repeat them here. Hudgell also flags up the issue of bankruptcy cases. We recognise and agree that bankruptcy cases are extremely complicated and may well take longer to resolve. We are actively working to resolve the challenges posed by such cases, including the issue of the costs of the Official Receiver or Trustee-in-Bankruptcy. In the meantime, Post Office expects that the first offer will be made to an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	calendar year. You will see that again on page 302. To date 115 applicants have formally engaged the dispute resolution process. 31 of those, 27 per cent, have now reached agreement on the amount of compensation. Good faith meetings have taken place with 47 applicants, escalation meetings with seven applicants, are there are a further 11 good faith meetings scheduled for the coming weeks. On delay there are a couple of particular points raised by other core participants. The first is raised by the National Federation of Subpostmasters who have suggested it would be justifiable, sir, for you to ask whether the non-renewal of a contract of the previous head of historical matters resulted in there being a significant period of time during which no individual was responsible for driving the scheme forward. The position is that the fixed term contract for the previous head of historical matters ended on 23 July 2021. Prior to that, in May 2021, the Government had announced that this Inquiry would be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Mr Racaldin(?) becoming Historical Matters Director in January 2022. However, in that period during which there was no longer a head of historical matters before Mr Recaldin took up his post the historical matters team continued throughout to focus on matters arising from the group litigation including the Historical Scheme. We wouldn't accept that any delay arose as a result of the reinstructing of Historical Matters Scheme which was considered necessary and appropriate to anticipate the needs of this Inquiry. As I say, we've set out the reasons for the delay in our May submissions and I don't repeat them here. Hudgell also flags up the issue of bankruptcy cases. We recognise and agree that bankruptcy cases are extremely complicated and may well take longer to resolve. We are actively working to resolve the challenges posed by such cases, including the issue of the costs of the Official Receiver or Trustee-in-Bankruptcy. In the meantime, Post Office
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	calendar year. You will see that again on page 302. To date 115 applicants have formally engaged the dispute resolution process. 31 of those, 27 per cent, have now reached agreement on the amount of compensation. Good faith meetings have taken place with 47 applicants, escalation meetings with seven applicants, are there are a further 11 good faith meetings scheduled for the coming weeks. On delay there are a couple of particular points raised by other core participants. The first is raised by the National Federation of Subpostmasters who have suggested it would be justifiable, sir, for you to ask whether the non-renewal of a contract of the previous head of historical matters resulted in there being a significant period of time during which no individual was responsible for driving the scheme forward. The position is that the fixed term contract for the previous head of historical matters ended on 23 July 2021. Prior to that, in May 2021, the Government had announced that this Inquiry would be moved on to a statutory footing. As a result, the Chief Executive Officer of Post Office, Mr Read, revised the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Mr Racaldin(?) becoming Historical Matters Director in January 2022. However, in that period during which there was no longer a head of historical matters before Mr Recaldin took up his post the historical matters team continued throughout to focus on matters arising from the group litigation including the Historical Scheme. We wouldn't accept that any delay arose as a result of the reinstructing of Historical Matters Scheme which was considered necessary and appropriate to anticipate the needs of this Inquiry. As I say, we've set out the reasons for the delay in our May submissions and I don't repeat them here. Hudgell also flags up the issue of bankruptcy cases. We recognise and agree that bankruptcy cases are extremely complicated and may well take longer to resolve. We are actively working to resolve the challenges posed by such cases, including the issue of the costs of the Official Receiver or Trustee-in-Bankruptcy. In the meantime, Post Office expects that the first offer will be made to an applicant in a bankruptcy case in the coming weeks.

evidence before you, sir, in the human import hearings. evidence before you, sir, in the human import hearings. if the inquity were to consider it helpful and if Mr Sethi were to consent we would be happy to provide the inquity with a full timeline of the processing of the inquity with a full timeline of the processing of ipust note that his application is one of the particularly complex ones which has raised a number of procedural issues in terms of representation. So for as the request for information that he received shortly before he gave velocities as concerned, request was in no way connected with the fact of his giving evidence. Rather, it reflected than his displacation, had reached the request for further information, that is the practive request for information, more particularly complex ones which has received and the process. Mr Sethi who of consider a not received and the process. The procedural issues in the residence is concerned, the procedural issues in the residence is concerned, the received shortly before he gave velocities as concerned, the received shortly before he gave velocities as concerned, the received shortly before he gave velocities as concerned, the received shortly before he gave velocities as concerned, the received shortly before he gave velocities as processed and the request for information of the gave evidence. Rather, it reflected than his the supplication is not velocities and the request for further information, that is the practice request for information, the received his process. Mr Seth helpfully responded at the end of March of the process. Mr Seth helpfully responded at the end of March of the process. Mr Seth helpfully responded at the end of March of the process. The his context we have been asked to confirm what the scheme in the usual way. Finally, there is a question of tax implication. The scheme in the usual way. The highly as a process of the purpose of the purpos				
If the Inquiry were to consider it helpful and if 3	1	Mr Sethi who of course was the first witness to give	1	provisions we have made for dealing with tax
Mr Sethi were to consent we would be happy to provide the linquiry with a full timeline of the processing of 5 his application. But for dody it may suffice for me 6 his application. But for dody it may suffice for me 7 just to note that his application is one of the 8 particularly complex ones which has raised a number of 8 particularly complex ones which has raised a number of 9 procedural issues in terms of representation. 9 procedural issues in terms of representation. 10 So far as the request for information that he 10 received shortly before begave evidence is concerned. 11 deuting less or more such that he fact of his 12 for the evidence of any doubt, the liming of that 13 request was in no way connected with the fact of his 14 giving evidence. Rather, it reflected that his 15 application had reached the request for further 15 information, that is the proactive request for 16 information, that is the proactive request for 17 information designed to elicit further information, 18 particularly in relation to consequential lisses stage 19 of the process. 20 Mr Sethi highfully responded at the end of March 21 and his responses becurrently being considered under 22 the scheme in the usual way. 23 Finally, there is a question of tax implications. 24 It is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in 25 them not 2400 where the offer is to pey the applicant's 26 ever been enfanced. So the figures that where we have been asked to contimit what 26 ever been enfanced. So the figures that where we have seen of 27 the number of contributions made we say reflects the 28 use from the figures that you have seen of 39 contribution to logal fees towards the making of the 40 suggested by howe & Co. 41 the scheme has been designed to be simple and 41 suggested by howe & Co. 42 This scheme has been designed to be simple and 43 suggested by howe & Co. 44 seed not consider an order made to 45 see order here neglects. That's 46 application is isself unfair or inadequate. That's 47 seed not in our May submissions. That's par	2	evidence before you, sir, in the human impact hearings.	2	implications on certain pecuniary heads of loss. That's
the loquity with a full limeline of the processing of 6 his application. But for today it may suffice for me 6 does not attract tax, but Post Office is obliged to 7 just to note that his application is one of it her 7 deduct tax for the other heads of compensation. It does 8 particularly complex ones which has raised a number of 8 so at the basic rate of 20% in accordance with the 9 procedural issues in terms of representation. 9 Income Tax At 2007 section 874, which as is explained 10 So far as the request for information that he 10 in outcome letters may result in POL. In Post Office, 11 request was in no way connected with the fact of his 13 request was in no way connected with the fact of his 13 polyrogividence. Rather, it reflected that his 14 reguest was in no way connected with the fact of his 13 polyrogividence. Rather, it reflected that his 14 regulated with the fact of his 14 giving ovidence. Rather, it reflected that his 14 regulated with the fact of his 15 application had reached the request for further 15 paid and that they may want to seek independent tax information, that is the proactive request for 16 advice, and the letter also points applicants towards information of the process. 18 his particular issue. In these circumstances, Post 19 office does not consider it necessary or appropriate to offer any indemnity of scheme applications. 19 office does not consider it necessary or appropriate to offer any indemnity of scheme applications. 19 office does not consider it necessary or appropriate to offer any indemnity of scheme applications. 19 office does not consider it necessary or appropriate to offer any indemnity of scheme applications. 19 office does not consider it necessary or appropriate to offer any indemnity of scheme applications. 19 office does not consider it necessary or appropriate to offer any indemnity of scheme applications. 19 office does not consider it necessary or appropriate to them, or £200 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 20 office any indemnity of scheme applica	3	If the Inquiry were to consider it helpful and if	3	
his application. But for roday it may suffice for me 7 just to note that his application is one of the 7 deduct tax for the other heads of compensation. It does 8 particularly complex ones which has raised a number of 8 particularly complex ones which has raised a number of 9 procedural issues in terms of representation. 9 Income Tax Act 2007 section 874, which as is explained 10 So far as the request for information that he 10 in outcome letters may result in POL, in Pozt Offico, 11 received shortly before he gave evidence is concerned, 11 deducting less or more tax than the applicant is 12 tor the evoidance of any doubt, the litring of that 13 request was in no way connected with the fact of his 14 giving evidence. Rather, it reflected that his 14 application had reached the request for further 15 application had reached the request for the fact of his 16 information, that is the proactive request for 17 in application had reached the request for the process. 18 particularly in relation to consequential losses stage 19 of the process. 19 of the process. 19 Office does not consider it necessary or appropriate to 10 office provides for a contribution of tax implications. 21 and his responses are currently being considered under 22 this not raised again in relation to the delay. But in 23 this not raised again in relation to the delay. But in 24 this nortex we have been asked to confirm what 25 Enably, there is a question of fax implications. 26 If is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in 27 aware no request for a contribution for legal advice has 28 ever been refused. So, the figures that you have seen of 29 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicantors 29 applicantor of request received. 20 A For this in applicant to consider an offer made to 21 the mumber of request received. 22 This former is requested for a contribution for legal advice has 24 the number of request received. 25 Enouthly, as I have already identified the Panel 26 application is its	4		4	question 2.
just to note that his application is one of the particularly complex ones which has raised a number of 8 so at the basic rate of 20% in accordance with the procedural issues in terms of representation. So far as the request for information that he 10 in outcome letters may result in POL, in Post Office, received shortly before he gave evidence is concerned, 11 deducting less or more tax than the applicant is request was in no way connected with the fact of his 13 request was in no way connected with the fact of his 13 Post Office notes that it's the applicant's actually liable to pay. Post Office notes that it's the applicant's actually liable to pay. Post Office notes that it's the applicant's actually liable to pay. Post Office notes that it's the applicant's actually liable to pay. Post Office notes that it's the applicant's actually liable to pay. Post Office notes that it's the applicant's actually liable to pay. Post Office notes that it's the applicant's actually liable to pay. Post Office notes that it's the applicant's actually liable to pay. Post Office notes that it's the applicant's actually liable to pay. Post Office notes that it's the applicant's actually liable to pay. Post Office notes that it's the applicant's actually liable to pay. Post Office notes that it's the applicant's actually liable to pay. Post Office adoes not consider in censure the correct amount of tax in particularly in relation to consequential losses stage of the process. Of Mr Sethi helpfully responded at the end of March 20 offer any indemnity for scheme applications. Mr Sethi helpfully responded at the end of March 20 offer any indemnity for scheme applications. Finally, there is a question of fax implications. 23 Finally, there is a question of fax implications. 24 It is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in 24 the scheme in the usual way. By Company the payor that in the payor that the payor that the scheme provides for a contribution or leaped and vice. The application is instituted in a	5	the Inquiry with a full timeline of the processing of	5	
particularly complex ones which has raised a number of 8 procedural issues in terms of representation 9 income Tax Act 2007 section 374, which as is explained in So far as the request for information that he 10 in outcome letters are yet with POL in Post Office, 11 received shortly before he gave evidence is concerned, 11 deducing less or more tax than the applicant is 12 request was in no way connected with the fact of his 13 request was in no way connected with the fact of his 13 request was in no way connected with the fact of his 14 responsibility to ensure the correct arount of fax is 16 application had reached the request for further 15 paid and that they may want to seek independent tax 16 information, that is the proactive request for 16 advice, and the letter also points applicants towards information on consequental losses stage 18 this particular issue. In these circumstances, Post of the process. 19 Office does not consider in the cessary or appropriate to office of any indemnity for scheme applications. 21 and his responses are currently being considered under 21 the scheme in the usual way. 22 question, sri, in relation to independent legal advice. 18 Finally, there is a question of tax implications. 23 It is availability. The inquiry is obvoised will aware 19 finally, and the second properties of the scheme in the usual way. 24 question, sri, in relation to independent legal advice. 19 The third issue, if I may move on to the third this context we have been asked to confirm what 25 E1,200 towards the cost of legal advice for the purpose 70 representation for ingel advice for making the purpose 70 representation for ingel advice for the purpose 70 representation for ingel advice for the purpose 70 representation of the facts of each particular rease including but not the facts of each particular rease including but not the facts of each particular rease including but not the facts of each particular rease including but not the facts of each particular rease including but not the facts of each part	6	his application. But for today it may suffice for me	6	does not attract tax, but Post Office is obliged to
procedural issues in terms of representation. So far as the request for information that he country is a significant of the process of the p	7	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	7	•
So far as the request for information that he received shortly before he gave evidence is concerned, received shortly before he gave evidence is concerned, received shortly before he gave evidence is concerned, request was in no way connected with the fact of his request was in no way connected with the fact of his giving evidence. Rather, it reflected that his plying evidence Rather, it reflected that his plying evidence Rather, it reflected that his plying evidence. Rather, it reflected that his plying evidence. Rather, it reflected that his plying evidence Rather, it reflected that his plying evidence. Rather reflected that his plying evidence. Rather reflected that his p	8	particularly complex ones which has raised a number of	8	so at the basic rate of 20% in accordance with the
received shortly before he gave evidence is concerned, for the avoidance of any doubt, the timing of that for the avoidance of any doubt, the timing of that for the avoidance of any doubt, the timing of that for the avoidance of any doubt, the timing of that for a giving evidence. Rather, it reflected that his formation, that is the proactive request for further finomation, that is the proactive request for finomation, that is the proactive request for finomation, that is the proactive request for finomation designed to elicit further information, for the process. Mr. Sethi helpfully responded at the end of March for the process. Mr. Sethi helpfully responded at the end of March and his responses are currently being considered under for the scheme in the usual way. Finally, there is a question of tax implications. Finally, there is a question of tax implications. Finally, there is a question of tax implications. Finally, there is a question for tax implications. Finally, there is a question for tax implications. Finally in the scheme in the usual way. Finally, there is a question of tax implications. Finally in the scheme in the usual way. Finally there is a question for tax implications. Finally in the scheme in the usual way. Finally there is a question for tax implications. Finally in the scheme in the usual way. Finally there is a question for tax implications. F	9	procedural issues in terms of representation.	9	Income Tax Act 2007 section 874, which as is explained
for the avoidance of any doubt, the timing of that request was in no way connected with the fact of his request was in no way connected with the fact of his ding evidence. Rather, it reflected that his application had reached the request for further information, that is the proactive request for information, that is the proactive request for information designed to eleit further information, particularly in relation to consequential losses stage if the process. Mr Seth helpfully responded at the end of March Mr Seth helpfully responded at the end of the wind wind the mean the scheme applications. It is available title. The hird issue, if I may move on to the third the scheme provides for a contribution count and the scheme Helpfully responded and the end of the wind win the consider march Helpfully responded and the end of the march	10	So far as the request for information that he	10	in outcome letters may result in POL, in Post Office,
request was in no way connected with the fact of his giving evidence. Rather, it reflected that his agining evidence. Rather, it reflected that his advice, and the letter also points applicants towards information, that is the proactive request for information designed to elicit further information, 77 resources they might look to for further information on 78 particularly in relation to consequential losses stage 19 of the process. 19 Office does not consider it necessary or appropriate to 70 offer any indemnity for scheme applications. 20 Mr Sethi helpfully responded at the end of March 21 methic issue, if I may move on to the third 22 the scheme in the usual way. 22 question, sir, in relation to independent legal advice. 31 It's availability. The Inquiry is obviously well aware 42 the scheme in the usual way. 23 Finally, there is a question of tax implications. 23 It's availability. The Inquiry is obviously well aware 44 the scheme provides for a contribution or relation to the delay. But in 25 this context we have been asked to confirm what 26 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 27 ever been refused. So the figures that you have seen of 38 dolaim in full or largely in full. So far as we are 39 dolaim in full or largely in full. So far as we are 30 dolaim in full or largely in full. So far as we are 31 dolaim in full or largely in full. So far as we are 32 dolaim in full or largely in full. So far as we are 33 and case assessors act proactively to obtain further 34 information from applicants where appropriate. 35 ever been refused. So the figures that you have seen of 36 the number of request received. 37 in the full discretion take into account any facts and 38 manu	11	received shortly before he gave evidence is concerned,	11	deducting less or more tax than the applicant is
giving evidence. Rather, it reflected that his application had reached the request for further information, that is the proactive request for information and reached the request for information and reached the request for information designed to elicit further information, information designed to elicit further information, for particularly in relation to consequential losses stage of the process. If this particular issue. In these circumstances, Post of the process. If this particular issue, In these circumstances, Post of the process. If this particular issue, In these circumstances, Post offer any indemnity for scheme applications. If this particular issue, In these circumstances, Post offer any indemnity for scheme applications. If the third issue, if I may move on to the third question, ari, in relation to independent legal advice, and his responses are currently being considered under the scheme in the usul way. Finally, there is a question of tax implications. It's availability. The Inquiry is obviously well aware the scheme in the usul way. Finally, there is a question of tax implications. It's availability. The Inquiry is obviously well aware this context we have been sked to confirm what egy this context we have been sked to confirm what egy them, or £400 whitere the offer is to pay the applicant's eyer been refused. So the figures that you have seen of eyer been refused. So the figures that you have seen of eyer been refused. So the figures that you have seen of eyer been refused. So the figures that you have seen of eyer been refused. So the figures that you have seen of eyer been refused to consider that the absence of any eyer individual popularity in the papelicants in the facts of each particular explicitions, including but not emphasized as well as papilicants the contribution to legal fees towards the making of the explainable legal principles. As we set out in our further note and as Mr Beer explainable legal principles. This scheme has been designed to be simple and explainable to	12	for the avoidance of any doubt, the timing of that	12	actually liable to pay.
application had reached the request for further information, that is the proactive request for information for properties in the scale and information for independent legical advice. It is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in it is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in it is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in it is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in it is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in it is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in it is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in it is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in it is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in it is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in it is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in it is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in it is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in it is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in it is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in it is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in it is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in it is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in it is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in	13	request was in no way connected with the fact of his	13	Post Office notes that it's the applicant's
information, that is the proactive request for information designed to elicif further information, 17 resources they might look to for further information on particularly in relation to consequential losses stage 18 this particular issue. In these circumstances, Post of the process. 19 Office does not consider it necessary or appropriate to of the process. 19 Office does not consider it necessary or appropriate to offer any indemnity for scheme applications. 21 and his responses are currently being considered under 21 The think issue, if I may move on to the third the scheme in the usual way. 22 question, sir, in relation to independent legal advice, 11's availability. The Inquiry is obviously well aware the scheme in the usual way. 22 question, sir, in relation to independent legal advice, 11's availability. The Inquiry is obviously well aware this context we have been asked to confirm what 69 this context we have been asked to confirm what 69 this context we have been asked to confirm what 69 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 2 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 2 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 2 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 2 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 2 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 2 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 2 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 2 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 2 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 2 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 2 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 2 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 2 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 2 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 3 and case assessors act proactively to obtain further aware no request for a contribution for legal advice has 4 information from applicants where appropriate. 4 aware	14	giving evidence. Rather, it reflected that his	14	responsibility to ensure the correct amount of tax is
information designed to elicit further information, particularly in relation to consequential losses stage 18 this particular issue. In these circumstances, Post 19 Office does not consider in tecessary or appropriate to offer any indemnity for scheme applications. Mr Sethi helpfully responded at the end of March 20 offer any indemnity for scheme applications. In the third issue, if I may move on to the third 20 offer any indemnity for scheme applications. The third issue, if I may move on to the third 21 the scheme in the usual way. 22 question, sir, in relation to independent legal advice. It is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in 24 the scheme provides for a contribution currently of 25 this context we have been asked to confirm what 25 £1,200 towards the cost of legal advice for the purpose 69 To 20 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 2 Fourthly, as I have already identified the Panel 2 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 2 Fourthly, as I have already identified the Panel 2 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 2 Fourthly, as I have already identified the Panel 2 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 2 Fourthly, as I have already identified the Panel 2 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 2 Fourthly, as I have already identified the Panel 2 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 2 Fourthly, as I have already identified the Panel 2 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 2 Fourthly, as I have already identified the Panel 3 each 2 information from applicants where appropriate. 10 and the part of request for a contribution for legal advice has 4 information from applicants where appropriate. 11 aware no request for a contribution for legal advice has 4 information from applicants where appropriate. 12 Again, sir, as you are also well aware, the Panel 4 information from applicants where appropriate. 13 Again, sir, as you are also well aware, the Panel 4 informati	15	application had reached the request for further	15	paid and that they may want to seek independent tax
of the process. Mr Sethi helpfully responded at the end of March Mr Sethi helpfully responded at the end of March Mr Sethi helpfully responded at the end of March Mr Sethi helpfully responded at the end of March Mr Sethi helpfully responded at the end of March Mr Sethi helpfully responded at the end of March Mr Sethi helpfully responded at the end of March Mr Sethi helpfully responded at the end of March The third issue, if I may move on to the third the scheme in the usual way. The third issue, if I may move on to the third question, sir, in relation to independent legal advice. It's availability. The Inquiry is obviously well aware this not raised again in relation to the delay. But in this context we have been asked to confirm what 69 To the scheme provides for a contribution currently of the scheme provides for a contribution currently of the scheme. To under the cost of legal advice for the purpose 70 The scheme applicants the responsibility of the purpose 70 The scheme applicants the responsibility of the purpose To under the cost of legal advice for the purpose To under the cost of legal advice for the purpose To under the cost of legal advice for the purpose To under the cost of legal advice for the purpose To under the cost of legal advice for the purpose To under of request for a contribution for legal advice has the number of contribution for legal advice has we do not contribution for legal advice has We do not consider that the absence of any we contribute the contribution of legal fees towards the making of the application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's We do not consider that the absence of any This scheme applicants where has been designed to be simple and Mr be a purpose and advice. This scheme applicants the fore freating, it has also paid The set out in our May submissions. That's paragraph 39 for A swe set out in our further note and as Mr Beer application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's poun note. This contribution to the costs of p	16	information, that is the proactive request for	16	advice, and the letter also points applicants towards
of the process. Mr Sethi helpfully responded at the end of March Mr Sethi helpfully responded at the end of March mathematical the scheme in the usual way. mathematical the scheme provides for a contribution currently of this context we have been asked to confirm what egg. mathematical the scheme provides for a contribution currently of this context we have been asked to confirm what egg. mathematical the scheme provides for a contribution currently of this context we have been asked to confirm what egg. mathematical the scheme provides for a contribution for legal advice has a full discretion take into account any facts and under the number of contributions made we say reflects the fundamental the number of equest received. mathematical the scheme is the facts of each particular case, including but not under the facts of each particular case, including but not under the facts of each particular case, including but not under the facts of each particular case, including but not under the facts of each particular case, including but not under the facts of each particular case, including but not under the facts of each particular case, including but not under the facts of each particular case, including but not under the facts of each particular case, including but not explication is itself unfair or inadequate. That's and particular case including but not under the facts of each particular case, including but not under the facts of each particular case, including but not explication is itself unfair or inadequate. That's and particular case in the offer stage, it has also paid user f	17	information designed to elicit further information,	17	resources they might look to for further information on
and his responses are currently being considered under 21 The third issue, if I may move on to the third 22 the scheme in the usual way. 22 question, sir, in relation to independent legal advice. 23 Finally, there is a question of tax implications. 23 It's availability. The inquiry is obviously well aware 24 It is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in 24 the scheme provides for a contribution currently of 25 this context we have been asked to confirm what 69 To enabling an applicant to consider an offer made to 1 the scheme. 25 E1,200 towards the cost of legal advice for the purpose 69 To of enabling an applicant to consider an offer made to 1 the scheme. 25 Enouthly, as I have already identified the Panel 26 daim in full or largely in full. So far as we are 3 and case assessors act proactively to obtain further aware no request for a contribution for legal advice has 4 information from applicants where appropriate. 26 ever been refused. So the figures that you have seen of 5 Again, sir, as you are also well aware, the Panel 26 the number of contributions made we say reflects the 6 has a full discretion take into account any facts and 7 number of request received. 7 matters which it considers will produce a fair result on 29 contribution to legal fees towards the making of the 9 limited to application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's 10 As we set out in our further note and as Mr Beer 11 suggested by Howe & Co. 11 emphasised as well as paying applicants the contribution 12 This scheme has been designed to be simple and 12 to them receiving a compensation offer in two cases, for 24 your note. 15 example, in relation to the costs of providing medical 15 records in support of a claim for personal injury. 16 seen a number of elements, key elements, of that 18 Office does recognise that there may be some cases in 19 quidance. 29 previous version of Horizon or a breach 21 It is currently considering whether contributions 20 contrary. 20 of duty by Post Office in the absence of evidence to the 22 tow	18	particularly in relation to consequential losses stage	18	this particular issue. In these circumstances, Post
and his responses are currently being considered under the scheme in the usual way. 22 question, sir, in relation to independent legal advice. 23 Finally, there is a question of tax implications. 23 It's availability. The Inquiry is obviously well aware the scheme provides for a contribution currently of this context we have been asked to confirm what 69 £1,200 towards the cost of legal advice for the purpose 70 for a contribution currently of the scheme provides for a contribution currently of 69 £1,200 towards the cost of legal advice for the purpose 70 for the purpose 70 for a contribution for the purpose 70 for the purpose 70 for a claim in full or largely in full. So far as we are 3 and case assessors act proactively to obtain further aware no request for a contribution for legal advice has 4 information from applicants where appropriate. 4 aware no request for a contribution for legal advice has 4 information from applicants where appropriate ever been refused. So the figures that you have seen of 5 Again, sir, as you are also well aware, the Panel 6 the number of contributions made we say reflects the 6 has a full discretion take into account any facts and matters which it considers will produce a fair result on mumber of request received. 7 matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on explication is listed fundir or inadequate. That's 10 As we set out in our further note and as Mr Beer emphasised as well as paying applicants the contribution to legal fees towards the making of the suggested by Howe & Co. 11 emphasized as well as paying applicants the contribution towards legal fees at the offer stage, it has also paid user friendly, to avoid the need to incur such costs, as 13 contributions towards costs incurred by applicants prior 14 set out in our May submissions. That's paragraph 39 for 14 to them receiving a compensation offer in two cases, for example, in relation to the costs of providing medical 19 minuted to user as the Post O	19	of the process.	19	Office does not consider it necessary or appropriate to
the scheme in the usual way. Finally, there is a question of tax implications. It is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in 24 the scheme provides for a contribution currently of 25 this context we have been asked to confirm what 69 £1,200 towards the cost of legal advice for the purpose 70 the scheme provides for a contribution currently of 25 £1,200 towards the cost of legal advice for the purpose 70 the scheme. It is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in 24 the scheme provides for a contribution currently of 25 £1,200 towards the cost of legal advice for the purpose 70 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 2 Fourthly, as I have already identified the Panel 3 claim in full or largely in full. So far as we are 3 and case assessors act proactively to obtain further 4 aware no request for a contribution for legal advice has 4 information from applicants where appropriate. Sever been refused. So the figures that you have seen of 5 Again, sir, as you are also well aware, the Panel 4 the number of contributions made we say reflects the 6 has a full discretion take into account any facts and number of request received. 7 matters which it considers will produce a fair result on 4 the facts of each particular case, including but not 1 the facts of each particular case, including but not 1 the facts of each particular case, including but not 1 the facts of each particular case, including but not 1 the facts of each particular case, including but not 1 the facts of each particular case, including but not 1 the facts of each particular case, including but not 1 the facts of each particular case, including but not 1 the facts of each particular case, including but not 1 the facts of each particular case, including but not 1 the facts of each particular case, including but not 1 the facts of each particular case, including but not 1 the facts of each particular case, including but not 1 the facts of each particular case, including but not 1 the facts of each particular case, inc	20	Mr Sethi helpfully responded at the end of March		offer any indemnity for scheme applications.
Finally, there is a question of tax implications. It is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in 24 the scheme provides for a contribution currently of this context we have been asked to confirm what 69 £1,200 towards the cost of legal advice for the purpose 70 fenabling an applicant to consider an offer made to 1 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 2 Fourthly, as I have already identified the Panel adam in full or largely in full. So far as we are 3 and case assessors act proactively to obtain further information from applicants where appropriate. 4 aware no request for a contribution for legal advice has 4 information from applicants where appropriate. 5 ever been refused. So the figures that you have seen of 5 Again, sir, as you are also well aware, the Panel 6 the number of contributions made we say reflects the 6 has a full discretion take into account any facts and 7 number of request received. 7 matters which it considers will produce a fair result on 8 We do not consider that the absence of any 8 infinited to application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's 10 As we set out in our further note and as Mr Beer 11 suggested by Howe & Co. 11 emphasised as well as paying applicants the contribution 22 This scheme has been designed to be simple and 12 towards legal fees at the offer stage, it has also paid 13 user friendly, to avoid the need to incur such costs, as 13 contributions to the costs of providing medical 14 records in support of a claim for personal injury. 2 assist them in preparing an application. Sir, you have 15 example, in relation to the costs of providing medical 16 In short, guidance is available to postmasters to 16 records in support of a claim for personal injury. 3 assist them in preparing an application. Sir, you have 17 So far as the Post Office phase is concerned, Post 19 guidance. 19 Griffice has agreed not to take any 24 towards further legal or other professional costs can be contrary. 23 made available to applicants to help resolve their claim. 24	21		21	•
this context we have been asked to confirm what 69 1 of enabling an applicant to consider an offer made to 1 the scheme. 1 of enabling an applicant to consider an offer made to 1 them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's 2 claim in full or largely in full. So far as we are 3 claim in full or largely in full. So far as we are 4 aware no request for a contribution for legal advice has 5 ever been refused. So the figures that you have seen of 6 the number of contributions made we say reflects the 6 the number of crequest received. 7 matters which it considers will produce a fair result on 8 We do not consider that the absence of any 9 contribution to legal fees towards the making of the 9 application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's 10 As we set out in our further note and as Mr Beer 11 suggested by Howe & Co. 11 emphasised as well as paying applicants the contribution 12 This scheme has been designed to be simple and 13 user friendly, to avoid the need to incur such costs, as 14 set out in our May submissions. That's paragraph 39 for 15 your note. 16 In short, guidance is available to postmasters to 16 In short, guidance is available to postmasters to 17 assist them in preparing an application. Sir, you have 18 seen a number of elements, key elements, of that 19 guidance. 20 Secondly, there is a presumption that a shortfall 21 was caused by a previous version of Horizon or a breach 22 folduly by Post Office has agreed not to take any 24 claims. We will obviously update the linquiry as soon as	22	the scheme in the usual way.	22	question, sir, in relation to independent legal advice.
this context we have been asked to confirm what 69	23	Finally, there is a question of tax implications.	23	It's availability. The Inquiry is obviously well aware
of enabling an applicant to consider an offer made to them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's claim in full or largely in full. So far as we are diam full or largely in full. So far as we are diam full or largely in full. So far as we are diam full or largely in full. So far as we are diam full or largely in full. So far as we are diam full or largely in full. So far as we are diam full or largely in full. So far as we are diam full or largely in full. So far as we are diam full or largely in full. So far as we are diam full or largely in full. So far as we are diam full or largely in full. So far as we are diam full or largely in full. So far as we are diam full or largely in full. So far as we are diam full or largely in full. So far as we are diam full or largely in full. So far as we are diam full or largely in full. So far as we are diam full or largely in full. So far as several endeaving which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair	24	It is not raised again in relation to the delay. But in	24	the scheme provides for a contribution currently of
of enabling an applicant to consider an offer made to them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's claim in full or largely in full. So far as we are diam in full or largely in full. So far as we are diam in full or largely in full. So far as we are diam in full or largely in full. So far as we are diam in full or largely in full. So far as we are diam in full or largely in full. So far as we are diam in full or largely in full. So far as we are diam in full or largely in full. So far as we are diam in full or largely in full. So far as we are diam and case assessors act proactively to obtain further diam and case assessors act proactively to obtain the palo well assessor act post off informa	25		25	
them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's claim in full or largely in full. So far as we are 3 and case assessors act proactively to obtain further aware no request for a contribution for legal advice has ever been refused. So the figures that you have seen of the number of contributions made we say reflects the number of request received. We do not consider that the absence of any contribution to legal fees towards the making of the application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's set out in our May submissions. That's paragraph 39 for your note. In short, guidance is available to postmasters to seen a number of elements, key elements, of that seen a number of elements, key elements, of that was caused by a previous version of Horizon or a breach Thirdly, Post Office has agreed not to take any 2 Fourthly, as I have already identified the Panel and case assessors act proactively to obtain further information from applicants where appropriate. A gain, sir, as you are also well aware, the Panel has a full discretion take into account any facts and has a full discretion take into account any facts and matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a f		99		70
them, or £400 where the offer is to pay the applicant's claim in full or largely in full. So far as we are 3 and case assessors act proactively to obtain further aware no request for a contribution for legal advice has ever been refused. So the figures that you have seen of the number of contributions made we say reflects the number of request received. We do not consider that the absence of any contribution to legal fees towards the making of the application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's set out in our May submissions. That's paragraph 39 for your note. In short, guidance is available to postmasters to seen a number of elements, key elements, of that seen a number of elements, key elements, of that was caused by a previous version of Horizon or a breach Thirdly, Post Office has agreed not to take any 2 Fourthly, as I have already identified the Panel and case assessors act proactively to obtain further information from applicants where appropriate. A gain, sir, as you are also well aware, the Panel has a full discretion take into account any facts and has a full discretion take into account any facts and matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a fair result on matters which it considers will produce a f	1	of enabling an applicant to consider an offer made to	1	the scheme
claim in full or largely in full. So far as we are 3 and case assessors act proactively to obtain further 4 aware no request for a contribution for legal advice has 5 ever been refused. So the figures that you have seen of 6 the number of contributions made we say reflects the 6 has a full discretion take into account any facts and 7 number of request received. 7 matters which it considers will produce a fair result on 8 We do not consider that the absence of any 9 contribution to legal fees towards the making of the 9 limited to applicable legal principles. 10 application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's 10 As we set out in our further note and as Mr Beer 11 suggested by Howe & Co. 11 emphasised as well as paying applicants the contribution 12 This scheme has been designed to be simple and 13 user friendly, to avoid the need to incur such costs, as 13 contributions towards costs incurred by applicants prior 14 set out in our May submissions. That's paragraph 39 for 15 your note. 16 In short, guidance is available to postmasters to 16 records in support of a claim for personal injury. 17 assist them in preparing an application. Sir, you have 18 seen a number of elements, key elements, of that 19 guidance. 20 Secondly, there is a presumption that a shortfall 21 was caused by a previous version of Horizon or a breach 22 of duty by Post Office in the absence of evidence to the 23 contrary. 24 Thirdly, Post Office has agreed not to take any 24 claims. We will obviously update the Inquiry as soon as				
aware no request for a contribution for legal advice has ever been refused. So the figures that you have seen of the number of contributions made we say reflects the the number of request received. We do not consider that the absence of any to contribution to legal fees towards the making of the application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's This scheme has been designed to be simple and user friendly, to avoid the need to incur such costs, as set out in our May submissions. That's paragraph 39 for your note. In short, guidance is available to postmasters to seen a number of elements, key elements, of that guidance. This or, you have Secondly, there is a presumption that a shortfall was caused by a previous version of Horizon or a breach of this paragraph to to take any information from applicants where appropriate. Again, sir, as you are also well awave, the Panel has a full discretion take into account any facts and has a full discretion take into account any facts and has a full discretion take into account any facts and has a full discretion take into account any facts and has a full discretion take into account any facts and has a full discretion take into account any facts and has a full discretion take into account any facts and has a full discretion take into account any facts and has a full discretion take into account any facts and has a full discretion take into account any facts and has a full discretion take into account any facts and has a full discretion take into account any facts and has a full discretion take into account any facts and has a full discretion take into account any facts and has a full discretion take into account any facts and has a full discretion take into account any facts and has a full discretion take into account any facts and has a full discretion take into account any facts and has a full discretion take into account any facts and has a full discretion the casc pull disc. Again, sir, as you are also and the fact				•
ever been refused. So the figures that you have seen of the number of contributions made we say reflects the the number of contributions made we say reflects the number of request received. Need on the number of request received. We do not consider that the absence of any the facts of each particular case, including but not the facts of each particular case, including but not the facts of each particular case, including but not the facts of each particular case, including but not the facts of each particular case, including but not the facts of each particular case, including but not the facts of each particular case, including but not the facts of each particular case, including but not the facts of each particular case, including but not the facts of each particular case, including but not the facts of each particular case, including but not the facts of each particular case, including but not the facts of each particular case, including but not the facts of each particular case, including but not the facts of each particular case, including but not the facts of each particular case, including but not the casts of each particular case, including but not the facts of each particular case, including but not the facts of each particular case, including but not death and it is particular case, including but not facts and full discretion take into account any facts and individual applicant to the cost of a fair result on illumination or a breach o				·
the number of contributions made we say reflects the number of request received. We do not consider that the absence of any supplication is itself unfair or inadequate. That's principles to application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's principles to application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's principles to application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's principles to application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's principles to application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's principles to application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's principles to application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's principles to application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's principles to application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's principles to application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's principles to application or application or inadequate. That's principles to application or applicat				**
number of request received. We do not consider that the absence of any contribution to legal fees towards the making of the application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's application is distered as well as paying applicants in contributions application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's application is distered as well as paying applicants in the contribution of the professional costs on be application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's application		•		
We do not consider that the absence of any contribution to legal fees towards the making of the application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's application is used out in our further note and as Mr Beer emphasised as well as paying applicants the contribution to wards legal fees at the offer stage, it has also paid user friendly, to avoid the need to incur such costs, as and user friendly, to avoid the need to incur such costs, as and user friendly, to avoid the need to incur such costs, as and user friendly, to avoid the need to incur such costs, as and user friendly, to avoid the need to incur such costs, as and user friendly, to avoid the need to incur such costs, as and user friendly, to avoid the need to incur such costs, as and user friendly, to avoid the need to incur such costs, as and user friendly, to avoid the need to incur such costs, as and contributions towards legal fees at the offer stage, it has also paid to wards legal fees at the offer stage, it has also paid to wards legal fees at the offer stage, it has also paid to wards legal fees at the offer stage, it has also paid to contribution to the costs of providing medical to the cost of user friendly, post office in two assignments and the offer stage, it has also paid to wards legal fees at the offer stage, it has also paid to the method as well as paying applicants to the contribution of the marks also paid as well as paying applicants in the contribution of the friendly. Post Office in the absence of evidence to the applicants to feel of unit in two them receiving as well as paying applicants in the contribution of the friendly as well avoid as the friendly as well as paying applicants in		•		•
contribution to legal fees towards the making of the application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's 10 As we set out in our further note and as Mr Beer suggested by Howe & Co. 11 emphasised as well as paying applicants the contribution This scheme has been designed to be simple and 12 towards legal fees at the offer stage, it has also paid user friendly, to avoid the need to incur such costs, as 13 contributions towards costs incurred by applicants prior set out in our May submissions. That's paragraph 39 for 14 to them receiving a compensation offer in two cases, for your note. 15 example, in relation to the costs of providing medical In short, guidance is available to postmasters to 16 records in support of a claim for personal injury. 17 So far as the Post Office phase is concerned, Post seen a number of elements, key elements, of that 18 Office does recognise that there may be some cases in guidance. 19 which the current provision may be insufficient to Secondly, there is a presumption that a shortfall 20 support an individual applicant to resolve their claim. 19 Was caused by a previous version of Horizon or a breach 21 It is currently considering whether contributions 22 of duty by Post Office in the absence of evidence to the 22 towards further legal or other professional costs can be 23 contrary. 23 made available to applicants to help resolve their 24 Claims. We will obviously update the Inquiry as soon as		·		
application is itself unfair or inadequate. That's 10 As we set out in our further note and as Mr Beer 11 suggested by Howe & Co. 12 This scheme has been designed to be simple and 13 user friendly, to avoid the need to incur such costs, as 13 contributions towards costs incurred by applicants prior 14 set out in our May submissions. That's paragraph 39 for 15 your note. 16 In short, guidance is available to postmasters to 16 lessen a number of elements, key elements, of that 17 So far as the Post Office phase is concerned, Post 18 seen a number of elements, key elements, of that 19 guidance. 19 which the current provision may be insufficient to 20 Secondly, there is a presumption that a shortfall 21 was caused by a previous version of Horizon or a breach 22 of duty by Post Office in the absence of evidence to the 23 contrary. 24 Thirdly, Post Office has agreed not to take any 24 claims. We will obviously update the Inquiry as soon as		•		•
11 suggested by Howe & Co. 12 This scheme has been designed to be simple and 13 user friendly, to avoid the need to incur such costs, as 13 contributions towards costs incurred by applicants prior 14 set out in our May submissions. That's paragraph 39 for 15 your note. 16 In short, guidance is available to postmasters to 16 lessen a number of elements, key elements, of that 17 seen a number of elements, key elements, of that 18 office does recognise that there may be some cases in 19 guidance. 19 which the current provision may be insufficient to 20 Secondly, there is a presumption that a shortfall 21 was caused by a previous version of Horizon or a breach 22 of duty by Post Office in the absence of evidence to the 23 contrary. 24 Thirdly, Post Office has agreed not to take any 24 claims. We will obviously update the Inquiry as soon as		•		
This scheme has been designed to be simple and user friendly, to avoid the need to incur such costs, as 13 contributions towards costs incurred by applicants prior 14 set out in our May submissions. That's paragraph 39 for 15 your note. 16 In short, guidance is available to postmasters to 16 lesen a number of elements, key elements, of that 18 seen a number of elements, key elements, of that 19 guidance. 19 which the current provision may be insufficient to 20 Secondly, there is a presumption that a shortfall 21 was caused by a previous version of Horizon or a breach 22 of duty by Post Office in the absence of evidence to the 23 contrary. 24 Thirdly, Post Office has agreed not to take any 24 claims. We will obviously update the Inquiry as soon as				
user friendly, to avoid the need to incur such costs, as 13 contributions towards costs incurred by applicants prior 14 set out in our May submissions. That's paragraph 39 for 15 your note. 15 example, in relation to the costs of providing medical 16 In short, guidance is available to postmasters to 16 records in support of a claim for personal injury. 17 assist them in preparing an application. Sir, you have 18 seen a number of elements, key elements, of that 18 Office does recognise that there may be some cases in 19 guidance. 19 which the current provision may be insufficient to 20 Secondly, there is a presumption that a shortfall 20 support an individual applicant to resolve their claim. 21 was caused by a previous version of Horizon or a breach 22 of duty by Post Office in the absence of evidence to the 23 contrary. 24 Thirdly, Post Office has agreed not to take any 25 contrary. Verified by applicants prior 16 to them receiving a compensation offer in two cases, for 17 to them receiving a compensation offer in two cases, for 18 example, in relation to the costs of providing medical 19 records in support of a claim for personal injury. So far as the Post Office phase is concerned, Post 20 Secondly, there is a presumption that a shortfall 20 support an individual applicant to resolve their claim. 21 It is currently considering whether contributions 22 towards further legal or other professional costs can be 23 made available to applicants to help resolve their 24 Claims. We will obviously update the Inquiry as soon as				
set out in our May submissions. That's paragraph 39 for your note. 15 your note. 16 In short, guidance is available to postmasters to 16 records in support of a claim for personal injury. 17 assist them in preparing an application. Sir, you have 17 So far as the Post Office phase is concerned, Post 18 seen a number of elements, key elements, of that 18 Office does recognise that there may be some cases in 19 guidance. 19 which the current provision may be insufficient to 19 Secondly, there is a presumption that a shortfall 20 support an individual applicant to resolve their claim. 19 Was caused by a previous version of Horizon or a breach 21 It is currently considering whether contributions 19 of duty by Post Office in the absence of evidence to the 20 towards further legal or other professional costs can be 19 made available to applicants to help resolve their 19 claims. 19 We will obviously update the Inquiry as soon as 19 claims. We will obviously update the Inquiry as soon as 19 claims. We will obviously update the Inquiry as soon as 19 claims. 19 claims 19 claims 19 claims 19 claims 20 claims. 19 claims 20 clai				
your note. 15 example, in relation to the costs of providing medical 16 In short, guidance is available to postmasters to 16 records in support of a claim for personal injury. 17 assist them in preparing an application. Sir, you have 18 seen a number of elements, key elements, of that 18 Office does recognise that there may be some cases in 19 guidance. 19 which the current provision may be insufficient to 20 Secondly, there is a presumption that a shortfall 20 support an individual applicant to resolve their claim. 21 was caused by a previous version of Horizon or a breach 22 of duty by Post Office in the absence of evidence to the 23 contrary. 24 Thirdly, Post Office has agreed not to take any 25 example, in relation to the costs of providing medical 26 records in support of a claim for personal injury. 28 So far as the Post Office phase is concerned, Post 29 Office does recognise that there may be some cases in 20 under the current provision may be insufficient to 20 support an individual applicant to resolve their claim. 21 tis currently considering whether contributions 22 towards further legal or other professional costs can be 23 contrary. 24 Claims. We will obviously update the Inquiry as soon as		-		
In short, guidance is available to postmasters to 16 records in support of a claim for personal injury. 17 assist them in preparing an application. Sir, you have 17 So far as the Post Office phase is concerned, Post 18 seen a number of elements, key elements, of that 18 Office does recognise that there may be some cases in 19 guidance. 19 which the current provision may be insufficient to 20 Secondly, there is a presumption that a shortfall 20 support an individual applicant to resolve their claim. 21 was caused by a previous version of Horizon or a breach 22 of duty by Post Office in the absence of evidence to the 23 contrary. 24 Thirdly, Post Office has agreed not to take any 25 records in support of a claim for personal injury. 26 So far as the Post Office phase is concerned, Post 27 Office does recognise that there may be some cases in 28 upon the current provision may be insufficient to 29 support an individual applicant to resolve their claim. 20 support an individual applicant to resolve their claim. 21 tis currently considering whether contributions 22 towards further legal or other professional costs can be 29 contrary. 20 made available to applicants to help resolve their 20 claims. We will obviously update the Inquiry as soon as				
assist them in preparing an application. Sir, you have 17 So far as the Post Office phase is concerned, Post seen a number of elements, key elements, of that 18 Office does recognise that there may be some cases in guidance. 19 which the current provision may be insufficient to support an individual applicant to resolve their claim. 20 support an individual applicant to resolve their claim. 21 was caused by a previous version of Horizon or a breach 21 It is currently considering whether contributions of duty by Post Office in the absence of evidence to the 22 towards further legal or other professional costs can be contrary. 23 made available to applicants to help resolve their 24 Thirdly, Post Office has agreed not to take any 24 claims. We will obviously update the Inquiry as soon as		•		
seen a number of elements, key elements, of that 18 Office does recognise that there may be some cases in 19 guidance. 19 which the current provision may be insufficient to 20 Secondly, there is a presumption that a shortfall 20 support an individual applicant to resolve their claim. 21 was caused by a previous version of Horizon or a breach 22 of duty by Post Office in the absence of evidence to the 23 contrary. 24 towards further legal or other professional costs can be 25 made available to applicants to help resolve their 26 claims. We will obviously update the Inquiry as soon as		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
guidance. 19 which the current provision may be insufficient to support an individual applicant to resolve their claim. 20 Secondly, there is a presumption that a shortfall 20 support an individual applicant to resolve their claim. 21 was caused by a previous version of Horizon or a breach 21 It is currently considering whether contributions 22 of duty by Post Office in the absence of evidence to the 22 towards further legal or other professional costs can be 23 contrary. 23 made available to applicants to help resolve their 24 Thirdly, Post Office has agreed not to take any 24 claims. We will obviously update the Inquiry as soon as				·
Secondly, there is a presumption that a shortfall 20 support an individual applicant to resolve their claim. Was caused by a previous version of Horizon or a breach 21 It is currently considering whether contributions of duty by Post Office in the absence of evidence to the 22 towards further legal or other professional costs can be 23 contrary. 23 made available to applicants to help resolve their 24 Thirdly, Post Office has agreed not to take any 24 claims. We will obviously update the Inquiry as soon as				,
21 was caused by a previous version of Horizon or a breach 22 of duty by Post Office in the absence of evidence to the 23 contrary. 24 Thirdly, Post Office has agreed not to take any 25 It is currently considering whether contributions 26 towards further legal or other professional costs can be 27 made available to applicants to help resolve their 28 claims. We will obviously update the Inquiry as soon as				
22 of duty by Post Office in the absence of evidence to the 22 towards further legal or other professional costs can be 23 contrary. 23 made available to applicants to help resolve their 24 Thirdly, Post Office has agreed not to take any 24 claims. We will obviously update the Inquiry as soon as				
contrary. 23 made available to applicants to help resolve their Thirdly, Post Office has agreed not to take any 24 claims. We will obviously update the Inquiry as soon as				
Thirdly, Post Office has agreed not to take any 24 claims. We will obviously update the Inquiry as soon as				
		•		**
25 irritation defence in relation to claims prought under 25 a decision has been reached on this issue.	25	limitation defence in relation to claims brought under	25	a decision has been reached on this issue.
71 72				

1	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I mean, the impression I get and I do not	1	to accepting offers under the scheme. It is suggested
2	want to say this in any flippant sense, but many of the	2	it is instructive to examine the level of offer or award
3	offers which have been made and accepted are	3	made to unrepresented applicants as opposed to
4	comparatively easy to resolve. One is now getting to	4	represented applicants.
5	the stage where there are likely to be much more	5	The position as at midnight yesterday is 1,300
6	significant difficulties in resolving the applications.	6	applicants have accepted settlement offers. Of those,
7	MS GALLAFENT: Yes, and for the reasons we set out in the	7	two applicants had legal representation. 92 applicants
8	May submissions that was because of the approach adopted	8	have rejected settlement offers and of those 13
9	to the scheme by dealing with what we would characterise	9	applicants had legal representation. Can I put some
10	as low value claims, and those were the ones that were	10	context on those statistics by virtue of the question of
11	dealt with first. So the low value claim is a claim for	11	low value claims, sir, that I was just alluding to.
12	a shortfall up to £8,000, in some cases a claim for	12	Of the 1,300 accepted offers, just over half of
13	distress and inconvenience, but not all, but not for any	13	them, 678 for precision, were claims for shortfalls up
14	other form of consequential loss.	14	to £8,000 and no consequential loss, so potentially for
15	So those block of cases were, I would entirely	15	distress and inconvenience.
16	agree, sir, they were on their face simpler to resolve	16	Of the 92 rejected offers ten of them were those
17	because of the presumption in relation to shortfall and	17	types of claims, what we have characterised as lower
18	because of there being no issue in relation to	18	value claims. So, sir, you anticipate entirely
19	consequential loss apart from distress and	19	correctly, which is there are more as it were rejected
20	inconvenience.	20	offers where it is not a lower value claim
21	It may assist, sir, if I then deal perhaps with	21	proportionately but there are roughly half and half when
22	the statistics, because Howe & Co also suggested that we	22	it comes to acceptance of offers.
23	should provide you, sir, with the percentage of	23	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Sorry, can you repeat that? Of the 92
24	applicants who were and were not represented at the time	24	rejected, on the [draft] transcript in front of me, the
25	of the application, and the same percentages in relation	25	number has not come up after that.
20	73	20	74
1	MC CALLACENT: Top of them were lower value claims. Thete	1	imported by the time processory to fully access their
1	MS GALLAFENT: Ten of them were lower value claims. That's	1	impacted by the time necessary to fully assess their
2	my lack of articulacy, I apologise. I'm standing too	2	claim and make a fair offer. To date, 28 such payments
2	my lack of articulacy, I apologise. I'm standing too far away from the microphone, ten.	2	claim and make a fair offer. To date, 28 such payments have been made, that includes circumstances of severe
2 3 4	my lack of articulacy, I apologise. I'm standing too far away from the microphone, ten. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm busily writing a note, even though	2 3 4	claim and make a fair offer. To date, 28 such payments have been made, that includes circumstances of severe financial hardship, terminal illness, risk of personal
2 3 4 5	my lack of articulacy, I apologise. I'm standing too far away from the microphone, ten. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm busily writing a note, even though I have a contemporaneous transcript. It's the habit of	2 3 4 5	claim and make a fair offer. To date, 28 such payments have been made, that includes circumstances of severe financial hardship, terminal illness, risk of personal hardship, and old age, where concerns have been raised
2 3 4 5 6	my lack of articulacy, I apologise. I'm standing too far away from the microphone, ten. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm busily writing a note, even though I have a contemporaneous transcript. It's the habit of a lifetime.	2 3 4 5 6	claim and make a fair offer. To date, 28 such payments have been made, that includes circumstances of severe financial hardship, terminal illness, risk of personal hardship, and old age, where concerns have been raised about the impact of the speed of progress on the
2 3 4 5 6 7	my lack of articulacy, I apologise. I'm standing too far away from the microphone, ten. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm busily writing a note, even though I have a contemporaneous transcript. It's the habit of a lifetime. MS GALLIFANT: It is, it is. I'm grateful, thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7	claim and make a fair offer. To date, 28 such payments have been made, that includes circumstances of severe financial hardship, terminal illness, risk of personal hardship, and old age, where concerns have been raised about the impact of the speed of progress on the applicant. Some of those concerns have been raised by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	my lack of articulacy, I apologise. I'm standing too far away from the microphone, ten. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm busily writing a note, even though I have a contemporaneous transcript. It's the habit of a lifetime. MS GALLIFANT: It is, it is. I'm grateful, thank you. I hope that provides some context in which the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	claim and make a fair offer. To date, 28 such payments have been made, that includes circumstances of severe financial hardship, terminal illness, risk of personal hardship, and old age, where concerns have been raised about the impact of the speed of progress on the applicant. Some of those concerns have been raised by the applicant. Others have been raised within Post
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	my lack of articulacy, I apologise. I'm standing too far away from the microphone, ten. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm busily writing a note, even though I have a contemporaneous transcript. It's the habit of a lifetime. MS GALLIFANT: It is, it is. I'm grateful, thank you. I hope that provides some context in which the otherwise quite bald figures of representatives being on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	claim and make a fair offer. To date, 28 such payments have been made, that includes circumstances of severe financial hardship, terminal illness, risk of personal hardship, and old age, where concerns have been raised about the impact of the speed of progress on the applicant. Some of those concerns have been raised by the applicant. Others have been raised within Post Office and a proposal for an interim payment made on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	my lack of articulacy, I apologise. I'm standing too far away from the microphone, ten. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm busily writing a note, even though I have a contemporaneous transcript. It's the habit of a lifetime. MS GALLIFANT: It is, it is. I'm grateful, thank you. I hope that provides some context in which the otherwise quite bald figures of representatives being on record and contributions being made, as to why perhaps	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	claim and make a fair offer. To date, 28 such payments have been made, that includes circumstances of severe financial hardship, terminal illness, risk of personal hardship, and old age, where concerns have been raised about the impact of the speed of progress on the applicant. Some of those concerns have been raised by the applicant. Others have been raised within Post Office and a proposal for an interim payment made on Post Office's recommendation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	my lack of articulacy, I apologise. I'm standing too far away from the microphone, ten. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm busily writing a note, even though I have a contemporaneous transcript. It's the habit of a lifetime. MS GALLIFANT: It is, it is. I'm grateful, thank you. I hope that provides some context in which the otherwise quite bald figures of representatives being on record and contributions being made, as to why perhaps those figures are not quite so straightforwardly an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	claim and make a fair offer. To date, 28 such payments have been made, that includes circumstances of severe financial hardship, terminal illness, risk of personal hardship, and old age, where concerns have been raised about the impact of the speed of progress on the applicant. Some of those concerns have been raised by the applicant. Others have been raised within Post Office and a proposal for an interim payment made on Post Office's recommendation. Where such appointments are made, it is expressly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	my lack of articulacy, I apologise. I'm standing too far away from the microphone, ten. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm busily writing a note, even though I have a contemporaneous transcript. It's the habit of a lifetime. MS GALLIFANT: It is, it is. I'm grateful, thank you. I hope that provides some context in which the otherwise quite bald figures of representatives being on record and contributions being made, as to why perhaps those figures are not quite so straightforwardly an indication there has been any form of inadequacy when it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	claim and make a fair offer. To date, 28 such payments have been made, that includes circumstances of severe financial hardship, terminal illness, risk of personal hardship, and old age, where concerns have been raised about the impact of the speed of progress on the applicant. Some of those concerns have been raised by the applicant. Others have been raised within Post Office and a proposal for an interim payment made on Post Office's recommendation. Where such appointments are made, it is expressly explained to the applicants that they would not need to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	my lack of articulacy, I apologise. I'm standing too far away from the microphone, ten. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm busily writing a note, even though I have a contemporaneous transcript. It's the habit of a lifetime. MS GALLIFANT: It is, it is. I'm grateful, thank you. I hope that provides some context in which the otherwise quite bald figures of representatives being on record and contributions being made, as to why perhaps those figures are not quite so straightforwardly an indication there has been any form of inadequacy when it comes to legal costs at the point of offer.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	claim and make a fair offer. To date, 28 such payments have been made, that includes circumstances of severe financial hardship, terminal illness, risk of personal hardship, and old age, where concerns have been raised about the impact of the speed of progress on the applicant. Some of those concerns have been raised by the applicant. Others have been raised within Post Office and a proposal for an interim payment made on Post Office's recommendation. Where such appointments are made, it is expressly explained to the applicants that they would not need to repay any of the interim payment in the event that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	my lack of articulacy, I apologise. I'm standing too far away from the microphone, ten. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm busily writing a note, even though I have a contemporaneous transcript. It's the habit of a lifetime. MS GALLIFANT: It is, it is. I'm grateful, thank you. I hope that provides some context in which the otherwise quite bald figures of representatives being on record and contributions being made, as to why perhaps those figures are not quite so straightforwardly an indication there has been any form of inadequacy when it comes to legal costs at the point of offer. Can I move to question 4, which is interim	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	claim and make a fair offer. To date, 28 such payments have been made, that includes circumstances of severe financial hardship, terminal illness, risk of personal hardship, and old age, where concerns have been raised about the impact of the speed of progress on the applicant. Some of those concerns have been raised by the applicant. Others have been raised within Post Office and a proposal for an interim payment made on Post Office's recommendation. Where such appointments are made, it is expressly explained to the applicants that they would not need to repay any of the interim payment in the event that the final offer is made for less, or that accepting an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	my lack of articulacy, I apologise. I'm standing too far away from the microphone, ten. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm busily writing a note, even though I have a contemporaneous transcript. It's the habit of a lifetime. MS GALLIFANT: It is, it is. I'm grateful, thank you. I hope that provides some context in which the otherwise quite bald figures of representatives being on record and contributions being made, as to why perhaps those figures are not quite so straightforwardly an indication there has been any form of inadequacy when it comes to legal costs at the point of offer. Can I move to question 4, which is interim payments. It's been suggested by Howe & Co that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	claim and make a fair offer. To date, 28 such payments have been made, that includes circumstances of severe financial hardship, terminal illness, risk of personal hardship, and old age, where concerns have been raised about the impact of the speed of progress on the applicant. Some of those concerns have been raised by the applicant. Others have been raised within Post Office and a proposal for an interim payment made on Post Office's recommendation. Where such appointments are made, it is expressly explained to the applicants that they would not need to repay any of the interim payment in the event that the final offer is made for less, or that accepting an interim payment would in anyway adversely impact their
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	my lack of articulacy, I apologise. I'm standing too far away from the microphone, ten. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm busily writing a note, even though I have a contemporaneous transcript. It's the habit of a lifetime. MS GALLIFANT: It is, it is. I'm grateful, thank you. I hope that provides some context in which the otherwise quite bald figures of representatives being on record and contributions being made, as to why perhaps those figures are not quite so straightforwardly an indication there has been any form of inadequacy when it comes to legal costs at the point of offer. Can I move to question 4, which is interim payments. It's been suggested by Howe & Co that the scheme should make provision for interim payments in all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	claim and make a fair offer. To date, 28 such payments have been made, that includes circumstances of severe financial hardship, terminal illness, risk of personal hardship, and old age, where concerns have been raised about the impact of the speed of progress on the applicant. Some of those concerns have been raised by the applicant. Others have been raised within Post Office and a proposal for an interim payment made on Post Office's recommendation. Where such appointments are made, it is expressly explained to the applicants that they would not need to repay any of the interim payment in the event that the final offer is made for less, or that accepting an interim payment would in anyway adversely impact their claim. It wouldn't.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	my lack of articulacy, I apologise. I'm standing too far away from the microphone, ten. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm busily writing a note, even though I have a contemporaneous transcript. It's the habit of a lifetime. MS GALLIFANT: It is, it is. I'm grateful, thank you. I hope that provides some context in which the otherwise quite bald figures of representatives being on record and contributions being made, as to why perhaps those figures are not quite so straightforwardly an indication there has been any form of inadequacy when it comes to legal costs at the point of offer. Can I move to question 4, which is interim payments. It's been suggested by Howe & Co that the scheme should make provision for interim payments in all cases, and it's unacceptable for Post Office to be able	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	claim and make a fair offer. To date, 28 such payments have been made, that includes circumstances of severe financial hardship, terminal illness, risk of personal hardship, and old age, where concerns have been raised about the impact of the speed of progress on the applicant. Some of those concerns have been raised by the applicant. Others have been raised within Post Office and a proposal for an interim payment made on Post Office's recommendation. Where such appointments are made, it is expressly explained to the applicants that they would not need to repay any of the interim payment in the event that the final offer is made for less, or that accepting an interim payment would in anyway adversely impact their claim. It wouldn't. So far as the position post offer is concerned,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	my lack of articulacy, I apologise. I'm standing too far away from the microphone, ten. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm busily writing a note, even though I have a contemporaneous transcript. It's the habit of a lifetime. MS GALLIFANT: It is, it is. I'm grateful, thank you. I hope that provides some context in which the otherwise quite bald figures of representatives being on record and contributions being made, as to why perhaps those figures are not quite so straightforwardly an indication there has been any form of inadequacy when it comes to legal costs at the point of offer. Can I move to question 4, which is interim payments. It's been suggested by Howe & Co that the scheme should make provision for interim payments in all cases, and it's unacceptable for Post Office to be able to decide to whom such payments should be made. It is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	claim and make a fair offer. To date, 28 such payments have been made, that includes circumstances of severe financial hardship, terminal illness, risk of personal hardship, and old age, where concerns have been raised about the impact of the speed of progress on the applicant. Some of those concerns have been raised by the applicant. Others have been raised within Post Office and a proposal for an interim payment made on Post Office's recommendation. Where such appointments are made, it is expressly explained to the applicants that they would not need to repay any of the interim payment in the event that the final offer is made for less, or that accepting an interim payment would in anyway adversely impact their claim. It wouldn't. So far as the position post offer is concerned, other than potential hardship interim payments, Post
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	my lack of articulacy, I apologise. I'm standing too far away from the microphone, ten. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm busily writing a note, even though I have a contemporaneous transcript. It's the habit of a lifetime. MS GALLIFANT: It is, it is. I'm grateful, thank you. I hope that provides some context in which the otherwise quite bald figures of representatives being on record and contributions being made, as to why perhaps those figures are not quite so straightforwardly an indication there has been any form of inadequacy when it comes to legal costs at the point of offer. Can I move to question 4, which is interim payments. It's been suggested by Howe & Co that the scheme should make provision for interim payments in all cases, and it's unacceptable for Post Office to be able to decide to whom such payments should be made. It is not clear whether that suggestion is made in the context	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	claim and make a fair offer. To date, 28 such payments have been made, that includes circumstances of severe financial hardship, terminal illness, risk of personal hardship, and old age, where concerns have been raised about the impact of the speed of progress on the applicant. Some of those concerns have been raised by the applicant. Others have been raised within Post Office and a proposal for an interim payment made on Post Office's recommendation. Where such appointments are made, it is expressly explained to the applicants that they would not need to repay any of the interim payment in the event that the final offer is made for less, or that accepting an interim payment would in anyway adversely impact their claim. It wouldn't. So far as the position post offer is concerned, other than potential hardship interim payments, Post Office's priority is to seek to resolve applicants
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	my lack of articulacy, I apologise. I'm standing too far away from the microphone, ten. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm busily writing a note, even though I have a contemporaneous transcript. It's the habit of a lifetime. MS GALLIFANT: It is, it is. I'm grateful, thank you. I hope that provides some context in which the otherwise quite bald figures of representatives being on record and contributions being made, as to why perhaps those figures are not quite so straightforwardly an indication there has been any form of inadequacy when it comes to legal costs at the point of offer. Can I move to question 4, which is interim payments. It's been suggested by Howe & Co that the scheme should make provision for interim payments in all cases, and it's unacceptable for Post Office to be able to decide to whom such payments should be made. It is not clear whether that suggestion is made in the context of pre offer interim payments or post offer payments.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	claim and make a fair offer. To date, 28 such payments have been made, that includes circumstances of severe financial hardship, terminal illness, risk of personal hardship, and old age, where concerns have been raised about the impact of the speed of progress on the applicant. Some of those concerns have been raised by the applicant. Others have been raised within Post Office and a proposal for an interim payment made on Post Office's recommendation. Where such appointments are made, it is expressly explained to the applicants that they would not need to repay any of the interim payment in the event that the final offer is made for less, or that accepting an interim payment would in anyway adversely impact their claim. It wouldn't. So far as the position post offer is concerned, other than potential hardship interim payments, Post Office's priority is to seek to resolve applicants claims in a manner which is fair in all the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	my lack of articulacy, I apologise. I'm standing too far away from the microphone, ten. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm busily writing a note, even though I have a contemporaneous transcript. It's the habit of a lifetime. MS GALLIFANT: It is, it is. I'm grateful, thank you. I hope that provides some context in which the otherwise quite bald figures of representatives being on record and contributions being made, as to why perhaps those figures are not quite so straightforwardly an indication there has been any form of inadequacy when it comes to legal costs at the point of offer. Can I move to question 4, which is interim payments. It's been suggested by Howe & Co that the scheme should make provision for interim payments in all cases, and it's unacceptable for Post Office to be able to decide to whom such payments should be made. It is not clear whether that suggestion is made in the context of pre offer interim payments or post offer payments. Can I address each of those in turn.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	claim and make a fair offer. To date, 28 such payments have been made, that includes circumstances of severe financial hardship, terminal illness, risk of personal hardship, and old age, where concerns have been raised about the impact of the speed of progress on the applicant. Some of those concerns have been raised by the applicant. Others have been raised within Post Office and a proposal for an interim payment made on Post Office's recommendation. Where such appointments are made, it is expressly explained to the applicants that they would not need to repay any of the interim payment in the event that the final offer is made for less, or that accepting an interim payment would in anyway adversely impact their claim. It wouldn't. So far as the position post offer is concerned, other than potential hardship interim payments, Post Office's priority is to seek to resolve applicants claims in a manner which is fair in all the circumstances of the case.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	my lack of articulacy, I apologise. I'm standing too far away from the microphone, ten. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm busily writing a note, even though I have a contemporaneous transcript. It's the habit of a lifetime. MS GALLIFANT: It is, it is. I'm grateful, thank you. I hope that provides some context in which the otherwise quite bald figures of representatives being on record and contributions being made, as to why perhaps those figures are not quite so straightforwardly an indication there has been any form of inadequacy when it comes to legal costs at the point of offer. Can I move to question 4, which is interim payments. It's been suggested by Howe & Co that the scheme should make provision for interim payments in all cases, and it's unacceptable for Post Office to be able to decide to whom such payments should be made. It is not clear whether that suggestion is made in the context of pre offer interim payments or post offer payments. Can I address each of those in turn. As Mr Beer indicated, payments have been made on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	claim and make a fair offer. To date, 28 such payments have been made, that includes circumstances of severe financial hardship, terminal illness, risk of personal hardship, and old age, where concerns have been raised about the impact of the speed of progress on the applicant. Some of those concerns have been raised by the applicant. Others have been raised within Post Office and a proposal for an interim payment made on Post Office's recommendation. Where such appointments are made, it is expressly explained to the applicants that they would not need to repay any of the interim payment in the event that the final offer is made for less, or that accepting an interim payment would in anyway adversely impact their claim. It wouldn't. So far as the position post offer is concerned, other than potential hardship interim payments, Post Office's priority is to seek to resolve applicants claims in a manner which is fair in all the circumstances of the case. That will we say typically be achieved by reaching
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	my lack of articulacy, I apologise. I'm standing too far away from the microphone, ten. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm busily writing a note, even though I have a contemporaneous transcript. It's the habit of a lifetime. MS GALLIFANT: It is, it is. I'm grateful, thank you. I hope that provides some context in which the otherwise quite bald figures of representatives being on record and contributions being made, as to why perhaps those figures are not quite so straightforwardly an indication there has been any form of inadequacy when it comes to legal costs at the point of offer. Can I move to question 4, which is interim payments. It's been suggested by Howe & Co that the scheme should make provision for interim payments in all cases, and it's unacceptable for Post Office to be able to decide to whom such payments should be made. It is not clear whether that suggestion is made in the context of pre offer interim payments or post offer payments. Can I address each of those in turn. As Mr Beer indicated, payments have been made on an interim basis, prior to an offer being made, to those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	claim and make a fair offer. To date, 28 such payments have been made, that includes circumstances of severe financial hardship, terminal illness, risk of personal hardship, and old age, where concerns have been raised about the impact of the speed of progress on the applicant. Some of those concerns have been raised by the applicant. Others have been raised within Post Office and a proposal for an interim payment made on Post Office's recommendation. Where such appointments are made, it is expressly explained to the applicants that they would not need to repay any of the interim payment in the event that the final offer is made for less, or that accepting an interim payment would in anyway adversely impact their claim. It wouldn't. So far as the position post offer is concerned, other than potential hardship interim payments, Post Office's priority is to seek to resolve applicants claims in a manner which is fair in all the circumstances of the case. That will we say typically be achieved by reaching full and final settlements with the applicants rather
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	my lack of articulacy, I apologise. I'm standing too far away from the microphone, ten. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm busily writing a note, even though I have a contemporaneous transcript. It's the habit of a lifetime. MS GALLIFANT: It is, it is. I'm grateful, thank you. I hope that provides some context in which the otherwise quite bald figures of representatives being on record and contributions being made, as to why perhaps those figures are not quite so straightforwardly an indication there has been any form of inadequacy when it comes to legal costs at the point of offer. Can I move to question 4, which is interim payments. It's been suggested by Howe & Co that the scheme should make provision for interim payments in all cases, and it's unacceptable for Post Office to be able to decide to whom such payments should be made. It is not clear whether that suggestion is made in the context of pre offer interim payments or post offer payments. Can I address each of those in turn. As Mr Beer indicated, payments have been made on an interim basis, prior to an offer being made, to those applicants to the scheme who Post Office understood to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	claim and make a fair offer. To date, 28 such payments have been made, that includes circumstances of severe financial hardship, terminal illness, risk of personal hardship, and old age, where concerns have been raised about the impact of the speed of progress on the applicant. Some of those concerns have been raised by the applicant. Others have been raised within Post Office and a proposal for an interim payment made on Post Office's recommendation. Where such appointments are made, it is expressly explained to the applicants that they would not need to repay any of the interim payment in the event that the final offer is made for less, or that accepting an interim payment would in anyway adversely impact their claim. It wouldn't. So far as the position post offer is concerned, other than potential hardship interim payments, Post Office's priority is to seek to resolve applicants claims in a manner which is fair in all the circumstances of the case. That will we say typically be achieved by reaching full and final settlements with the applicants rather than on a piecemeal basis through interim and part
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	my lack of articulacy, I apologise. I'm standing too far away from the microphone, ten. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm busily writing a note, even though I have a contemporaneous transcript. It's the habit of a lifetime. MS GALLIFANT: It is, it is. I'm grateful, thank you. I hope that provides some context in which the otherwise quite bald figures of representatives being on record and contributions being made, as to why perhaps those figures are not quite so straightforwardly an indication there has been any form of inadequacy when it comes to legal costs at the point of offer. Can I move to question 4, which is interim payments. It's been suggested by Howe & Co that the scheme should make provision for interim payments in all cases, and it's unacceptable for Post Office to be able to decide to whom such payments should be made. It is not clear whether that suggestion is made in the context of pre offer interim payments or post offer payments. Can I address each of those in turn. As Mr Beer indicated, payments have been made on an interim basis, prior to an offer being made, to those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	claim and make a fair offer. To date, 28 such payments have been made, that includes circumstances of severe financial hardship, terminal illness, risk of personal hardship, and old age, where concerns have been raised about the impact of the speed of progress on the applicant. Some of those concerns have been raised by the applicant. Others have been raised within Post Office and a proposal for an interim payment made on Post Office's recommendation. Where such appointments are made, it is expressly explained to the applicants that they would not need to repay any of the interim payment in the event that the final offer is made for less, or that accepting an interim payment would in anyway adversely impact their claim. It wouldn't. So far as the position post offer is concerned, other than potential hardship interim payments, Post Office's priority is to seek to resolve applicants claims in a manner which is fair in all the circumstances of the case. That will we say typically be achieved by reaching full and final settlements with the applicants rather

,	have and to see her third of anythered of the		
1	been made to over two-thirds of applicants and of those	1	principles, and therefore potentially not in the same
2	accepted by 80 per cent of those applicants.	2	sum as any interim payment which might have been made.
3	There is a structured and clear plan to work	3	So we say that the position under the scheme is
4	through the dispute resolution process with those who	4	significantly different from the approach to interim
5	formally engaged it and to provide, as I've indicated,	5	payments in relation to postmasters whose convictions
6	at least 95 per cent of applicants with offer letters by	6	have been overturned when its considered by Post Office
7	the end of this year.	7	and BEIS that all such persons were likely to receive
8	Our position is it would be an unhelpful	8	greater sums than the up to £100,000 in due course for
9	divergence of resource and cost to set up some form of	9	their claims.
10	sub-scheme within the Historical Shortfall Scheme by	10	As for the suggestion that it should not be Post
11	which applicants could then apply for and interim offers	11	Office which decides when an interim payment should be
12	be made to them other than on hardship grounds.	12	made, were an independent body such as the Panel to
13	An additional factor for not making interim offers	13	determine such requests, there would inevitably be some
14	is that the approach under the scheme is to reach an	14	further delay in the process for applicants generally,
15	overall offer, as you have heard me say on a number of	15	in order to accommodate such cases going to the Panel
16	occasions, rather than break down the offer by	16	not once but twice. In those circumstances, we do not
17	individual heads of loss. As already indicated it's	17	accept that the absence of an express provision for
18	made on a number of applicant-friendly presumptions,	18	interim payments under the scheme is unfair or
19	such as the presumption that a shortfall loss was caused	19	inappropriate.
20	by Horizon. These presumptions would not apply were it	20	Sir, I'm going to move now to section B dealing
21	not possible to resolve the claim without the applicant	21	with final compensation for postmasters with quashed
22	going to court. In that situation, it's entirely	22	convictions. I note the time. I am very happy to press
23	possible in principle that a postmaster would not obtain	23	on with section B then I have very little to say on C
24	compensation in the same sum as the offer, which offer	24	and a couple of other points, but if you would prefer me
25	of course is built on those applicant-friendly 77	25	to break now and come back 78
	,,		.•
1	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I think my view is simply this,	1	principles apply to compensation. Here the ordinary
2	Ms Gallafent, if you were to complete your submissions	2	principles do not apply, so that's why you might be able
3	within say 25 minutes that might be preferable, but if	3	to agree in principle a particular element of the offer,
4	that's not possible we'll have a break whenever it suits	4	say the shortfall or some element but I emphasise again,
5	you.	5	offers are made in the round, so you might be able to
6	MS GALLAFENT: No, I'm confident I can do that.	6	agree in principle and say, well, we accept this or
7	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Let's carry on until the end then.	7	that, but it wouldn't follow that then were there to be
8	Before we do, just a variation on the theme of	8	no agreement overall, that the applicant would actually
9	interim payments, which I don't think you touched on.	9	obtain through civil litigation a sum anything like the
10	The suggestion and this might become more	10	amount that's been offered based on the
11	a possibility as the more complicated cases are dealt	11	applicant-friendly principles. So I do say it raises
12	with that interim payments may be made about agreed	12	very different and difficult questions that simply are
13	sums, not whether they need them, just if agreed, let's	13	not there in the scheme in relation to sorry, the
14	get it over with and only discuss what's not agreed.	14	mechanism used in relation to postmasters with quashed
15	Have you got anything to say about that?	15	convictions.
16	MS GALLAFENT: I do because that's goes back to the factor	16	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: All right. I will think about that.
17	I mentioned in relation to the applicant-friendly	17	MS GALLAFENT: I thought you might.
18	premise of the offer. So when it's an agreed offer, it	18	Section B then, final compensation for postmasters
19	will be made on the basis that, you know, the shortfall	19	with quashed convictions. Mr Beer also emphasised and
20	of (unclear) Horizon, no limitation, et cetera. So	20	we say it is important to emphasise as well. There is
21	again it's a slightly different position to the position	21	no formal remediation scheme such as that established by
22	under the final scheme or the interim or final scheme	22	the Historical Shortfall Scheme for the payment of
23	for postmasters with quashed convictions, because	23	compensation to such persons. All claims are being
23 24	there's no such presumption. The approach under section	23 24	dealt with through without prejudice negotiations. We
25	B, which I will come on to, is simply that the ordinary	25	say that is an important distinction, because a number
20	79	20	80

1	of the submissions made by other core participants are	1	It is in order to find a way thorough that issue
2	predicated on a scheme approach.	2	that we agreed with a number of former postmasters
3	It's also important to emphasise that as at	3	represented by Hudgell Solicitors that the issue of
4	3 July, Post Office has only received a total of six	4	non-pecuniary damages should be referred an early
5	largely fully quantified claims. So that's where we are	5	neutral valuation. That of course is an expression of
6	in terms of final compensation.	6	a view on the likely outcome if the matter were to go to
7	So far as the principles to be applied to the	7	court.
8	calculation of final compensation payments are	8	We emphasise that the fact that the process is
9	concerned, some of those representing postmasters have	9	without prejudice and is confidential allows a more open
10	suggested that BEIS and/or ourselves should be invited	10	and less formal process in that respect. We're very
11	to clarify the approach to the general principles in	11	grateful that the very eminent senior judge Lord Dyson
12	play in assessing liability and quantum.	12	has agreed to act as the evaluator for that process. It
13	I can confirm that Post Office agrees with Hudgell	13	is anticipated that the evaluation will be concluded by
14	Solicitors that the value of any individual claim must	14	the end of this month.
15	be calculated applying the ordinary principles	15	The outcome is not of course binding on the
16	applicable to the recovery of civil damages for	16	parties. But it is hoped that it will allow these
17	malicious prosecution. We also agree that such damages	17	issues to be resolved quickly.
18	may include aggravated and exemplary damages.	18	We are also and separate to the early neutral
19	Mr Beer has already alluded to it but in applying	19	evaluation continuing to progress without prejudice
20	those principles it's the issue of non-pecuniary damages	20	negotiations in relation to the first of two fully
21	that's proved particularly damaging in the negotiations	21	quantified claims from the total of six that we have
22	to date. There is case law in this area which indicates	22	largely quantified. Good progress has been made on
23	what likely awards may look like but the current	23	pecuniary loss claims to date. We anticipate that the
24	circumstances of the particular postmasters involved are	24	early neutral evaluation process to be conducted by Lord
25	unique, we say.	25	Dyson will provide guidance that will facilitate the
	81		82
1	parties reaching an agreed resolution on the	1	fraud.
2	non-pecuniary aspects of those claims and we hope that	2	I note Mr Beer didn't reference to this in his
3	that guidance may also be of wider use.	3	opening, and I anticipate that's for the same reasons
4	In this context it's also important for me to	4	that we say is simply isn't open to you, sir, to
5	emphasise that in no circumstances will Post Office be	5	consider it at this point. It goes way beyond the issue
6	the final arbiter of individual claims. That's	6	identified in your invitation, which is the principles
7	a suggestion made by Hodge Jones & Allen. If the	7	that are being applied to the calculation of final
8	parties cannot resolve the claims themselves, whether	8	compensation payments, rather than the principles which
9	with the involvement of early evaluation, mediation, or	9	some of those representing postmasters suggest should
10	some other process, then the final arbiter of individual	10	be.
11	claims will be the court. But would I would like to	11	It also doesn't appear to fall within the scope of
12	emphasise that Post Office remains wholly committed to	12	the Inquiry's Terms of Reference, but even were the
13	seeking a negotiated outcome to all claims to avoid that	13	Terms of Reference to be amended in some way, it is
14	outcome if at all possible.	14	obvious that any such argument could be not be fairly
15	We also note the suggestion made by Hodge Jones	15	considered far less in some way any view given on it at
16	& Allen that the settlement deed is flawed, insofar as	16	this point of Inquiry, prior to the Inquiry having heard
17	it limits GLO claimants to claims of malicious	17	or considered any of the evidence in relation to the
18	prosecution. It should be amended.	18	conduct of the group litigation. That's a matter also
19	Paul Marshall goes further. He argues and says	19	due to be heard next spring.
20	there are prima facie grounds for the view that Post	20	For the avoidance of any doubt, Post Office would
21	Office secured the settlement deed as a result of	21	emphatically refute any suggestion that it behaved in
22	misleading the claimants and the court. On that basis	22	a fraudulent way or misled the GLO claimants or the
23	he and Hodge Jones & Allen seek to argue the approach to	23	court in resolving those proceedings. The terms of the
	aa riougo donico a rinon dodit lo digue ino approden lo		The terms of the

25

24

25

the calculation of direct and consequential loss should

be carried out by reference to the approach to claims in 83

settlement deed were negotiated and agreed in good

faith. But we do emphasise we say at this stage that

1	one simply cannot consider or reach any view on those	1	confirmation from HMRC that the removal of the claw back
2	submissions made by Mr Marshall and Hodge Jones & Allen	2	provisions will not affect the tax status on which the
3	in that context.	3	payments are made. We wrote yesterday to all claimants
4	On the question of disgorgement which is raised by	4	to communicate the position of HMRC in this regard, so
5	Mr Marshall and Hodge Jones & Allen again, they have	5	that concern has been assuaged.
6	raised the issue of the inclusion of sums received by	6	Secondly, it is suggested that any disputes should
7	Post Office by way of compensation or confiscation post	7	be referred to independent arbitration within an
8	conviction as being included as direct and consequential	8	appropriate arbitration scheme. That's also Howe & Co.
9	losses. I can confirm that claimants can claim any sum	9	If particular representatives wish to raise that
10	Post Office received through post conviction orders for	10	option with Post Office they are obviously free to do so
11	compensation or confiscation as losses directly	11	and Post Office can assess with those claimants the best
12	connected to their wrongly conviction, so that is	12	way to resolve the cases. For example, arbitration or
13	claimable.	13	early neutral valuation or mediation or even litigation
14	Moving to the mechanisms by which final	14	potentially were it to be regarded as being relevant for
15	compensation payments are being calculated, to an extent	15	precedential value.
16	our response here overlaps with the question as to the	16	Thirdly, Mr Marshall has suggested that Post
17	principles being applied, but three discrete issues have	17	Office should make available to claimants data that it
18	been raised in this context.	18	holds on employees' pay bands over time. I can confirm
19	First, Howe & Co have suggested that BEIS should	19	Post Office already proactively offers and provides,
20	undertake will undertake sorry, that BEIS should	20	subject to the provision of necessary data protection
21	undertake, that it will undertake not to seek to claw	21	consents, the remuneration data that it holds to
22	back any interim payment made to a postmaster. This is	22	claimants with quashed convictions.
23	a subject on which Post Office has been very closely	23	Question 7 is the provision for applicants to
24	engaged with HMRC and we confirmed in our late night	24	obtain independent legal advice. As we indicated in our
25	note from yesterday that as of yesterday we had received 85	25	May submissions, Post Office will consider the payment 86
1	of a postmaster's reasonable costs as part of the	1	not a point flagged up by Mr Beer in his opening
2	negotiations.	2	therefore I anticipate it may not be a point that you
3	Question 8 is about procedures adopted to resolve	3	deal with directly, it's the role of Post Office in the
4	disputes about the valuation of final compensation	4	resolution of these claims.
5	payment. I have already highlighted in particular the	5	In their initial submissions Hodge Jones & Allen
6	early neural evaluation process. But Post Office	6	submitted that what was required was a transparent
7	remains open and supportive to the use of further such	7	process operated by BEIS working with Herbert Smith
8	processes or other alternative dispute mechanisms to	8	Freehills. In an annex they now argue that Post Office
9	resolve other disputes in due course.	9	should terminate its continuing retainer of Herbert
10	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Ms Gallafent, when Mr Beer was addressing	10	Smith Freehills and they say Herbert Smith Freehills
11	me, he suggested that I might wish to probe with the	11	should be retained by BEIS with a consequential set of
12	representatives of this category of claimants to what	12	agreements about duties of confidence and the like owed
13	extent I should involve myself at all. He put it rather	13	to Post Office. So they say that Herbert Smith
14	more elegantly, I should butt out of it perhaps.	14	Freehills would be retained by BEIS for both final and
15	MS GALLAFENT: He did.	15	further compensation claims. Further, by which I mean
16	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: What's the Post Office view about that?	16	you have identified in category C fair compensation
17	MS GALLAFENT: Sir, in response to the questions that you	17	claimants.
18	have raised, our position is that there is no need for	18	This argument again goes well beyond the
19	you to intervene on those points. There is nothing that	19	questions, sir, set out in your invitation and,
20	would give you concern from what we have told you about	20	arguably, again beyond the Terms of Reference of the
21	the concerns that have been raised by the other core	21	Inquiry, but without prejudice to the position can
22	participants, so that's our position.	22	I make it clear the Post Office immediate view is there
23	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Fine, all right.	23	is no justification at all for any such recommendation.
24	MS GALLAFENT: The other position though that's the other	24	So far as final compensation for postmasters with
25	issue is the rele of Post Office and this again it is	25	guestiand convictions is concerned, it is clear we say

25

issue is the role of Post Office and this again it is

quashed convictions is concerned, it is clear we say

1	from the information updates provided, that Post Office,	1	the outset, we leave it to BEIS to address the Inquiry
2	represented by Herbert Smith Freehills, is acting	2	on those matters but, of course, if there is any issue
3	promptly and reasonably in its approach negotiating	3	arising following BEIS's submissions next week on which
4	settlements with those that have brought fully	4	the Inquiry would like to hear from us then we're very
5	quantified claims and there is no reason to doubt that	5	happy to do that in writing after the hearing next week.
6	it will continue to do so.	6	Of course, more generally we're very keen to
7	Certainly, we'd submit that the inherent and	7	ensure that we listen carefully to the points to be made
8	obvious complications with any such rearrangement in	8	by other core participants who follow us later today and
9	terms on legal representation and the entity with whom	9	next week and we will seek to pick up any further
10	negotiations take place, would very considerably	10	matters which we consider we haven't already adequately
11	outweigh any perceived benefit, particularly in terms of	11	addressed so we can offer clarification or assistance as
12	the speed of resolution of the claims.	12	soon as possible thereafter.
13	•	13	·
	Finally, can I just deal then with final		Finally, and very briefly, can I deal shortly with
14	compensation, in that context where its suggested that	14 15	your provisional view on compensation issues relating
15	Post Office shouldn't be involved, Post Office has made	15	prosecuted subpostmasters. Just for the avoidance of
16	it clear that it has not been asked by Government to	16	any doubt we can confirm, as set out in your document on
17	deliver this type of compensation. This is, sorry, the	17	compensation issue dated 9 May, we agree with your
18	further or fair compensation. But it will of course	18	provisional views, subject to two points. The first is
19	cooperate to the fullest extent possible with any scheme	19	we do not seek to make any submissions on BEIS's
20	or mechanism set up for that purpose and any request for	20	position that persons in categories 1 and 2 were
21	support from Government in that matter. So we say it's	21	eligible for claims for compensation under the December
22	wholly premature to raise any issue as to Post Office	22	announcement, that is predating the subsequent March
23	involvement in any further or final compensation scheme	23	announcement. We have seen what BEIS says on the
24	or mechanism.	24	subject. We don't say anything about that.
25	As for that scheme or mechanism, as I indicated at 89	25	Secondly, so far as persons falling within 90
4	catarany 2 are concerned as those are as it was the	4	Laws resign to planes over just to about that there
1	category 3 are concerned, so those are as it were the	1	I am going to glance over just to check that those
2	public interest quashed convictions, paragraph 28 of	2	sitting behind me and behind me behind me, as it were,
3	your provisional view, you indicated that fairness	3	have nothing further to add.
4	demands that Post Office should not be the final arbiter	4	I am very grateful. Those are our submissions.
5	of whether an interim or a final payment should be made	5	As I said, we stand ready to assist in any other way we
6	to those postmasters.	6	can on these subjects.
7	Neither announcement by the Minister, neither the	7	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you, Ms Gallafent.
8	December announcement nor the July announcement on	8	All right. It's time for another break. Can
9	interim compensation, neither of those resulted in the	9	I ask just ask Mr Mertens because I think you are next,
10	establishment of a remediation scheme such as HSS, so	10	some kind of rough time estimate?
11	ultimately the question of whether or not compensation	11	MR MERTENS: Very short, it will be five or ten minutes.
12	is payable falls to go to the court.	12	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. Well, Mr Stein, Mr Enright
13	I confirm in the event of any dispute over payment	13	predicted you wouldn't need a full two hours and I will
14	of compensation, whether on an interim or final basis,	14	say no more than that.
15	POL, as with the scheme more generally, remains willing	15	MR STEIN: Thank you, sir.
16	to engage in mediation, arbitration, other forms of	16	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Because of the likely timings this
17	alternative dispute resolution, to avoid if possible any	17	afternoon it is now 1.08, according to this wonderful
18	applicant having to bring civil proceedings.	18	machine I have in front of me, so I think we'll start at
19	I can also confirm that Post Office legal	19	2.05 and then we should finish comfortably before the
20	representatives continue to liaise with the	20	cricket begins. Thank you.
21	representatives of the three named potential category 3	21	(1.10 pm)
22	claimants set out in your provisional view on the	22	(Luncheon adjournment)
23	subject of whether they are or are not entitled to	23	(2.07 pm)
24	compensation. Sir, we say that in no circumstances	24	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, Mr Mertens.
25	would we be the final at arbiter.	25	Submission by MR MERTENS
	91		92

1	MR MERTENS: Good afternoon. May I first of all thank the	1	Since the hearings began on 14 February, UKGI has
2	Inquiry for having been given the opportunity to provide	2	followed the Human Impact Hearings and Focus Groups
3	written submissions in relation to today's issues and	3	closely. It's been concerned to hear in many of the
4	also for being given the opportunity to address you	4	accounts that have been given, which are now reflected
5	briefly today. I make these submissions on behalf of UK	5	in some of the submissions that the Inquiry has received
6	Government Investments who I will refer to as UKGI.	6	for these hearings, that compensation is not being
7	As indicated in its written submissions, UKGI is	7	delivered effectively.
8	very grateful to the Inquiry for being able to attend	8	UKGI wants to ensure that it has as full an
9	and participate in these hearings concerning issues of	9	understanding of these issues as it can so that it can
10	compensation to subpostmasters and others. It	10	fulfil its functions most effectively. UKGI has
11	recognises that the issues that you have identified are	11	therefore referred each of the written submissions for
12	very important issues for the Inquiry to examine now,	12	these hearings with care. It now attends these hearings
13	and it's ready to work with the Inquiry to assist in	13	today and next week for the principal purpose of
14	anyway that it can.	14	listening, listening so as to hear clearly the
15	UKGI's role in relation to these issues is, as	15	submissions made on behalf of all Core Participants,
16	described in our submissions, one of assisting BEIS with	16	including the responses that POL gives to the issues
17	its oversight of various of the arrangements that have	17	that have been raised by others. In that way, the views
18	been put in place and providing challenge to POL on its	18	expressed by all concerned can be taken into account in
19	delivery of those arrangements, both at official level	19	UKGI's delivery of its function of supporting BEIS, both
20	and through the attendance of the shareholder	20	in terms of oversight and of challenge.
21	non-executive director on the Post Office board and	21	As indicated in UKGI's written submissions,
22	relevant subcommittee. It seeks to fulfil those	22	additional detail concerning its involvement in the
23	functions in light of the clear objective of achieving	23	compensation issues and arrangements have been set out
24	full and fair compensation delivered as promptly and as	24	in the Government's response to the BEIS Committee's
25	effectively as possible.	25	report on Post Office compensation, which appears in the
	93		94
1	bundle for today at tab 13.	1	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: The floor is yours. Mr Stein.
2	UKGI's role in supporting BEIS is also reflected	2	Submission by MR STEIN, QC
2 3	UKGI's role in supporting BEIS is also reflected in BEIS's written submissions for these hearings and, to	2 3	Submission by MR STEIN, QC MR STEIN: Sir, good afternoon. Sir, as you know, I appear
2 3 4	UKGI's role in supporting BEIS is also reflected in BEIS's written submissions for these hearings and, to the extent that they bear on UKGI's role, it notes and	2 3 4	Submission by MR STEIN, QC MR STEIN: Sir, good afternoon. Sir, as you know, I appear with Mr Jacobs instructed by Howe & Co Solicitors.
2 3 4 5	UKGI's role in supporting BEIS is also reflected in BEIS's written submissions for these hearings and, to the extent that they bear on UKGI's role, it notes and endorses their submissions.	2 3 4 5	Submission by MR STEIN, QC MR STEIN: Sir, good afternoon. Sir, as you know, I appear with Mr Jacobs instructed by Howe & Co Solicitors. Together we represent 153 subpostmaster,
2 3 4 5 6	UKGI's role in supporting BEIS is also reflected in BEIS's written submissions for these hearings and, to the extent that they bear on UKGI's role, it notes and endorses their submissions. UKGI, nevertheless, recognises that there is an	2 3 4 5 6	Submission by MR STEIN, QC MR STEIN: Sir, good afternoon. Sir, as you know, I appear with Mr Jacobs instructed by Howe & Co Solicitors. Together we represent 153 subpostmaster, subpostmistresses and Post Office manager Core
2 3 4 5 6 7	UKGI's role in supporting BEIS is also reflected in BEIS's written submissions for these hearings and, to the extent that they bear on UKGI's role, it notes and endorses their submissions. UKGI, nevertheless, recognises that there is an urgent and ongoing need to examine rigorously the	2 3 4 5 6 7	Submission by MR STEIN, QC MR STEIN: Sir, good afternoon. Sir, as you know, I appear with Mr Jacobs instructed by Howe & Co Solicitors. Together we represent 153 subpostmaster, subpostmistresses and Post Office manager Core Participants involved in this Inquiry.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	UKGI's role in supporting BEIS is also reflected in BEIS's written submissions for these hearings and, to the extent that they bear on UKGI's role, it notes and endorses their submissions. UKGI, nevertheless, recognises that there is an urgent and ongoing need to examine rigorously the operation of the compensation arrangements in light of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Submission by MR STEIN, QC MR STEIN: Sir, good afternoon. Sir, as you know, I appear with Mr Jacobs instructed by Howe & Co Solicitors. Together we represent 153 subpostmaster, subpostmistresses and Post Office manager Core Participants involved in this Inquiry. All of our clients have had lives devastated by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	UKGI's role in supporting BEIS is also reflected in BEIS's written submissions for these hearings and, to the extent that they bear on UKGI's role, it notes and endorses their submissions. UKGI, nevertheless, recognises that there is an urgent and ongoing need to examine rigorously the operation of the compensation arrangements in light of the submissions of some of the Core Participants that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Submission by MR STEIN, QC MR STEIN: Sir, good afternoon. Sir, as you know, I appear with Mr Jacobs instructed by Howe & Co Solicitors. Together we represent 153 subpostmaster, subpostmistresses and Post Office manager Core Participants involved in this Inquiry. All of our clients have had lives devastated by this scandal. All of our clients have had lives that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	UKGI's role in supporting BEIS is also reflected in BEIS's written submissions for these hearings and, to the extent that they bear on UKGI's role, it notes and endorses their submissions. UKGI, nevertheless, recognises that there is an urgent and ongoing need to examine rigorously the operation of the compensation arrangements in light of the submissions of some of the Core Participants that have been received, and of any interim conclusions which	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Submission by MR STEIN, QC MR STEIN: Sir, good afternoon. Sir, as you know, I appear with Mr Jacobs instructed by Howe & Co Solicitors. Together we represent 153 subpostmaster, subpostmistresses and Post Office manager Core Participants involved in this Inquiry. All of our clients have had lives devastated by this scandal. All of our clients have had lives that have been badly affected by the scandal. Within our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	UKGI's role in supporting BEIS is also reflected in BEIS's written submissions for these hearings and, to the extent that they bear on UKGI's role, it notes and endorses their submissions. UKGI, nevertheless, recognises that there is an urgent and ongoing need to examine rigorously the operation of the compensation arrangements in light of the submissions of some of the Core Participants that have been received, and of any interim conclusions which the Inquiry may now decide to express in a report or any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Submission by MR STEIN, QC MR STEIN: Sir, good afternoon. Sir, as you know, I appear with Mr Jacobs instructed by Howe & Co Solicitors. Together we represent 153 subpostmaster, subpostmistresses and Post Office manager Core Participants involved in this Inquiry. All of our clients have had lives devastated by this scandal. All of our clients have had lives that have been badly affected by the scandal. Within our client group, we represent GLO litigants and I'll just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	UKGI's role in supporting BEIS is also reflected in BEIS's written submissions for these hearings and, to the extent that they bear on UKGI's role, it notes and endorses their submissions. UKGI, nevertheless, recognises that there is an urgent and ongoing need to examine rigorously the operation of the compensation arrangements in light of the submissions of some of the Core Participants that have been received, and of any interim conclusions which the Inquiry may now decide to express in a report or any other update following these hearings. Thank you for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Submission by MR STEIN, QC MR STEIN: Sir, good afternoon. Sir, as you know, I appear with Mr Jacobs instructed by Howe & Co Solicitors. Together we represent 153 subpostmaster, subpostmistresses and Post Office manager Core Participants involved in this Inquiry. All of our clients have had lives devastated by this scandal. All of our clients have had lives that have been badly affected by the scandal. Within our client group, we represent GLO litigants and I'll just explain that, so that we all understand what I mean. If
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	UKGI's role in supporting BEIS is also reflected in BEIS's written submissions for these hearings and, to the extent that they bear on UKGI's role, it notes and endorses their submissions. UKGI, nevertheless, recognises that there is an urgent and ongoing need to examine rigorously the operation of the compensation arrangements in light of the submissions of some of the Core Participants that have been received, and of any interim conclusions which the Inquiry may now decide to express in a report or any other update following these hearings. Thank you for the opportunity to address you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Submission by MR STEIN, QC MR STEIN: Sir, good afternoon. Sir, as you know, I appear with Mr Jacobs instructed by Howe & Co Solicitors. Together we represent 153 subpostmaster, subpostmistresses and Post Office manager Core Participants involved in this Inquiry. All of our clients have had lives devastated by this scandal. All of our clients have had lives that have been badly affected by the scandal. Within our client group, we represent GLO litigants and I'll just explain that, so that we all understand what I mean. If I refer to "GLO litigants" that means the individuals
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	UKGI's role in supporting BEIS is also reflected in BEIS's written submissions for these hearings and, to the extent that they bear on UKGI's role, it notes and endorses their submissions. UKGI, nevertheless, recognises that there is an urgent and ongoing need to examine rigorously the operation of the compensation arrangements in light of the submissions of some of the Core Participants that have been received, and of any interim conclusions which the Inquiry may now decide to express in a report or any other update following these hearings. Thank you for the opportunity to address you. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr Mertens. For those who may	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Submission by MR STEIN, QC MR STEIN: Sir, good afternoon. Sir, as you know, I appear with Mr Jacobs instructed by Howe & Co Solicitors. Together we represent 153 subpostmaster, subpostmistresses and Post Office manager Core Participants involved in this Inquiry. All of our clients have had lives devastated by this scandal. All of our clients have had lives that have been badly affected by the scandal. Within our client group, we represent GLO litigants and I'll just explain that, so that we all understand what I mean. If I refer to "GLO litigants" that means the individuals that were part of the group litigation that took this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	UKGI's role in supporting BEIS is also reflected in BEIS's written submissions for these hearings and, to the extent that they bear on UKGI's role, it notes and endorses their submissions. UKGI, nevertheless, recognises that there is an urgent and ongoing need to examine rigorously the operation of the compensation arrangements in light of the submissions of some of the Core Participants that have been received, and of any interim conclusions which the Inquiry may now decide to express in a report or any other update following these hearings. Thank you for the opportunity to address you. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr Mertens. For those who may not be as familiar as others with the aim and object of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Submission by MR STEIN, QC MR STEIN: Sir, good afternoon. Sir, as you know, I appear with Mr Jacobs instructed by Howe & Co Solicitors. Together we represent 153 subpostmaster, subpostmistresses and Post Office manager Core Participants involved in this Inquiry. All of our clients have had lives devastated by this scandal. All of our clients have had lives that have been badly affected by the scandal. Within our client group, we represent GLO litigants and I'll just explain that, so that we all understand what I mean. If I refer to "GLO litigants" that means the individuals that were part of the group litigation that took this matter and broke this scandal by taking that action at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	UKGI's role in supporting BEIS is also reflected in BEIS's written submissions for these hearings and, to the extent that they bear on UKGI's role, it notes and endorses their submissions. UKGI, nevertheless, recognises that there is an urgent and ongoing need to examine rigorously the operation of the compensation arrangements in light of the submissions of some of the Core Participants that have been received, and of any interim conclusions which the Inquiry may now decide to express in a report or any other update following these hearings. Thank you for the opportunity to address you. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr Mertens. For those who may not be as familiar as others with the aim and object of these hearings, can I say in respect of UKGI that I'm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Submission by MR STEIN, QC MR STEIN: Sir, good afternoon. Sir, as you know, I appear with Mr Jacobs instructed by Howe & Co Solicitors. Together we represent 153 subpostmaster, subpostmistresses and Post Office manager Core Participants involved in this Inquiry. All of our clients have had lives devastated by this scandal. All of our clients have had lives that have been badly affected by the scandal. Within our client group, we represent GLO litigants and I'll just explain that, so that we all understand what I mean. If I refer to "GLO litigants" that means the individuals that were part of the group litigation that took this matter and broke this scandal by taking that action at the High Court.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	UKGI's role in supporting BEIS is also reflected in BEIS's written submissions for these hearings and, to the extent that they bear on UKGI's role, it notes and endorses their submissions. UKGI, nevertheless, recognises that there is an urgent and ongoing need to examine rigorously the operation of the compensation arrangements in light of the submissions of some of the Core Participants that have been received, and of any interim conclusions which the Inquiry may now decide to express in a report or any other update following these hearings. Thank you for the opportunity to address you. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr Mertens. For those who may not be as familiar as others with the aim and object of these hearings, can I say in respect of UKGI that I'm grateful for their explanation of their role and, for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Submission by MR STEIN, QC MR STEIN: Sir, good afternoon. Sir, as you know, I appear with Mr Jacobs instructed by Howe & Co Solicitors. Together we represent 153 subpostmaster, subpostmistresses and Post Office manager Core Participants involved in this Inquiry. All of our clients have had lives devastated by this scandal. All of our clients have had lives that have been badly affected by the scandal. Within our client group, we represent GLO litigants and I'll just explain that, so that we all understand what I mean. If I refer to "GLO litigants" that means the individuals that were part of the group litigation that took this matter and broke this scandal by taking that action at the High Court. We also represent those threatened with criminal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	UKGI's role in supporting BEIS is also reflected in BEIS's written submissions for these hearings and, to the extent that they bear on UKGI's role, it notes and endorses their submissions. UKGI, nevertheless, recognises that there is an urgent and ongoing need to examine rigorously the operation of the compensation arrangements in light of the submissions of some of the Core Participants that have been received, and of any interim conclusions which the Inquiry may now decide to express in a report or any other update following these hearings. Thank you for the opportunity to address you. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr Mertens. For those who may not be as familiar as others with the aim and object of these hearings, can I say in respect of UKGI that I'm grateful for their explanation of their role and, for present purposes, that is sufficient for me. But when	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Submission by MR STEIN, QC MR STEIN: Sir, good afternoon. Sir, as you know, I appear with Mr Jacobs instructed by Howe & Co Solicitors. Together we represent 153 subpostmaster, subpostmistresses and Post Office manager Core Participants involved in this Inquiry. All of our clients have had lives devastated by this scandal. All of our clients have had lives that have been badly affected by the scandal. Within our client group, we represent GLO litigants and I'll just explain that, so that we all understand what I mean. If I refer to "GLO litigants" that means the individuals that were part of the group litigation that took this matter and broke this scandal by taking that action at the High Court. We also represent those threatened with criminal action, those who were wrongly convicted, those who were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	UKGI's role in supporting BEIS is also reflected in BEIS's written submissions for these hearings and, to the extent that they bear on UKGI's role, it notes and endorses their submissions. UKGI, nevertheless, recognises that there is an urgent and ongoing need to examine rigorously the operation of the compensation arrangements in light of the submissions of some of the Core Participants that have been received, and of any interim conclusions which the Inquiry may now decide to express in a report or any other update following these hearings. Thank you for the opportunity to address you. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr Mertens. For those who may not be as familiar as others with the aim and object of these hearings, can I say in respect of UKGI that I'm grateful for their explanation of their role and, for present purposes, that is sufficient for me. But when it comes to phase 5, I think it is, when there will be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Submission by MR STEIN, QC MR STEIN: Sir, good afternoon. Sir, as you know, I appear with Mr Jacobs instructed by Howe & Co Solicitors. Together we represent 153 subpostmaster, subpostmistresses and Post Office manager Core Participants involved in this Inquiry. All of our clients have had lives devastated by this scandal. All of our clients have had lives that have been badly affected by the scandal. Within our client group, we represent GLO litigants and I'll just explain that, so that we all understand what I mean. If I refer to "GLO litigants" that means the individuals that were part of the group litigation that took this matter and broke this scandal by taking that action at the High Court. We also represent those threatened with criminal action, those who were wrongly convicted, those who were cautioned, those threatened with civil cases, and those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	UKGI's role in supporting BEIS is also reflected in BEIS's written submissions for these hearings and, to the extent that they bear on UKGI's role, it notes and endorses their submissions. UKGI, nevertheless, recognises that there is an urgent and ongoing need to examine rigorously the operation of the compensation arrangements in light of the submissions of some of the Core Participants that have been received, and of any interim conclusions which the Inquiry may now decide to express in a report or any other update following these hearings. Thank you for the opportunity to address you. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr Mertens. For those who may not be as familiar as others with the aim and object of these hearings, can I say in respect of UKGI that I'm grateful for their explanation of their role and, for present purposes, that is sufficient for me. But when it comes to phase 5, I think it is, when there will be a more detailed examination, including evidence, then	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Submission by MR STEIN, QC MR STEIN: Sir, good afternoon. Sir, as you know, I appear with Mr Jacobs instructed by Howe & Co Solicitors. Together we represent 153 subpostmaster, subpostmistresses and Post Office manager Core Participants involved in this Inquiry. All of our clients have had lives devastated by this scandal. All of our clients have had lives that have been badly affected by the scandal. Within our client group, we represent GLO litigants and I'll just explain that, so that we all understand what I mean. If I refer to "GLO litigants" that means the individuals that were part of the group litigation that took this matter and broke this scandal by taking that action at the High Court. We also represent those threatened with criminal action, those who were wrongly convicted, those who were cautioned, those threatened with civil cases, and those who are hounded by the Post Office to pay sums of money
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	UKGI's role in supporting BEIS is also reflected in BEIS's written submissions for these hearings and, to the extent that they bear on UKGI's role, it notes and endorses their submissions. UKGI, nevertheless, recognises that there is an urgent and ongoing need to examine rigorously the operation of the compensation arrangements in light of the submissions of some of the Core Participants that have been received, and of any interim conclusions which the Inquiry may now decide to express in a report or any other update following these hearings. Thank you for the opportunity to address you. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr Mertens. For those who may not be as familiar as others with the aim and object of these hearings, can I say in respect of UKGI that I'm grateful for their explanation of their role and, for present purposes, that is sufficient for me. But when it comes to phase 5, I think it is, when there will be a more detailed examination, including evidence, then I would expect that UKGI would have a significantly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Submission by MR STEIN, QC MR STEIN: Sir, good afternoon. Sir, as you know, I appear with Mr Jacobs instructed by Howe & Co Solicitors. Together we represent 153 subpostmaster, subpostmistresses and Post Office manager Core Participants involved in this Inquiry. All of our clients have had lives devastated by this scandal. All of our clients have had lives that have been badly affected by the scandal. Within our client group, we represent GLO litigants and I'll just explain that, so that we all understand what I mean. If I refer to "GLO litigants" that means the individuals that were part of the group litigation that took this matter and broke this scandal by taking that action at the High Court. We also represent those threatened with criminal action, those who were wrongly convicted, those who were cautioned, those threatened with civil cases, and those who are hounded by the Post Office to pay sums of money for which subpostmasters were not at fault.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	UKGI's role in supporting BEIS is also reflected in BEIS's written submissions for these hearings and, to the extent that they bear on UKGI's role, it notes and endorses their submissions. UKGI, nevertheless, recognises that there is an urgent and ongoing need to examine rigorously the operation of the compensation arrangements in light of the submissions of some of the Core Participants that have been received, and of any interim conclusions which the Inquiry may now decide to express in a report or any other update following these hearings. Thank you for the opportunity to address you. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr Mertens. For those who may not be as familiar as others with the aim and object of these hearings, can I say in respect of UKGI that I'm grateful for their explanation of their role and, for present purposes, that is sufficient for me. But when it comes to phase 5, I think it is, when there will be a more detailed examination, including evidence, then I would expect that UKGI would have a significantly greater role.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Submission by MR STEIN, QC MR STEIN: Sir, good afternoon. Sir, as you know, I appear with Mr Jacobs instructed by Howe & Co Solicitors. Together we represent 153 subpostmaster, subpostmistresses and Post Office manager Core Participants involved in this Inquiry. All of our clients have had lives devastated by this scandal. All of our clients have had lives that have been badly affected by the scandal. Within our client group, we represent GLO litigants and I'll just explain that, so that we all understand what I mean. If I refer to "GLO litigants" that means the individuals that were part of the group litigation that took this matter and broke this scandal by taking that action at the High Court. We also represent those threatened with criminal action, those who were wrongly convicted, those who were cautioned, those threatened with civil cases, and those who are hounded by the Post Office to pay sums of money for which subpostmasters were not at fault. So you will recall through the evidence that has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	UKGI's role in supporting BEIS is also reflected in BEIS's written submissions for these hearings and, to the extent that they bear on UKGI's role, it notes and endorses their submissions. UKGI, nevertheless, recognises that there is an urgent and ongoing need to examine rigorously the operation of the compensation arrangements in light of the submissions of some of the Core Participants that have been received, and of any interim conclusions which the Inquiry may now decide to express in a report or any other update following these hearings. Thank you for the opportunity to address you. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr Mertens. For those who may not be as familiar as others with the aim and object of these hearings, can I say in respect of UKGI that I'm grateful for their explanation of their role and, for present purposes, that is sufficient for me. But when it comes to phase 5, I think it is, when there will be a more detailed examination, including evidence, then I would expect that UKGI would have a significantly greater role. MR MERTENS: Yes, of course.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Submission by MR STEIN, QC MR STEIN: Sir, good afternoon. Sir, as you know, I appear with Mr Jacobs instructed by Howe & Co Solicitors. Together we represent 153 subpostmaster, subpostmistresses and Post Office manager Core Participants involved in this Inquiry. All of our clients have had lives devastated by this scandal. All of our clients have had lives that have been badly affected by the scandal. Within our client group, we represent GLO litigants and I'll just explain that, so that we all understand what I mean. If I refer to "GLO litigants" that means the individuals that were part of the group litigation that took this matter and broke this scandal by taking that action at the High Court. We also represent those threatened with criminal action, those who were wrongly convicted, those who were cautioned, those threatened with civil cases, and those who are hounded by the Post Office to pay sums of money for which subpostmasters were not at fault. So you will recall through the evidence that has been heard through the Human Impact Hearings that each
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	UKGI's role in supporting BEIS is also reflected in BEIS's written submissions for these hearings and, to the extent that they bear on UKGI's role, it notes and endorses their submissions. UKGI, nevertheless, recognises that there is an urgent and ongoing need to examine rigorously the operation of the compensation arrangements in light of the submissions of some of the Core Participants that have been received, and of any interim conclusions which the Inquiry may now decide to express in a report or any other update following these hearings. Thank you for the opportunity to address you. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr Mertens. For those who may not be as familiar as others with the aim and object of these hearings, can I say in respect of UKGI that I'm grateful for their explanation of their role and, for present purposes, that is sufficient for me. But when it comes to phase 5, I think it is, when there will be a more detailed examination, including evidence, then I would expect that UKGI would have a significantly greater role. MR MERTENS: Yes, of course. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Submission by MR STEIN, QC MR STEIN: Sir, good afternoon. Sir, as you know, I appear with Mr Jacobs instructed by Howe & Co Solicitors. Together we represent 153 subpostmaster, subpostmistresses and Post Office manager Core Participants involved in this Inquiry. All of our clients have had lives devastated by this scandal. All of our clients have had lives that have been badly affected by the scandal. Within our client group, we represent GLO litigants and I'll just explain that, so that we all understand what I mean. If I refer to "GLO litigants" that means the individuals that were part of the group litigation that took this matter and broke this scandal by taking that action at the High Court. We also represent those threatened with criminal action, those who were wrongly convicted, those who were cautioned, those threatened with civil cases, and those who are hounded by the Post Office to pay sums of money for which subpostmasters were not at fault. So you will recall through the evidence that has been heard through the Human Impact Hearings that each one of our client families have been affected, their
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	UKGI's role in supporting BEIS is also reflected in BEIS's written submissions for these hearings and, to the extent that they bear on UKGI's role, it notes and endorses their submissions. UKGI, nevertheless, recognises that there is an urgent and ongoing need to examine rigorously the operation of the compensation arrangements in light of the submissions of some of the Core Participants that have been received, and of any interim conclusions which the Inquiry may now decide to express in a report or any other update following these hearings. Thank you for the opportunity to address you. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr Mertens. For those who may not be as familiar as others with the aim and object of these hearings, can I say in respect of UKGI that I'm grateful for their explanation of their role and, for present purposes, that is sufficient for me. But when it comes to phase 5, I think it is, when there will be a more detailed examination, including evidence, then I would expect that UKGI would have a significantly greater role. MR MERTENS: Yes, of course.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Submission by MR STEIN, QC MR STEIN: Sir, good afternoon. Sir, as you know, I appear with Mr Jacobs instructed by Howe & Co Solicitors. Together we represent 153 subpostmaster, subpostmistresses and Post Office manager Core Participants involved in this Inquiry. All of our clients have had lives devastated by this scandal. All of our clients have had lives that have been badly affected by the scandal. Within our client group, we represent GLO litigants and I'll just explain that, so that we all understand what I mean. If I refer to "GLO litigants" that means the individuals that were part of the group litigation that took this matter and broke this scandal by taking that action at the High Court. We also represent those threatened with criminal action, those who were wrongly convicted, those who were cautioned, those threatened with civil cases, and those who are hounded by the Post Office to pay sums of money for which subpostmasters were not at fault. So you will recall through the evidence that has been heard through the Human Impact Hearings that each

1	generally the family life of those individuals derailed	1	part of the settlement were swallowed in legal costs,
2	by the actions of the Post Office, Fujitsu and BEIS.	2	and we also know that the settlement described in its
3	So we have considered your statement of 30 June of	3	terms a reference to "litigation funders". So it is
4	this year where you have stated that once you have heard	4	very clear that the Post Office has known for some time
5	oral submissions, you will make a determination as to	5	that a lot of the money that would otherwise have been
6	whether to proceed to an interim report pursuant to	6	paid over in a settlement was never going to go to the
7	section 24(3) of the Inquiries Act 2005 or provide a	7	GLO litigants. One of the points that we make,
8	non-statutory progress update.	8	therefore, in relation to this is the delay that has
9	Can we strongly request that you issue an interim	9	taken place.
10	report. It is our submission that it will be important	10	We have heard obviously on 22 March the Minister
11	you, sir, as the Chair of this Inquiry, having heard the	11	announcing that additional funding would be made
12	evidence from those people that have given evidence	12	available to give those in the GLO Compensation Group
13	before you within the Human Impact Hearings, having seen	13	compensation that is similar to that which is available
14	all of the written representations that have been made	14	to non-GLO group members. One of the findings that we
15	by the various bodies and institutions, to make findings	15	would ask you to make, though, is this, that since March
16	as to the position reached in relation to compensation.	16	of this year not one GLO group member has received any
17	But the other value of an interim report will be	17	compensation.
18	that within that report you can set out your	18	We do say that there has been obfuscation and
19	recommendations, recommendations which you will then be	19	delay in dealing with these matters as should have been
20	able to consider and review during the lifetime of the	20	appropriate by essentially what is a public body: the
21	Inquiry.	21	Post Office. We know it is privatised but it is owned
22	Now, we know the background to this. In relation	22	by the Government. Therefore, an interim report setting
23	to the GLO litigants, it is that they played a crucial	23	out recommendations would provide a target list for the
24	role in exposing the Post Office Horizon scandal. We	24	Government and for the Post Office to then follow.
25	also know that in 2019 much of the monies paid over as	25	We ask for the following points to be made if you
	97		98
1	would consider them, please, in such part of your	1	in A, B or C.
2	recommendations as you would be prepared to consider.	2	Point 4, that BEIS should make provision for
3	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Mr Stein, will you give me those in	3	reasonable legal costs all in stages of compensation
4	slightly slower fashion because, for whatever reason,	4	applications in all three categories that you have
5	I'm not getting a simultaneous transcript now. I want	5	identified, and that claimants are provided with proper
6	to make a careful note of what you are saying.	6	access to disclosure at all stages.
7	MR STEIN: Sir, not only will I do that but we will also	7	Point 5, that of the principles that you have
8	undertake to provide it in writing so that you have	8	sought to discover for all compensation schemes, or
9	those set out.	9	proposed schemes, there needs to be transparent and
10	There are six individual points that we ask you to	10	disclosed settled precedents and comparables, allowing
11	consider making. Firstly, that significant interim	11	for legal advice to be given to the Post Office's
12	payments are made immediately to all of those	12	victims at their individual category of claim and
13	subpostmasters who are outstanding.	13	expected financial outcome.
14	Point 2, that as regards the recent press release	14	Finally, at point 6, a timetable be set out for
15	from BEIS that they are making available 19.5 million as	15	the establishment of the GLO Compensation Scheme capable
16	an interim payment fund, that you, sir, are provided	16	of being monitored and followed by all those involved.
17	with the principles to be used for the distribution of	17	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Can I just be clear with you, Mr Stein.
18	these funds amongst the GLO litigants. Sir, that would	18	That last point, point 6, is clearly related solely to
19	allow you to consider the fairness of payments amongst	19	I will call them the GLO claimants. You call them GLO.
20	the litigants and make any recommendations as may be	20	Point 1 to 5 apply to all categories, so that I'm clear,
21	required.	21	A, B and C.
22	Point 3, that fairness demands that the	22	MR STEIN: Sir, yes.
23	Post Office should not be the final arbiter of whether	23	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: A, B and C, 1 to 5, 6 is specific to GLO.
24	an interim or final payment should be made in	24	MR STEIN: Sir, yes.
25	compensation claims made by any individual in categories	25	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Okay.
	99		100

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

STEIN: Sir, we recognise, as has already been made in	1
passing comment this morning, this is not a court. This	2
is not the High Court. Your powers are limited to	3
making statements, recommendations, and putting forward	4
findings. It is, though, nevertheless possible for you	5
to set out what you would regard as being within the	6
range of reasonable responses that could be made by	7
setting out a timetable and, of course, that can then be	8
reconsidered if there is any attempt, if you like, or	9
any suspicion that such a timetable is not being	10
followed. It would be an indication, in other words.	11
The reason why we say that such recommendations	12

13 are required is because, in our submission, the approach of the Post Office and BEIS to compensation replicates 14 past behaviour. We suggest that what is happening is 15 that the Post Office is continuing to attempt, and 16 actually succeeding, in siloing subpostmasters, keeping 17 them ignorant of what is happening in relation to 18 compensation claims as regards to one to another. There 19 is a limitation being provided on access to full legal 20 21 advice. The onus of proof point has been made already, 22 but the onus of proof point is that despite the fact that many Post Office business papers and accounts were 23 removed, or over the years have gone, that the burden of 24 25 proof is nevertheless placed upon the applicants within

issues is causing the same problem that you have heard through the Human Impact Hearings, that each one of the subpostmasters in their individual post offices was left in ignorance of what going on elsewhere without information that would have assisted them in dealing with the Post Office. Now if, sir, you are able to follow that request

these schemes. We say that the collection of those

and put forward an interim report, it would assist in providing us with a way forward because one of the things that has been apparent this week, and indeed up until today, is that the sands have been moving in the background. We have heard very submissions coming in late. The submission that you referred to as the one last night, in fact, I think my instructing solicitors received it at 8.30 this morning, as it was passed on by the Inquiry -- we're grateful for that -- and so we didn't even have it at the 9.50 last night that it otherwise might have been available. We know that what has been happening is behind the scenes letters have been sent to many of the people that we represent and, therefore, there is a problem that exists which is a shifting sands of position that is hard to grasp, which is why, sir, an interim report setting out what you would regard as being the way forward would be of real

assistance

MR

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The interim report that we ask you, sir, to make does not relate to recent events. The Post Office and its sole shareholder (the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, BEIS) which monitors the performance of the Post Office through UK Government Investments, has been firmly aware of the failings of the Horizon system for many years.

There were the two judgments by Mr Justice Fraser in 2019 that demonstrated that the Post Office had failed to ensure that its operating system, Horizon, was fit and reliable for the purposes of its systems and as a basis for any type of legal case. Nevertheless, the Post Office throughout those proceedings fought the case tooth and nail thorough the High Court, even seeking at one stage to remove from Mr Justice Fraser from the case

Not one of the Horizon system. The Horizon system 18 is not a sentient being. The Horizon system did not 19 20 pick its victims. The Horizon system did not decide which of the Post Office offices individual balances it 21 22 would disturb and infect with its bugs. The Horizon 23 system is a product of the negligence and lack of care 24 of the people who operated and owned it. In fact, we 25 suspect, as the Inquiry progresses we're going to find

that all post offices had some problems. The question is: to what degree?

The Post Office should never have thought to preserve its reputation at all costs by fighting the High Court case. But what it did do, by doing so, was at the cost of further harm to the lives, financial health, and mental wellbeing of those we represent. The Post Office is in, in effect, a public organisation and should have immediately told the truth to its Post Office workers. Instead, what has happened in relation to compensation it has set about putting in place complicated schemes run by corporate lawyers to provide access to some compensation for some its victims.

Sir, on 8 November last year I addressed you at the first hearing of this Public Inquiry after it had been put on a statutory basis. I set out then that many ex-subpostmasters face imminent financial ruin and that people will lose their homes unless something is done urgently to assist them. I added then that some may not survive the lifetime of the Inquiry due to stress-related illnesses. Indeed, since the Inquiry has started hearings in February of this year, I am sad to say that I have been informed that another of those affected by the Post Office in this scandal has died.

1	We don't of course forget such individuals as Marian	1	ite reference and issues to compel the Post Office and
2	We don't, of course, forget such individuals as Marian Holmes' husband Peter, a proud and distinguished	2	its reference and issues to compel the Post Office and BEIS to disclose an up-to-date clarification on
3	ex-police officer who went to his grave with a wholly	3	compensation.
4	undeserved conviction recorded against his name.	4	Of course, all of our clients have asked me to
5	The obfuscation and denial that I have referred to	5	convey their gratitude to you and your team at this
6	has continued since the time of the High Court hearings.	6	Inquiry for acknowledging and prioritising this
7	On 1 December 2021, BEIS wrote to two of our clients and	7	important issue through conducting these hearings today
8	told them a full and final settlement was reached	8	and next week. But it may assist you to know that many
9	between the claimants in the GLO and the Post Office.	9	of our clients have found it helpful to give evidence in
10	There is nothing further the Department can do at this	10	the Human Impact Hearings, finding the experience
11	time.	11	cathartic and giving them a degree of closure.
12	On 6 December last year, Mr Enright, partner at	12	But the harm which the Post Office has caused to
13	Howe & Co Solicitors, wrote to Mr Scully and stated	13	our clients is ongoing and is made manifest in the their
14	that:	14	desperate financial consequences. Let me give you some
15	"Neither you nor your Government's hands are tied	15	examples of what has been said. Marion Drydale says:
16	by the settlement in the Group Litigation. It is	16	
17	entirely open to your department and your Government to	17	"I have sold my jewellery, used my inheritance, cashed in my pension. Every day is filled with
18	acknowledge the widely accepted fact that claimants in		
	, ,	18	uncertainty, a dread of more bills I cannot pay."
19 20	the Group Litigation performed a vital public service."	19	Peter Worsfold says that he has still not been
20	Without their action, for which they paid a very	20	able to repay his year-old mother for bailing him out
21	high price, the greatest miscarriage of justice in	21	when the Post Office demanded money for shortfalls in
22	British legal history would never have been uncovered.	22	2002. He visits the supermarket at 4 p.m. when they
23	In November, I asked you, sir, as Chair, to use	23	have put short-dated items out at reduced prices.
24	your wide powers to require the production of evidence	24	Faisal Aziz is on the verge of declaring
25	that the Inquiry believes is relevant to the terms of 105	25	bankruptcy. He worries that he will not be able to feed 106
1	his five children.	1	expressed in relation to groups A, B and C. We need to
2	Susan Hazzleton, who you will recall as you asked	2	know, looking forward, what are the principles that are
3	questions in relation to her particular circumstance.	3	going to be used in relation to the setting out of
4	She says that she is years old in December and she	4	compensation in the future for the GLO group.
5	still works four days a week as she can't afford to	5	Now, sir, we have had comment today about the
6	retire, and she has just had to put her house on the	6	responses made in the institutions to this Inquiry. Can
7	market.	7	we set out our disappointment at the responses from the
8	Geoffrey Pound says.	8	Post Office Limited and BEIS to the questions that you
9	"Our house and business were repossessed back in	9	have asked, particularly, may we say, sir, in relation
10	2008. At I would need to live until about 150 years	10	to the issue of fair compensation for the Group
11	old to repay in full."	11	Litigation claimants. You called, sir, for specific
12	Shazia Siddig:	12	answers at questions 1 to 12 on 10 May of this year,
13	"The ounce of dignity I thought was remaining is	13	nearly two months ago. Your direction was this, this is
14	being eroded daily. I am so tired. At the age of	14	on 9 May:
15	I feel like a pensioner. The effect of Post Office	15	"Although the Minister's announcement of 22 March
16	Limited actions have destroyed me."	16	2022 was no doubt very welcome to the claimants in the
17	All these Core Participants are GLO litigants and	17	Group Litigation, it is extremely important that effect
18	there are obviously many other examples that we could	18	is given to the announcement as expeditiously as
19	provide. These are the very people who risked	19	possible. No doubt these two issues will be the subject
20	everything to expose the scandal. Some you heard from.	20	of detailed submissions at the hearing which I have
21	Some, like Gareth Etheridge, received sums as little as	21	decided to convene."
22	£1,800 from the Group Litigation, which is why we go	22	On 10 May, you set out with considerable clarity
23	back to the point we're making in relation to	23	the questions you invited answers to as regards the GLO
24	recommendations.	24	litigants, setting them out of at paragraphs 9 to 10,
25	Sir, you've asked for the principles to be	25	fair compensation for the Group Litigant claimants. The
20	107	20	108

The Post Office Horizon IT Inquiry

1	principles which we apply to the calculation of further	1	questions, setting out the need for simple answers,
2	compensation payments.	2	targeted at what is required by the Group Litigation
3	10. The mechanism or mechanisms by which further	3	individuals.
4	compensation payments will be calculated.	4	Our clients do not wish to wait to hear BEIS
5	11. The provision, if any, which will be made for	5	proposals such as they may be on the next occasion that
6	applicants to obtain independent legal advice in	6	we meet in relation to this Inquiry.
7	relation to their claims.	7	May I make a note now that, because of the
8	12. The procedure or procedures which will be	8	timetabling (of which I make no complaint whatsoever),
9	adopted to resolve disputes about the value of further	9	that we would ask if points arise that we need to deal
10	compensation payments.	10	with that we may need to then return to make some
11	Yet the Post Office responded in six lines at	11	submissions in response after hearing from BEIS on the
12	paragraph 58 of its written submissions to say that:	12	next occasion.
13	"Until further information is released by	13	Sir, what is more concerning is that on 30 June,
14	Government, Post Office is unable to assist the Chair	14	instead of complying with your requests for information,
15	further in relation to issues 9 to 12."	15	BEIS decided to issue a press statement on its website
16	Well, BEIS went one better and responded in two	16	entitled:
17	paragraphs. At paragraphs 38 and subsequently 39 of	17	"New Story 19.5 million interim compensation
18	their submissions dated 31 May, they have said that they	18	package for subpostmasters who helped uncover Horizon
19	convened a working group, that decisions have been made,	19	scandal."
20	and, whilst the Department has a strong desire to begin	20	This is a terrible and heartrending scandal. It
21	payments as soon as possible, the Department hopes to be	21	should not be an opportunity for a Government department
22	able to provide a further update to the Inquiry at the	22	to seek to score public relations points through the
23	hearing in July.	23	Media. Nor should BEIS seek to disregard the Inquiry
24	So we are at a loss to understand why BEIS has	24	process and embark on a frolic of its own, particularly
25	failed to answer your questions. They were simple	25	when directed by the Chair to answer particular
	109		110
1	questions.	1	basis upon which the funds will be apportioned. These
2	The view that our clients takes is that BEIS has	2	matters need to be clarified so that the representatives
3	to be dragged kicking and screaming by my instructing	3	of the Core Participants and my instructing solicitors
4	solicitors Howe & Co and this Inquiry into finally	4	and others can consider them and comment upon them, if
5	agreeing to at least move in the right direction. Is it	5	necessary, on the next occasion.
6	actually possible to believe that the Post Office and	6	May I also add at this point that the lack of
7	BEIS are so incapable of understanding, even now, that	7	trust between my client group and the Post Office,
8	they have victimised their own staff?	8	Fujitsu and BEIS is so extreme that they doubt the
9	So what does this mean? Our clients are now	9	reality of the interim compensation package and, given
10	aware, and this is all it means to them, that the	10	the track record of the Post Office and BEIS, who can
11	Government announcement means that they may be receiving	11	blame them? Put it this way: there are not many
12	some interim compensation. Now, of course, this	12	ex-subpostmasters who are holding their breath.
13	position should have been reached a very long time ago	13	Sir, as you know from the hearings, some people
14	and we still have no clear time-frame for a matter that	14	who are before you and before this Inquiry, are facing
15	is urgent. This is not a gift. The people we represent	15	ruin, absolute ruin, right now staving off people coming
16	are not a charity. They deserve adequate immediate	16	to their door demanding money. So we do ask for a
17	compensation, as we have said many times, for their huge	17	commitment from BEIS to making immediate looking this
18	actual and reputational losses.	18	up to make sure we know what it means. It mean do at
19	The BEIS news story says that Ministers are to	19	once, instantly, get this done, hardship payments to
20	provide a 19.5 million interim compensation package to	20	those SPMs who are facing hardship as a consequence of
21	the postmasters who played a crucial role in exposing	21	the scandal.
22			
	the Horizon scandal. The news story contains next to no	22	We've heard Ms Gallafent today speak about
23	the Horizon scandal. The news story contains next to no detail. There is nothing setting out the date by which		We've heard Ms Gallafent today speak about hardship payments in relation to the Group A group or

24

25

24

25

that will be set out. My clients do not know who will

be eligible, what the application process is, and the

class A group. But what we would respectfully invite

you to accept, sir, is that this appears to have been

1	done at the will of the Post Office when it feels that	1	councilian and prove each and every loss, preferably with
1 2	it should do so in particular circumstances that it's	1 2	causation and prove each and every loss, preferably with contemporaneous evidence.
3	notified of. No system, no settled way ahead, no	3	Many people we represent, and I'm sure many people
4	application process.	4	who have suffered at the hands of the Post Office,
5	Now, aside from our criticisms of the delay and	5	endure victim fatigue and some may well be suffering
6	the BEIS failure to follow your directions, the	6	from undiagnosed PTSD. This system that is put forward
7	announcement of 30 June may represent some progress but	7	is a system in which people who are already finding it
8	it needs to be made reality now, not at some later	8	difficult to manage their lives and look after their
9	stage. We need a timetable and we need that now.	9	families then have to go through this rather difficult
10	May I set out then and move on to the particular	10	process. You will remember that the evidence is that in
11	•	11	•
12	positions in relation to the points that you have asked.		many, if not most, cases the Post Office seized the
	Sir, you have made it very clear that you have read all	12	paperwork of subpostmasters and their records when
13	the written submissions and that indeed we interpret, in	13	suspending them.
14	fact, the need of this Inquiry for these particular	14	The Post Office now seeks to place the burden on
15	hearing purposes as being more directed towards the	15 16	subpostmasters to produce the very records that POL (the
16	institutions to see what they are saying about it as	16	Post Office) took from them. This is wrong-headed and
17	well as the points that we make on their submissions.	17	badly thought out and we'll look at the details been
18	Sir, can we set out our concerns with the HSS.	18	moment.
19	I wonder who came up with that title? Our first point	19	Ms Linnell (Kay Linnell will be, we suspect, an
20	is this in relation to the burden of proving losses:	20	important witness in the later phases of this Inquiry)
21	Post Office Limited and BEIS as responsible for this	21	tells us that during the mediation scheme a senior
22	scandal. They should not be treating the issue of	22	Post Office official told Sir Anthony Hooper during the
23	compensating victims as anything akin to litigation or,	23	mediation scheme that Post Office Limited destroys all
24	indeed, what appears to be adversarial litigation. The	24	records after six years. If that is right, then Post
25	HSS scheme requires that SPMs, subpostmasters, establish 113	25	Office Limited requires HSS applicants, and presumably 114
1	all applicants for compensation, to bear a burden of	1	wrong. The scheme should be tailored to reflect the
2	producing documents which Post Office Limited have	2	consequences of Post Office's actions and include:
3	seized and destroyed, in effect directing hurdles that	3	suffering to children and family members; the roles that
4	no horse could jump.	4	family members have played in caring for traumatised
5	It is no answer, we suggest, to our concerns for	5	subpostmasters; and the fact that many subpostmasters
6	Post Office Limited BEIS to rely on the statements in	6	have been required to work long into what would
7	the guidance to the effect that where the postmaster is	7	otherwise have been a planned retirement, and, sir, you
8	unable to satisfy the burden of proof in relation to	8	have heard evidence that relates to such matters.
9	their claim, their claim may nonetheless be accepted in	9	Well, the administration of the compensation
10	whole or in part if the scheme considers it to be fair	10	scheme has been described by Post Office Limited. They
11	in all the circumstances. What does that mean? What	11	say it's designed to be simple and user-friendly to
12	are the principles being used for such a determination?	12	avoid the need to incur costs of legal representation.
13	Essentially, this has been, and remains, an	13	Well, we suggest that the scheme is neither simple nor
14	enormous and far-reaching public scandal. Our clients	14	user-friendly. It's beset with problems. You will
15	should not have to go cap in hand to the perpetrators of	15	recall the evidence of Mr Sethi, the Inquiry's first
16	that scandal when applying for compensation to ask for	16	witness, who received a request from the HSS for answers
17	indulgences or some form of largesse.	17	to 68 questions which included a number of sub-accounts,
18	The heads of loss within the HSS scheme. Whilst	18	which brought the total to approximately 100 questions.
19	the heads of loss in the HSS are non-exhaustive and	19	Mr Sethi expressed considerable frustration while giving
20	generic, it is problematic that they do not reflect the	20	evidence that he has being asked to consider questions
20	gonono, it io problemade that they do not relied the	21	in relation to matters that had occurred some 20 years
21	full range of harm caused by the Post Office in this		in relation to matters that had bootings sollie 20 years
21 22	full range of harm caused by the Post Office in this scandal		•
22	scandal.	22	previously, in respect of which much of information was
22 23	scandal. Now, Post Office Limited states at paragraph 11 of	22 23	previously, in respect of which much of information was still being held by the Post Office.
22	scandal.	22	previously, in respect of which much of information was

1	received offered from the HSS that have been derisory.	1	There's a danger, we suggest, of there being
2	Fiona Elliott gave evidence on 19 May 2022. Ms Elliott	2	a scandal within a scandal about the compensation and
3	said that she had lost just over a £1 million but had	3	the way it is being handled by the Post Office.
4	been offered instead £24,000. BEIS's assertion at	4	Sir, you have questioned already the sign or the
5	paragraph 21 of their written submissions is that	5	lack of sign of independence in the running of the
6	sorry, the Post Office Limited is on track to issue at	6	scheme. At paragraph 31 of the submissions filed on
7	least 95 per cent of offers by the end of this year.	7	behalf of Post Office Limited, it is stated that HSS
8	It seems to us, and even having listened to	8	claims will be first assessed an assessor from Herbert
9	carefully to what Ms Gallafent has said today, that	9	Smith Freehills and then by a team of reviewers at
10	given the difficulties and the restrictions in	10	Post Office. The assessment is then reviewed again by
11	application process, that there may well be a number of	11	the case assessor before being looked at by a so-called
12	people who have already had offers, and in fact accepted	12	Independent Advisory Panel. Ultimately, it is the
13	them, through settlements, that could well have put	13	Post Office which decides the outcome with the benefit
14	forward further matters that relation to consequential	14	of the Panel's assessment and recommendation.
15	losses. It's a matter of grave concern, we suggest that	15	We suggest, and we agree with the provisional view
16	at paragraph 25 of the Post Office Limited's written	16	that you have set out, that faimess demands that the
17	submissions that they are saying that the vast mortality	17	Post Office Limited should not be the final arbiter of
18	of offers have been accepted. We say that those offers	18	whether an interim or final payment of compensation
19	may well have been made within a scheme where applicants	19	should be made in accordance with the Minister's
20	are not able to receive legal advice or disclosure in	20	announcements in July and December last year, and that
21	relation to their possible claims. It is quite likely,	21	any disputes should be determined therefore by an
22	we say, that there will be many subpostmasters who	22	independent person. In particular, it would be
23	received offers in a similar derisory way to that	23	inappropriate for Post Office Limited to play any part
24	received by Ms Elliott and who, in the absence of legal	24	in the determination of aggravated or exemplary damages
25	advice, have accepted those offers.	25	which will be claimed by subpostmasters. We are not 118
1	aware of any previous scheme where an abuser institution	1	worked it out as being 4 per cent of applicants to the
2	awards punitive damages against itself.	2	HSS scheme were legally represented. In fact, having
3	The further disturbing feature of the HSS scheme	3	looked at the documentation again and considered what
4	you've already dealt with today in discussion with	4	has been said for us this morning, it looks as though
5	Ms Gallafent and Mr Beer, Queen's Counsel, is that there	5	it's 3 per cent of those applying to HSS have had some
6	is a denial before an application is made of access to	6	type of legal representation.
7	documents disclosed by Post Office Limited at those	7	Now, it may be therefore useful to briefly go to
8	initial stages. We have submitted in our written	8	the application form itself. Sir, can I take you to the
9	submissions that there is therefore a substantial	9	bundle, please. At page 192 you have been directed
10	procedural flaw in the HSS scheme. We say that that is	10	to already by Mr Beer sir, this is a form that we
11	wholly unacceptable.	11	learn from Ms Gallafent and I hope I quote her
12	Now, as to legal representation during the	12	correctly, just after midday today this is designed
13	compensation process, we saw in the BEIS news story of	13	not to refer to the consequential losses and that is
14	30 June a comment that is made there which says,	14	done to help lay persons who are making an application.
15	"Postmasters will be able to claim reasonable legal fees	15	Well, therefore it seems we're being told that it
16	as part of participating in the final compensation	16	was quite deliberate that this form didn't have a
17	scheme." Well, we hope that the wording of the	17	reference to consequential losses. You've been directed
18	Ministerial Statement reflects acceptance by POL and by	18	to paragraph, I think, 24 by Mr Beer. Can I take you to
19	BEIS that postmasters simply cannot be expected to	19	paragraph 193. Sorry, page 193 which is paragraph 29.
20	embark upon a complex procedure involving detailed and	20	In the bundle, page 193 and it's paragraph 29 of the
21	historic claims without legal representation and access	21	form. Let's see what it says here.
22	to experts, if necessary.	22	"Please provide an explanation as to why you
00	It is increased and to bright limbs (although the allete in	00	haliana yan hana nat haan traatad fairhi hii tha

24

25

23

24

25

It is important to highlight (although the data is

still not, we suggest, entirely clear) that it appears

that when we were drafting these oral submissions we

believe you have not been treated fairly by the

Post Office. In doing so, you should set out what you

would like the Post Office to do to remedy the situation

1	and why."	1	make much by way of reference to consequential losses:
2	Well, there are a number of answers to that I'm	2	it makes no reference to it.
3	sure that many of my clients would like to give in	3	We take away our legal qualifications and put
4	relation to what the Post Office can do with itself.	4	ourselves in the position of the distressed
5	But otherwise, why is the Post Office setting out there	5	subpostmaster who is trying to deal with such a form in
6	a suggestion of what has happened as a result of the	6	awkward circumstances such as this thinking about, no
7	unfair treatment but it is not dealing in any way with	7	doubt, the time that they've got to get it in otherwise
8	the consequential losses and the effect upon and the	8	that door is going to be closed. What we say is, in
9	stigma of having been dealt with by the Post Office in	9	effect, a form that appears to be designed not to help
10	a particular way or regarding people's character or what	10	lay people make the application but, in fact, to avoid
11	has happened to them by way of their own experiences,	11	particular types of losses.
12	their mental health or their medical health.	12	You will have seen, sir, that the HSS scheme only
13	We have also been directed to the guidance that is	13	provides for contribution of 1200 or 400, depending on
14	set out at page 303 as being guidance that might assist.	14	the scope of the dispute, taken in relation to an offer
15	It doesn't take but a moment to look at the pages that	15	in relation to legal costs or legal expenses. And POL
16	have been referred to already to realise that these are	16	(Post Office Limited) states in its written submissions
17	complex matters, dealing with heads of loss, in terms of	17	that it's made payments of legal expenses in 35 cases
18	loss of earnings, loss of profits, loss of property,	18	where requested to. This should have been built into
19	loss of opportunity, loss of chance (these are legal	19	the scheme. People that are making such applications
20	terms), penalties, general or increased costs of	20	that really have to be told, as we learned today from
21	financing, bankruptcy, insolvency, and so on.	21	Ms Gallafent, that what they should do is look at this
22	We listened carefully to Ms Gallafent who did her	22	application form and look at guidance, make sure that
23	very best in, we would suggest, rather difficult	23	they put in a separate document setting out their answer
24	circumstances to defend the Post Office's actions. This	24	to these heads of damages in relation to consequential
25	form is wholly inadequate. It is not that it doesn't	25	damages. The Post Office is essentially asking for
	121		122
1	individuals to perform with, one would hope, the	1	disadvantage subpostmasters.
2	facility of a trained lawyer and that, we suggest, is	2	Now, we understand that Post Office Limited and
3	continuing unfairness.	3	the Department of Business are considering using Freeths
4	Now, it is quite clear that Post Office Limited	4	Solicitors to assist eligible subpostmasters in relation
5	views the compensation process as litigious. I mention	5	to compensation claims that were brought in the Group
6	Ms Elliott again, Fiona Elliott. She applied to the HSS	6	litigation. Now, we can provide some further update in
7	and on 26 June Ms Elliott attended a good faith meeting,	7	relation to that as being contact to clients of ours by
8	accompanied by Mr Enright, a partner at Howe & Co who is	8	Freeths in a letter that's essentially called Freeths
9	handling these matters, and that was because she had	9	facts. Again, going back to the fast-moving pace of
10	rejected an offer that had been made to her. Now,	10	matters, this is yesterday. Freeths write to
11	attending at that meeting, which was conducted by	4.4	
	and having at that meeting, times trade contacted by	11	subpostmasters:
12	a barrister instructed or employed by Herbert Smith	12	subpostmasters: "Please note that you are not obliged to
12 13	•		'
	a barrister instructed or employed by Herbert Smith	12	"Please note that you are not obliged to
13	a barrister instructed or employed by Herbert Smith Freehills, it was pure good fortune that Mr Enright was	12 13	"Please note that you are not obliged to reinstruct Freeths. If you do not instruct us, this
13 14	a barrister instructed or employed by Herbert Smith Freehills, it was pure good fortune that Mr Enright was present. At the start of the meeting, it was explained	12 13 14	"Please note that you are not obliged to reinstruct Freeths. If you do not instruct us, this means that we will not be able to represent you in stage
13 14 15	a barrister instructed or employed by Herbert Smith Freehills, it was pure good fortune that Mr Enright was present. At the start of the meeting, it was explained to Ms Elliot that the meeting was to be conducted on	12 13 14 15	"Please note that you are not obliged to reinstruct Freeths. If you do not instruct us, this means that we will not be able to represent you in stage 1 of the process and we will not be able to pay your
13 14 15 16	a barrister instructed or employed by Herbert Smith Freehills, it was pure good fortune that Mr Enright was present. At the start of the meeting, it was explained to Ms Elliot that the meeting was to be conducted on a without prejudice basis. Well, it seemed to us, on	12 13 14 15 16	"Please note that you are not obliged to reinstruct Freeths. If you do not instruct us, this means that we will not be able to represent you in stage 1 of the process and we will not be able to pay your interim payment to you."
13 14 15 16 17	a barrister instructed or employed by Herbert Smith Freehills, it was pure good fortune that Mr Enright was present. At the start of the meeting, it was explained to Ms Elliot that the meeting was to be conducted on a without prejudice basis. Well, it seemed to us, on her behalf, that a good faith but without prejudice	12 13 14 15 16	"Please note that you are not obliged to reinstruct Freeths. If you do not instruct us, this means that we will not be able to represent you in stage 1 of the process and we will not be able to pay your interim payment to you." Freeths, therefore, have already acknowledged
13 14 15 16 17 18	a barrister instructed or employed by Herbert Smith Freehills, it was pure good fortune that Mr Enright was present. At the start of the meeting, it was explained to Ms Elliot that the meeting was to be conducted on a without prejudice basis. Well, it seemed to us, on her behalf, that a good faith but without prejudice meeting is absurd and this, yet again, has all the	12 13 14 15 16 17 18	"Please note that you are not obliged to reinstruct Freeths. If you do not instruct us, this means that we will not be able to represent you in stage 1 of the process and we will not be able to pay your interim payment to you." Freeths, therefore, have already acknowledged and, sir, you've considered the wording of their
13 14 15 16 17 18	a barrister instructed or employed by Herbert Smith Freehills, it was pure good fortune that Mr Enright was present. At the start of the meeting, it was explained to Ms Elliot that the meeting was to be conducted on a without prejudice basis. Well, it seemed to us, on her behalf, that a good faith but without prejudice meeting is absurd and this, yet again, has all the trappings of litigation.	12 13 14 15 16 17 18	"Please note that you are not obliged to reinstruct Freeths. If you do not instruct us, this means that we will not be able to represent you in stage 1 of the process and we will not be able to pay your interim payment to you." Freeths, therefore, have already acknowledged and, sir, you've considered the wording of their communication to the Inquiry already that not all
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a barrister instructed or employed by Herbert Smith Freehills, it was pure good fortune that Mr Enright was present. At the start of the meeting, it was explained to Ms Elliot that the meeting was to be conducted on a without prejudice basis. Well, it seemed to us, on her behalf, that a good faith but without prejudice meeting is absurd and this, yet again, has all the trappings of litigation. We hope that Post Office Limited and BEIS accept	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	"Please note that you are not obliged to reinstruct Freeths. If you do not instruct us, this means that we will not be able to represent you in stage 1 of the process and we will not be able to pay your interim payment to you." Freeths, therefore, have already acknowledged and, sir, you've considered the wording of their communication to the Inquiry already that not all individuals will necessarily be wishing to instruct them
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a barrister instructed or employed by Herbert Smith Freehills, it was pure good fortune that Mr Enright was present. At the start of the meeting, it was explained to Ms Elliot that the meeting was to be conducted on a without prejudice basis. Well, it seemed to us, on her behalf, that a good faith but without prejudice meeting is absurd and this, yet again, has all the trappings of litigation. We hope that Post Office Limited and BEIS accept that the provision in the HSS scheme, which probably is	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	"Please note that you are not obliged to reinstruct Freeths. If you do not instruct us, this means that we will not be able to represent you in stage 1 of the process and we will not be able to pay your interim payment to you." Freeths, therefore, have already acknowledged and, sir, you've considered the wording of their communication to the Inquiry already that not all individuals will necessarily be wishing to instruct them within this process.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	a barrister instructed or employed by Herbert Smith Freehills, it was pure good fortune that Mr Enright was present. At the start of the meeting, it was explained to Ms Elliot that the meeting was to be conducted on a without prejudice basis. Well, it seemed to us, on her behalf, that a good faith but without prejudice meeting is absurd and this, yet again, has all the trappings of litigation. We hope that Post Office Limited and BEIS accept that the provision in the HSS scheme, which probably is going to be asked for or attempted to be replicated in	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	"Please note that you are not obliged to reinstruct Freeths. If you do not instruct us, this means that we will not be able to represent you in stage 1 of the process and we will not be able to pay your interim payment to you." Freeths, therefore, have already acknowledged and, sir, you've considered the wording of their communication to the Inquiry already that not all individuals will necessarily be wishing to instruct them within this process. Now, Mr Enright of Howe & Co Solicitors recently

Inquiry will be included in the further discussions 124

1	about how the scheme for the GLO litigants will be put	1	not convicted can apply through the HSS scheme.
2	together and its terms. So moving forwards, it seems as	2	Presumably BEIS will say that any subpostmaster who was
3	though there is acceptance by BEIS that Howe & Co, and	3	acquitted and who was a member of the GLO can apply
4	no doubt other firms of solicitors, will be involved in	4	under the new, but as yet unparticularised, scheme.
5	that process.	5	Our position is that those subpostmasters who were
6	Now, we welcome that. It will enable discussions	6	acquitted fall between the mechanisms and should be
7	about funds being distributed to be discussed openly and	7	transferred into the category B cohort of cases and
8	transparently and that will be capable of being shared	8	should have the facility to receive up to £100,000 in
9	with the Inquiry as the Inquiry makes it progress.	9	interim compensation in accordance with that process.
10	Nevertheless, the work that will need to be done	10	This would remove the unacceptable position reflected in
11	within those discussions and in making the applications	11	the evidence of Ms Hamilton and Ms Palmer, that those
12	in the future must be properly funded to put those	12	who are convicted are at least eligible for conviction
13	applicants within the GLO litigation on the same basis	13	whereas those who were acquitted were not.
14	as the Post Office in terms of legal representation.	14	We hope that the announcement of 30 June that
15	Can I then deal with interim patients themselves.	15	Ministers are to provide a 19.5 million compensation
16	This is interim payments for those who underwent	16	package for all GLO litigants will assist in practical
17	prosecutions, not convicted. We have submitted that	17	terms. But the distinction should be made. However,
18	there should be no distinction between those who are	18	basic mathematics suggest that acquitted subpostmasters
19	entitled to interim payments having had their	19	will still receive substantially less in interim relief
20	convictions overturned and to those who are prosecuted	20	than those who were convicted.
21	and acquitted at trial or where prosecutions were	21	Can we deal with the compensation questions that
22	discontinued or cautions accepted.	22	relate to subpostmasters with quashed convictions. The
23	We understand that BEIS's position as stated in	23	subpostmasters with overturned convictions who we
24	their written submissions is that any subpostmaster who	24	represent would wish that BEIS clarify their position in
25	was acquitted or otherwise prosecuted and cautioned or	25	relation to how it will proceed in this category of
	125		126
1	cases in these hearings.	1	open and clear to others.
2	Can I deal immediately with a point that's already	2	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Mr Stein, you probably heard Mr Beer
3	been subject to some discussion. We know that there are	3	suggest that I might want to enquire of the affected
4	discussions ongoing that include a reference to	4	Core Participants to what extent I should butt out or in
5	Lord Dyson who, as we understand, has agreed to come in	5	in relation to this particular issue. I asked
6	and consider these particular category of cases. We go	6	Ms Gallafent what she thought and she answered me. Am
7	back to our primary submission which is that you, sir,	7	I butting in or out or somewhere in between on what you
8	should have answers to what are the principles being	8	say?
9	employed in relation to such determinations. We were	9	MR STEIN: Well, sir, naturally of course, we are asking you
10	pleased to hear the possibility set out today that the	10	to stay somewhat in the doorway.
11	comparables or the precedents or the determinations made	11	The position that we are asking you to adopt is
12	by Lord Dyson may well be available so that people can	12	this: that it is important that the principles for
13	see what has happened one to another with such	13	compensation are established, are known, are transparent
14	applications.	14	and accessible. We also don't wish to interfere in
15	We do not wish to make any further submissions on	15	anyway with any current application or anything that we
16	this particular point because we would like to consider	16	put forward delay compensation being provided. So on
17	what has have be said so far between now and the next	17	that basis, and subject to further thought between now
18	hearing, but our main consideration being that	18	and the next occasion in this rather rapidly moving
19	principles need to be open, need to be transparent, need	19	situation, we suggest that the way forward will be for
10	principles need to be open, need to be transparent, need	19	situation, we suggest that the way forward will be for

21

22

23

24

25

20

21

22

23

24

25

to be capable of being examined by subpostmasters and

through what may be described as the alternative scheme

principles upon which decisions should be made should be

our representatives remain in relation to all of those,

including those individuals who otherwise might go

employing the good services of Lord Dyson. But the

your to stand in that doorway and say that the process

needs to have some level of oversight and needs to be

respectfully, a halfway house that would be acceptable

transparent and to request, if all parties agree, that

the Lord Tyson principles, can I put it that way, be

made available. That would seem to us to be,

1	at this time.	1	the Inquiry and in such contact, the Inquiry may be
2	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I mean, I'm looking at this from	2	prepare, I know not, to accept that he would be prepared
3	a practical point of view as well. You invited me in	3	to set out the general nature of his considerations.
4	the strongest terms to provide an interim report. In	4	We don't, in any event wish, to put anything
5	the very nature of this things that would probably mean	5	forward that delays any compensation going to anyone.
6	a greater length of time between these hearings elapsing	6	There have been enough delays and enough obfuscation and
7	than if I were to just provide a progress update	7	that that cannot be done. So we accept the problem and
8	because, as you will appreciate, an interim report has	8	we accept also, therefore, the solution.
9	to be laid before Parliament and all the rest of it.	9	Now, we understand that as regards the claw-back
10	MR STEIN: Yes.	10	position that this is one of the matters that has
11	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: If it happened to be the case that	11	changed. For us, we learnt about this this morning.
12	Lord Dyson's work was I think someone suggested that	12	We're told in the correspondence that was received last
13	he may complete part of his work by the end of July, who	13	night, that we saw I think at 8.30 this morning, that
14	knows what then might follow from that. So I think the	14	there would be no attempt now to claw that back. That
15	probability is that instead of us talking to each other	15	is progress at least in relation to those payments.
16	sideways about doors open and shut, I should just the	16	We note that Post Office Limited has made that
17	very great likelihood is that Lord Dyson might pronounce	17	concession in relation to paragraph 43, we think, of its
18	before I certainly provide and interim report and my	18	written submissions. BEIS has now confirmed, it seems,
19	interim report, if that's what it is, will then no doubt	19	that it agrees with that position.
20	take great account of what transpires. Does that sound	20	Now, I turn then to paragraph 33 of the written
21	reasonable?	21	submissions from BEIS which states this:
22	MR STEIN: Sir, yes. It does seem to us to be a practical	22	"One reason for the Department providing funding
23	way forward. Being blunt, it may well be that	23	to Post Office Limited to enable claimants to receive an
24	Lord Dyson will hear of this hearing, may well pay	24	interim payment of up to 100,000 was to make ensure that
25	attention to it, and may want to consider contact with	25	they could secure independent legal advice to assist
20	129	20	130
1	them in making claims."	1	the postmasters at source and deducted from interim
2	It also stated that the Department was concerned	2	payments at the outset.
3	to avoid a situation whereby postmasters were forced to	3	The money is needed right now to solve people's
4			The meney is needed light new to serve people's
	endade expensive litidation funders and end up with	Δ	immediate problems, to get them out of the financial
7	engage expensive litigation funders and end up with	4 5	immediate problems, to get them out of the financial
5 6	their compensation reduced as a result, as happened of	5	hole created by the Post Office. What are those
6	their compensation reduced as a result, as happened of course with the Group Litigation.	5 6	hole created by the Post Office. What are those individuals to do? To receive an interim payment, put
6 7	their compensation reduced as a result, as happened of course with the Group Litigation. The need for interim payment is such that that is	5 6 7	hole created by the Post Office. What are those individuals to do? To receive an interim payment, put some rather unspecified sum of money aside which they
6 7 8	their compensation reduced as a result, as happened of course with the Group Litigation. The need for interim payment is such that that is required to allow people to get their heads above water,	5 6 7 8	hole created by the Post Office. What are those individuals to do? To receive an interim payment, put some rather unspecified sum of money aside which they can't touch to use for legal costs. At the heart of
6 7 8 9	their compensation reduced as a result, as happened of course with the Group Litigation. The need for interim payment is such that that is required to allow people to get their heads above water, not for such luxuries as legal costs. Legal costs	5 6 7 8 9	hole created by the Post Office. What are those individuals to do? To receive an interim payment, put some rather unspecified sum of money aside which they can't touch to use for legal costs. At the heart of this suggestion, it is badly wrong that those
6 7 8 9 10	their compensation reduced as a result, as happened of course with the Group Litigation. The need for interim payment is such that that is required to allow people to get their heads above water, not for such luxuries as legal costs. Legal costs should be paid for by BEIS and we suggest that there	5 6 7 8 9	hole created by the Post Office. What are those individuals to do? To receive an interim payment, put some rather unspecified sum of money aside which they can't touch to use for legal costs. At the heart of this suggestion, it is badly wrong that those individuals are being deprived of the ability to
6 7 8 9 10 11	their compensation reduced as a result, as happened of course with the Group Litigation. The need for interim payment is such that that is required to allow people to get their heads above water, not for such luxuries as legal costs. Legal costs should be paid for by BEIS and we suggest that there still is a failure of understanding by BEIS and the	5 6 7 8 9 10	hole created by the Post Office. What are those individuals to do? To receive an interim payment, put some rather unspecified sum of money aside which they can't touch to use for legal costs. At the heart of this suggestion, it is badly wrong that those individuals are being deprived of the ability to properly have fully funded legal assistance.
6 7 8 9 10 11	their compensation reduced as a result, as happened of course with the Group Litigation. The need for interim payment is such that that is required to allow people to get their heads above water, not for such luxuries as legal costs. Legal costs should be paid for by BEIS and we suggest that there still is a failure of understanding by BEIS and the Post Office that the subpostmasters were, and are, their	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	hole created by the Post Office. What are those individuals to do? To receive an interim payment, put some rather unspecified sum of money aside which they can't touch to use for legal costs. At the heart of this suggestion, it is badly wrong that those individuals are being deprived of the ability to properly have fully funded legal assistance. BEIS will know that the aim of compensation is to
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	their compensation reduced as a result, as happened of course with the Group Litigation. The need for interim payment is such that that is required to allow people to get their heads above water, not for such luxuries as legal costs. Legal costs should be paid for by BEIS and we suggest that there still is a failure of understanding by BEIS and the Post Office that the subpostmasters were, and are, their victims. They have created this problem. They have	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	hole created by the Post Office. What are those individuals to do? To receive an interim payment, put some rather unspecified sum of money aside which they can't touch to use for legal costs. At the heart of this suggestion, it is badly wrong that those individuals are being deprived of the ability to properly have fully funded legal assistance. BEIS will know that the aim of compensation is to try to place postmasters back in the position where they
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	their compensation reduced as a result, as happened of course with the Group Litigation. The need for interim payment is such that that is required to allow people to get their heads above water, not for such luxuries as legal costs. Legal costs should be paid for by BEIS and we suggest that there still is a failure of understanding by BEIS and the Post Office that the subpostmasters were, and are, their victims. They have created this problem. They have created the need for subpostmasters to have legal	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	hole created by the Post Office. What are those individuals to do? To receive an interim payment, put some rather unspecified sum of money aside which they can't touch to use for legal costs. At the heart of this suggestion, it is badly wrong that those individuals are being deprived of the ability to properly have fully funded legal assistance. BEIS will know that the aim of compensation is to try to place postmasters back in the position where they would have been but for the scandal. Costs are a
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	their compensation reduced as a result, as happened of course with the Group Litigation. The need for interim payment is such that that is required to allow people to get their heads above water, not for such luxuries as legal costs. Legal costs should be paid for by BEIS and we suggest that there still is a failure of understanding by BEIS and the Post Office that the subpostmasters were, and are, their victims. They have created this problem. They have created the need for subpostmasters to have legal assistance at all.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	hole created by the Post Office. What are those individuals to do? To receive an interim payment, put some rather unspecified sum of money aside which they can't touch to use for legal costs. At the heart of this suggestion, it is badly wrong that those individuals are being deprived of the ability to properly have fully funded legal assistance. BEIS will know that the aim of compensation is to try to place postmasters back in the position where they would have been but for the scandal. Costs are a separate issue.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	their compensation reduced as a result, as happened of course with the Group Litigation. The need for interim payment is such that that is required to allow people to get their heads above water, not for such luxuries as legal costs. Legal costs should be paid for by BEIS and we suggest that there still is a failure of understanding by BEIS and the Post Office that the subpostmasters were, and are, their victims. They have created this problem. They have created the need for subpostmasters to have legal assistance at all. Now, there appears to be some conflict with	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	hole created by the Post Office. What are those individuals to do? To receive an interim payment, put some rather unspecified sum of money aside which they can't touch to use for legal costs. At the heart of this suggestion, it is badly wrong that those individuals are being deprived of the ability to properly have fully funded legal assistance. BEIS will know that the aim of compensation is to try to place postmasters back in the position where they would have been but for the scandal. Costs are a separate issue. Of course, BEIS may pay the reasonable legal costs
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	their compensation reduced as a result, as happened of course with the Group Litigation. The need for interim payment is such that that is required to allow people to get their heads above water, not for such luxuries as legal costs. Legal costs should be paid for by BEIS and we suggest that there still is a failure of understanding by BEIS and the Post Office that the subpostmasters were, and are, their victims. They have created this problem. They have created the need for subpostmasters to have legal assistance at all. Now, there appears to be some conflict with submissions made by the Post Office at paragraph 56 of	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	hole created by the Post Office. What are those individuals to do? To receive an interim payment, put some rather unspecified sum of money aside which they can't touch to use for legal costs. At the heart of this suggestion, it is badly wrong that those individuals are being deprived of the ability to properly have fully funded legal assistance. BEIS will know that the aim of compensation is to try to place postmasters back in the position where they would have been but for the scandal. Costs are a separate issue. Of course, BEIS may pay the reasonable legal costs associated with making claims under the scheme. It
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	their compensation reduced as a result, as happened of course with the Group Litigation. The need for interim payment is such that that is required to allow people to get their heads above water, not for such luxuries as legal costs. Legal costs should be paid for by BEIS and we suggest that there still is a failure of understanding by BEIS and the Post Office that the subpostmasters were, and are, their victims. They have created this problem. They have created the need for subpostmasters to have legal assistance at all. Now, there appears to be some conflict with submissions made by the Post Office at paragraph 56 of its written submissions, that as part of the	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	hole created by the Post Office. What are those individuals to do? To receive an interim payment, put some rather unspecified sum of money aside which they can't touch to use for legal costs. At the heart of this suggestion, it is badly wrong that those individuals are being deprived of the ability to properly have fully funded legal assistance. BEIS will know that the aim of compensation is to try to place postmasters back in the position where they would have been but for the scandal. Costs are a separate issue. Of course, BEIS may pay the reasonable legal costs associated with making claims under the scheme. It appears to have agreed to do so in relation to category
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	their compensation reduced as a result, as happened of course with the Group Litigation. The need for interim payment is such that that is required to allow people to get their heads above water, not for such luxuries as legal costs. Legal costs should be paid for by BEIS and we suggest that there still is a failure of understanding by BEIS and the Post Office that the subpostmasters were, and are, their victims. They have created this problem. They have created the need for subpostmasters to have legal assistance at all. Now, there appears to be some conflict with submissions made by the Post Office at paragraph 56 of its written submissions, that as part of the negotiations Post Office will consider the postmasters'	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	hole created by the Post Office. What are those individuals to do? To receive an interim payment, put some rather unspecified sum of money aside which they can't touch to use for legal costs. At the heart of this suggestion, it is badly wrong that those individuals are being deprived of the ability to properly have fully funded legal assistance. BEIS will know that the aim of compensation is to try to place postmasters back in the position where they would have been but for the scandal. Costs are a separate issue. Of course, BEIS may pay the reasonable legal costs associated with making claims under the scheme. It appears to have agreed to do so in relation to category C, the GLO litigants. It cannot, we suggest, reasonably
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	their compensation reduced as a result, as happened of course with the Group Litigation. The need for interim payment is such that that is required to allow people to get their heads above water, not for such luxuries as legal costs. Legal costs should be paid for by BEIS and we suggest that there still is a failure of understanding by BEIS and the Post Office that the subpostmasters were, and are, their victims. They have created this problem. They have created the need for subpostmasters to have legal assistance at all. Now, there appears to be some conflict with submissions made by the Post Office at paragraph 56 of its written submissions, that as part of the negotiations Post Office will consider the postmasters' reasonable legal costs. So it seems that BEIS will need	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	hole created by the Post Office. What are those individuals to do? To receive an interim payment, put some rather unspecified sum of money aside which they can't touch to use for legal costs. At the heart of this suggestion, it is badly wrong that those individuals are being deprived of the ability to properly have fully funded legal assistance. BEIS will know that the aim of compensation is to try to place postmasters back in the position where they would have been but for the scandal. Costs are a separate issue. Of course, BEIS may pay the reasonable legal costs associated with making claims under the scheme. It appears to have agreed to do so in relation to category C, the GLO litigants. It cannot, we suggest, reasonably fail to do likewise in respect of HSS applicants and it
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	their compensation reduced as a result, as happened of course with the Group Litigation. The need for interim payment is such that that is required to allow people to get their heads above water, not for such luxuries as legal costs. Legal costs should be paid for by BEIS and we suggest that there still is a failure of understanding by BEIS and the Post Office that the subpostmasters were, and are, their victims. They have created this problem. They have created the need for subpostmasters to have legal assistance at all. Now, there appears to be some conflict with submissions made by the Post Office at paragraph 56 of its written submissions, that as part of the negotiations Post Office will consider the postmasters' reasonable legal costs. So it seems that BEIS will need to reconsider its position based upon the way that the	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	hole created by the Post Office. What are those individuals to do? To receive an interim payment, put some rather unspecified sum of money aside which they can't touch to use for legal costs. At the heart of this suggestion, it is badly wrong that those individuals are being deprived of the ability to properly have fully funded legal assistance. BEIS will know that the aim of compensation is to try to place postmasters back in the position where they would have been but for the scandal. Costs are a separate issue. Of course, BEIS may pay the reasonable legal costs associated with making claims under the scheme. It appears to have agreed to do so in relation to category C, the GLO litigants. It cannot, we suggest, reasonably fail to do likewise in respect of HSS applicants and it should not try to short change those who are convicted
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	their compensation reduced as a result, as happened of course with the Group Litigation. The need for interim payment is such that that is required to allow people to get their heads above water, not for such luxuries as legal costs. Legal costs should be paid for by BEIS and we suggest that there still is a failure of understanding by BEIS and the Post Office that the subpostmasters were, and are, their victims. They have created this problem. They have created the need for subpostmasters to have legal assistance at all. Now, there appears to be some conflict with submissions made by the Post Office at paragraph 56 of its written submissions, that as part of the negotiations Post Office will consider the postmasters' reasonable legal costs. So it seems that BEIS will need to reconsider its position based upon the way that the Post Office has set matters out.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	hole created by the Post Office. What are those individuals to do? To receive an interim payment, put some rather unspecified sum of money aside which they can't touch to use for legal costs. At the heart of this suggestion, it is badly wrong that those individuals are being deprived of the ability to properly have fully funded legal assistance. BEIS will know that the aim of compensation is to try to place postmasters back in the position where they would have been but for the scandal. Costs are a separate issue. Of course, BEIS may pay the reasonable legal costs associated with making claims under the scheme. It appears to have agreed to do so in relation to category C, the GLO litigants. It cannot, we suggest, reasonably fail to do likewise in respect of HSS applicants and it should not try to short change those who are convicted unlawfully as a result of Post Office's abusive
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	their compensation reduced as a result, as happened of course with the Group Litigation. The need for interim payment is such that that is required to allow people to get their heads above water, not for such luxuries as legal costs. Legal costs should be paid for by BEIS and we suggest that there still is a failure of understanding by BEIS and the Post Office that the subpostmasters were, and are, their victims. They have created this problem. They have created the need for subpostmasters to have legal assistance at all. Now, there appears to be some conflict with submissions made by the Post Office at paragraph 56 of its written submissions, that as part of the negotiations Post Office will consider the postmasters' reasonable legal costs. So it seems that BEIS will need to reconsider its position based upon the way that the Post Office has set matters out. Effectively, BEIS is saying that they don't want	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	hole created by the Post Office. What are those individuals to do? To receive an interim payment, put some rather unspecified sum of money aside which they can't touch to use for legal costs. At the heart of this suggestion, it is badly wrong that those individuals are being deprived of the ability to properly have fully funded legal assistance. BEIS will know that the aim of compensation is to try to place postmasters back in the position where they would have been but for the scandal. Costs are a separate issue. Of course, BEIS may pay the reasonable legal costs associated with making claims under the scheme. It appears to have agreed to do so in relation to category C, the GLO litigants. It cannot, we suggest, reasonably fail to do likewise in respect of HSS applicants and it should not try to short change those who are convicted unlawfully as a result of Post Office's abusive prosecutions. It is obvious that Post Office or BEIS
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	their compensation reduced as a result, as happened of course with the Group Litigation. The need for interim payment is such that that is required to allow people to get their heads above water, not for such luxuries as legal costs. Legal costs should be paid for by BEIS and we suggest that there still is a failure of understanding by BEIS and the Post Office that the subpostmasters were, and are, their victims. They have created this problem. They have created the need for subpostmasters to have legal assistance at all. Now, there appears to be some conflict with submissions made by the Post Office at paragraph 56 of its written submissions, that as part of the negotiations Post Office will consider the postmasters' reasonable legal costs. So it seems that BEIS will need to reconsider its position based upon the way that the Post Office has set matters out. Effectively, BEIS is saying that they don't want legal costs to eat into subpostmasters' final	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	hole created by the Post Office. What are those individuals to do? To receive an interim payment, put some rather unspecified sum of money aside which they can't touch to use for legal costs. At the heart of this suggestion, it is badly wrong that those individuals are being deprived of the ability to properly have fully funded legal assistance. BEIS will know that the aim of compensation is to try to place postmasters back in the position where they would have been but for the scandal. Costs are a separate issue. Of course, BEIS may pay the reasonable legal costs associated with making claims under the scheme. It appears to have agreed to do so in relation to category C, the GLO litigants. It cannot, we suggest, reasonably fail to do likewise in respect of HSS applicants and it should not try to short change those who are convicted unlawfully as a result of Post Office's abusive prosecutions. It is obvious that Post Office or BEIS never has to worry about the cost of its own legal
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	their compensation reduced as a result, as happened of course with the Group Litigation. The need for interim payment is such that that is required to allow people to get their heads above water, not for such luxuries as legal costs. Legal costs should be paid for by BEIS and we suggest that there still is a failure of understanding by BEIS and the Post Office that the subpostmasters were, and are, their victims. They have created this problem. They have created the need for subpostmasters to have legal assistance at all. Now, there appears to be some conflict with submissions made by the Post Office at paragraph 56 of its written submissions, that as part of the negotiations Post Office will consider the postmasters' reasonable legal costs. So it seems that BEIS will need to reconsider its position based upon the way that the Post Office has set matters out. Effectively, BEIS is saying that they don't want	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	hole created by the Post Office. What are those individuals to do? To receive an interim payment, put some rather unspecified sum of money aside which they can't touch to use for legal costs. At the heart of this suggestion, it is badly wrong that those individuals are being deprived of the ability to properly have fully funded legal assistance. BEIS will know that the aim of compensation is to try to place postmasters back in the position where they would have been but for the scandal. Costs are a separate issue. Of course, BEIS may pay the reasonable legal costs associated with making claims under the scheme. It appears to have agreed to do so in relation to category C, the GLO litigants. It cannot, we suggest, reasonably fail to do likewise in respect of HSS applicants and it should not try to short change those who are convicted unlawfully as a result of Post Office's abusive prosecutions. It is obvious that Post Office or BEIS

1	Our clients are very grateful, sir, that these	1	counsel on behalf of the Post Office that says that that
2	hearings have been convened in what we all know is an	2	is being considered. It needs to be said that the door
3	early stage of the inquiry process. But sadly it seems	3	is open and applications can be made.
4	that it is only by repeated correspondence from my	4	Let's compare briefly y the evidence that you have
5	instructing solicitors and others, and by this Inquiry	5	heard, what's happened in the past to what is happening
6	taking upon itself the need to have these hearings, that	6	now. Sinead Rainey's evidence heard in Belfast in the
7	BEIS and the Post Office are having their feet held to	7	Human Impact Hearings, transcript 18 May (just for your
8	the fire in order to make them pay up.	8	note) at page 43, lines 12 onwards. You will remember
9	There is still a very, very long way to go.	9	that she spoke of an audit which take place on 1 May
10	A large number of subpostmasters remain in highly	10	2019 and she had just dropped her children off at
11	precarious situations. The HSS scheme itself is riven	11	school small children. Sinead said that when the
12	with problems. No doubt for those people that have made	12	auditors had finished tallying up, they came to her and
13	applications already and we suggest that it's very	13	they called her into the office and they said, "Sinead,
14	likely that many people, if they are prepared to listen	14	have you got any more money belong beginning to the
15	to the representations we have made and others, will be	15	Post Office?" The auditors explained, "There's a
16	wanting to go back to the Post Office and say, "Well, we	16	discrepancy here of £63,000". The auditor said,
17	didn't realise the consequential losses could be	17	"Sinead, you've got an hour to get as much money into
18	claimed".	18	that safe. I'll be locking that safe in an hour and
19	It would also be helpful to have it confirmed for	19	you've got an hour to get as much money in there as you
20	all of those people out there that might be in a	20	possibly can. Whatever money you can put in there will
21	position, who having heard what is being said by	21	be deducted off the total discrepancy".
22	Ms Gallafent regarding the potential for there being an	22	So Sinead says this:
23	open door to making a claim within the HSS scheme, for	23	"Well, I got into the car. I drove home and
24	that door to be made clear that it is open and that the	24	I lifted a bucket in my house and I emptied my wee'uns
25	application system is still present. It needs more than 133	25	moneyboxes into them and I emptied my own purse and any 134
1	money that I had in the house, tuppences, 5ps,	1	showing in the system. We need to get that £6,000 now
2	everything went into the bucket."	2	or you'll have a criminal offence." Well, she said,
3	She explained that her mummy and daddy arrived.	3	"Where did that £6,000 come?" She said, "I'm constantly
4	She didn't know it until that point but Darren, her	4	putting money here all the time, hundreds of pounds a
5	husband, had phoned them and they went to Ballymena and	5	week and never showed up that huge amount. What will
6	withdrew as much money as they could out of their own	6	I do now?" They said, "You'll have to pay it". She
7	bank accounts but they couldn't get enough. So they	7	hadn't got it in the shop. "So I ended up by saying can
8	rang two of the uncles and they did the same.	8	I go to the bank?" The bank was closed. They said no.
9	"My sister, when she was on the way to her shop to	9	"So I couldn't leave and go that far. They wouldn't
10	lodge her own takings, she gave me her takings. So	10	wait on until the bank was going to open in the
11	I don't know the exact figure because I never got a	11	afternoon. She tried to offer the Post Office official
12	receive but somewhere in the region of £42,000 was in	12	a cheque. They wouldn't accept that.
13	that bucket."	13	And Ms Elliott said to you, Fiona said to you,sir:
14	Counsel to the Inquiry asked Sinead:	14	"Then I went and my brother owned a car business
15	"Where did that bucket go?"	15	in the village as well and I asked him would he have any
16	Sinead said:	16	cash on him and he said, 'Aye, there's cash there'. So
17	"I couldn't drive at that stage. So I got my	17	I got the cash off him and gave it to the Post Office.
18	sister to drive me down to the shop and I carried that	18	I never got a receipt for it."
19	bucket in and the auditors made me stand there and watch	19	These are just two examples but you have heard
20	them count it. And they tutted, made me feel so lousy	20	scores of witnesses when the Post Office wanted their
21	for bringing them all these pennies but I brought them	21	money, they wanted it there and then under threat of
22	whatever I could."	22	criminal prosecution. However, when we see the failings
23	I mentioned Fiona Elliott. She gave evidence on	23	of the Horizon system and the Post Office's conduct is
24	19 May. Two auditors arrived at the office. The	24	uncovered repeatedly and starkly, and they are called
25	auditors told Figure "There's a shortfall have of CG 000	25	upon to proporty companyate the victime, we auggest

25

auditors told Fiona, "There's a shortfall here of £6,000 $$\operatorname{135}$$

upon to properly compensate the victims, we suggest 136

1	there has been delay, obfuscation and basically these	1	Chancellor will make additional funding available to
2	issues being kicked into the long grass. They make	2	give those in the GLO group compensation similar to that
3	statements to Parliament, they issue press releases,	3	which is available to their non-GLO peers."
4	they do everything but pay up promptly.	4	And accepting that, because they had signed a full
5	I go back to where I started. Our clients simply	5	and final settlement of the court case in 2019,
6	asks that compensation schemes are drawn up in such	6	postmasters in the group were ineligible to apply to the
7	a manner that indications are given as to the amounts	7	Historical Shortfall Scheme.
8	they are likely to receive by way of final compensation.	8	"So despite winning the case [the Minister went on
9	That requires precedence, it requires comparables, it	9	to say] the group was left worse off than other affected
10	requires a way of accessing what it is that they might	10	postmasters for whom they had blazed the trail."
11	be able to receive by way of the application. Schemes	11	In your announcements on 9 May, you refer to the
12	should be transparent. They should provide indications	12	fact that in their written submissions both Post Office
13	of likely quantum in a banding format. This would	13	Limited and BEIS suggest that claimants in the group
14	assist in removing the unfortunate litigious elements	14	litigation falling within categories 1 and 2 will be
15	that the schemes currently contain and provide a measure	15	eligible to claim compensation for malicious prosecution
16	of certainty and facilitate targeted representations.	16	by virtue of the Minister's announcement of 22 March.
17	Our clients, for very good reason, do not trust	17	You go on to say this:
18	the Post Office nor BEIS, the department of Government	18	"It is also [your] provisional view, however, that
19	which owns the Post Office. On 22 March, the Minister	19	Post Office Limited and BEIS are correct to suggest that
20	made an announcement in Parliament accepting that the	20	claimants in the Group Litigation who fall within
21	Government has long considered unfair the unequal	21	categories 1 and 2 can claim compensation for malicious
22	treatment received by members of the GLO litigation	22	prosecution in reliance upon the Minister's
23	group and their non-GLO litigation peers. The Minister	23	announcement."
24	said:	24	So it is for these reasons that I have set out
25	"I'm therefore pleased to announce that the 137	25	today that we invite you to set out your view on the 138
1	current compensation schemes and what little is known	1	between now and then and after having had a little bit
2	about the GLO compensation proposals and that we ask you	2	more and more time to think of some of the submissions
3	do that within the format of an interim report.	3	that have been made today. I will make a promise that
4	Sir, those are our submissions this afternoon.	4	it will be a short series of submissions targeted at
5	I hope I have dealt with them reasonably so that if	5	only those issues itself, and no more than that, and
6	cricket is about to start that people might start to	6	obviously after hearing from others that set out their
7	turn out to the windows to their side and watch that.	7	submissions on that day.
8	I finish with this: it is troubling that in order	8	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr Stein. I think that
9	to get BEIS and the Post Office to come to arrangements	9	I would be remiss in not making some reference to what
10	that relate or explanations that relate to the HSS	10	might happen on the next occasion and so I'll do it.
11	scheme or to answer questions that you have set out,	11	In the notice which I published on 30 June,
12	that all of the expense that is required to set up such	12	I anticipated that these hearings would produce a flurry
13	hearing has been done. It is troubling that the	13	of activity. I didn't use those words but that was what
14	Post Office does not seem to have been able to	14	was in my mind and I'm not disappointed. I am quite
15	understand that individuals that have been affected by	15	sure that between now and 13 July there may be further
16	the Post Office's actions, Post Office being wholly	16	activity, in which case I will give people an
17	owned by BEIS, need support and need assistance. It is	17	appropriate opportunity to deal with what occurs. What
18	troubling that all of those matters have been behind the	18	is appropriate will depend on what occurs. So I'm not
19	scenes to a large extent and that, right up until the	19	going to promise anyone that they can make any further
20	day of this hearing, including today (and I am quite	20	submissions (although I don't rule it out) and, as
21	sure whilst I have been on my feet), that further	21	I say, an appropriate opportunity will be available to
22	changes have been taking place.	22	everyone to respond to this shifting process.
23	So I ask, sir, that you indulge us if need be on	23	Thank you all very much for the economy with which
24	the next occasion by the ability, if required, to make	24	you've addressed me and for accepting my invitation to
25	further short submissions in relation to what happens 139	25	deal with things which were controversial rather than to 140

The Post Office Horizon IT Inquiry

1	major on what you thought were your good points.	1	INDEX	
2	I look forward to seeing many, if not all, of you	2	Submission by MR BEER	2
3	again next week.	3	Submission by MS GALLAFENT	39
4	(3.22 pm)	4	Submission by MR MERTENS	92
5	(The hearing adjourned until Wednesday, 13 July at 10.30 am)	5	Submission by MR STEIN, QC	96
6		6		
7		7		
8		8		
9		9		
10		10		
11		11		
12		12		
13		13		
14		14		
15		15		
16		16		
17		17		
18		18		
19		19		
20		20		
21		21		
22		22		
23		23		
24		24		
25		25		
	141		142	

MR BEER: [10] 2/19 9/1 9/4 18/7 18/9 34/9 34/13 34/17 38/3 38/7 MR MERTENS: [4] 92/11 93/1 95/23 95/25 MR STEIN: [9] 92/15 96/3 99/7 100/22 100/24 101/1 128/9 129/10 129/22 MS GALLAFENT: [29] 38/18 39/11 47/8 48/5 49/4 52/18 57/11 58/9 59/2 62/25 63/2 63/6 63/16 63/18 64/11 64/24 66/2 66/5 66/8 66/14 66/16 73/7 75/1 79/6 79/16 80/17 87/15 87/17 87/24 MS GALLIFANT: [3] 47/12 63/4 75/7 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: [58] 1/3 8/23 9/2 18/4 18/8 34/7 34/11 34/15 37/18 38/4 38/14 38/19 38/24 47/3 47/9 47/21 48/24 52/16 57/9 57/22 58/24 62/22 63/1 63/3 63/5 63/15 63/17 64/3 64/20 65/22 66/3 66/6 66/10 66/15 73/1 74/23 75/4 79/1 79/7 80/16 87/10 87/16 87/23 92/7 92/12 92/16 92/24 95/14 95/24 96/1 99/3 100/17 100/23 100/25 128/2 129/2 129/11 140/8 'any [1] 18/20 'Aye [1] 136/16 1 1 May [1] 25/2 1 October 2020 [1] 51/17 1,100 [1] 29/5 1,135 [1] 26/4	100 [1] 116/18 100,000 [5] 9/16 10/9 78/8 126/8 130/24 11 [4] 4/11 67/8 109/5 115/23 11.42 [1] 38/21 11.56 [1] 38/23 115 [1] 67/3 12 [6] 13/18 35/4 108/12 109/8 109/15 134/8 12 May [1] 4/11 1200 [1] 122/13 13 [4] 74/8 95/1 140/15 141/5 14 [7] 4/10 11/7 14/12 16/3 25/2 61/11 94/1 14 December 2021 [1] 11/3	19.5 [1] 35/8 19.5 million [5] 13/3 99/15 110/17 111/20 126/15 190 [1] 19/9 191 [1] 19/11 192 [1] 120/9 193 [3] 120/19 120/19 120/20 194 [1] 14/24 195 [1] 15/1 2 2 March [1] 4/10 2,368 [1] 9/8 2,370 [1] 65/20 2,523 [2] 9/10 9/12 2.05 [1] 92/19 2.07 [1] 92/23 2.1 [1] 6/20 20 [6] 8/19 19/17 55/8 60/11 70/8 116/21 2002 [1] 106/22 2005 [1] 97/7	36/18 117/5 21 July [1] 9/13 217 [1] 9/24 219 [1] 11/10 22 [5] 19/20 98/10 108/15 137/19 138/16 22 July [1] 9/22 22 March 2022 [1] 12/4 23 [2] 19/21 24/24 23 July 2021 [1] 67/20 24 [4] 19/23 50/20 97/7 120/18 24,000 [1] 117/4 25 [3] 30/17 30/20 117/16 25 February [1] 4/10 25 minutes [1] 79/3 26 [1] 123/7 27 [5] 9/11 25/3 43/21 59/24 67/4 27 November [1] 25/20 28 [2] 76/2 91/2 283 [1] 61/13 285 [1] 16/10	3.30 [1] 2/9 30 [12] 12/20 22/13 40/12 52/15 54/21 55/8 97/3 110/13 113/7 119/14 126/14 140/11 30 June [1] 65/9 302 [4] 9/6 65/24 66/18 67/2 303 [3] 25/25 65/24 121/14 31 [3] 67/4 109/18 118/6 33 [1] 130/20 35 [2] 44/15 122/17 38 [2] 107/14 109/17 4 4 o'clock [1] 2/9 4.1 [1] 7/9 400 [3] 27/9 71/2 122/13 42 million [2] 6/25 7/18 42,000 [1] 135/12 43 [2] 130/17 134/8 45 [3] 28/25 29/2 29/16 47 [1] 67/7 48 [1] 26/5 48 per [1] 26/13 4A [1] 16/11 4D [1] 16/15 5 5 July [1] 66/23 5.1 [1] 16/20 5.8.1 [1] 42/22 50 [2] 21/9 27/2 52 [1] 26/11 554 [1] 6/1 555 [3] 35/21 35/25 36/15 56 [1] 131/17 57.75 million [1] 6/22 5ps [1] 135/1
---	---	--	--	--

6	119/15 124/14 124/15	accompanied [1]	actually [5] 66/22	117/25 130/25
62 [1] 34/20	137/11 139/14	123/8	70/12 80/8 101/17	advise [1] 32/9
63 [1] 26/8	about [53] 1/10 1/12	accordance [4] 2/24	111/6	Advisory [12] 14/14
63 per [1] 26/4	1/15 2/2 2/9 4/13 5/6	70/8 118/19 126/9	acute [1] 45/3	16/7 16/12 22/12
63,000 [1] 134/16	5/18 8/25 18/2 19/18	according [2] 29/14	add [2] 92/3 112/6	28/21 28/22 41/7
65 [2] 26/8 26/11	20/14 25/15 30/22	92/17	added [1] 104/20	41/21 43/13 43/22
66 [1] 32/24	32/11 32/12 35/6 36/8	accordingly [3] 5/9	additional [10] 9/25	59/8 118/12
67 [1] 26/10	36/19 37/19 39/3	7/24 18/17	12/11 15/6 15/10 26/6	advocate [1] 1/23
678 [1] 74/13	41/19 51/21 57/23	account [16] 22/23	31/7 77/13 94/22	affect [1] 86/2
68 [1] 116/17	60/23 62/23 65/5	23/5 45/22 45/25 46/3	98/11 138/1	affected [12] 4/4 57/5
69 [2] 32/23 107/4	66/13 76/6 79/12	49/17 49/21 52/12	address [14] 3/12	57/21 58/19 96/10
	79/15 80/16 87/3 87/4	54/4 56/2 56/20 58/17	17/15 25/12 32/14	96/24 96/25 96/25
7	87/16 87/20 88/12	72/6 94/18 115/25	33/17 40/21 40/23	104/25 128/3 138/9
7 June [6] 8/22 9/7	90/24 104/11 107/10	129/20	42/11 54/14 56/14	139/15
9/9 25/25 30/21 65/25	108/5 109/9 112/22	accountancy [1]	75/21 90/1 93/4 95/13	afford [1] 107/5
70 [3] 65/21 66/9	113/16 118/2 122/6	27/18	addressed [5] 5/8	after [22] 11/6 24/21
66/21	125/1 125/7 129/16	accounting [1] 43/15	39/20 90/11 104/15	25/20 26/1 26/14
73 [1] 32/22	130/11 132/24 139/2	accounts [6] 4/21	140/24	26/20 31/16 31/17
74 [1] 107/10	139/6	26/24 94/4 101/23	addressing [2] 5/17	54/6 56/12 57/2 64/9
7A [1] 14/22	above [1] 131/8	116/17 135/7	87/10	74/25 90/5 104/16
	absence [8] 33/10	achieved [1] 76/22	adds [1] 9/9	110/11 114/8 114/24
8	45/6 54/20 55/24 71/8	achieving [1] 93/23	adequate [6] 4/3	120/12 123/24 140/1
8,000 [2] 73/12 74/14	71/22 78/17 117/24	acknowledge [1]	25/15 27/8 27/22 51/9	140/6
8.30 [2] 102/16	absolute [1] 112/15	105/18	111/16	afternoon [5] 92/17
130/13	absurd [1] 123/18	acknowledged [1]	adequately [1] 90/10	93/1 96/3 136/11
8.59pm [1] 34/13	abuser [1] 119/1	124/17	adjourned [1] 141/5	139/4
80 per [1] 77/2	abusive [1] 132/22	acknowledgements	adjournment [1]	again [32] 16/4 25/25
874 [1] 70/9	accept [16] 22/8 30/5	[1] 26/19	92/22	27/18 30/8 37/17
8A [1] 9/21	51/13 54/12 58/3	acknowledging [1]	administer [2] 33/5	38/11 38/20 45/11
8B [1] 11/7	59/14 62/19 68/9	106/6	35/16	49/7 50/5 50/11 55/16
8C [1] 12/6	78/17 80/6 112/25	acquitted [6] 125/21	administered [1]	56/5 60/4 63/21 65/7
8D [1] 12/22	123/20 130/2 130/7	125/25 126/3 126/6	116/25	65/10 67/2 69/24 72/5
9	130/8 136/12	126/13 126/18	administration [1]	79/21 80/4 85/5 87/25
	acceptable [1] 128/25		116/9	88/18 88/20 118/10
9 May [3] 5/9 12/17	acceptance [3] 74/22		admission [1] 7/6	120/3 123/6 123/18
90/17	119/18 125/3	97/7	adopt [1] 128/11	124/9 141/3
9.4 [1] 7/15	accepted [13] 21/18	acted [1] 6/24	adopted [5] 32/10	against [4] 4/17 6/1
9.50 [1] 102/18	66/17 73/3 74/6 74/12		40/7 73/8 87/3 109/9	105/4 119/2
92 [3] 74/7 74/16	77/2 105/18 115/9	89/2	adopting [1] 44/10	age [4] 30/19 31/1
74/23	117/12 117/18 117/25		advance [1] 34/11	76/5 107/14
94-year-old [1]	124/23 125/22	33/6 96/15 96/18	advantageous [1]	aggravated [7] 45/13
106/20	accepting [5] 74/1	105/20	44/20	45/17 46/2 46/10 47/1
95 [2] 66/20 117/7	76/14 137/20 138/4	actions [5] 97/2	adversarial [1]	81/18 118/24
95 per [2] 66/25 77/6	140/24	107/16 116/2 121/24	113/24	aggravation [2] 45/19
Α	access [9] 3/14 60/13		adversely [1] 76/15	45/24
ability [2] 132/10	62/3 62/6 100/6	actively [5] 11/21	advice [22] 27/6	aggregate [1] 6/21
139/24	101/20 104/13 119/6	18/11 25/11 56/14	28/11 42/13 43/12	ago [7] 12/20 24/8
able [17] 13/9 44/22	119/21	68/18	51/5 59/7 59/9 59/10	35/6 35/19 60/11
75/17 80/2 80/5 93/8	accessible [1] 128/14		59/15 59/21 59/23	108/13 111/13
97/20 102/8 106/20	accessing [1] 137/10	140/16	70/16 70/22 70/25	agree [14] 8/17 33/23
106/25 109/22 117/20	accommodate [2]	acts [1] 6/7	71/4 86/24 100/11	40/15 45/8 46/25
	25/6 78/15	actual [2] 43/8 111/18	101/21 109/0 11//20	50/12 68/16 73/16
	I	l	I	(38) 62 - agree

135/21 136/4 139/12 128/6 139/20 140/14 any [105] 2/1 2/5 7/7 18/19 19/10 19/12 Α 139/18 140/23 141/2 141/5 14/7 15/12 18/18 24/13 43/24 44/2 44/3 agree... [6] 80/3 80/6 alleged [13] 6/6 8/1 amended [2] 83/18 19/20 19/25 22/3 22/4 44/21 44/21 45/1 81/17 90/17 118/15 19/23 20/1 20/3 20/4 84/13 22/23 23/5 23/16 45/18 46/20 49/11 128/22 20/4 20/5 50/23 51/8 amendment [1] 25/5 26/21 26/24 27/15 49/19 50/22 53/3 agreed [19] 1/22 6/20 54/18 58/6 60/23 amongst [5] 3/5 3/14 32/7 36/2 40/16 43/2 53/15 53/25 59/17 13/14 29/23 31/2 Allen [6] 83/7 83/16 26/7 99/18 99/19 43/24 44/4 44/4 44/4 61/22 61/25 62/10 33/21 34/5 58/13 83/23 85/2 85/5 88/5 45/9 46/1 46/14 46/24 amount [5] 21/14 62/18 62/23 63/11 71/24 79/12 79/13 allow [3] 82/16 99/19 67/5 70/14 80/10 50/10 50/22 51/12 63/13 63/19 63/21 79/14 79/18 82/2 131/8 136/5 51/14 51/22 51/25 68/23 70/11 71/1 82/12 83/1 84/24 allowing [1] 100/10 amounted [1] 6/21 52/12 53/15 53/16 72/20 76/7 76/8 77/18 127/5 132/18 amounts [1] 137/7 allows [2] 15/19 82/9 53/17 58/2 59/25 77/21 77/25 79/17 agreeing [1] 111/5 alluded [1] 81/19 analogies [1] 2/6 61/18 62/11 63/3 80/8 80/11 91/18 agreement [2] 67/5 alluding [1] 74/11 analysis [6] 28/20 63/18 63/24 64/7 64/7 applicant's [3] 62/17 80/8 alone [1] 57/14 41/10 41/14 59/11 68/9 69/12 70/20 71/8 70/13 71/2 agreements [1] 88/12 59/14 64/1 71/24 72/6 73/2 73/13 along [5] 2/23 15/5 applicant-friendly [5] agrees [3] 44/1 81/13 75/12 76/13 78/2 49/11 77/18 77/25 46/15 64/4 64/10 annex [1] 88/8 130/19 announce [2] 12/10 81/14 84/14 84/15 79/17 80/11 already [25] 13/2 ahead [1] 113/3 29/15 32/16 43/17 137/25 84/17 84/20 84/21 applicants [58] 24/17 aim [4] 10/4 58/22 44/14 52/18 56/21 **announced** [7] 5/9 85/1 85/9 85/22 86/6 25/4 27/6 29/1 29/15 95/15 132/12 72/2 77/17 81/19 9/14 10/6 13/13 34/3 88/23 89/8 89/11 30/12 30/17 32/8 46/8 aimed [1] 53/9 86/19 87/5 90/10 35/18 67/21 89/19 89/20 89/22 46/23 51/12 51/18 akin [3] 53/19 58/2 101/1 101/21 114/7 announcement [21] 89/23 90/2 90/9 90/16 51/22 52/5 52/6 53/23 113/23 117/12 118/4 119/4 2/4 5/7 9/19 9/20 10/9 90/19 91/13 91/17 53/23 54/16 55/17 Alan [1] 6/1 120/10 121/16 124/17 12/5 35/5 35/9 90/22 92/5 95/10 95/11 58/21 58/22 62/12 all [94] 1/20 2/15 2/20 124/19 127/2 133/13 90/23 91/7 91/8 91/8 98/16 99/20 99/25 65/19 66/9 67/1 67/3 3/20 3/24 4/1 7/11 **also [43]** 1/17 5/1 101/9 101/10 103/13 67/7 67/8 70/16 72/4 108/15 108/18 111/11 7/24 8/8 12/23 14/3 13/10 16/16 19/17 113/7 126/14 137/20 109/5 118/21 118/23 72/11 72/13 72/23 21/19 22/19 24/14 22/3 41/25 44/13 45/1 138/16 138/23 119/1 121/7 125/24 73/24 74/3 74/4 74/6 25/11 26/25 32/12 49/25 51/20 53/25 announcements [2] 126/2 127/15 128/15 74/7 74/7 74/9 75/24 33/3 34/12 34/15 55/23 62/12 68/15 118/20 138/11 130/4 130/5 134/14 76/12 76/19 76/23 35/14 35/25 36/15 70/16 72/5 72/12 134/25 136/15 140/19 announcing [1] 98/11 77/1 77/2 77/6 77/11 37/9 38/16 38/19 39/7 73/22 80/19 81/3 another [8] 13/2 49/5 anyone [2] 130/5 78/14 86/23 101/25 46/15 48/9 51/9 51/18 54/8 58/5 92/8 101/19 81/17 82/18 83/3 83/4 140/19 109/6 114/25 115/1 52/4 53/9 56/17 62/5 83/15 84/11 84/18 104/24 127/13 anything [6] 79/15 117/19 120/1 125/13 62/8 62/11 62/16 answer [9] 33/3 38/4 132/20 86/8 91/19 93/4 95/2 80/9 90/24 113/23 63/11 64/21 65/14 96/17 97/25 98/2 99/7 38/6 56/1 109/25 128/15 130/4 application [41] 65/23 66/10 73/13 112/6 121/13 128/14 110/25 115/5 122/23 anyway [3] 76/15 10/23 14/23 18/6 75/16 76/20 78/7 130/8 131/2 133/19 139/11 93/14 128/15 18/10 18/17 19/6 24/1 80/16 80/23 83/13 138/18 answered [1] 128/6 apart [2] 1/18 73/19 41/4 43/4 43/7 50/20 83/14 86/3 87/13 alternative [6] 10/3 answers [7] 14/19 apologise [1] 75/2 52/1 52/3 53/5 53/6 87/23 88/23 92/8 93/1 10/12 10/17 87/8 108/12 108/23 110/1 apparent [2] 37/4 53/12 53/20 53/22 94/15 94/18 96/8 96/9 91/17 127/23 116/16 121/2 127/8 102/11 60/22 61/15 61/20 96/12 97/14 99/12 appear [5] 2/23 17/16 although [6] 5/15 **Anthony [1]** 114/22 61/21 62/4 63/7 69/6 100/3 100/4 100/6 26/18 46/8 108/15 anticipate [7] 33/16 32/17 84/11 96/3 69/7 69/15 71/10 100/8 100/16 100/20 119/23 140/20 48/18 68/12 74/18 appears [10] 23/20 71/17 73/25 111/25 104/1 104/4 106/4 am [24] 2/9 2/9 2/10 82/23 84/3 88/2 28/21 30/23 94/25 113/4 117/11 119/6 107/17 111/10 113/12 2/10 11/11 12/10 38/4 anticipated [6] 40/18 112/25 113/24 119/24 120/8 120/14 122/10 114/23 115/1 115/11 38/4 38/21 38/23 40/25 51/4 66/19 122/9 131/16 132/18 122/22 128/15 133/25 123/18 124/19 126/16 48/25 48/25 52/18 82/13 140/12 applicable [3] 42/3 137/11 127/21 128/22 129/9 58/4 63/17 78/22 92/1 anticipating [1] 64/14 72/9 81/16 applications [31] 9/7 131/15 133/2 133/20 anticipation [1] 61/22 applicant [42] 8/16 9/10 9/12 17/19 17/23 92/4 104/23 107/14

Α applications... [26] 24/19 24/22 25/1 25/7 25/9 25/10 25/13 25/19 25/22 56/11 56/15 56/19 56/21 57/1 57/8 58/17 65/14 65/21 70/20 73/6 100/4 122/19 125/11 127/14 133/13 134/3 applied [11] 10/20 23/13 32/4 32/23 51/23 54/19 58/5 81/7 84/7 85/17 123/6 applies [1] 28/4 apply [16] 24/17 25/4 36/13 47/14 56/24 57/6 58/8 77/11 77/20 80/1 80/2 100/20 109/1 126/1 126/3 138/6 applying [5] 19/14 81/15 81/19 115/16 120/5 appointed [2] 28/18 39/4 appointing [1] 13/6 appointments [3] 11/1 29/4 76/11 apportioned [1] 112/1 appreciate [3] 38/25 54/1 129/8 approach [24] 23/11 24/20 25/13 27/21 30/3 30/24 34/22 44/10 49/11 52/20 52/22 52/23 60/23 73/8 77/14 78/4 79/24 81/2 81/11 83/23 83/25 89/3 101/13 115/25 appropriate [13] 40/2 52/4 55/1 55/21 59/8 68/11 70/19 72/4 86/8 98/20 140/17 140/18 140/21 appropriately [1] 67/25 approximately [2] 7/18 116/18 arbiter [8] 58/1 58/7

83/6 83/10 91/4 91/25 99/23 118/17 arbitration [4] 86/7 86/8 86/12 91/16 are [187] area [1] 81/22 arguably [1] 88/20 argue [2] 83/23 88/8 argues [1] 83/19 argument [3] 31/3 84/14 88/18 arise [12] 6/19 17/7 17/16 27/1 28/7 28/7 31/5 35/13 42/10 47/19 53/3 110/9 arisen [1] 37/11 arises [1] 24/3 arising [7] 2/21 6/7 13/21 14/3 14/8 68/7 90/3 arose [2] 20/5 68/9 around [3] 2/8 2/13 26/13 arrangements [13] 4/22 10/3 10/12 11/15 34/25 36/24 37/9 37/24 93/17 93/19 94/23 95/8 139/9 arrived [2] 135/3 135/24 articulacy [1] 75/2 as [256] as I mentioned [1] 32/16 aside [5] 7/19 17/13 35/8 113/5 132/7 ask [18] 19/23 34/24 38/24 53/2 63/9 63/14 67/13 92/9 92/9 98/15 98/25 99/10 103/2 110/9 112/16 115/16 139/2 139/23 asked [22] 26/17 40/9 attempt [4] 55/11 41/19 44/8 50/21 50/24 53/7 53/8 53/11 69/25 89/16 105/23 106/4 107/2 107/25 108/9 113/11 116/20 123/22 128/5 135/14 136/15 asking [7] 15/4 36/16 38/4 53/15 122/25

128/9 128/11 asks [1] 137/6 aspect [1] 57/24 aspects [3] 40/13 57/22 83/2 assertion [1] 117/4 assess [6] 3/6 13/7 30/15 33/23 76/1 86/11 assessed [7] 8/13 9/8 51/20 70/23 9/8 43/13 62/9 63/12 118/8 assessing [4] 22/4 45/22 52/21 81/12 assessment [4] 62/14 62/14 118/10 118/14 **assessor [2]** 118/8 118/11 **assessors** [1] 72/3 assist [19] 41/13 44/10 53/9 57/12 64/18 68/1 71/17 73/21 92/5 93/13 102/9 104/20 106/8 109/14 121/14 124/4 126/16 130/25 137/14 27/16 41/15 43/19 43/20 43/25 53/18 59/25 90/11 103/1 123/23 131/15 132/11 139/17 assistants [1] 4/5 assisted [1] 102/6 assisting [1] 93/16 associated [4] 36/24 37/23 43/6 132/17 assuage [1] 54/14 assuaged [1] 86/5 assuming [1] 42/3 assure [1] 58/21 **ATE [1]** 7/1 101/9 101/16 130/14 attempted [1] 123/22 attend [1] 93/8 attendance [1] 93/20 attended [1] 123/7 attending [1] 123/11 attends [1] 94/12 attention [4] 9/24 15/18 56/17 129/25

attract [1] 70/6 audit [2] 19/19 134/9 auditor [1] 134/16 auditors [5] 134/12 134/15 135/19 135/24 135/25 August [1] 25/2 August 2020 [1] 25/2 availability [3] 12/1 available [21] 9/15 11/12 12/12 12/13 29/10 35/11 46/21 48/22 53/22 71/16 72/23 86/17 98/12 98/13 99/15 102/19 127/12 128/24 138/1 138/3 140/21 avoid [8] 2/6 45/2 71/13 83/13 91/17 116/12 122/10 131/3 avoidance [4] 22/20 69/12 84/20 90/15 award [6] 23/17 23/24 47/10 47/24 48/16 74/2 assistance [14] 17/13 awarded [2] 8/18 48/3 awards [4] 25/23 81/23 119/2 131/25 aware [7] 51/23 70/23 71/4 72/5 103/7

111/10 119/1

away [2] 75/3 122/3

awkward [1] 122/6

Aziz [1] 106/24

back [22] 9/5 14/22 22/9 25/23 32/1 34/25 42/5 50/4 66/18 78/25 79/16 85/22 86/1 107/9 107/23 124/9 127/7 130/9 130/14 132/13 133/16 137/5 background [4] 5/15 5/22 97/22 102/13 badly [3] 96/10 114/17 132/9 bailing [1] 106/20 balance [5] 20/18 21/8 23/15 27/19 51/15

balances [1] 103/21 **bald [1]** 75/9 Baljit [1] 26/17 Ballymena [1] 135/5 **banding [1]** 137/13 bands [1] 86/18 bang [1] 9/3 banging [1] 8/24 bank [4] 135/7 136/8 136/8 136/10 bankruptcies [1] 4/22 **bankruptcy** [9] 16/25 28/8 28/8 68/15 68/16 68/21 68/23 106/25 121/21 bar [1] 60/19 barrier [1] 53/21 barrister [1] 123/12 barristers [1] 6/24 based [4] 48/11 66/1 80/10 131/21 basic [2] 70/8 126/18 basically [1] 137/1 basis [22] 23/25 28/21 30/11 30/17 36/13 44/24 47/18 48/21 50/10 51/14 59/10 75/23 76/24 79/19 83/22 91/14 103/13 104/17 112/1 123/16 125/13 128/17 Bates [1] 6/1 be [295] bear [2] 95/4 115/1 because [31] 1/14 2/6 6/3 8/24 32/16 38/8 41/16 47/9 48/20 50/8 51/3 51/12 55/20 73/8 73/17 73/18 73/22 79/16 79/23 80/25 92/9 92/16 99/4 101/13 102/10 110/7 123/9 127/16 129/8 135/11 138/4 become [2] 65/16 79/10 becoming [1] 68/2 been [163] Beer [29] 2/3 2/17 2/18 8/23 34/7 37/18 41/17 41/20 41/25 42/6 51/1 52/2 56/10

В	132/10 133/21 133/22	bills [1] 106/18	built [4] 43/17 53/19	81/15 85/15 109/4
Beer [16] 61/3	134/2 137/2 139/16	binding [3] 33/25	77/25 122/18	calculation [5] 32/4
65/25 66/11 68/25	BEIS [69] 9/23 33/9	34/1 82/15	bundle [9] 8/20 9/22	81/8 83/24 84/7 109/1
72/10 75/22 80/19	34/4 34/7 36/9 36/11	bit [2] 64/1 140/1	13/19 22/11 43/23	calendar [1] 67/2
81/19 84/2 87/10 88/1	36/22 37/7 37/22	Blake [1] 2/23	65/23 95/1 120/9	call [2] 100/19 100/19
119/5 120/10 120/18	40/21 78/7 81/10	blame [1] 112/11	120/20	called [8] 6/21 7/2
128/2 142/2	85/19 85/20 88/7	blazed [1] 138/10	burden [11] 20/18	14/17 108/11 118/11
before [20] 26/21	88/11 88/14 90/1	block [1] 73/15	21/4 21/6 21/17 22/1	124/8 134/13 136/24
26/22 34/2 38/24	90/23 93/16 94/19	blunt [1] 129/23	31/18 101/24 113/20	came [2] 113/19
40/23 59/3 64/7 68/5	94/24 95/2 97/2 99/15	board [1] 93/21	114/14 115/1 115/8	134/12
69/2 69/11 79/8 92/19	100/2 101/14 103/5	bodies [1] 97/15	burdensome [1]	can [99] 1/4 1/5 1/11
97/13 112/14 112/14	105/7 106/2 108/8	body [2] 78/12 98/20	53/21	2/15 16/19 16/21
118/11 119/6 124/24	109/16 109/24 110/4	both [11] 17/16 20/12	busily [1] 75/4	20/22 20/24 22/10
129/9 129/18	110/11 110/15 110/23	33/9 35/16 37/7 39/13		23/1 25/23 29/9 31/25
began [1] 94/1	111/2 111/7 111/19	56/20 88/14 93/19	9/14 101/23 103/4	35/2 37/18 38/5 40/22
begin [4] 2/8 5/24	112/8 112/10 112/17	94/19 138/12	107/9 124/3 136/14	40/24 41/12 41/18
11/16 109/20	113/6 113/21 115/6	box [1] 20/7	but [90] 2/11 2/14 8/9	42/3 42/10 44/1 46/22
beginning [2] 40/4	119/13 119/19 123/20	boxes [1] 19/10	16/19 17/8 22/23	49/5 49/10 56/8 56/25
134/14	124/23 124/23 125/3	branch [1] 19/19	24/16 30/1 31/1 34/15	57/9 57/11 57/18
begins [1] 92/20	126/2 126/24 130/18	breach [6] 43/9 43/9	38/15 39/7 41/9 41/15	58/21 58/24 59/3 59/4
behalf [14] 3/1 3/2 3/3	130/21 131/10 131/11	46/21 48/23 49/14	42/24 45/5 47/4 47/15	60/24 61/10 61/24
9/23 28/19 31/12	131/20 131/23 132/12	71/21	47/16 47/19 47/25	62/10 62/12 62/20
36/21 37/20 40/14	132/16 132/23 133/7	breaches [1] 6/7	48/16 52/3 52/12	62/20 62/24 63/13
93/5 94/15 118/7	137/18 138/13 138/19	break [8] 9/3 38/16	52/22 53/8 54/13 55/5	63/14 63/23 63/24
123/17 134/1	139/9 139/17	38/22 39/1 77/16	56/3 56/9 58/4 59/5	65/2 65/17 72/22 74/9
behaved [1] 84/21	BEIS's [5] 90/3 90/19	78/25 79/4 92/8	60/16 60/19 62/22	74/23 75/14 75/21
behaviour [1] 101/15	95/3 117/4 125/23	breath [1] 112/12	64/14 65/16 69/6	79/6 81/13 85/9 85/9
behind [8] 11/7 12/22	Belfast [2] 4/12 134/6	briefly [5] 31/25	69/24 70/6 72/8 73/2	86/11 86/18 88/21
26/16 92/2 92/2 92/2	believe [3] 61/12	90/13 93/5 120/7	73/13 73/13 74/21	89/13 90/11 90/13
102/20 139/18	111/6 120/23	134/4	78/16 78/24 79/3 80/4	90/16 91/19 92/6 92/8
being [71] 7/13 10/23	believes [1] 105/25	bring [5] 3/23 44/4	80/7 81/19 81/23	93/14 94/9 94/9 94/18
16/15 32/3 32/7 32/10	belong [1] 134/14	50/9 56/16 91/18	82/16 83/11 84/12	95/16 97/9 97/18
32/19 33/6 35/10	benefit [3] 8/8 89/11	bringing [5] 10/7 43/3	84/25 85/17 87/6	100/17 101/8 105/10
35/15 41/23 43/25	118/13	43/7 50/8 135/21	88/21 89/18 90/2	108/6 112/4 112/10
45/12 45/25 51/15	beset [1] 116/14	brings [2] 5/17 5/22	95/18 97/17 98/21	113/18 120/8 120/18
51/16 51/16 52/21	bespoke [2] 52/24	British [1] 105/22	99/7 101/22 104/5	121/4 124/6 125/15
53/13 53/18 54/21	53/1	broad [5] 17/2 19/24	106/8 106/12 112/24	126/1 126/3 126/21
55/2 59/10 65/12	best [6] 17/11 25/12	22/17 23/2 23/25	113/7 117/3 121/5	127/2 127/12 128/23
67/15 69/21 73/18	56/14 57/7 86/11	broader [1] 23/22	121/7 121/15 122/10	134/3 134/20 134/20
75/9 75/10 75/23	121/23	broadly [3] 12/3	123/17 126/4 126/17	136/7 138/21 140/19
80/23 84/7 85/8 85/15	better [1] 109/16	13/20 24/14	127/18 127/24 132/14	can I be [1] 1/11
85/17 86/14 93/4 93/8	between [22] 1/25	broke [1] 96/15	133/3 135/4 135/7	Can I invite [1] 20/24
94/6 100/16 101/6	4/10 5/25 7/19 16/20	brother [1] 136/14	135/12 135/21 136/19	Can I turn [1] 31/25
101/10 101/20 102/25	19/8 36/9 42/24 51/15	brought [14] 4/16 6/5	137/4 140/13	can't [4] 2/6 46/19
103/19 107/14 113/15	54/19 54/21 65/5	6/10 7/12 7/13 47/17	but I do [1] 2/14	107/5 132/8
115/12 116/20 116/23	105/9 112/7 125/18	47/17 47/20 48/21	butt [3] 34/24 87/14	cannot [10] 8/17
116/24 118/1 118/3	126/6 127/17 128/7	71/25 89/4 116/18	128/4	20/17 57/17 83/8 85/1
118/11 120/1 120/15	128/17 129/6 140/1	124/5 135/21	butting [1] 128/7	106/18 115/25 119/19
121/14 124/7 125/7	140/15	bucket [5] 134/24	by [239]	130/7 132/19
125/8 127/8 127/18	beyond [3] 84/5 88/18		C	cap [1] 115/15
	88/20	135/19		capable [4] 51/16
127/20 128/16 129/23	bill [1] 44/6	bugs [1] 103/22	calculated [4] 32/7	100/15 125/8 127/20
	- -			

C causation [3] 24/2 134/11 84/22 85/9 86/3 86/11 66/23 75/19 77/3 28/5 114/1 children's [1] 96/25 86/17 86/22 87/12 88/22 88/25 89/16 car [2] 134/23 136/14 cause [3] 21/14 27/2 choice [1] 1/23 88/17 91/22 100/5 93/23 98/4 100/17 cardiac [1] 44/9 choose [1] 36/21 38/9 100/19 105/9 105/18 100/20 111/14 113/12 Cardiff [1] 4/10 caused [8] 17/4 18/3 **chose [1]** 37/21 108/11 108/16 108/25 119/24 123/4 128/1 care [2] 94/12 103/23 45/19 49/8 71/21 chronology [1] 5/16 130/23 138/13 138/20 133/24 careful [1] 99/6 77/19 106/12 115/21 circumstance [1] claimed [16] 7/2 7/21 clearly [3] 42/4 94/14 carefully [10] 46/15 causes [1] 25/18 107/3 8/2 17/5 18/21 22/22 100/18 46/24 47/15 47/25 23/4 23/18 23/23 client [3] 96/11 96/24 causing [2] 33/22 circumstances [32] 48/3 48/5 57/19 90/7 102/2 2/16 21/20 22/19 23/7 27/23 42/3 52/11 112/7 117/9 121/22 55/15 55/22 118/25 cautioned [2] 96/19 24/5 25/16 27/22 clients [16] 96/8 96/9 caring [2] 49/9 116/4 105/7 106/4 106/9 29/13 30/14 30/18 133/18 125/25 carried [2] 83/25 cautions [1] 125/22 37/11 39/25 44/3 45/8 claims [63] 6/5 7/7 106/13 110/4 111/2 135/18 cent [24] 21/9 26/4 48/13 51/9 54/5 55/12 7/11 7/12 8/15 10/5 111/9 111/24 115/14 carry [2] 39/7 79/7 26/5 26/8 26/8 26/11 60/12 61/21 70/18 10/7 16/22 17/14 121/3 124/7 133/1 case [35] 22/19 22/25 26/11 26/13 27/3 75/25 76/3 76/21 18/12 22/7 26/3 26/9 137/5 137/17 23/7 27/12 27/13 27/7 28/7 32/9 33/5 30/22 54/21 55/8 55/9 78/16 81/24 83/5 clients' [1] 33/15 28/16 43/12 44/6 91/24 113/2 115/11 33/5 33/5 33/15 33/17 65/21 66/9 66/20 close [1] 59/1 45/23 46/12 48/13 66/22 66/25 67/4 77/2 121/24 122/6 42/17 44/10 44/15 closed [6] 8/19 9/11 52/14 52/23 53/4 53/5 77/6 117/7 120/1 civil [7] 4/16 10/7 46/16 47/17 47/19 25/21 54/5 122/8 54/13 54/25 56/6 57/7 120/5 43/5 80/9 81/16 91/18 50/6 71/25 72/24 136/8 62/14 68/23 68/24 certain [3] 24/13 96/19 73/10 74/11 74/13 closely [2] 85/23 94/3 72/3 72/8 76/21 81/22 33/15 70/2 claim [59] 13/10 20/2 74/17 74/18 75/1 closing [1] 56/12 103/13 103/14 103/17 76/20 78/9 80/23 81/5 closure [5] 24/21 certainly [5] 33/12 21/7 21/17 21/18 104/5 118/11 129/11 64/11 64/14 89/7 21/24 22/2 22/4 26/20 82/21 82/23 83/2 83/6 25/9 26/1 26/14 138/5 138/8 140/16 83/8 83/11 83/13 129/18 27/12 27/17 30/15 106/11 cases [34] 4/20 26/3 31/15 31/17 31/19 83/17 83/25 88/4 certainty [1] 137/16 **Co [32]** 3/4 12/17 26/4 26/12 29/2 29/5 cetera [1] 79/20 31/22 32/17 42/24 88/15 89/5 89/12 17/16 20/12 29/20 29/5 30/20 30/23 45/4 Chair [4] 97/11 43/7 43/10 44/4 44/16 90/21 99/25 101/19 29/24 31/7 31/12 48/20 49/15 55/10 44/23 45/21 46/9 46/9 105/23 109/14 110/25 109/7 117/21 118/8 31/20 33/13 33/14 55/14 55/19 55/20 **challenge [2]** 93/18 46/11 46/14 46/17 119/21 124/5 131/1 33/21 34/19 37/5 37/7 59/17 68/16 68/16 46/22 46/24 47/6 42/14 45/12 49/7 60/9 94/20 132/17 68/19 72/14 72/18 **challenges** [1] 68/19 47/23 48/1 48/5 49/15 clarification [2] 90/11 61/5 68/24 71/11 73/12 73/15 75/17 **chance [2]** 16/24 50/8 50/10 50/24 106/2 73/22 75/15 85/19 78/15 79/11 86/12 121/19 53/10 71/3 72/16 **clarified [1]** 112/2 86/8 96/4 105/13 96/19 114/11 122/17 Chancellor [2] 12/11 72/20 73/11 73/11 111/4 123/8 124/22 clarify [2] 81/11 126/7 127/1 127/6 138/1 73/12 74/20 76/2 126/24 125/3 cash [3] 136/16 **change [2]** 54/23 76/16 77/21 81/14 clarity [2] 54/11 cohort [2] 13/1 126/7 136/16 136/17 132/21 85/9 100/12 115/9 108/22 collaborate [2] 36/23 cashed [1] 106/17 changed [1] 130/11 115/9 119/15 133/23 class [2] 23/18 37/23 categories [10] 13/20 138/15 138/21 112/24 changes [1] 139/22 collecting [1] 28/2 14/2 23/22 31/25 collection [2] 64/1 claimable [1] 85/13 **character** [1] 121/10 **classes [3]** 15/20 90/20 99/25 100/4 claimant [2] 50/7 50/9 characterise [1] 73/9 16/1 24/13 102/1 100/20 138/14 138/21 characterised [3] claimants [50] 6/1 6/5 clause [5] 6/20 7/4 collective [1] 33/3 category [18] 14/8 45/25 46/9 74/17 7/9 7/15 22/13 6/24 7/8 7/11 7/14 come [11] 1/23 22/9 14/8 23/22 25/17 31/6 charity [1] 111/16 7/20 7/24 8/5 12/24 claw [4] 85/21 86/1 23/17 34/16 66/9 32/1 32/17 35/2 49/5 13/6 13/25 27/3 34/21 chat [2] 39/2 39/6 130/9 130/14 74/25 78/25 79/25 87/12 88/16 91/1 35/3 35/7 35/12 35/14 check [2] 52/16 92/1 claw-back [1] 130/9 127/5 136/3 139/9 91/21 100/12 126/7 **cheque [1]** 136/12 35/17 35/22 35/25 **clear [27]** 1/11 16/2 comes [4] 41/7 74/22 126/25 127/6 132/18 Chief [1] 67/22 36/15 36/21 36/25 16/6 16/16 40/24 75/13 95/19 category 3 [1] 91/21 37/2 37/4 37/10 37/21 48/24 54/12 57/13 comfortably [1] 92/19 **children [5]** 49/9 cathartic [1] 106/11 107/1 116/3 134/10 37/25 83/17 83/22 60/3 60/18 65/13 coming [4] 67/9 68/23 C 80/23 81/6 81/8 84/8 94/3 94/18 131/2 14/17 16/8 16/13 consistency [1] 54/11 85/7 85/11 85/15 87/4 **concerning [5]** 13/22 16/17 16/18 17/12 consistent [1] 55/24 coming... [2] 102/13 88/15 88/16 88/24 41/1 93/9 94/22 17/22 18/12 18/22 constantly [1] 136/3 112/15 18/23 18/25 19/3 19/4 89/14 89/17 89/18 110/13 constituted [1] 10/16 commas [1] 64/5 89/23 90/14 90/17 concerns [8] 19/20 20/10 20/11 20/25 constrain [1] 55/6 commenced [1] 5/25 90/21 91/9 91/11 38/9 54/14 76/5 76/7 21/4 22/2 22/22 23/18 **construed** [1] 7/5 comment [4] 101/2 91/14 91/24 93/10 87/21 113/18 115/5 27/17 27/20 27/23 consulting [2] 36/22 108/5 112/4 119/14 28/9 31/8 41/22 41/23 93/24 94/6 94/23 concession [1] 37/22 commitment [1] 94/25 95/8 97/16 130/17 41/25 42/8 51/2 51/7 contact [6] 26/24 112/17 98/12 98/13 98/17 concluded [2] 3/17 52/11 52/21 53/10 48/23 49/14 124/7 commitments [2] 3/6 99/25 100/3 100/8 82/13 54/3 54/6 54/9 55/4 129/25 130/1 100/15 101/14 101/19 conclusion [4] 33/25 60/17 69/18 73/14 contain [1] 137/15 **committed [2]** 57/20 104/11 104/13 106/3 36/1 37/15 48/11 73/19 74/14 83/24 contains [2] 6/18 83/12 108/4 108/10 108/25 conclusions [1] 85/8 88/11 117/14 111/22 Committee's [1] 109/2 109/4 109/10 95/10 120/13 120/17 121/8 contemporaneous [8] 94/24 110/17 111/12 111/17 122/1 122/24 133/17 conduct [2] 84/18 28/1 60/10 60/18 common [6] 6/13 60/24 62/8 63/12 75/5 111/20 112/9 115/1 136/23 consider [37] 18/1 21/11 50/21 56/23 115/16 116/9 118/2 **conducted [4]** 13/16 20/9 22/3 22/7 25/12 114/2 58/15 70/5 118/18 119/13 119/16 82/24 123/11 123/15 27/21 29/12 30/3 content [2] 34/22 communicate [2] 123/5 124/5 126/9 conducting [2] 5/10 30/24 31/25 37/6 40/5 51/19 86/4 126/15 126/21 128/13 39/20 46/22 47/15 106/7 context [13] 43/11 communication [1] 128/16 130/5 131/5 confidence [1] 88/12 50/4 58/18 59/12 44/12 55/7 56/10 124/19 confident [2] 2/10 131/25 132/12 137/6 59/20 69/3 70/19 71/1 57/12 69/25 74/10 comparables [3] 137/8 138/2 138/15 71/8 84/5 85/1 86/25 75/8 75/19 83/4 85/3 100/10 127/11 137/9 138/21 139/1 139/2 confidential [1] 82/9 90/10 97/20 99/1 99/2 85/18 89/14 comparatively [1] compete [1] 2/12 99/11 99/19 112/4 confined [3] 22/21 continue [6] 4/25 73/4 complaint [2] 3/15 23/4 52/10 116/20 127/6 127/16 34/22 58/18 58/22 compare [1] 134/4 110/8 confirm [11] 11/11 129/25 131/19 89/6 91/20 compel [1] 106/1 complete [4] 2/11 41/12 56/25 65/17 considerable [3] continued [2] 68/6 compensate [1] 19/10 79/2 129/13 69/25 81/13 85/9 56/16 108/22 116/19 105/6 136/25 **completed** [1] 51/4 86/18 90/16 91/13 considerably [1] continues [2] 11/21 compensated [1] completeness [1] 91/19 89/10 31/4 20/21 49/24 confirmation [1] 86/1 consideration [7] continuing [8] 18/25 compensating [1] confirmed [3] 85/24 completion [1] 29/19 3/18 15/5 23/25 27/1 65/11 65/13 66/24 113/23 complex [6] 27/24 130/18 133/19 38/13 62/17 127/18 82/19 88/9 101/16 compensation [135] 28/10 55/10 69/8 confiscation [2] 85/7 considerations [3] 123/3 1/8 1/13 2/21 3/16 4/3 119/20 121/17 85/11 22/17 23/3 130/3 contract [5] 6/7 43/9 5/2 5/6 5/18 6/6 7/20 complicated [3] conflict [1] 131/16 considered [18] 12/8 46/21 67/14 67/18 7/25 8/7 8/12 8/17 68/17 79/11 104/12 connected [3] 61/1 46/15 46/25 47/25 contractual [2] 47/18 9/16 10/2 10/5 10/13 complications [1] 69/13 85/12 48/3 48/6 50/11 62/18 48/21 11/5 11/13 11/18 89/8 conscious [3] 39/18 68/11 69/21 78/6 contrary [1] 71/23 11/23 12/1 12/12 complying [1] 110/14 | 45/1 65/8 84/15 84/17 97/3 contrast [1] 28/18 12/18 13/1 13/5 13/11 120/3 124/18 134/2 comprehensive [1] consent [1] 69/4 contributed [1] 28/25 13/22 13/24 15/20 consents [1] 86/21 51/15 137/21 contribution [6] 29/2 16/1 29/6 30/12 32/2 consequence [5] 8/9 70/24 71/4 71/9 72/11 comprising [1] 43/14 considering [9] 25/11 32/4 32/5 32/6 32/11 concepts [1] 28/4 17/4 21/10 53/13 29/8 49/17 56/14 57/7 122/13 35/2 35/10 35/12 concern [4] 45/4 86/5 57/19 58/18 72/21 112/20 contributions [5] 36/14 39/16 45/24 124/3 29/8 71/6 72/13 72/21 87/20 117/15 consequences [5] 49/11 49/25 57/4 concerned [14] 3/13 4/14 4/16 4/18 106/14 considers [11] 21/19 75/10 57/20 58/19 67/6 70/5 39/19 40/6 45/18 116/2 22/18 22/24 23/6 controversial [2] 30/1 70/7 72/14 77/24 60/22 69/11 72/17 consequent [1] 6/6 43/18 44/19 45/7 46/3 140/25 78/21 80/1 80/18 76/17 81/9 88/25 91/1 52/13 72/7 115/10 consequential [53] convene [1] 108/21

(43) coming... - convene

C could [22] 1/23 9/17 18/13 25/5 dead [1] 39/4 defend [1] 121/24 16/9 30/14 34/16 40/6 critical [1] 6/15 deadline [5] 25/2 deficiency [5] 45/9 convened [2] 109/19 48/14 50/11 57/5 58/9 criticised [1] 2/15 56/16 57/2 58/10 47/1 50/12 51/25 56/7 133/2 61/25 75/25 77/11 criticism [1] 41/8 58/15 deficient [3] 42/15 convenient [1] 38/16 84/14 101/7 107/18 **criticisms** [1] 113/5 deal [16] 45/20 47/5 45/16 53/24 convey [1] 106/5 115/4 117/13 130/25 cross [2] 18/22 21/21 55/11 55/15 57/8 defined [5] 7/13 16/13 **convicted** [7] 7/13 133/17 135/6 135/22 crucial [2] 97/23 73/21 88/3 89/13 16/15 19/1 41/23 96/18 125/17 126/1 90/13 110/9 122/5 couldn't [3] 135/7 111/21 definition [1] 41/22 126/12 126/20 132/21 135/17 136/9 125/15 126/21 127/2 degree [4] 43/16 55/3 **crusty** [1] 39/3 conviction [6] 4/19 counsel [8] 2/23 14/3 current [7] 34/22 60/2 140/17 140/25 104/2 106/11 85/8 85/10 85/12 dealing [10] 1/8 15/16 14/6 34/19 59/13 65/14 72/19 81/23 delay [17] 1/25 25/18 105/4 126/12 42/25 70/1 73/9 78/20 119/5 134/1 135/14 128/15 139/1 25/18 27/2 57/15 65/3 convictions [23] 9/17 count [1] 135/20 **currently [6]** 29/8 98/19 102/6 121/7 65/7 67/10 68/9 68/13 10/14 10/18 10/19 couple [4] 26/22 39/24 69/21 70/24 69/24 78/14 98/8 121/17 11/2 11/5 11/14 13/13 72/21 137/15 98/19 113/5 128/16 42/11 67/10 78/24 dealt [6] 73/11 79/11 13/23 32/3 32/13 80/24 119/4 121/9 course [45] 4/9 6/11 137/1 D 32/22 78/5 78/22 29/11 31/23 35/21 139/5 delays [3] 26/24 79/23 80/15 80/19 daddy [1] 135/3 36/1 36/7 40/10 40/21 130/5 130/6 debt [1] 4/22 86/22 88/25 91/2 daily [1] 107/14 42/22 46/5 47/6 47/15 decade [1] 24/7 deliberate [1] 120/16 125/20 126/22 126/23 damage [2] 17/1 48/10 48/13 50/8 52/3 decades [1] 24/8 deliberately [1] 32/15 cooperate [2] 61/17 46/20 52/7 53/12 58/11 December [12] 3/11 delineates [2] 42/21 89/19 60/22 62/4 62/5 62/18 | damages [27] 6/25 6/11 11/3 11/8 38/10 42/24 copy [2] 62/10 62/12 13/15 45/14 45/18 63/24 65/18 66/19 66/21 90/21 91/8 deliver [2] 11/18 core [25] 3/3 5/14 46/2 46/10 46/13 66/25 69/1 77/25 78/8 105/7 105/12 107/4 89/17 11/24 12/16 13/17 46/18 47/2 47/6 47/11 82/5 82/15 87/9 89/18 118/20 delivered [7] 3/9 3/21 14/4 14/10 15/6 24/15 47/24 48/2 48/12 90/2 90/6 95/23 101/8 57/4 57/20 58/19 December 2019 [1] 34/20 37/7 42/12 48/16 48/19 48/22 38/10 93/24 94/7 105/1 106/4 111/12 50/15 50/15 50/18 53/16 81/16 81/17 128/9 131/6 132/16 **December 2021 [2]** delivering [2] 5/12 67/11 81/1 87/21 90/8 81/18 81/20 82/4 court [15] 34/2 39/4 11/8 105/7 13/5 94/15 95/9 96/6 118/24 119/2 122/24 77/22 82/7 83/11 December 2022 [1] delivery [2] 93/19 107/17 112/3 128/4 122/25 83/22 84/23 91/12 66/21 94/19 corporate [2] 50/1 damaging [1] 81/21 96/16 101/2 101/3 decide [3] 75/18 demanded [1] 106/21 104/12 danger [1] 118/1 103/15 104/5 105/6 95/11 103/20 demanding [1] correct [5] 1/6 19/3 Darren [1] 135/4 138/5 decided [3] 5/4 112/16 29/1 70/14 138/19 data [14] 13/7 23/10 courts [1] 10/7 108/21 110/15 demands [3] 91/4 correctly [2] 74/19 41/10 41/14 62/3 62/5 cover [1] 39/20 decides [2] 78/11 99/22 118/16 120/12 62/16 64/1 64/7 64/13 **covered [2]** 13/2 49/6 118/13 demonstrate [2] 21/8 correspondence [3] 86/17 86/20 86/21 covering [1] 41/3 decision [6] 6/15 22/2 33/6 130/12 133/4 119/23 Covid [2] 25/7 56/21 37/12 46/1 54/11 demonstrated [1] cost [7] 43/21 44/2 date [12] 25/11 30/16 crack [1] 64/13 54/17 72/25 103/10 59/23 70/25 77/9 41/9 56/12 57/1 59/19 created [3] 131/13 decisions [4] 6/8 demonstrates [1] 104/6 132/24 67/3 76/2 81/22 82/23 131/14 132/5 28/23 109/19 127/25 65/13 costs [30] 6/23 7/1 106/2 111/23 declaring [1] 106/24 creation [1] 4/1 denial [2] 105/5 119/6 7/1 7/23 16/24 28/14 dated [5] 6/11 9/22 credibly [1] 54/1 deduct [1] 70/7 department [11] 28/25 29/9 43/6 68/20 90/17 106/23 109/18 **credit [3]** 4/23 55/13 **deducted** [2] 132/1 11/21 103/4 105/10 71/13 72/13 72/15 dates [1] 20/4 55/19 134/21 105/17 109/20 109/21 72/22 75/13 87/1 98/1 day [9] 1/22 4/25 9/21 deducting [1] 70/11 cricket [5] 2/7 2/13 110/21 124/3 130/22 100/3 104/4 116/12 12/4 64/21 64/25 131/2 137/18 2/14 92/20 139/6 deed [11] 3/11 6/10 121/20 122/15 131/9 106/17 139/20 140/7 cricketing [1] 2/5 6/18 7/5 7/10 7/15 8/3 depend [2] 55/2 131/9 131/20 131/24 days [9] 1/8 1/11 1/12 58/13 83/16 83/21 criminal [4] 4/19 140/18 131/25 132/8 132/14 1/18 12/20 26/22 35/6 96/17 136/2 136/22 84/24 dependent [1] 27/11 132/16 35/19 107/5 criteria [4] 14/15 16/4 defence [1] 71/25 depending [1] 122/13

D	devoted [1] 1/12	100/6 117/20	50/17 51/13 51/25	128/20
deprived [2] 60/13	did [11] 24/17 34/7	discontinued [1]	53/16 53/16 55/19	doubt [12] 22/20
132/10	54/1 87/15 103/19	125/22	55/21 57/13 63/25	69/12 84/20 89/5
derailed [1] 97/1	103/20 104/5 121/22	discover [1] 100/8	64/9 64/10 64/24	90/16 108/16 108/19
derisory [2] 117/1	135/8 135/15 136/3	discrepancy [2]	65/11 71/8 73/1 78/16	112/8 122/7 125/4
117/23	didn't [8] 51/12 56/24	134/16 134/21	79/6 79/8 79/16 80/2	129/19 133/12
	84/2 102/18 120/16	discrete [2] 12/1	80/11 84/25 86/10	down [3] 6/12 77/16
describe [1] 15/7	133/17 135/4 140/13	85/17	89/6 90/5 90/19 98/18	135/18
described [8] 22/11	died [1] 104/25	discretion [5] 22/21	99/7 104/5 105/10	draft [1] 74/24
24/5 35/20 45/21	difference [4] 19/8	23/3 52/9 55/6 72/6	110/4 111/24 112/16	drafting [2] 17/8
93/16 98/2 116/10	30/23 54/18 54/24	discuss [1] 79/14	112/18 113/2 115/20	119/25
127/23	differences [1] 58/3	discussed [2] 58/12	120/25 121/4 122/21	dragged [1] 111/3
description [1] 51/7	different [6] 28/12	125/7	124/13 127/15 132/6	draw [1] 9/24
deserve [2] 11/19	46/14 63/6 78/4 79/21	discussion [2] 119/4	132/18 132/20 136/6	drawn [1] 137/6
111/16	80/12	127/3	137/4 137/17 139/3	dread [1] 106/18
design [1] 14/11	difficult [7] 28/7	discussions [6] 1/12	140/10	drive [2] 135/17
designed [12] 18/10	30/13 75/25 80/12	1/13 124/25 125/6	document [11] 14/17	135/18
37/14 44/20 51/4	114/8 114/9 121/23	125/11 127/4	14/19 15/4 18/24 19/4	driving [1] 67/17
51/15 53/2 69/17	difficulties [3] 25/6	disgorgement [1]	19/5 21/1 21/22 66/7	dropped [1] 134/10
71/12 116/11 120/12	73/6 117/10	85/4	90/16 122/23	drove [1] 134/23
122/9 123/25	difficulty [1] 33/23	dishonesty [1] 9/18	documentary [1] 28/1	
desire [2] 30/23				
109/20	dignity [1] 107/13 direct [4] 17/4 20/5	dispute [13] 8/15 10/3 10/12 10/17 28/14	22/5 62/23 120/3	due [9] 21/15 25/7 29/10 40/10 40/21
desperate [1] 106/14		48/14 60/25 67/4 77/4		78/8 84/19 87/9
despite [4] 15/17	83/24 85/8	1	documents [5] 17/6	1
49/22 101/22 138/8	directed [5] 110/25	87/8 91/13 91/17	62/1 62/11 115/2	104/21
destroyed [3] 60/14	113/15 120/9 120/17	122/14	119/7	during [10] 6/11
107/16 115/3	121/13	disputes [7] 32/11	does [17] 16/8 19/23	24/18 62/4 65/18
destroys [1] 114/23	directing [1] 115/3	62/20 86/6 87/4 87/9	27/13 46/18 46/22	67/16 68/4 97/20
detail [2] 94/22	direction [2] 108/13	109/9 118/21	50/6 55/16 70/6 70/7	114/21 114/22 119/12
111/23	111/5	disregard [1] 110/23	70/19 72/18 103/3	duties [1] 88/12
detailed [5] 8/14	directions [2] 5/11 13/6	distance [1] 1/4	111/9 115/11 129/20 129/22 139/14	duty [2] 43/9 71/22
52/24 95/20 108/20		distinction [3] 80/25 125/18 126/17	doesn't [6] 51/1 51/2	Dyson [9] 13/16 34/4 82/11 82/25 127/5
119/20	directly [9] 20/1 50/7	1	59/12 84/11 121/15	127/12 127/24 129/17
detailing [1] 5/22	50/23 51/8 54/14 56/8	distinguished [1] 105/2	121/25	129/24
details [4] 20/3 35/10	59/5 85/11 88/3	1		
50/25 114/17	director [2] 68/2	distress [10] 45/2	doing [7] 2/15 22/18	Dyson's [1] 129/12
determination [3]	93/21	46/3 49/13 49/16	22/20 48/25 64/23	E
97/5 115/12 118/24	directors [1] 50/3	49/25 55/25 56/2	104/5 120/24	each [15] 10/10 19/13
determinations [2]	disadvantage [1]	73/13 73/19 74/15	don't [14] 54/11 54/22	20/3 50/25 56/1 61/17
127/9 127/11	124/1	distressed [1] 122/4	61/11 65/9 66/13	61/20 63/9 72/8 75/21
determine [1] 78/13	disagree [1] 40/15	distributed [1] 125/7	68/14 79/9 90/24	94/11 96/23 102/3
determined [2] 8/16	disagreement [1]	distribution [1] 99/17	105/1 128/14 130/4 131/23 135/11 140/20	114/1 129/15
118/21		disturb [1] 103/22		earlier [6] 25/24
devastated [1] 96/8	disappointed [1]	disturbing [2] 8/24	done [10] 8/25 20/14	31/10 31/11 54/2
devastating [1] 4/14	140/14	119/3	41/15 104/19 112/19 113/1 120/14 125/10	63/20 64/25
developed [2] 13/8	disappointment [1]	divergence [1] 77/9		early [11] 5/5 13/15
35/10	108/7	divided [1] 13/20	130/7 139/13	30/5 33/24 82/4 82/18
developing [2] 36/23	discharge [1] 20/17	do [64] 2/4 2/14 5/20	door [8] 54/5 58/20	82/24 83/9 86/13 87/6
37/23	disclose [1] 106/2	10/6 15/10 23/23	58/25 112/16 122/8	133/3
development [2]	disclosed [3] 31/22	32/14 39/7 42/23	133/23 133/24 134/2	earmarked [1] 6/23
33/19 35/15	100/10 119/7	46/25 48/18 48/20	doors [1] 129/16	earnings [2] 16/22
	disclosure [3] 63/19	49/20 49/22 50/4	doorway [2] 128/10	541111195 [E] 10/22
		1		(45) deprived - earnings
				. ,

E	employed [2] 123/12	124/8	ex [3] 104/18 105/3	experiences [1]
earnings [1] 121/18	127/9	establish [1] 113/25	112/12	121/11
easy [2] 1/20 73/4	employees' [1] 86/18	established [3] 8/4	ex-police [1] 105/3	expert [9] 42/13
eat [1] 131/24	employing [1] 127/24	80/21 128/13	ex-subpostmasters	42/16 43/12 43/19
economy [1] 140/23	emptied [2] 134/24	establishment [3]	[2] 104/18 112/12	43/25 44/8 44/17
effect [8] 58/2 104/8	134/25	7/16 91/10 100/15	exact [1] 135/11	44/22 59/25
107/15 108/17 115/3	enable [5] 11/16 22/7	estimate [1] 92/10	exactly [3] 63/6 66/5	expertise [1] 43/16
115/7 121/8 122/9	25/4 125/6 130/23	et [1] 79/20	66/17	experts [1] 119/22
effected [1] 31/3	enables [1] 44/21	et cetera [1] 79/20	examination [1]	explain [3] 1/17 40/16
effectively [7] 10/25	enabling [1] 71/1	Etheridge [1] 107/21	95/20	96/12
42/6 53/19 93/25 94/7	encouraged [1] 18/11		examine [3] 74/2	explained [6] 24/14
94/10 131/23	end [13] 6/10 31/24	33/24 82/13 82/19	93/12 95/7	70/9 76/12 123/14
effectiveness [1] 5/2	36/16 66/2 66/22 67/1	82/24 83/9 87/6	examined [1] 127/20	134/15 135/3
eight [1] 33/1	69/20 77/7 79/7 82/14	evaluator [2] 34/5	example [5] 27/16	explains [2] 56/1
either [5] 27/9 47/2	117/7 129/13 131/4	82/12	31/1 53/15 72/15	62/10
48/6 58/25 61/15	endeavour [1] 64/24	even [11] 20/17 23/13		explanation [6] 23/10
elapsing [1] 129/6	ended [2] 67/19 136/7	54/6 55/21 75/4 84/12	examples [7] 23/16	51/5 55/24 65/4 95/17
elegantly [2] 47/4	endorses [1] 95/5	86/13 102/18 103/15	23/24 51/13 54/15	120/22
87/14	endure [1] 114/5	111/7 117/8	106/15 107/18 136/19	explanations [1]
element [5] 46/11	Energy [2] 9/14 103/5		excess [1] 25/10	139/10
55/4 61/12 80/3 80/4	engage [3] 11/21	event [5] 8/16 58/2	exclusion [3] 24/12	explore [2] 24/10
elements [5] 12/23	91/16 131/4	76/13 91/13 130/4	24/13 24/16	34/19
28/12 71/18 71/18	engaged [4] 35/19	events [4] 35/5 48/6	exclusions [2] 15/12	expose [1] 107/20
137/14	67/3 77/5 85/24	60/11 103/3	15/14	exposing [2] 97/24
elicit [2] 53/9 69/17	enormous [1] 115/14	ever [2] 55/7 71/5	executive [2] 67/23	111/21
eligibility [4] 14/15	enough [3] 130/6	every [5] 43/12 54/13	93/21	express [4] 33/11
16/3 18/13 25/5	130/6 135/7	55/11 106/17 114/1	exemplary [13] 45/13	61/22 78/17 95/11
eligible [18] 8/6 9/8	enquire [1] 128/3	everyone [6] 1/3 49/2	46/13 46/18 47/2 47/6	expressed [3] 94/18
9/9 13/1 26/3 26/9	Enright [5] 92/12	57/4 57/21 58/19	47/11 47/24 48/2	108/1 116/19
26/12 27/3 29/15	105/12 123/8 123/13	140/22	48/12 48/19 48/22	expresses [1] 33/25
56/17 65/19 66/9	124/22	everything [3] 107/20	81/18 118/24	expression [1] 82/5
66/25 90/21 111/25	ensure [14] 20/20	135/2 137/4	exhaustive [2] 42/2	expressly [5] 42/21
124/4 126/12 138/15	36/14 37/8 54/10 57/3	evidence [48] 1/16	115/19	46/8 62/10 63/11
Elliot [1] 123/15	57/4 58/18 58/22	5/1 5/4 5/6 21/7 21/22	existence [1] 52/5	76/11
Elliott [8] 117/2 117/2	67/25 70/14 90/7 94/8	21/23 22/1 22/3 23/14	existing [2] 13/21	extant [2] 14/25 15/1
117/24 123/6 123/6	103/11 130/24	26/23 27/16 31/13	67/24	extended [3] 25/3
123/7 135/23 136/13	ensuring [1] 57/20	31/16 35/24 44/8	exists [1] 102/22	56/18 58/11
elsewhere [1] 102/5	entertained [1] 47/7	44/16 44/17 44/22	expect [2] 40/17	extension [1] 25/20
embark [3] 1/7	entirely [5] 73/15	45/6 60/11 60/18	95/21	extent [12] 1/10 3/20
110/24 119/20	74/18 77/22 105/17	60/20 60/24 62/8	expected [2] 100/13	4/1 35/25 36/2 36/4
eminent [1] 82/11	119/24	62/11 63/12 69/2	119/19	85/15 87/13 89/19
emphasise [15] 41/9	entities [1] 50/2	69/11 69/14 71/22	expects [1] 68/22	95/4 128/4 139/19
49/10 50/5 53/1 55/16	entitled [4] 17/25	84/17 95/20 96/22	expeditiously [1]	extreme [1] 112/8
60/4 60/16 66/23 80/4	91/23 110/16 125/19	97/12 97/12 105/24	108/18	extremely [2] 68/17
80/20 81/3 82/8 83/5	entity [1] 89/9	106/9 114/2 114/10	expense [1] 139/12	108/17
83/12 84/25	equally [1] 61/24	116/8 116/15 116/20	expenses [3] 44/5	F
emphasised [3] 47/16	eroded [1] 107/14	117/2 126/11 134/4	122/15 122/17	face [4] 15/13 46/1
72/11 80/19	escalated [1] 62/21	134/6 135/23	expensive [1] 131/4	73/16 104/18
emphasises [1] 63/8	escalation [1] 67/7	evidenced [1] 27/25	experience [2] 17/19	facie [1] 83/20
emphatically [1]	especially [1] 17/21	evidencing [1] 21/13	106/10	facilitate [5] 1/20 10/4
84/21	essentially [5] 1/14	evidential [1] 60/8	experienced [2]	11/12 82/25 137/16
	98/20 115/13 122/25	evidently [1] 28/4	19/25 50/22	
	I	1	(46) earnings facilitate

F	84/11 126/6 138/20	final [50] 7/11 10/2	firstly [5] 12/23 12/24	122/22
	fallen [1] 23/14	11/1 11/13 11/16 13/5		formal [5] 10/15 33/4
facility [6] 20/15	falling [2] 90/25	13/11 30/12 32/1 32/4		33/10 80/21 82/10
20/22 23/12 24/4	138/14	32/5 32/6 33/1 35/9	fits [1] 38/2	formally [2] 67/3 77/5
123/2 126/8	falls [2] 62/6 91/12	35/11 35/16 36/12	five [4] 33/1 59/13	format [2] 137/13
facing [2] 112/14	familiar [1] 95/15	36/19 58/1 58/7 76/14	92/11 107/1	139/3
112/20	families [4] 2/22 4/13	76/23 78/21 79/22	fixed [1] 67/18	former [2] 27/12 82/2
fact [23] 2/6 10/15	96/24 114/9	79/22 80/18 81/6 81/8		forms [4] 14/23 27/15
15/18 20/19 21/13	family [6] 49/9 49/12	83/6 83/10 84/7 85/14		52/3 91/16
23/16 34/24 49/22	49/17 97/1 116/3	87/4 88/14 88/24	53/23 56/10 61/3 88/1	formulate [1] 64/4
50/6 54/23 65/16	116/4	89/13 89/23 91/4 91/5		formulated [1] 31/16
69/13 82/8 101/22	far [22] 1/4 39/18 40/5		flags [1] 68/15	formulating [1] 22/15
102/15 103/24 105/18	41/15 45/17 47/17	99/24 105/8 118/17	flaw [3] 61/5 61/9	forth [1] 53/17
113/14 116/5 117/12	47/20 53/18 56/5	118/18 119/16 131/24		fortune [1] 123/13
120/2 122/10 138/12	64/22 69/10 71/3	137/8 138/5	flawed [1] 83/16	forward [15] 40/3
factor [2] 77/13 79/16	72/17 75/3 76/17 81/7	finalise [1] 11/15	flippant [1] 73/2	48/17 67/17 101/4
factors [1] 56/1	84/15 88/24 90/25	finality [1] 3/23	float [1] 57/23	102/9 102/10 102/25
facts [14] 22/23 22/25	115/14 127/17 136/9	finally [9] 8/19 10/13	floor [1] 96/1	108/2 114/6 117/14
23/5 23/21 46/12	far-reaching [1]	55/23 68/24 69/23	flowing [1] 43/8	128/16 128/19 129/23
52/12 52/14 53/4	115/14	89/13 90/13 100/14	flurry [1] 140/12	130/5 141/2
54/13 54/25 55/21	fashion [1] 99/4	111/4	focus [6] 15/18 18/14	
72/6 72/8 124/9	fast [1] 124/9	financial [19] 4/5 4/14		
factual [2] 5/15 60/20	fast-moving [1] 124/9		focused [2] 37/20	found [2] 21/11 106/9
fail [1] 132/20	fatigue [1] 114/5	16/14 19/1 19/1 30/18	38/7	foundation [1] 7/16
failed [2] 103/11	fault [3] 51/25 62/22	39/23 41/23 41/24	focusing [1] 40/8	founded [1] 43/10
109/25	96/21	76/4 100/13 104/6	follow [7] 50/6 80/7	four [5] 15/3 15/7
failings [2] 103/7	feature [1] 119/3	104/18 106/14 132/4	90/8 98/24 102/8	31/5 42/18 107/5
136/22	February [4] 4/8 4/10	financing [2] 16/24	113/6 129/14	fourth [1] 44/12
failure [2] 113/6	94/1 104/23	121/21	followed [5] 9/20 60/4	
131/11	Federation [1] 67/12	find [2] 82/1 103/25	94/2 100/16 101/11	frame [1] 111/14
fair [27] 11/18 13/24	feed [1] 106/25	finding [2] 106/10	following [12] 3/18	frankly [1] 64/17
21/19 22/18 22/24	feel [4] 49/20 55/21	114/7	17/16 19/12 20/3 25/4	
23/6 23/25 30/16 35/2	107/15 135/20	findings [3] 97/15	28/8 61/25 62/19 64/8	
35/22 36/14 44/19	feels [4] 54/25 55/18	98/14 101/5	90/3 95/12 98/25	fraud [1] 84/1
45/7 46/6 47/21 49/20	63/21 113/1	Fine [3] 18/8 66/6	follows [1] 29/4	fraudulent [1] 84/22
52/13 55/19 72/7 76/2	fees [12] 13/10 16/25	87/23		free [3] 59/14 62/18
76/20 88/16 89/18	27/10 27/16 29/9		footing [2] 44/5 67/22	
93/24 108/10 108/25	29/17 36/4 42/25 43/3		footnote [1] 18/23	Freehills [10] 59/11
115/10	71/9 72/12 119/15	Fiona [5] 117/2 123/6		59/15 62/13 88/8
fairly [5] 35/15 58/23	feet [2] 133/7 139/21	135/23 135/25 136/13		88/10 88/10 88/14
84/14 116/25 120/23	fifthly [1] 28/10	fire [1] 133/8	forensic [2] 27/18	89/2 118/9 123/13
fairness [16] 20/17	fighting [1] 104/4	firm [2] 28/18 35/21	43/14	Freeths [13] 13/6
20/23 22/10 22/17	figure [8] 26/12 26/13		forget [1] 105/1	35/19 36/10 36/17
23/3 23/13 24/4 41/4	27/9 27/10 27/12	firms [1] 125/4	form [29] 18/6 18/10	36/20 37/1 37/10
41/10 44/25 46/23	27/13 66/11 135/11	first [25] 1/7 15/16	18/17 19/6 26/19	124/3 124/8 124/8
56/4 91/3 99/19 99/22	figures [11] 8/22 9/10	25/17 31/6 40/6 40/25	28/21 50/20 51/3	124/10 124/13 124/17
118/16	25/25 26/1 26/7 26/15	42/13 42/20 54/18	51/14 52/2 53/5 53/6	frequency [1] 23/12
Faisal [1] 106/24	29/15 66/1 71/5 75/9	56/9 56/10 59/6 61/10	53/12 53/20 53/24	friendly [8] 49/11
faith [8] 28/15 62/19 63/23 67/6 67/8 84/25	75/11	67/11 68/22 69/1	64/8 73/14 75/12 77/9	
123/7 123/17	filed [2] 26/6 118/6	73/11 82/20 85/19	115/17 115/24 120/8	79/17 80/11 116/11
fall [5] 39/23 50/7	fill [1] 15/8	90/18 93/1 104/16	120/10 120/16 120/21	116/14
ומוו נשן ששובט שעורן	filled [1] 106/17	113/19 116/15 118/8	121/25 122/5 122/9	frolic [1] 110/24
				_
				(47) facility - frolid

F 131/4 79/14 112/19 122/7 64/4 64/10 65/3 66/18 12/12 13/9 13/25 35/3 funding [9] 7/1 7/23 131/8 132/4 134/17 77/22 78/15 78/20 35/12 35/17 35/22 from [91] 1/15 2/21 11/12 11/17 12/11 134/19 135/7 136/1 92/1 98/6 102/5 37/13 37/16 68/7 2/25 3/1 3/3 4/12 5/13 57/17 98/11 130/22 139/9 103/25 108/3 122/8 84/18 96/11 96/14 9/4 10/6 12/16 13/21 138/1 getting [3] 66/3 73/4 123/22 124/9 130/5 98/12 98/14 98/16 14/24 14/25 14/25 funds [4] 9/15 99/18 99/5 136/10 140/19 105/16 105/19 107/22 15/1 15/14 15/22 16/2 112/1 125/7 gift [1] 111/15 gone [2] 26/8 101/24 108/4 108/10 108/17 16/6 16/17 16/19 further [51] 11/4 12/5 give [11] 12/12 54/17 good [17] 1/3 1/6 108/25 109/19 110/2 16/20 17/6 17/13 69/1 87/20 98/12 99/3 12/21 25/4 28/6 33/8 112/7 112/23 112/23 28/15 62/19 63/23 17/22 19/9 23/17 24/7 33/19 44/17 48/14 106/9 106/14 121/3 67/6 67/8 82/22 84/24 112/24 124/5 131/6 25/2 26/19 26/25 52/25 53/1 53/2 53/6 138/2 140/16 93/1 96/3 123/7 137/23 138/2 138/6 31/16 39/6 40/18 43/8 56/19 59/4 65/17 given [16] 18/23 123/13 123/17 127/24 138/9 138/13 138/20 44/24 49/14 50/6 50/8 65/25 67/8 69/15 19/16 54/15 55/14 137/17 141/1 groups [2] 94/2 108/1 50/18 51/5 51/24 52/2 69/17 70/17 72/3 55/20 59/15 84/15 got [12] 39/5 79/15 guess [1] 1/5 53/3 53/18 56/12 59/3 72/10 72/22 78/14 93/2 93/4 94/4 97/12 122/7 134/14 134/17 guidance [40] 14/18 60/11 63/9 63/25 64/7 100/11 108/18 112/9 83/19 87/7 88/15 134/19 134/23 135/11 16/17 18/24 19/4 19/5 64/19 64/23 65/21 88/15 89/18 89/23 117/10 137/7 135/17 136/7 136/17 20/12 20/25 21/22 68/7 72/4 73/19 75/3 90/9 92/3 104/6 gives [1] 94/16 136/18 31/9 42/1 42/15 42/16 78/4 82/21 85/25 86/1 105/10 109/1 109/3 giving [3] 69/14 42/17 42/20 42/22 governance [2] 57/15 87/20 89/1 89/21 90/4 109/9 109/13 109/15 106/11 116/19 57/23 45/15 51/13 51/17 97/12 99/15 103/16 109/22 117/14 119/3 51/20 51/21 52/1 52/3 glance [1] 92/1 **Government [21]** 3/2 103/16 107/20 107/22 124/6 124/25 127/15 Glasgow [1] 4/11 11/11 11/17 12/8 52/5 53/19 53/22 54/9 108/7 110/11 112/13 128/17 139/21 139/25 GLO [50] 6/4 7/20 12/25 13/4 35/19 54/10 54/23 56/6 112/17 113/5 114/6 140/15 140/19 67/21 89/16 89/21 60/17 60/21 63/3 12/9 12/10 12/12 114/16 116/16 117/1 future [2] 108/4 12/13 12/24 13/1 13/6 93/6 98/22 98/24 71/16 71/19 82/25 118/8 120/11 122/20 13/9 35/7 35/14 35/21 103/6 105/17 109/14 83/3 115/7 121/13 125/12 129/2 129/14 130/21 110/21 111/11 132/25 35/25 36/15 36/21 121/14 122/22 131/25 132/1 133/4 G 36/25 37/2 37/4 37/9 137/18 137/21 guided [2] 22/17 23/2 140/6 Gallafent [20] 3/1 37/21 37/25 83/17 Government's [2] front [3] 14/9 74/24 38/15 38/24 39/9 84/22 96/11 96/13 94/24 105/15 92/18 39/10 47/3 57/10 habit [1] 75/5 97/23 98/7 98/12 grasp [1] 102/23 frustration [1] 116/19 64/20 79/2 87/10 92/7 had [62] 2/14 3/12 98/14 98/16 99/18 grass [1] 137/2 Fujitsu [2] 97/2 112/8 112/22 117/9 119/5 3/17 4/15 4/17 4/20 100/15 100/19 100/19 grateful [10] 39/12 fulfil [2] 93/22 94/10 120/11 121/22 122/21 8/2 8/5 9/7 9/10 9/18 100/23 105/9 107/17 41/20 52/18 75/7 full [16] 7/10 27/12 128/6 133/22 142/3 10/8 10/14 11/5 13/7 108/4 108/23 125/1 82/11 92/4 93/8 95/17 39/22 69/5 71/3 71/3 Gareth [1] 107/21 13/13 13/14 15/3 125/13 126/3 126/16 102/17 133/1 72/6 76/23 92/13 gave [9] 5/11 26/22 19/19 26/18 26/20 132/19 137/22 137/23 gratitude [1] 106/5 93/24 94/8 101/20 65/25 66/11 69/11 27/3 29/16 31/16 138/2 138/3 139/2 grave [2] 105/3 105/8 107/11 115/21 117/2 135/10 135/23 32/12 32/23 32/24 go [19] 25/23 30/8 117/15 138/4 35/19 40/24 50/22 136/17 65/10 82/6 91/12 98/6 great [3] 47/5 129/17 fullest [1] 89/19 general [3] 81/11 52/16 52/17 56/21 107/22 114/9 115/15 129/20 fully [8] 30/15 45/22 121/20 130/3 58/12 67/21 69/15 greater [9] 21/9 54/10 120/7 127/6 127/22 50/11 76/1 81/5 82/20 generally [11] 30/4 74/7 74/9 85/25 96/8 133/9 133/16 135/15 54/22 55/3 56/5 60/19 89/4 132/11 32/19 40/3 43/6 44/11 96/9 103/10 104/1 136/8 136/9 137/5 78/8 95/22 129/6 function [1] 94/19 48/22 57/16 78/14 104/16 107/6 108/5 138/17 greatest [1] 105/21 functioning [1] 41/4 90/6 91/15 97/1 116/21 117/3 117/3 goes [7] 28/16 56/4 ground [6] 2/13 17/10 functions [2] 93/23 generated [1] 6/9 117/12 120/5 123/9 65/24 79/16 83/19 50/21 56/23 58/15 94/10 generic [2] 44/9 123/10 124/23 125/19 70/5 84/5 88/18 fund [2] 35/7 99/16 134/10 134/12 135/1 115/20 going [31] 1/7 1/11 grounds [3] 23/14 funded [2] 125/12 **Geoffrey [1]** 107/8 135/5 138/4 138/10 1/14 2/13 9/2 12/2 77/12 83/20 132/11 get [16] 1/19 8/24 140/1 12/22 14/22 24/15 group [43] 6/2 6/3 funders [2] 98/3 63/9 64/14 66/20 73/1 hadn't [3] 41/16 51/23 39/7 48/17 50/4 58/4 6/24 8/2 8/6 8/10

72/12 72/25 74/25 42/14 42/17 42/19 120/11 121/22 123/10 | **Hooper [1]** 114/22 Н 75/12 81/4 81/19 45/15 49/8 50/16 123/17 134/10 134/12 hope [9] 33/7 75/8 hadn't... [1] 136/7 82/12 82/22 85/23 52/11 55/14 70/2 70/7 134/13 135/3 135/4 83/2 119/17 120/11 half [7] 26/5 26/13 86/5 86/16 89/15 77/17 115/18 115/19 135/9 135/10 135/10 123/1 123/20 126/14 29/15 36/19 74/12 89/16 94/1 94/5 94/8 121/17 122/24 131/8 Herbert [10] 59/11 139/5 74/21 74/21 94/10 96/22 98/4 98/8 health [5] 44/9 45/4 59/15 62/13 88/7 88/9 hoped [1] 82/16 halfway [1] 128/25 98/16 98/18 101/1 104/7 121/12 121/12 88/10 88/13 89/2 hopeful [2] 2/9 2/10 Hamilton [1] 126/11 hear [11] 1/5 2/24 5/6 101/21 102/11 102/20 118/8 123/12 hopes [1] 109/21 hand [4] 2/2 36/9 48/9 103/7 104/10 104/11 58/6 59/2 90/4 94/3 here [10] 1/21 30/24 **Horizon [26]** 4/15 6/9 115/15 104/22 104/25 105/6 94/14 110/4 127/10 39/1 68/14 80/1 85/16 6/14 8/9 17/4 18/21 handed [1] 6/12 106/12 106/15 106/19 129/24 120/21 134/16 135/25 21/11 21/12 21/15 handled [1] 118/3 107/6 109/20 109/24 heard [20] 4/12 35/15 136/4 42/5 43/1 55/15 71/21 handling [1] 123/9 111/2 115/13 116/10 52/2 77/15 84/16 high [7] 24/6 96/16 77/20 79/20 97/24 hands [3] 38/18 116/20 117/9 120/4 84/19 96/23 97/4 101/3 103/15 104/5 103/8 103/11 103/18 105/15 114/4 121/6 121/11 123/18 97/11 98/10 102/2 105/6 105/21 103/18 103/19 103/20 happen [3] 37/17 64/6 102/13 107/20 112/22 123/24 124/23 127/5 |higher [3] 30/7 55/1 103/22 110/18 111/22 140/10 127/13 127/17 129/8 116/8 128/2 133/21 60/6 136/23 happened [7] 104/10 130/10 130/16 130/18 134/5 134/6 136/19 horse [1] 115/4 highlight [3] 40/13 121/6 121/11 127/13 131/22 132/24 137/1 hearing [18] 1/16 61/10 119/23 hounded [1] 96/20 129/11 131/5 134/5 137/21 139/13 1/24 1/25 2/20 39/22 highlighted [1] 87/5 hour [3] 134/17 happening [4] 101/15 hasn't [1] 55/22 40/1 90/5 104/16 highly [1] 133/10 134/18 134/19 101/18 102/20 134/5 have [266] 108/20 109/23 110/11 him [5] 34/2 106/20 hours [2] 92/13 happens [1] 139/25 haven't [4] 41/9 41/15 113/15 127/18 129/24 136/15 136/16 136/17 123/24 happy [4] 41/13 69/4 55/14 90/10 139/13 139/20 140/6 his [17] 31/18 35/8 house [6] 12/21 107/6 78/22 90/5 141/5 107/9 128/25 134/24 having [24] 1/24 4/15 68/6 68/25 69/6 69/7 harassment [1] 17/2 4/17 4/20 9/3 23/17 hearings [34] 1/8 69/13 69/14 69/21 135/1 hard [1] 102/23 45/20 49/18 51/5 1/21 2/1 4/9 5/10 84/2 88/1 105/3 105/4 how [10] 8/15 20/4 **hardly [1]** 1/5 53/25 62/18 63/20 26/18 39/19 52/20 106/20 107/1 129/13 25/12 38/1 55/24 hardship [9] 30/18 84/16 91/18 93/2 64/9 64/9 69/2 93/9 130/3 56/14 57/7 58/18 30/19 76/4 76/5 76/18 97/11 97/13 117/8 94/1 94/2 94/6 94/12 historic [4] 3/24 3/25 125/1 126/25 77/12 112/19 112/20 120/2 121/9 125/19 94/12 95/3 95/12 4/2 119/21 Howe [27] 3/4 12/17 112/23 133/7 133/21 140/1 95/16 96/23 97/13 historical [24] 3/8 17/16 20/12 29/24 harm [3] 104/6 Hazzleton [1] 107/2 102/3 104/23 105/6 7/17 8/3 13/21 14/9 31/7 31/12 31/20 37/5 106/12 115/21 he [25] 12/7 12/24 106/7 106/10 112/13 14/11 14/14 14/16 37/7 42/14 45/12 49/7 has [120] 3/20 4/1 13/4 26/18 26/18 127/1 129/6 133/2 14/18 14/20 14/23 60/9 61/5 68/24 71/11 10/17 10/21 10/24 133/6 134/7 140/12 26/20 26/20 26/21 40/22 45/9 67/15 73/22 75/15 85/19 10/25 12/8 14/4 18/3 26/22 69/10 69/11 heart [1] 132/8 67/19 67/24 68/2 68/5 86/8 96/4 105/13 18/19 20/12 23/12 68/6 68/8 68/10 77/10 83/19 83/23 87/11 heartrending [1] 111/4 123/8 124/22 23/14 23/19 23/24 87/13 87/15 106/19 110/20 80/22 138/7 125/3 24/21 25/10 25/18 106/22 106/25 106/25 height [1] 24/20 history [1] 105/22 however [10] 4/7 10/5 26/8 27/5 27/7 28/17 held [5] 61/2 61/7 116/20 129/13 130/2 **HMRC [3]** 85/24 86/1 16/6 33/19 45/20 28/18 28/25 29/1 136/15 136/16 62/20 116/23 133/7 86/4 46/22 68/4 126/17 29/13 29/18 29/21 Hodge [6] 83/7 83/15 136/22 138/18 head [5] 42/8 45/11 help [4] 54/14 72/23 30/4 30/16 33/19 34/2 67/15 67/19 68/5 120/14 122/9 83/23 85/2 85/5 88/5 HSS [44] 7/17 8/7 34/4 35/23 35/24 36/7 helped [1] 110/18 headed [2] 21/3 hold [2] 30/6 55/17 10/8 14/12 15/12 41/17 44/8 44/16 45/5 114/16 helpful [4] 64/16 69/3 holding [1] 112/12 15/18 16/7 17/8 17/12 45/18 49/10 49/16 holds [3] 22/4 86/18 heading [4] 9/25 106/9 133/19 17/14 17/20 18/17 49/24 54/6 55/13 86/21 19/11 21/3 21/21 helpfully [1] 69/20 22/13 25/19 26/25 55/19 56/25 59/17 headings [1] 16/21 helping [1] 11/18 hole [1] 132/5 27/7 29/20 29/22 59/18 60/5 61/15 heads [24] 15/11 hence [1] 46/6 Holmes' [1] 105/2 29/25 30/4 30/13 63/20 63/22 69/8 71/4 15/13 15/16 17/21 her [17] 31/19 34/2 47/17 57/16 91/10 home [1] 134/23 71/12 71/24 72/6 22/22 23/4 41/1 41/19 38/24 107/3 107/6 homes [1] 104/19 113/18 113/25 114/25

Н	86/18 91/19	I make [6] 40/6 44/12	I would [9] 14/1 36/16	ignorant [1] 101/18
HSS [17] 115/18	I can't [1] 2/6	64/7 88/22 110/7	39/11 49/24 55/16	illness [3] 30/19 31/1
115/19 116/16 117/1	I cannot [1] 106/18	110/8	73/15 83/11 95/21	76/4
118/7 119/3 119/10	I carried [1] 135/18	I mean [5] 47/5 73/1	140/9	illnesses [1] 104/22
120/2 120/5 122/12	I certainly [2] 64/11	88/15 96/12 129/2	I'II [4] 57/23 96/11	imagine [1] 1/18
123/6 123/21 126/1	129/18	I meant [1] 34/9	134/18 140/10	immediate [4] 88/22
132/20 133/11 133/23	I confirm [1] 91/13	I mentioned [3] 31/10	l'm [29] 2/2 2/13 12/2	111/16 112/17 132/4
139/10	I could [1] 135/22	79/17 135/23	12/22 24/15 38/1 39/7	immediately [3] 99/12
Hudgell [16] 12/17	I couldn't [2] 135/17	I might [2] 87/11	48/15 48/16 57/9	104/9 127/2
17/17 20/13 29/20	136/9	128/3	64/14 65/3 65/7 65/22	
33/13 33/14 33/21	I deal [1] 127/2	I move [6] 41/18 49/5	75/2 75/4 75/7 78/20	impact [12] 4/9 26/18
34/19 54/9 54/15	I didn't [1] 140/13	56/8 59/3 65/2 75/14	79/6 95/16 99/5	49/18 69/2 76/6 76/15
54/20 59/6 68/15 70/3	l do [7] 2/4 42/23	I need [1] 61/23	100/20 114/3 121/2	94/2 96/23 97/13
81/13 82/3	65/11 73/1 79/16	I never [2] 135/11	129/2 136/3 137/25	102/3 106/10 134/7
Hudgells [1] 51/10	80/11 136/6	136/18	140/14 140/18	impacted [2] 30/14
huge [2] 111/17 136/5	I don't [6] 61/11 66/13		l've [1] 77/5	76/1
human [10] 4/9 26/16	08/14 /9/9 135/11	I pick [2] 59/3 59/4	i.e [11] 10/22 21/9	impede [1] 2/1
26/17 69/2 94/2 96/23	140/20	I published [1]	23/12 23/19 26/3 26/5	implementation [1]
97/13 102/3 106/10	I drove [1] 134/23	140/11	26/9 28/21 31/15	4/2
134/7	l emphasise [4] 49/10		34/21 55/7	implications [2]
hundreds [1] 136/4	60/4 66/23 80/4	74/9 128/23	identified [14] 14/2	69/23 70/2
hurdles [1] 115/3	I emphasised [1]	quote [1] 120/11	15/4 15/6 15/8 39/14	important [12] 21/24
husband [2] 105/2	47/16	I raise [1] 38/12	45/19 46/1 46/7 68/25	
135/5	l emptied [2] 134/24	I recognise [1] 49/1	72/2 84/6 88/16 93/11	
	134/25	I refer [1] 96/13	100/5	108/17 114/20 119/23
<u> </u>	l ended [1] 136/7	I require [1] 64/7	identifies [1] 8/11	128/12
I accept [1] 58/3	I feel [1] 107/15	I said [1] 38/8	identify [5] 14/1 18/18	
I added [1] 104/20	I finish [1] 139/8	I say [3] 37/18 95/16	53/2 53/6 54/21	imprisonment [1]
I address [1] 40/23	I first [1] 93/1	140/21	if [73] 2/11 3/20 4/1	4/20
I addressed [1]	I focused [1] 38/7	I see [1] 9/4	7/24 8/20 8/24 9/9	improvements [1]
104/15	l get [1] 73/1	I set [2] 104/17	16/9 16/11 18/1 18/4	3/22
I agreed [1] 1/22	go [1] 136/8	113/10	19/6 20/2 20/13 21/19	
I also [1] 112/6	i got [3] 134/23 135/17 136/17	I should [1] 128/4	22/17 25/18 25/23 28/16 29/1 30/8 32/7	inadequate [2] 71/10 121/25
l am [11] 2/9 2/10	I had [4] 2/14 52/16	start [1] 40/22 started [1] 137/5	37/17 39/6 43/25	inappropriate [3]
38/4 38/4 48/25 48/25	52/17 135/1		47/22 48/1 50/25	55/6 78/19 118/23
58/4 63/17 78/22	I have [14] 35/20	I take [3] 38/15 120/8		incapable [1] 111/7
107/14 140/14	46/24 72/2 75/5 78/23	120/18	63/20 63/21 64/6	include [8] 16/22
I anticipate [1] 88/2	87/5 92/18 104/24	I then [2] 73/21	64/11 66/6 66/16 69/3	
I anticipated [1]	105/5 106/16 108/20	125/15	69/3 70/21 73/21	81/18 116/2 127/4
140/12	138/24 139/5 139/21	I thought [3] 34/11		included [6] 4/21 18/5
l appear [2] 2/23 96/3		80/17 107/13	82/6 83/7 83/14 86/9	46/10 85/8 116/17
appreciate [1] 38/25	I hope [2] 120/11	I turn [2] 35/2 130/20	90/2 91/17 96/12	124/25
l ask [3] 38/24 92/9	139/5	I want [1] 99/5	98/25 101/9 101/9	includes [4] 8/14
139/23	l indicated [1] 89/25	I wasn't [1] 39/5	102/8 109/5 110/9	15/25 52/22 76/3
l asked [3] 105/23	l just [5] 40/24 42/10	I went [1] 136/14	112/4 114/11 114/24	including [15] 3/8
128/5 136/15	61/10 89/13 100/17	l were [1] 129/7	115/10 119/22 124/13	
l assure [1] 58/21	I know [2] 34/15	I will [12] 15/7 17/15	128/22 129/7 129/11	44/9 46/9 49/12 68/8
brought [1] 135/21	130/2	22/9 50/5 64/3 64/9	129/19 133/14 139/5	68/19 72/8 94/16
butting [1] 128/7	I leave [1] 63/24	66/7 79/25 92/13	139/23 139/24 141/2	95/20 127/22 139/20
l can [11] 2/15 41/12	I lifted [1] 134/24	100/19 140/3 140/16	if I could [1] 16/9	inclusion [1] 85/6
56/25 57/11 57/18	131- 547 444/0	I wonder [1] 113/19	ignorance [1] 102/5	Income [1] 70/9
65/17 79/6 81/13 85/9			.g	
	•	•		(50) HSS - Income

incomplete [1] 63/22 inconsistent [1] 54/17 inconvenience [11] 45/2 46/4 49/13 49/16 50/1 50/2 55/25 56/2 73/13 73/20 74/15 increased [2] 16/24 121/20 incur [2] 71/13 116/12 incurred [5] 21/13 42/25 43/3 46/20 72/13 indeed [7] 51/2 57/11 66/16 102/11 104/22 113/13 113/24 indemnity [1] 70/20 independence [2] 60/3 118/5 independent [26] 14/13 16/7 16/12 22/12 27/6 28/20 28/22 32/8 41/7 41/21 43/13 43/22 59/7 59/8 59/9 59/21 60/2 70/15 70/22 78/12 86/7 86/24 109/6 118/12 118/22 130/25 indicate [1] 64/12 indicated [11] 41/17 59/16 75/22 76/25 77/5 77/17 86/24 89/25 91/3 93/7 94/21 indicates [1] 81/22 indication [6] 40/11 63/24 64/17 65/8 75/12 101/11 indications [2] 137/7 137/12 indirect [1] 49/18 indirectly [1] 60/7 individual [15] 33/17 36/21 37/21 53/4 67/16 72/20 77/17 81/14 83/6 83/10 99/10 99/25 100/12 102/4 103/21 individually [2] 34/6 34/17

individuals [10] 96/13 130/1 133/3 133/5 97/1 105/1 110/3 123/1 124/20 127/22 132/6 132/10 139/15 indulge [1] 139/23 indulgences [1] 115/17 Industrial [2] 9/14 103/5 ineligible [1] 138/6 inevitably [3] 53/14 55/9 78/13 infect [1] 103/22 information [31] 6/9 9/25 10/24 19/15 20/8 23/9 32/18 52/25 53/2 53/9 54/2 61/2 61/6 61/16 61/18 61/19 62/23 63/9 64/22 66/19 69/10 69/16 69/17 69/17 70/17 72/4 89/1 102/6 109/13 110/14 116/22 informed [1] 104/24 inherent [1] 89/7 inheritance [1] 106/16 initial [4] 46/17 56/18 88/5 119/8 initially [1] 25/1 initiative [2] 23/16 23/20 injury [6] 17/1 44/15 50/1 50/3 53/17 72/16 | interfere [2] 34/25 **Inquiries [1]** 97/7 inquiry [60] 3/13 3/19 interim [74] 4/3 9/16 4/7 10/24 11/25 17/18 23/10 29/10 32/18 35/23 36/7 36/19 37/5 41/13 64/22 67/21 68/1 68/12 69/3 69/5 70/23 72/24 84/16 84/16 88/21 90/1 90/4 93/2 93/8 93/12 93/13 94/5 95/11 96/7 97/11 97/21 102/17 103/25 104/16 104/21 104/22 105/25 106/6 108/6 109/22 110/6 110/23 111/4 112/14 113/14 114/20 124/19 124/25 125/9 125/9 130/1

135/14 Inquiry's [4] 2/1 39/24 84/12 116/15 insofar [1] 83/16 **insolvency [2]** 16/25 121/21 instances [1] 27/23 instantly [1] 112/19 instead [10] 30/1 30/6 interpreted [1] 41/16 31/2 32/25 33/5 33/14 104/10 110/14 117/4 129/15 **institution** [1] 119/1 institutions [3] 97/15 108/6 113/16 instruct [7] 36/22 36/25 37/2 37/21 37/25 124/13 124/20 **instructed** [2] 96/4 123/12 instructing [4] 102/15 111/3 112/3 133/5 instructive [1] 74/2 insufficient [2] 44/16 72/19 intend [1] 40/18 intended [4] 8/8 12/25 39/19 39/21 interest [1] 91/2 interests [6] 20/17 36/5 36/24 37/2 37/9 37/24 128/14 10/5 10/10 10/20 10/25 12/25 29/19 29/21 29/25 30/4 30/11 30/17 30/20 30/22 30/25 32/15 32/23 35/7 35/16 36/12 75/14 75/16 75/20 75/23 76/9 76/13 76/15 76/18 76/24 77/11 77/13 78/2 78/4 78/11 78/18 79/9 79/12 79/22 85/22 91/5 91/9 91/14 95/10 97/6 97/9 97/17 | irredeemably [1] 98/22 99/11 99/16 99/24 102/9 102/24

103/2 110/17 111/12 111/20 112/9 118/18 125/19 126/9 126/19 129/4 129/8 129/18 129/19 130/24 131/7 132/1 132/6 139/3 internally [1] 61/13 interpret [1] 113/13 intervene [1] 87/19 into [34] 1/19 13/20 19/19 19/21 20/23 22/23 23/5 39/3 43/17 45/22 45/24 46/2 49/17 49/21 52/12 53/20 54/4 56/2 56/4 56/20 72/6 94/18 111/4 115/25 116/6 122/18 126/7 131/24 134/13 134/17 134/23 134/25 135/2 137/2 introduced [1] 51/17 introducing [1] 41/20 introduction [2] 1/17 2/2 inverted [1] 64/5 investigated [1] 29/23 investigation [2] 19/21 62/13 Investments [3] 3/2 93/6 103/7 invitation [6] 39/14 39/18 40/19 84/6 88/19 140/24 invite [5] 13/19 16/9 20/24 112/24 138/25 invited [5] 13/17 18/17 81/10 108/23 129/3 involve [1] 87/13 involved [6] 28/9 81/24 89/15 96/7 100/16 125/4 involvement [3] 83/9 89/23 94/22 involving [2] 45/4 119/20 30/14

irrelevant [1] 53/14

irremediably [1] 75/25 124/16 125/15 125/16 | irrespective [1] 30/25 isn't [2] 46/7 84/4 isolated [1] 3/17 issue [54] 3/12 3/19 11/1 15/6 15/10 15/11 17/14 20/12 20/15 24/10 24/16 25/17 27/1 27/5 29/18 31/7 32/3 32/5 32/7 32/9 33/21 34/17 37/6 41/14 41/16 46/3 49/12 57/24 59/6 61/3 68/15 68/19 70/18 70/21 72/25 73/18 81/20 82/1 82/3 84/5 85/6 87/25 89/22 90/2 90/17 97/9 106/7 108/10 110/15 113/22 117/6 128/5 132/15 137/3 issue 6 [1] 32/5 issued [1] 12/18 issues [66] 1/9 1/13 1/15 2/20 3/17 3/18 3/24 5/8 5/18 6/13 6/14 6/19 13/15 13/18 13/20 13/22 13/24 14/2 14/7 14/8 15/3 15/7 15/13 17/6 17/15 21/12 21/12 28/7 31/5 32/14 34/6 35/3 35/4 35/13 35/24 36/4 37/11 38/9 39/13 39/16 39/22 40/9 44/9 44/10 45/5 45/20 48/17 60/7 69/9 82/17 85/17 90/14 93/3 93/9 93/11 93/12 93/15 94/9 94/16 94/23 102/2 106/1 108/19 109/15 137/2 140/5 it's [48] 16/16 18/16 24/6 28/11 29/8 31/11 31/20 33/9 35/22 36/19 39/1 43/24 44/1 47/12 50/21 54/12 56/3 58/2 60/9 61/13 63/5 63/13 70/5 70/13 70/23 75/5 75/15 75/17 77/17 77/22

(52) it's... - litigation

knows [2] 36/8 46/17 47/10 47/12 63/25 64/16 80/9 jump [1] 115/4 June [20] 8/22 9/7 9/9 129/14 47/13 47/23 47/25 81/23 83/11 88/12 it's... [18] 79/18 79/21 9/12 12/20 15/2 19/8 48/2 48/7 50/10 55/17 90/4 101/9 107/15 81/3 81/20 83/4 88/3 25/25 30/21 40/12 59/7 59/9 59/10 59/21 107/21 120/25 121/3 89/21 92/8 93/13 94/3 lack [5] 60/23 75/2 65/9 65/25 66/2 97/3 62/13 70/22 70/25 127/16 113/2 116/11 116/14 103/23 112/6 118/5 110/13 113/7 119/14 71/4 71/9 72/9 72/12 likelihood [2] 21/9 117/15 120/5 120/20 lagged [1] 56/10 123/7 126/14 140/11 72/22 74/7 74/9 75/13 129/17 122/17 133/13 laid [2] 7/15 129/9 June 2020 [1] 15/2 86/24 89/9 91/19 98/1 likely [15] 24/6 27/24 items [1] 106/23 large [4] 38/25 54/16 June 20202 [1] 12/20 100/3 100/11 101/20 28/11 34/1 46/2 55/2 its [47] 2/8 3/22 8/5 133/10 139/19 June 2022 [1] 9/12 103/13 105/22 109/6 73/5 78/7 81/23 82/6 15/13 15/17 22/15 largely [4] 32/18 71/3 just [34] 1/17 16/21 116/12 117/20 117/24 92/16 117/21 133/14 28/19 28/23 28/24 81/5 82/22 26/20 37/20 40/24 119/12 119/15 119/21 137/8 137/13 31/24 40/2 41/7 54/13 largesse [1] 115/17 42/10 46/11 48/18 120/6 121/19 122/3 likewise [1] 132/20 54/18 55/2 55/21 59/9 last [17] 11/9 18/16 122/15 122/15 122/17 limit [2] 58/5 58/7 52/16 52/22 55/5 78/6 88/9 89/3 89/14 26/6 28/24 34/4 34/8 57/23 59/23 61/10 123/23 125/14 130/25 limitation [4] 58/2 93/7 93/17 93/18 34/9 34/13 66/1 66/12 66/18 69/7 74/11 131/9 131/9 131/14 71/25 79/20 101/20 94/10 94/19 94/22 100/18 102/15 102/18 74/12 79/8 79/13 131/20 131/24 132/8 limited [24] 72/9 98/2 103/4 103/11 104/15 105/12 118/20 89/13 90/15 92/1 92/9 132/11 132/16 132/24 101/3 107/16 108/8 103/12 103/20 103/22 130/12 96/11 100/17 107/6 legally [1] 120/2 113/21 114/23 114/25 104/4 104/9 104/13 late [7] 34/15 56/11 117/3 120/12 129/7 length [1] 129/6 115/2 115/6 115/23 106/1 109/12 110/15 58/17 58/20 65/15 129/16 134/7 134/10 lengths [1] 56/16 116/10 117/6 118/7 110/24 115/24 122/16 85/24 102/14 136/19 less [10] 2/11 8/1 118/17 118/23 119/7 125/2 130/17 131/18 later [6] 2/24 5/9 justice [4] 3/14 103/9 26/5 59/18 64/19 122/16 123/4 123/20 131/21 132/24 39/21 90/8 113/8 70/11 76/14 82/10 124/2 130/16 130/23 103/16 105/21 itself [19] 18/10 31/20 114/20 justifiable [2] 57/6 84/15 126/19 138/13 138/19 37/13 42/20 42/22 latter [1] 27/13 lesser [1] 55/3 67/13 Limited's [1] 117/16 48/5 51/24 53/20 law [2] 28/18 81/22 justification [1] 88/23 lest [1] 48/24 limits [2] 49/1 83/17 53/24 54/9 57/16 lawyer [2] 51/6 123/2 justified [2] 46/12 Let [2] 39/2 106/14 line [4] 18/16 40/7 59/20 71/10 119/2 lawyers [4] 1/15 1/19 49/22 let's [4] 79/7 79/13 40/11 43/5 120/8 121/4 133/6 1/21 104/12 120/21 134/4 lines [2] 109/11 134/8 133/11 140/5 K lay [5] 28/2 51/4 letter [10] 36/17 linked [2] 42/4 56/9 **Kay [1]** 114/19 51/16 120/14 122/10 36/18 56/1 62/7 62/8 **Linnell [2]** 114/19 keen [2] 57/3 90/6 **lead [1]** 55/10 62/25 63/1 63/10 114/19 Jacobs [1] 96/4 learn [1] 120/11 keeping [1] 101/17 70/16 124/8 list [5] 3/17 35/4 42/2 January [1] 68/3 key [4] 21/3 22/4 53/4 learned [1] 122/20 letters [6] 65/17 63/11 98/23 jewellery [1] 106/16 71/18 learnt [1] 130/11 65/20 67/1 70/10 77/6 listen [3] 64/4 90/7 **JFSA [4]** 36/6 36/9 kicked [1] 137/2 least [8] 31/23 54/12 102/20 133/14 36/22 37/22 66/25 77/6 111/5 kicking [1] 111/3 level [6] 17/9 54/19 listened [2] 117/8 Jones [6] 83/7 83/15 kind [3] 9/5 57/24 117/7 126/12 130/15 54/24 74/2 93/19 121/22 83/23 85/2 85/5 88/5 92/10 leave [5] 40/20 58/24 128/21 listening [3] 5/19 judge [3] 6/12 39/3 knew [1] 35/25 63/24 90/1 136/9 liability [2] 7/6 81/12 94/14 94/14 82/11 know [23] 5/16 27/8 leaving [1] 9/4 liable [1] 70/12 lists [1] 62/8 judgment [4] 6/14 34/15 38/6 64/20 led [1] 20/12 liaise [1] 91/20 Litigant [1] 108/25 6/14 21/12 21/12 79/19 96/3 97/22 Leeds [1] 4/11 life [1] 97/1 litigants [11] 96/11 judgments [3] 6/13 97/25 98/2 98/21 left [3] 17/25 102/4 lifetime [3] 75/6 97/20 96/13 97/23 98/7 6/13 103/9 102/19 106/8 108/2 138/9 104/21 99/18 99/20 107/17 **July [15]** 1/1 9/13 111/24 112/13 112/18 | legal [78] 5/13 6/23 lifted [1] 134/24 108/24 125/1 126/16 9/22 10/8 66/4 66/22 127/3 130/2 132/12 13/10 16/25 17/13 light [5] 5/4 14/3 60/2 132/19 66/23 67/20 81/4 91/8 133/2 135/4 135/11 24/1 27/6 27/10 28/4 93/23 95/8 litigation [46] 5/25 109/23 118/20 129/13 known [6] 6/2 7/16 28/13 28/25 29/9 like [22] 5/21 18/12 6/2 6/3 6/5 6/12 6/17 140/15 141/5 21/25 98/4 128/13 29/17 32/8 36/3 42/4 20/2 38/16 39/11 44/7 6/25 7/1 7/8 7/21 7/23 **July 2021 [1]** 10/8 139/1 42/24 43/2 43/14 50/24 57/18 58/9 8/2 8/6 8/10 13/25 July 5 [1] 66/4

L litigation... [31] 33/8 35/3 35/12 35/17 35/22 36/2 37/13 37/16 68/8 80/9 84/18 86/13 96/14 98/3 105/16 105/19 107/22 108/11 108/17 110/2 113/23 113/24 123/19 124/6 125/13 131/4 131/6 137/22 137/23 138/14 138/20 litigious [2] 123/5 137/14 little [9] 5/21 15/8 20/7 63/25 64/24 78/23 107/21 139/1 140/1 live [1] 107/10 lives [5] 96/8 96/9 96/25 104/6 114/8 loans [1] 4/23 locking [1] 134/18 lodge [1] 135/10 lodged [1] 14/4 logical [1] 53/13 London [1] 4/9 long [8] 5/16 12/8 57/25 111/13 116/6 133/9 137/2 137/21 longer [3] 42/10 68/5 68/17 look [11] 25/24 36/16 40/3 70/17 81/23 114/8 114/17 121/15 122/21 122/22 141/2 looked [3] 25/24 118/11 120/3 looking [6] 19/3 34/6 34/18 108/2 112/17 129/2 looks [2] 16/11 120/4 **Lord [11]** 13/16 34/4 82/11 82/24 127/5 127/12 127/24 128/23 129/12 129/17 129/24 Lord Dyson [2] 127/5 129/24 Lord Dyson's [1] 129/12 lose [1] 104/19

loss [90] 4/23 8/9 14/17 15/11 15/14 15/16 16/17 16/22 16/22 16/23 16/23 16/23 17/5 17/21 18/23 18/25 19/1 19/2 19/3 19/4 20/3 20/4 20/4 20/5 20/6 20/11 20/19 20/25 21/13 21/14 21/14 22/2 22/22 23/4 23/15 23/18 23/18 23/22 23/23 29/23 31/8 41/1 41/19 41/22 41/22 41/23 41/24 41/24 42/1 42/2 42/8 42/14 42/19 43/2 45/11 45/16 46/20 49/5 49/8 50/16 50/25 52/11 52/21 53/10 54/3 54/6 55/4 55/14 55/24 56/3 60/17 70/2 73/14 73/19 74/14 77/17 77/19 82/23 83/24 109/24 114/1 115/18 115/19 115/24 121/17 121/18 121/18 121/18 121/19 121/19 losses [51] 6/6 7/20 8/1 16/8 16/13 16/14 16/14 16/15 16/18 17/3 17/12 17/22 18/12 18/20 18/21 18/22 19/25 20/10 21/4 21/10 24/9 27/17 27/19 27/23 27/25 28/9 29/22 31/2 31/4 33/16 33/22 43/8 49/7 50/22 51/2 51/7 51/7 54/20 55/8 69/18 85/9 85/11 111/18 113/20 117/15 120/13 120/17 121/8 122/1 122/11 133/17 lost [2] 36/3 117/3 lot [1] 98/5 lousy [1] 135/20 low [3] 73/10 73/11 74/11 lower [5] 55/1 60/6 74/17 74/20 75/1 **Ltd [5]** 3/1 3/7 3/20

Luncheon [1] 92/22 luxuries [1] 131/9 M machine [1] 92/18 made [147] main [3] 10/21 12/23 127/18 maintain [1] 11/22 major [1] 141/1 majority [3] 17/17 34/21 47/16 make [54] 2/5 3/22 6/20 11/13 12/11 12/25 17/14 29/21 30/15 38/24 39/13 40/2 40/6 40/24 41/8 42/18 43/11 43/19 44/12 48/24 62/9 64/7 65/22 66/7 75/16 76/2 86/17 88/22 90/19 93/5 97/5 97/15 98/7 98/15 99/6 99/20 100/2 103/2 110/7 110/8 110/10 112/18 113/17 122/1 122/10 122/22 127/15 130/24 133/8 137/2 138/1 139/24 140/3 140/19 makes [6] 27/8 27/15 28/23 60/17 122/2 125/9 making [32] 5/11 11/12 14/6 22/16 25/6 29/24 30/4 37/13 40/3 43/7 44/18 45/23 49/19 52/10 53/21 54/11 54/17 62/4 71/9 77/13 99/11 99/15 101/4 107/23 112/17 120/14 122/19 125/11 131/1 132/17 133/23 140/9 malicious [5] 7/12 81/17 83/17 138/15 138/21 manage [1] 114/8 management [1] 4/23 manager [2] 53/5 96/6 managers [2] 4/4

6/2 11/22

52/24 managing [1] 6/12 manifest [1] 106/13 manner [2] 76/20 137/7 many [22] 1/19 4/24 27/23 53/14 73/2 94/3 101/23 102/21 103/8 104/17 106/8 107/18 111/17 112/11 114/3 114/3 114/11 116/5 117/22 121/3 133/14 141/2 March [12] 4/8 4/10 4/11 11/24 12/4 69/20 90/22 98/10 98/15 108/15 137/19 138/16 March 2022 [1] 11/24 Marian [1] 105/1 Marion [1] 106/15 marked [1] 52/16 market [1] 107/7 Marshall [4] 83/19 85/2 85/5 86/16 match [1] 2/7 material [10] 14/4 14/10 15/2 19/8 28/1 28/1 28/22 31/19 31/21 63/22 maters [1] 62/1 mathematics [1] 126/18 matter [18] 33/16 34/1 46/17 47/22 47/24 48/1 48/7 48/14 53/12 54/6 56/4 60/24 82/6 84/18 89/21 96/15 111/14 117/15 matters [29] 12/3 21/24 22/23 23/6 39/15 52/13 54/3 67/15 67/19 67/24 68/2 68/5 68/6 68/7 68/10 72/7 90/2 90/10 98/19 112/2 116/8 116/21 117/14 121/17 123/9 124/10 130/10 131/22 139/18 may [120] 2/8 4/11 4/12 5/9 5/19 12/17 14/25 17/7 18/1 19/7 19/8 20/9 21/18 22/16

23/5 24/10 25/2 25/12 26/16 27/1 27/14 27/21 28/2 28/5 28/7 28/10 29/12 30/3 30/24 32/21 34/18 35/13 37/6 38/6 38/9 39/14 39/17 39/19 40/10 41/17 43/1 43/20 44/18 45/1 45/3 46/8 47/18 50/6 52/19 53/9 56/13 57/12 57/13 59/16 60/12 60/14 60/19 61/16 61/18 64/6 64/6 65/4 65/16 66/18 67/20 68/14 68/17 69/6 70/10 70/15 70/21 71/14 72/18 72/19 73/8 73/21 79/12 81/18 81/23 83/3 86/25 88/2 90/17 93/1 95/11 95/14 99/20 104/20 106/8 108/9 108/12 108/14 108/22 109/18 110/5 110/7 110/10 111/11 112/6 113/7 113/10 114/5 115/9 117/2 117/11 117/19 120/7 127/12 127/23 129/13 129/23 129/24 129/25 130/1 132/16 134/7 134/9 135/24 138/11 140/15 me [36] 1/5 34/11 39/2 47/22 54/14 57/24 61/23 64/15 64/21 64/22 64/22 65/25 66/6 66/11 69/6 74/24 77/15 78/24 83/4 87/11 92/2 92/2 92/2 92/18 95/18 99/3 106/4 106/14 107/16 128/6 129/3 135/10 135/18 135/19 135/20 140/24 mean [12] 16/13 18/5 19/1 47/5 73/1 88/15 96/12 111/9 112/18 115/11 129/2 129/5 meaning [2] 17/23 51/6 means [9] 4/4 9/9

M means... [7] 21/13 29/1 96/13 111/10 111/11 112/18 124/14 meant [1] 34/9 meantime [1] 68/21 measure [1] 137/15 mechanism [10] 20/20 32/6 33/4 33/10 57/14 80/14 89/20 89/24 89/25 109/3 mechanisms [5] 37/8 85/14 87/8 109/3 126/6 Media [1] 110/23 mediation [10] 3/7 3/10 3/15 3/22 28/16 83/9 86/13 91/16 114/21 114/23 medical [4] 27/16 44/17 72/15 121/12 meet [2] 42/3 110/6 meeting [9] 28/16 62/20 63/23 123/7 123/11 123/14 123/15 123/18 124/23 meetings [3] 67/6 67/7 67/9 member [2] 98/16 126/3 member's [1] 49/12 members [11] 4/13 12/9 13/1 13/9 43/13 49/9 49/17 98/14 116/3 116/4 137/22 men [1] 32/22 mental [4] 44/9 45/4 104/7 121/12 mention [1] 123/5 mentioned [4] 31/10 32/16 79/17 135/23 mentioning [2] 20/10 20/11 merits [2] 33/15 33/17 Mertens [6] 3/2 92/9 92/24 92/25 95/14 142/4 methodology [1] 13/7 microphone [1] 75/3 mid [1] 5/17

mid-2022 [1] 5/17 midday [1] 120/12 midnight [3] 65/17 66/3 74/5 might [24] 44/7 54/13 55/9 58/6 64/16 64/18 70/17 78/2 79/3 79/10 80/2 80/5 80/17 87/11 102/19 121/14 127/22 128/3 129/14 129/17 133/20 137/10 139/6 140/10 mildly [2] 37/17 38/8 million [12] 6/22 6/22 6/25 7/18 7/18 13/3 35/8 99/15 110/17 111/20 117/3 126/15 mind [4] 37/19 38/5 65/9 140/14 Minister [13] 11/3 11/10 12/4 12/20 13/13 34/3 35/6 35/18 91/7 98/10 137/19 137/23 138/8 Minister's [4] 108/15 118/19 138/16 138/22 Ministerial [1] 119/18 Ministers [2] 111/19 126/15 minutes [3] 38/19 79/3 92/11 miscarriage [1] 105/21 misleading [3] 51/11 51/14 83/22 misled [1] 84/22 misreporting [1] 1/10 move [10] 41/18 49/5 missed [3] 17/22 18/4 48/19 misunderstand [1] 48/25 misunderstanding [1] moving [6] 58/25 37/19 misunderstood [1] 63/22 mitigation [2] 24/2 28/5 Moderately [1] 9/1 moment [6] 8/21 17/15 22/9 38/17 114/18 121/15 money [21] 4/24

15/21 15/23 17/24 29/16 32/17 36/11 96/20 98/5 106/21 112/16 132/3 132/7 134/14 134/17 134/19 134/20 135/1 135/6 136/4 136/21 moneyboxes [1] 134/25 monies [1] 97/25 monitored [1] 100/16 monitors [1] 103/5 month [1] 82/14 months [4] 26/1 26/14 27/2 108/13 more [30] 2/11 12/3 16/16 16/20 17/9 31/25 50/18 57/16 59/8 64/16 64/18 70/11 73/5 74/19 79/10 79/11 82/9 87/14 90/6 91/15 92/14 95/20 106/18 110/13 113/15 133/25 Mr Stein [5] 92/12 134/14 140/2 140/2 140/5 Moreover [2] 52/7 59/20 morning [8] 1/3 38/16 41/17 101/2 102/16 120/4 130/11 130/13 mortality [1] 117/17 mortgages [1] 4/24 most [5] 7/24 46/2 58/4 94/10 114/11 mother [1] 106/20 56/8 59/3 65/2 70/21 75/14 78/20 111/5 113/10 moved [2] 12/3 67/22 85/14 102/12 124/9 125/2 128/18 **MP [2]** 11/3 12/5 Mr [69] 2/3 2/17 2/18 2/23 3/2 3/3 6/1 8/23 12/21 26/17 34/3 34/7 37/18 41/17 41/20 41/25 42/6 51/1 52/2 56/10 61/3 65/25 66/11 67/23 68/2 68/5

72/10 75/22 80/19 81/19 84/2 85/2 85/5 86/16 87/10 88/1 92/9 92/12 92/12 92/24 92/25 95/14 96/1 96/2 96/4 99/3 100/17 103/9 103/16 105/12 105/13 116/15 116/19 119/5 120/10 120/18 123/8 123/13 124/22 128/2 128/2 140/8 142/2 142/4 142/5 Mr Alan [1] 6/1 Mr Beer [1] 72/10 Mr Jacobs [1] 96/4 Mr Justice [1] 103/9 Mr Mertens [2] 3/2 92/9 Mr Racaldin [1] 68/2 Mr Read [1] 67/23 Mr Recaldin [1] 68/5 Mr Sethi [1] 69/4 96/1 99/3 100/17 140/8 Mr Stein QC [1] 3/3 Ms [29] 3/1 38/15 38/24 39/9 39/10 47/3 57/10 64/20 79/2 87/10 92/7 112/22 114/19 117/2 117/9 117/24 119/5 120/11 121/22 122/21 123/6 123/7 123/15 126/11 126/11 128/6 133/22 136/13 142/3 Ms Elliott [2] 123/7 136/13 Ms Gallafent [8] 3/1 57/10 79/2 119/5 121/22 122/21 128/6 133/22 much [16] 1/6 2/19 9/4 15/20 16/1 38/14 42/8 73/5 95/25 97/25 116/22 122/1 134/17 134/19 135/6 140/23 mummy [1] 135/3 must [6] 8/12 28/9 42/4 55/7 81/14 125/12

68/25 69/1 69/4 69/20 my [32] 11/20 37/19 38/5 48/8 49/2 50/4 57/23 58/24 62/22 65/23 75/2 79/1 102/15 106/16 106/16 106/17 111/3 111/24 112/3 112/7 121/3 129/18 133/4 134/24 134/24 134/25 135/9 135/17 136/14 139/21 140/14 140/24 myself [1] 87/13

nail [1] 103/15 name [2] 15/17 105/4 named [1] 91/21 namely [1] 18/21 National [1] 67/12 naturally [3] 37/1 46/18 128/9 nature [4] 20/3 27/22 129/5 130/3 nearly [1] 108/13 necessarily [5] 46/7 47/19 63/20 116/24 124/20 necessary [12] 24/8 28/11 30/15 54/12 59/13 62/20 68/11 70/19 76/1 86/20 112/5 119/22 need [33] 21/23 42/23 61/23 64/15 66/13 71/13 76/12 79/13 87/18 92/13 95/7 107/10 108/1 110/1 110/9 110/10 112/2 113/9 113/9 113/14 116/12 125/10 127/19 127/19 127/19 131/7 131/14 131/20 133/6 136/1 139/17 139/17 139/23 needed [4] 1/21 5/8 54/2 132/3 needs [7] 68/12 100/9 113/8 128/21 128/21 133/25 134/2 negligence [1] 103/23 negotiated [2] 83/13 84/24

(54) means... - negotiated

113/3 113/3 113/3 87/19 92/3 105/10 obliged [2] 70/6 80/10 117/1 117/4 Ν 115/4 115/5 115/24 111/23 124/12 offers [31] 22/8 26/2 negotiating [1] 89/3 122/2 122/6 125/4 notice [1] 140/11 obscure [1] 26/15 26/9 27/11 30/21 negotiations [8] 125/18 129/19 130/14 **notified** [1] 113/3 observation [1] 58/25 45/23 46/10 46/23 11/16 36/8 80/24 133/12 136/8 140/5 noting [1] 42/4 obtain [14] 4/5 27/6 59/10 60/6 65/21 66/8 81/21 82/20 87/2 non [22] 2/21 9/9 32/8 42/16 44/8 44/22 73/3 74/1 74/6 74/8 **novel [1]** 30/1 89/10 131/19 12/10 12/13 13/15 November [8] 8/19 44/23 62/24 63/14 74/12 74/16 74/20 neither [5] 91/7 91/7 9/11 25/3 25/20 56/12 72/3 77/23 80/9 86/24 16/14 19/1 33/21 74/22 76/25 77/11 91/9 105/15 116/13 33/25 34/1 41/24 42/2 56/20 104/15 105/23 109/6 77/13 80/5 86/19 neural [1] 87/6 67/14 81/20 82/4 83/2 November 2020 [3] obtained [5] 27/17 117/7 117/12 117/18 neutral [6] 13/16 93/21 97/8 98/14 8/19 9/11 25/3 43/21 44/1 59/23 117/18 117/23 117/25 33/24 82/5 82/18 115/19 137/23 138/3 now [59] 2/13 7/16 61/19 office [219] 82/24 86/13 non-binding [2] 33/25 26/15 37/18 39/6 obtaining [1] 45/3 Office's [11] 43/21 never [8] 18/5 98/6 41/12 44/20 45/17 obvious [3] 84/14 45/17 59/23 76/10 34/1 104/3 105/22 132/24 non-eligible [1] 9/9 51/17 53/11 56/25 89/8 132/23 76/19 100/11 116/2 135/11 136/5 136/18 non-executive [1] 64/3 65/15 66/3 67/5 obviously [9] 19/2 121/24 132/22 136/23 nevertheless [10] 93/21 73/4 78/20 78/25 88/8 54/15 66/11 70/23 139/16 44/18 44/23 45/5 92/17 93/12 94/4 72/24 86/10 98/10 officer [2] 67/23 non-exhaustive [2] 49/16 56/23 95/6 42/2 115/19 94/12 95/11 97/22 107/18 140/6 105/3 101/5 101/25 103/13 non-financial [3] 99/5 102/8 108/5 occasion [8] 39/5 offices [3] 102/4 125/10 16/14 19/1 41/24 110/7 111/7 111/9 64/25 110/5 110/12 103/21 104/1 new [3] 35/9 110/17 non-GLO [5] 12/10 111/12 112/15 113/5 112/5 128/18 139/24 official [4] 68/20 126/4 12/13 98/14 137/23 113/8 113/9 114/14 140/10 93/19 114/22 136/11 news [3] 111/19 occasional [1] 8/23 115/23 119/12 120/7 often [2] 10/22 17/23 138/3 111/22 119/13 non-payment [1] 2/21 123/4 123/10 124/2 occasions [1] 77/16 Okay [1] 100/25 next [26] 1/11 1/25 124/6 124/22 125/6 non-pecuniary [5] occur [1] 4/8 old [7] 30/19 31/1 4/8 5/5 9/21 12/4 19/7 127/17 128/17 130/9 13/15 33/21 81/20 occurred [2] 10/17 39/3 76/5 106/20 38/15 39/25 64/25 82/4 83/2 130/14 130/18 130/20 116/21 107/4 107/11 84/19 90/3 90/5 90/9 non-renewal [1] 131/16 132/3 134/6 occurs [2] 140/17 once [5] 38/11 61/15 92/9 94/13 106/8 67/14 136/1 136/6 140/1 140/18 78/16 97/4 112/19 110/5 110/12 111/22 non-statutory [1] 140/15 October [1] 51/17 one [37] 1/4 2/4 9/9 112/5 127/17 128/18 97/8 number [30] 4/12 off [6] 59/3 112/15 16/11 16/19 16/21 139/24 140/10 141/3 none [2] 7/4 8/5 8/11 13/14 20/23 24/6 134/10 134/21 136/17 18/9 23/1 36/9 39/5 night [14] 26/6 28/24 25/22 26/9 33/20 37/4 nonetheless [2] 138/9 42/13 43/14 43/14 34/4 34/8 34/10 34/14 21/18 115/9 38/25 46/10 49/15 offence [1] 136/2 43/15 57/15 57/23 64/21 65/15 66/1 nor [7] 23/15 91/8 53/8 54/16 56/24 62/2 offences [2] 4/19 9/18 58/5 58/12 69/7 73/4 66/12 85/24 102/15 105/15 110/23 116/13 65/19 69/8 71/6 71/7 offer [48] 6/16 22/15 85/1 93/16 96/24 98/7 102/18 130/13 116/24 137/18 71/18 74/25 77/15 22/16 30/12 30/16 98/14 98/16 101/19 no [60] 2/4 10/15 19/7 norm [1] 30/2 77/18 80/25 82/2 31/17 44/19 45/6 46/6 102/3 102/10 102/14 23/9 23/10 23/10 not [193] 116/17 117/11 121/2 54/1 54/4 54/6 55/18 103/16 103/18 109/16 27/15 28/13 29/4 33/4 note [24] 42/21 43/23 133/10 56/1 56/4 60/6 61/8 123/1 127/13 130/10 33/13 34/9 34/13 44/7 48/20 49/24 numbers [2] 26/15 62/17 62/19 65/20 130/22 35/10 37/19 41/8 67/1 68/22 70/20 71/1 53/25 65/8 65/15 56/20 ones [3] 17/7 69/8 42/10 42/15 44/1 71/2 72/12 72/14 74/2 65/22 66/7 66/18 69/7 73/10 45/14 59/17 60/4 63/4 75/13 75/20 75/20 71/15 72/10 75/4 ongoing [3] 95/7 67/16 68/4 69/13 71/4 o'clock [1] 2/9 78/22 83/15 84/2 75/23 76/2 76/14 106/13 127/4 73/18 74/14 79/6 obfuscation [4] 98/18 76/17 77/6 77/15 85/25 99/6 110/7 only [18] 16/3 16/4 79/20 79/24 80/8 105/5 130/6 137/1 77/16 77/24 77/24 124/12 130/16 134/8 21/25 27/2 29/16 80/21 83/5 87/18 object [1] 95/15 noted [4] 30/10 32/21 79/18 79/18 80/3 31/14 37/1 38/12 88/23 89/5 91/24 objective [1] 93/23 51/1 56/13 90/11 122/14 123/10 39/19 53/3 55/7 79/14 92/14 108/16 108/19 **obligation [1]** 48/21 notes [2] 70/13 95/4 123/24 136/11 81/4 99/7 122/12 110/8 111/14 111/22 obligations [1] 47/18 nothing [6] 36/8 42/9 offered [5] 5/3 59/17 123/24 133/4 140/5

27/15 28/1 29/9 29/23 0 31/4 36/3 36/10 39/23 onus [2] 101/21 40/9 40/14 42/12 101/22 46/16 49/20 50/15 onwards [1] 134/8 50/18 56/8 59/25 open [19] 2/3 24/18 61/16 61/17 61/18 25/1 43/24 50/9 58/25 61/18 63/9 67/11 70/7 59/22 64/12 82/9 84/4 72/22 73/14 76/18 87/7 105/17 127/19 77/12 78/24 81/1 128/1 129/16 133/23 83/10 87/8 87/9 87/21 133/24 134/3 136/10 87/24 87/24 90/8 opening [4] 40/2 91/16 92/5 95/12 68/25 84/3 88/1 97/17 101/11 107/18 openly [1] 125/7 123/23 124/24 125/4 openness [1] 37/12 129/15 138/9 operate [1] 28/19 others [11] 49/9 operated [4] 10/25 49/17 76/8 93/10 18/2 88/7 103/24 94/17 95/15 112/4 operating [4] 20/19 128/1 133/5 133/15 24/4 29/14 103/11 140/6 operation [9] 4/14 5/1 otherwise [8] 75/9 14/10 14/20 17/9 98/5 102/19 116/7 20/22 23/8 31/8 95/8 121/5 122/7 125/25 opportunity [11] 127/22 16/23 39/12 40/13 ought [5] 5/5 23/23 63/8 93/2 93/4 95/13 29/25 30/25 31/22 110/21 121/19 140/17 ounce [1] 107/13 140/21 our [53] 3/17 12/6 opposed [2] 26/12 39/1 40/5 40/7 40/18 74/3 49/22 50/14 52/19 option [1] 86/10 56/13 57/13 65/7 or [166] 68/14 71/14 72/10 oral [8] 1/14 1/16 2/24 77/8 85/16 85/24 5/12 39/13 39/15 97/5 86/24 87/18 87/22 119/25 92/4 93/16 96/8 96/9 order [10] 25/4 36/23 96/10 96/24 97/10 37/22 43/19 51/6 101/13 105/7 106/4 62/16 78/15 82/1 106/9 106/13 107/9 133/8 139/8 108/7 110/4 111/2 orders [1] 85/10 111/9 113/5 113/18 ordinary [3] 79/25 113/19 115/5 115/14 80/1 81/15 119/8 122/3 126/5 organisation [2] 127/7 127/18 127/21 37/12 104/8 133/1 137/5 137/17 organisations [1] 139/4 40/14 ours [1] 124/7 organizing [1] 28/3 ourselves [3] 40/25 originally [1] 3/12 81/10 122/4 other [61] 3/6 3/14 out [77] 6/7 7/10 6/1 6/7 7/1 7/1 7/23 12/23 13/18 15/8 17/15 18/20 19/20 17/25 18/4 19/15 19/25 26/7 26/24 24/22 25/14 29/2 30/6

31/11 34/24 38/5 39/15 42/9 42/17 48/6 48/9 48/15 51/13 52/19 62/25 65/4 65/18 65/20 68/13 71/14 72/10 73/7 83/25 87/14 88/19 90/16 91/22 94/23 97/18 98/23 99/9 100/14 101/6 101/8 102/24 104/17 106/20 106/23 108/3 108/7 108/22 108/24 110/1 111/23 111/24 113/10 | pace [2] 59/1 124/9 113/18 114/17 118/16 120/1 120/24 121/5 121/14 122/23 127/10 128/4 128/7 130/3 131/22 132/4 133/20 135/6 138/24 138/25 139/7 139/11 140/6 140/20 outcome [16] 14/7 22/6 31/15 34/1 62/7 62/7 62/25 63/1 63/10 70/10 82/6 82/15 83/13 83/14 100/13 118/13 outcomes [1] 55/10 outline [1] 12/2 outset [4] 31/23 39/12 121/15 90/1 132/2 outside [2] 23/17 39/6 outstanding [3] 3/24 24/16 99/13 outweigh [1] 89/11 Oval [1] 2/7 over [16] 1/21 2/2 6/25 31/4 31/7 65/24 74/12 77/1 79/14 86/18 91/13 92/1 97/25 98/6 101/24 117/3 overall [5] 46/6 46/22 56/4 77/15 80/8 overlaps [1] 85/16 overly [2] 53/21 55/10 oversight [4] 11/22 93/17 94/20 128/21 overtaken [1] 35/5 overturned [5] 10/14 11/14 78/6 125/20

126/23 59/14 59/18 59/20 owed [1] 88/12 60/3 60/5 62/9 62/14 owing [2] 15/24 18/20 63/12 72/2 72/5 78/12 own [10] 40/18 54/13 78/15 118/12 59/9 110/24 111/8 Panel's [9] 22/20 23/3 121/11 132/24 134/25 43/22 44/13 46/5 55/6 135/6 135/10 59/24 60/23 118/14 owned [4] 98/21 papers [2] 35/23 103/24 136/14 139/17 101/23 owns [1] 137/19 paperwork [2] 54/20 114/12 paragraph [30] 12/7 **p.m [1]** 106/22 16/11 16/15 16/19 21/2 21/3 24/23 31/8 package [4] 110/18 36/19 42/22 43/21 111/20 112/9 126/16 52/15 59/24 61/13 page [31] 9/6 9/24 61/14 63/7 71/14 91/2 9/24 11/10 14/24 109/12 115/23 117/5 16/10 18/16 19/9 117/16 118/6 120/18 19/11 19/11 21/2 120/19 120/19 120/20 22/13 24/23 25/25 130/17 130/20 131/17 25/25 30/9 31/9 31/10 paragraph 6 [2] 61/14 36/18 43/23 52/15 63/7 61/13 65/24 65/24 paragraphs [5] 11/9 66/18 67/2 120/9 16/20 108/24 109/17 120/19 120/20 121/14 109/17 134/8 **Parliament [5]** 9/19 page **290 [1]** 31/9 12/5 129/9 137/3 page 302 [1] 65/24 137/20 pages [3] 16/21 65/23 part [20] 7/6 8/10 12/6 13/10 21/19 paid [17] 6/25 9/17 36/10 52/8 57/14 10/13 13/22 15/22 58/13 60/25 76/24 27/12 27/14 29/16 87/1 96/14 98/1 99/1 29/17 36/2 36/11 115/10 118/23 119/16 70/15 72/12 97/25 129/13 131/18 98/6 105/20 131/10 participants [24] 2/20 Palmer [1] 126/11 3/3 5/14 11/24 12/16 pandemic [2] 24/20 13/17 14/5 15/7 24/15 25/7 34/20 37/7 42/12 panel [52] 14/14 16/7 50/15 50/18 67/11 16/12 22/13 22/15 81/1 87/22 90/8 94/15 22/18 22/24 23/2 23/5 95/9 96/7 107/17 23/17 23/19 23/24 112/3 128/4 28/21 28/22 41/7 participate [1] 93/9 41/21 43/14 43/18 participating [1] 44/1 44/7 44/18 44/19 119/16 44/24 45/5 46/3 46/22 participation [1] 48/10 49/10 49/16 13/11 49/24 52/8 52/9 52/13 particular [44] 3/18

52/22 54/25 55/16

55/20 59/9 59/13

(56) onus - particular

22/19 22/25 23/2 23/7

23/10 24/10 34/19

Р
particular [36] 35/5 38/3 38/8 40/1 40/23 41/5 41/18 41/20 45/23 47/23 48/1 48/13 50/19 52/14 53/15 54/25 55/4 61/12 67/10 70/18 72/8 80/3 81/24 86/9 87/5 107/3 110/25 113/2 113/10 113/14 118/22 121/10 122/11 127/6 127/16 128/5 particularly [10] 21/23 33/22 45/3 60/11 69/8 69/18 81/21 89/11 108/9 110/24
parties [6] 61/17 63/8 82/16 83/1 83/8 128/22
partner [2] 105/12 123/8
partners [1] 96/25 parts [1] 11/9 party [6] 8/6 36/7 49/7 61/15 61/18 64/7 passed [3] 28/20 57/2
102/16 passing [1] 101/2 past [8] 5/2 5/6 37/11 37/21 38/1 44/8 101/15 134/5
patience [1] 65/1 patients [1] 125/15 Paul [3] 11/3 12/4 83/19
pay [12] 27/11 70/12 71/2 86/18 96/20 106/18 124/15 129/24 132/16 133/8 136/6 137/4
payable [1] 91/12 paying [2] 72/11 132/25
payment [41] 2/21 2/21 5/18 7/3 7/19 7/22 10/9 10/20 10/22 11/4 13/24 15/19 16/1 16/8 20/16 27/9 28/13 29/25 30/7 31/2 32/16

35/9 35/11 76/9 76/13 76/15 78/2 78/11 80/22 85/22 86/25 87/5 91/5 91/13 99/16 99/24 118/18 124/16 130/24 131/7 132/6 payments [65] 6/21 9/16 10/6 10/10 11/13 12/25 26/4 26/10 26/11 27/3 28/12 29/3 percentage [2] 66/8 29/6 29/19 29/22 30/4 30/6 30/11 30/16 30/20 30/22 30/25 32/5 32/6 32/11 32/15 32/19 32/23 32/24 33/1 35/6 35/7 35/16 36/12 66/12 75/15 75/16 75/18 75/20 75/20 75/22 76/2 76/18 76/25 78/5 78/18 79/9 79/12 81/8 84/8 85/15 86/3 99/12 99/19 109/2 109/4 109/10 109/21 112/19 112/23 122/17 125/16 125/19 130/15 132/2 pecuniary [7] 13/15 33/21 70/2 81/20 82/4 82/23 83/2 peers [4] 12/10 12/14 137/23 138/3 penalties [2] 16/24 121/20 pending [1] 29/19 pennies [1] 135/21 pension [1] 106/17 pensioner [1] 107/15 penury [1] 4/21 people [28] 1/4 10/6 28/6 39/1 39/2 48/24 64/20 97/12 102/21 103/24 104/19 107/19 111/15 112/13 112/15 114/3 114/3 114/7 117/12 122/10 122/19 127/12 131/8 133/12 133/14 133/20 139/6 140/16 people's [2] 121/10 132/3 per [26] 9/16 10/9

21/9 26/4 26/5 26/8

26/8 26/10 26/11 26/13 27/2 30/22 54/21 55/8 55/8 65/21 66/9 66/20 66/22 66/25 67/4 77/2 77/6 117/7 120/1 120/5 perceive [1] 48/17 perceived [2] 53/21 89/11 73/23 percentages [1] 73/25 perform [1] 123/1 performance [1] 103/6 **performed [1]** 105/19 perhaps [9] 16/16 26/15 42/9 48/18 64/24 73/21 75/10 87/14 123/23 period [4] 25/20 56/18 67/16 68/4 permission [1] 5/21 permit [1] 16/8 permutations [1] 55/12 perpetrators [1] 115/15 person [5] 9/17 10/9 20/7 28/2 118/22 personal [8] 17/1 30/19 44/15 50/1 50/2 53/17 72/16 76/4 personally [1] 47/6 persons [8] 40/15 51/4 51/16 78/7 80/23 90/20 90/25 120/14 persuading [1] 47/5 pertaining [1] 56/22 **Peter [2]** 105/2 106/19 **phase [7]** 3/13 3/19 4/7 39/24 40/4 72/17 95/19 phase 2 [1] 40/4 **phase 5 [5]** 3/13 3/19 4/7 39/24 95/19 phases [1] 114/20 **phoned** [1] 135/5 phrase [1] 18/5 pick [4] 59/3 59/4

90/9 103/20 piecemeal [1] 76/24 pieces [1] 62/11 place [13] 22/10 36/9 37/8 39/25 67/6 89/10 93/18 98/9 104/12 114/14 132/13 134/9 139/22 placed [3] 30/5 60/20 101/25 places [2] 20/24 23/1 **plan [1]** 77/3 planned [2] 3/12 116/7 plans [1] 4/23 play [2] 81/12 118/23 | played [3] 97/23 111/21 116/4 pleading [1] 55/17 please [13] 14/22 16/9 19/14 20/2 20/24 25/23 39/7 61/23 61/25 99/1 120/9 120/22 124/12 pleased [4] 11/11 12/10 127/10 137/25 pm [3] 92/21 92/23 141/4 point [45] 5/17 5/23 18/9 28/17 31/11 40/2 42/18 43/11 44/12 48/8 50/4 51/18 51/23 54/8 60/13 61/1 61/1 61/7 62/1 62/2 63/5 63/7 63/10 75/13 84/5 84/16 88/1 88/2 99/14 99/22 100/2 100/7 100/14 100/18 100/18 100/20 101/21 101/22 107/23 112/6 113/19 127/2 127/16 129/3 135/4 points [24] 34/18 38/12 39/20 40/6 42/11 42/18 50/14 50/15 56/8 59/4 67/10 70/16 78/24 87/19 90/7 90/18 98/7 98/25 99/10 110/9 110/22 113/11 113/17 141/1 POL [10] 47/5 52/4 58/1 70/10 91/15

93/18 94/16 114/15 119/18 122/15 **POL's [1]** 46/16 police [1] 105/3 polite [1] 34/23 pondered [1] 38/6 pondering [1] 57/9 posed [2] 65/3 68/19 position [36] 17/11 40/7 43/5 46/13 49/23 57/18 57/19 59/19 65/6 67/18 74/5 76/17 77/8 78/3 79/21 79/21 86/4 87/18 87/22 87/24 88/21 90/20 97/16 102/23 111/13 122/4 125/23 126/5 126/10 126/24 128/11 130/10 130/19 131/21 132/13 133/21 positions [1] 113/11 positive [3] 14/6 65/13 66/24 possesses [3] 31/14 31/20 31/21 possibility [3] 30/7 79/11 127/10 possible [16] 11/17 17/11 47/24 77/21 77/23 79/4 83/14 89/19 90/12 91/17 93/25 101/5 108/19 109/21 111/6 117/21 possibly [1] 134/20 post [236] Post Office [71] 99/23 101/14 101/16 101/23 102/7 103/3 103/6 103/10 103/14 103/21 104/3 104/8 104/10 104/25 105/9 106/1 106/12 106/21 107/15 108/8 109/11 109/14 111/6 112/7 112/10 114/4 114/11 114/14 114/16 114/22 115/21 115/23 116/10 116/23 117/6 117/16 118/3 118/10 118/13 119/7 120/24 120/25 121/4 121/5 121/9 122/16 122/25 123/4

Р	126/16 129/3 129/22	71/20 73/17 77/19	probably [3] 123/21	66/19 66/20 76/6
Post Office [23]	practically [1] 49/21	79/24	128/2 129/5	82/19 82/22 97/8
124/2 125/14 130/16	practice [4] 10/19	presumptions [2]	probe [1] 87/11	113/7 125/9 129/7
130/23 131/12 131/17	20/20 23/9 24/4	77/18 77/20	problem [6] 47/9	130/15
131/19 131/22 132/5	pre [2] 33/6 75/20	pretty [2] 42/8 59/1	47/12 102/2 102/22	progresses [1]
132/23 133/7 133/16	pre-action [1] 33/6	prevent [1] 10/6	130/7 131/13	103/25
134/1 134/15 136/11	precarious [2] 4/22	previous [7] 26/12	problematic [1]	promise [2] 140/3
136/17 136/20 137/18	133/11	30/10 48/20 67/14	115/20	140/19
137/19 138/19 139/9	precedence [1] 137/9	67/19 71/21 119/1	problems [4] 104/1	prompted [1] 53/5
139/14 139/16	precedential [1]	previously [4] 15/4	116/14 132/4 133/12	promptly [5] 10/22
Post Office's [6]	86/15	15/8 59/16 116/22	procedural [4] 61/5	32/20 89/3 93/24
100/11 116/2 121/24	precedents [2]	price [1] 105/21	61/9 69/9 119/10	137/4
132/22 136/23 139/16	100/10 127/11	prices [1] 106/23	procedure [4] 28/14	pronounce [1] 129/17
1	precisely [1] 64/15	prima [1] 83/20	60/3 109/8 119/20	proof [7] 21/4 21/6
post offices [2] 102/4	precision [1] 74/13	primarily [2] 40/8	procedures [5] 8/15	21/17 101/21 101/22
	precluded [1] 50/8	48/21	29/19 32/10 87/3	101/25 115/8
posting [1] 52/1	predate [1] 52/3	primary [1] 127/7	109/8	proper [1] 100/5
postmaster [13]	predating [1] 90/22	principal [1] 94/13	proceed [3] 34/2 97/6	
10/10 21/6 21/25	predicated [1] 81/2	principle [22] 15/19	126/25	20/21 28/10 125/12
22/16 22/22 31/18	predicted [1] 92/13	15/25 16/18 17/3 17/7	proceeded [1] 6/3	132/11 136/25
43/3 44/19 45/21	prefer [2] 66/4 78/24	17/24 20/23 22/11	proceeding [1] 35/1	property [2] 16/23
52/12 77/23 85/22	preferable [1] 79/3	23/13 41/4 41/11	proceedings [9] 2/3	121/18
115/7	preferably [1] 114/1	46/14 47/22 47/23	4/16 5/20 6/10 43/5	proportion [2] 7/21
postmaster's [2]	prejudice [7] 63/18	47/25 48/2 48/7 58/11	50/10 84/23 91/18	29/3
21/24 87/1	80/24 82/9 82/19	58/14 77/23 80/3 80/6	103/14	proportionate [1]
postmasters [31]	88/21 123/16 123/17	principles [40] 8/12	process [35] 11/23	61/20
11/13 11/19 12/2	preliminary [2] 12/18	14/17 16/17 18/23	13/15 31/23 33/24	proportionately [1]
18/18 22/1 22/6 56/18	40/6	19/5 20/11 20/25 21/3	43/17 48/15 52/24	74/21
56/24 58/14 60/12	premature [1] 89/22	24/1 31/9 32/3 36/13	54/4 60/25 65/5 67/4	proposal [2] 10/11
62/2 71/16 78/5 78/21	premise [1] 79/18	42/1 47/10 47/13	69/19 77/4 78/14 82/8	76/9
79/23 80/14 80/18	preparation [1] 2/8	47/13 58/12 72/9 78/1	82/10 82/12 82/24	proposals [2] 110/5
81/9 81/24 82/2 84/9	prepare [2] 28/19	80/1 80/2 80/11 81/7	83/10 87/6 88/7	139/2
88/24 91/6 111/21	130/2	81/11 81/15 81/20	110/24 111/25 113/4	propose [1] 14/1
119/15 119/19 131/3	prepared [4] 59/11	84/6 84/8 85/17 99/17	114/10 117/11 119/13	proposed [1] 100/9
132/1 132/13 138/6 138/10	99/2 130/2 133/14	100/7 107/25 108/2	123/5 124/15 124/21	proposing [1] 10/3
	preparing [1] 71/17	109/1 115/12 127/8	125/5 126/9 128/20	prosecuted [4] 39/17
postmasters' [1] 131/19	present [8] 1/23 5/2	127/19 127/25 128/12	133/3 140/22	90/15 125/20 125/25
potential [11] 38/10	5/6 5/24 38/1 95/18	128/23	processes [1] 87/8	prosecution [6] 7/12
45/2 48/17 50/9 52/6	123/14 133/25	prior [7] 30/11 62/3	processing [2] 25/19	81/17 83/18 136/22
53/6 53/23 55/11	presented [2] 19/12	63/3 67/20 72/13	69/5	138/15 138/22
76/18 91/21 133/22	23/21	75/23 84/16	produce [7] 22/18	prosecutions [3]
potentially [8] 44/22	presenting [1] 28/3	prioritising [1] 106/6	22/24 23/6 52/13 72/7	125/17 125/21 132/23
45/12 46/13 51/11	presently [1] 4/7	priority [1] 76/19	114/15 140/12	protection [1] 86/20
56/17 74/14 78/1	preserve [1] 104/4	privatised [1] 98/21	producing [1] 115/2	proud [1] 105/2
86/14	press [8] 9/20 9/23	proactive [4] 52/20	product [1] 103/23	prove [5] 24/8 27/18
Pound [1] 107/8	51/21 58/4 78/22	52/22 52/23 69/16	production [1] 105/24	31/18 44/22 114/1
pounds [1] 136/4	99/14 110/15 137/3	proactively [2] 72/3	professional [6]	proved [1] 81/21
power [1] 45/5	pressure [1] 30/5	86/19	16/25 29/9 36/4 42/25	provide [32] 20/2
powers [2] 101/3	presumably [2]	probabilities [4]	43/3 72/22	21/7 21/23 22/1 44/13
105/24	114/25 126/2	20/18 21/8 23/15	profit [1] 16/23	47/14 52/9 54/2 61/23
practical [4] 17/9	presumed [1] 37/14	27/19	profits [1] 121/18	61/25 64/17 66/25
practical [4] 11/3	presumption [4]	probability [1] 129/15	progress [11] 65/12	69/4 73/23 77/5 82/25
				9) Post Office provide

P pursue [2] 17/14 question 1 [2] 59/4 reach [4] 48/10 66/21 69/11 71/7 81/4 85/6 18/11 60/8 77/14 85/1 85/10 85/25 94/5 provide... [16] 93/2 pursued [1] 33/6 reached [8] 65/6 95/10 98/16 102/16 questioned [1] 118/4 97/7 98/23 99/8 put [30] 5/7 17/11 questions [30] 14/19 66/22 67/5 69/15 107/21 116/16 117/1 104/13 107/19 109/22 117/23 117/24 130/12 37/8 37/15 47/3 51/11 26/17 32/25 33/1 33/3 72/25 97/16 105/8 111/20 120/22 124/6 52/19 57/12 57/18 40/9 40/20 40/24 111/13 137/22 126/15 129/4 129/7 58/9 60/9 74/9 87/13 42/10 53/3 53/7 53/7 reaching [3] 76/22 Receiver [1] 68/20 129/18 137/12 137/15 93/18 102/9 104/17 53/11 57/17 65/2 83/1 115/14 receiving [3] 61/8 provided [17] 4/3 7/4 106/23 107/6 112/11 80/12 87/17 88/19 reaction [1] 1/3 72/14 111/11 7/9 31/12 44/16 50/25 114/6 117/13 122/3 107/3 108/8 108/12 read [6] 12/22 31/11 recent [2] 99/14 53/4 58/10 61/19 62/5 122/23 125/1 125/12 108/23 109/25 110/1 41/2 41/17 67/23 103/3 62/16 65/15 89/1 128/16 128/23 130/4 111/1 116/17 116/18 113/12 recently [1] 124/22 99/16 100/5 101/20 132/6 134/20 116/20 126/21 139/11 reads [3] 10/1 21/5 recognise [5] 49/1 128/16 putting [5] 37/16 38/8 quickly [1] 82/17 22/14 50/17 68/16 72/18 provides [6] 61/14 101/4 104/11 136/4 ready [3] 64/14 92/5 quite [9] 38/1 57/25 101/1 66/21 70/24 75/8 **puzzle [1]** 38/5 75/9 75/11 117/21 93/13 recognised [1] 5/13 86/19 122/13 120/16 123/4 139/20 real [1] 102/25 recognises [2] 93/11 providing [9] 11/17 95/6 140/14 realise [2] 121/16 17/3 41/13 61/17 QC [5] 2/3 3/1 3/3 quote [1] 120/11 133/17 recommend [7] 22/16 64/22 72/15 93/18 96/2 142/5 reality [3] 47/4 112/9 43/20 44/1 44/18 45/6 102/10 130/22 qualifications [1] 55/18 59/22 113/8 proving [3] 20/18 122/3 **Racaldin** [1] 68/2 really [1] 122/20 recommendation [10] 23/15 113/20 Rainey's [1] 134/6 quantification [1] rearrangement [1] 43/19 44/24 48/11 provision [22] 17/13 10/4 raise [6] 2/14 35/24 52/10 60/5 62/9 62/15 89/8 27/5 27/9 27/15 28/13 quantified [6] 55/25 38/12 43/24 86/9 reason [8] 51/3 56/24 76/10 88/23 118/14 29/18 32/7 42/16 56/3 81/5 82/21 82/22 89/22 60/1 89/5 99/4 101/12 recommendations 44/14 44/20 45/15 raised [25] 20/13 31/7 89/5 130/22 137/17 **[11]** 41/8 49/19 49/25 58/3 58/15 64/13 quantify [1] 42/17 32/25 40/10 42/19 reasonable [11] 6/15 97/19 97/19 98/23 72/19 75/16 78/17 quantum [4] 24/2 50/15 54/8 56/9 59/6 13/10 36/14 52/4 87/1 99/2 99/20 101/4 86/20 86/23 100/2 60/25 63/23 67/11 28/5 81/12 137/13 100/3 101/7 119/15 101/12 107/24 109/5 123/21 quashed [19] 9/18 67/11 68/24 69/8 129/21 131/20 132/16 recommended [2] provisional [7] 39/16 10/18 10/19 11/2 11/6 69/24 76/5 76/7 76/8 reasonably [4] 61/19 22/15 59/18 90/14 90/18 91/3 11/6 13/13 13/23 32/2 85/4 85/6 85/18 87/18 89/3 132/19 139/5 recommending [3] 91/22 118/15 138/18 32/13 32/23 78/21 87/21 94/17 reasons [12] 15/12 45/23 46/6 46/23 provisions [4] 8/14 79/23 80/14 80/19 raises [3] 15/13 35/3 15/14 24/5 24/12 reconsider [1] 131/21 41/6 70/1 86/2 86/22 88/25 91/2 80/11 24/13 40/16 57/6 reconsidered [1] PTSD [1] 114/6 126/22 raising [2] 42/10 54/5 57/15 68/13 73/7 84/3 101/9 public [8] 5/7 91/2 Queen's [2] 59/13 rang [1] 135/8 138/24 record [3] 62/14 98/20 104/8 104/16 119/5 range [4] 17/2 27/25 75/10 112/10 Recaldin [1] 68/5 105/19 110/22 115/14 question [39] 19/17 101/7 115/21 recall [5] 26/16 30/21 recorded [1] 105/4 published [6] 2/25 19/17 19/18 19/20 rapidly [1] 128/18 96/22 107/2 116/15 records [6] 24/7 8/22 14/19 51/21 19/21 19/23 19/24 rate [3] 65/21 66/20 60/13 72/16 114/12 receipt [2] 31/17 51/22 140/11 20/10 24/3 32/14 41/1 70/8 136/18 114/15 114/24 punitive [1] 119/2 41/3 41/18 42/7 43/25 rather [24] 5/8 23/25 receive [10] 22/6 78/7 recourse [1] 33/7 **pure [1]** 123/13 45/13 47/1 47/18 34/6 34/17 39/21 40/9 117/20 126/8 126/19 recover [1] 17/11 **purpose** [5] 35/8 50/16 50/19 50/20 41/3 45/25 50/18 51/5 130/23 132/6 135/12 recoverable [18] 52/20 70/25 89/20 51/11 55/3 56/9 59/4 55/8 59/9 64/3 64/10 137/8 137/11 15/11 15/14 15/16 94/13 60/8 60/8 64/1 69/23 69/14 76/23 77/16 received [31] 7/25 16/19 17/3 28/10 41/2 purposes [4] 5/24 70/4 70/22 74/10 84/8 87/13 114/9 10/24 12/9 12/15 41/2 41/19 42/7 43/1 95/18 103/12 113/15 121/23 128/18 132/7 75/14 85/4 85/16 25/10 26/19 26/21 45/12 48/8 48/12 purse [1] 134/25 86/23 87/3 91/11 140/25 31/15 31/15 32/18 49/14 49/23 50/5 pursuant [2] 8/3 97/6 104/1 ratings [1] 4/23 35/23 41/10 54/1 57/1 50/17

(59) provide... - recoverable

releases [1] 137/3 129/18 129/19 139/3 R reimbursement [1] requires [7] 27/25 44/4 relevant [16] 6/19 repossessed [1] 43/18 113/25 114/25 recovery [1] 81/16 reinstruct [1] 124/13 11/4 11/9 12/6 19/19 107/9 137/9 137/9 137/10 redress [3] 3/14 4/5 reinstructing [1] 22/3 24/8 31/21 43/9 represent [13] 17/17 requiring [1] 54/22 39/23 55/1 59/5 61/16 65/23 68/10 34/20 54/15 96/5 resolution [13] 8/15 reduce [1] 55/7 reject [3] 59/14 60/1 86/14 93/22 105/25 96/11 96/17 102/21 10/3 10/5 10/12 10/17 reduced [2] 106/23 reliable [1] 103/12 62/19 104/7 111/15 113/7 28/14 48/15 67/4 77/4 131/5 114/3 124/14 126/24 83/1 88/4 89/12 91/17 rejected [8] 48/4 48/9 reliance [2] 6/8 reduction [3] 54/19 60/5 74/8 74/16 74/19 138/22 representation [10] resolve [14] 32/10 54/24 55/1 74/24 123/10 relied [2] 22/5 43/10 47/21 69/9 74/7 74/9 68/18 68/18 72/20 refer [8] 13/14 16/3 relate [6] 32/25 33/2 relief [2] 7/2 126/19 89/9 116/12 119/12 72/23 73/4 73/16 16/4 51/1 93/6 96/13 103/3 126/22 139/10 119/21 120/6 125/14 76/19 77/21 83/8 rely [1] 115/6 120/13 138/11 139/10 remain [4] 15/5 57/19 representations [3] 86/12 87/3 87/9 109/9 reference [37] 3/5 3/9 resolved [2] 33/7 related [7] 20/1 50/23 127/21 133/10 97/14 133/15 137/16 3/10 14/1 14/12 14/13 51/8 59/5 60/7 100/18 remaining [1] 107/13 representatives [12] 82/17 15/9 16/2 16/6 16/12 5/13 37/6 58/14 75/9 104/22 resolving [4] 8/15 remains [11] 11/1 18/13 18/22 22/12 65/14 73/6 84/23 relates [3] 19/18 50/9 57/3 57/7 57/18 86/9 87/12 91/20 41/6 41/21 43/22 21/24 116/8 59/18 66/24 83/12 91/21 112/2 124/24 resource [1] 77/9 44/13 45/14 47/14 relating [3] 13/24 87/7 91/15 115/13 127/21 132/25 resources [1] 70/17 49/2 52/8 58/10 59/25 39/16 90/14 remediation [4] 8/4 represented [13] 3/4 respect [18] 3/24 7/7 61/10 63/8 83/25 84/2 10/16 80/21 91/10 12/16 33/20 35/15 19/13 20/1 27/7 27/10 relation [74] 10/18 84/12 84/13 88/20 12/18 12/24 13/8 remedy [1] 120/25 35/21 36/5 37/5 37/10 29/22 41/8 45/10 47/1 98/3 106/1 120/17 73/24 74/4 82/3 89/2 13/12 14/10 17/8 remember [2] 114/10 50/13 50/24 53/24 122/1 122/2 127/4 19/16 21/4 21/17 134/8 120/2 56/7 82/10 95/16 140/9 28/11 32/9 42/13 remiss [1] 140/9 representing [2] 81/9 116/22 132/20 referred [8] 33/23 42/19 42/25 43/12 remoteness [2] 24/2 84/9 respected [1] 33/25 65/16 82/4 86/7 94/11 44/15 56/11 57/16 28/5 reputation [2] 17/1 respectfully [2] 102/14 105/5 121/16 59/7 59/25 61/20 65/3 removal [1] 86/1 104/4 112/24 128/25 reflect [3] 49/8 69/18 69/24 70/3 remove [2] 103/16 reputational [1] respond [2] 11/25 115/20 116/1 70/22 71/25 72/15 126/10 111/18 140/22 reflected [4] 69/14 73/17 73/18 73/25 removed [1] 101/24 request [22] 12/16 responded [3] 69/20 94/4 95/2 126/10 78/5 79/17 80/13 removing [1] 137/14 13/17 33/11 33/13 109/11 109/16 reflecting [1] 46/11 80/14 82/20 84/17 remuneration [1] 53/1 61/16 61/19 62/6 responding [1] 3/15 reflects [5] 43/5 93/3 93/15 97/16 86/21 62/10 62/12 69/10 response [7] 12/15 54/22 54/24 71/6 97/22 98/8 101/18 renewal [1] 67/14 69/13 69/15 69/16 42/18 45/17 85/16 119/18 104/11 107/3 107/23 repaid [1] 18/19 70/3 71/4 71/7 89/20 87/17 94/24 110/11 refused [2] 29/21 97/9 102/8 116/16 108/1 108/3 108/9 repay [3] 76/13 responses [5] 69/21 71/5 109/7 109/15 110/6 106/20 107/11 128/22 94/16 101/7 108/6 refute [1] 84/21 112/23 113/11 113/20 repayment [1] 15/21 requested [3] 11/24 108/7 regard [7] 14/5 19/9 115/8 116/21 117/14 repeat [5] 38/10 63/21 122/18 responsibility [1] 36/16 49/18 86/4 53/22 65/4 68/14 117/21 121/4 122/14 requesting [1] 52/25 70/14 101/6 102/25 122/15 122/24 124/4 74/23 responsible [2] 67/17 requests [4] 62/3 regarded [3] 18/19 124/7 126/25 127/9 repeated [1] 133/4 64/5 78/13 110/14 113/21 41/3 86/14 127/21 128/5 130/15 require [6] 3/5 51/5 repeatedly [1] 136/24 rest [1] 129/9 regarding [2] 121/10 130/17 132/18 139/25 60/10 64/7 65/10 restrictions [1] replicated [1] 123/22 133/22 relations [1] 110/22 replicates [1] 101/14 105/24 117/10 regardless [1] 39/4 required [12] 28/16 result [16] 18/3 19/22 relationships [1] 3/23 reply [1] 26/22 regards [4] 99/14 43/25 56/6 60/18 88/6 report [18] 45/3 62/13 relatively [2] 24/17 20/5 22/19 22/24 23/6 101/19 108/23 130/9 24/19 64/8 94/25 95/11 97/6 99/21 101/13 110/2 52/14 63/19 67/22 region [1] 135/12 release [4] 9/21 9/23 97/10 97/17 97/18 116/6 131/8 139/12 68/10 70/10 72/7 regularly [1] 41/12 51/21 99/14 98/22 102/9 102/24 139/24 83/21 121/6 131/5 rehearse [1] 24/15 103/2 129/4 129/8 released [1] 109/13 requirement [1] 55/18 132/22

(60) recovery - result

R	134/18	53/16 58/16 61/23	78/23 79/24 80/18	September [1] 40/4
resulted [3] 67/15	said [40] 2/19 10/11	99/6 113/16 117/17	97/7	series [2] 19/9 140/4
68/1 91/9	11/10 12/7 12/24 13/4	131/23 136/7	section 5 [1] 42/2	service [1] 105/19
resulting [1] 4/20	18/25 25/19 30/10	says [14] 29/7 54/1	sections [1] 40/19	services [2] 27/18
retail [1] 43/15	33/9 33/22 38/8 45/14	60/22 83/19 90/23	secure [1] 130/25	127/24
retained [3] 24/7	46/16 46/19 46/24	106/15 106/19 107/4	secured [1] 83/21	set [47] 7/10 7/18
88/11 88/14	66/1 92/5 106/15	107/8 111/19 119/14	see [17] 1/5 8/21 9/4	10/8 10/11 13/18
retainer [1] 88/9	109/18 111/17 116/25	120/21 134/1 134/22	9/6 9/22 16/19 19/9	33/14 35/8 39/15
retire [1] 107/6	117/3 117/9 120/4	scan [1] 16/21	20/22 22/10 23/1	42/17 51/13 52/18
retirement [1] 116/7	127/17 133/21 134/2	scandal [18] 3/16	24/23 57/9 67/2	62/25 65/4 67/25
return [1] 110/10	134/11 134/13 134/16	96/9 96/10 96/15	113/16 120/21 127/13	68/13 71/14 72/10
review [2] 3/15 97/20	135/16 136/2 136/3	97/24 104/25 107/20	136/22	73/7 77/9 88/11 88/19
reviewed [1] 118/10	136/6 136/8 136/13	110/19 110/20 111/22	seeing [1] 141/2	89/20 90/16 91/22
reviewers [1] 118/9	136/13 136/16 137/24	112/21 113/22 115/14	seek [12] 8/6 44/4	94/23 97/18 99/9
revised [1] 67/23	same [15] 1/19 1/19	115/16 115/22 118/2	55/17 65/3 70/15	100/14 101/6 104/11
right [18] 18/1 37/15	15/10 29/7 60/1 64/5	118/2 132/14	76/19 83/23 85/21	104/17 108/7 108/22
38/19 39/8 63/15	64/23 66/12 73/25	scenarios [1] 58/4	90/9 90/19 110/22	111/24 113/10 113/18
63/17 66/6 66/10	77/24 78/1 84/3 102/2	scenes [2] 102/20	110/23	118/16 120/24 121/14
66/15 80/16 87/23	125/13 135/8	139/19	seeking [5] 40/15	127/10 130/3 131/22
92/8 92/12 111/5	sands [2] 102/12	schedule [2] 1/22	48/15 48/25 83/13	138/24 138/25 139/11
112/15 114/24 132/3	102/23	7/15	103/15	139/12 140/6
139/19	satisfactorily [1] 35/1		seeks [2] 93/22	Sethi [6] 26/17 69/1
rightly [1] 42/21	satisfactory [1] 29/13		114/14	69/4 69/20 116/15
rigorously [1] 95/7	satisfy [2] 21/17	scheme [143]	seem [3] 128/24	116/19
rise [1] 54/17	115/8	scheme's [1] 25/5	129/22 139/14	setting [11] 19/15
risk [3] 30/19 42/9	save [1] 7/12	schemes [14] 3/16	seemed [1] 123/16	65/5 98/22 101/8
76/4	saw [2] 119/13	5/3 5/7 12/19 32/5	seems [12] 15/3 17/6	102/24 108/3 108/24
risked [1] 107/19	130/13	100/8 100/9 102/1	34/20 35/13 36/8	110/1 111/23 121/5
riven [1] 133/11	say [72] 18/4 18/15	104/12 123/23 137/6	53/12 117/8 120/15	122/23
rocket [1] 39/5	24/25 34/7 35/22	137/11 137/15 139/1	125/2 130/18 131/20	settled [3] 42/8
role [10] 46/5 87/25	36/20 37/18 42/20	school [1] 134/11	133/3	100/10 113/3
88/3 93/15 95/2 95/4	43/4 47/9 47/12 47/13 51/2 51/8 51/25 53/18		seen [13] 15/17 19/2 23/9 29/20 30/1 35/18	settlement [30] 3/7 3/10 3/10 3/22 6/11
95/17 95/22 97/24	54/22 55/5 55/7 55/11		35/24 60/16 71/5	6/17 6/18 6/20 7/3 7/5
111/21	56/5 56/6 59/2 59/5	scores [1] 136/20	71/18 90/23 97/13	7/10 7/11 7/19 7/22
roles [2] 49/9 116/3	61/8 61/24 63/18 64/3		122/12	11/16 13/8 26/2 30/21
room [1] 1/19	65/13 68/13 71/6 73/2		seized [2] 114/11	58/13 74/6 74/8 83/16
rough [1] 92/10	76/22 77/15 78/3	12/21 34/3 105/13	115/3	83/21 84/24 98/1 98/2
roughly [1] 74/21	78/23 79/3 79/15 80/4	second [14] 4/24 9/23		98/6 105/8 105/16
round [2] 45/25 80/5	80/6 80/11 80/20	12/7 19/10 20/15	senior [2] 82/11	138/5
routinely [1] 17/22	80/25 81/25 84/4	22/10 25/24 43/11	114/21	settlements [3] 76/23
ruin [3] 104/18	84/25 88/10 88/13		sense [1] 73/2	89/4 117/13
112/15 112/15	88/25 89/21 90/24	62/2 65/2	sensitive [1] 45/4	seven [4] 12/20 35/6
rule [2] 48/15 140/20	91/24 92/14 95/16	secondly [8] 8/11	sent [3] 65/18 65/20	35/19 67/7
ruled [1] 42/9	98/18 101/12 102/1	13/4 13/12 27/24	102/21	severe [2] 30/18 76/3
rules [2] 55/11 64/5	104/24 108/9 109/12	40/11 71/20 86/6	sentence [2] 37/20	shall [2] 61/17 64/24
run [1] 104/12	116/11 117/18 117/22	90/25	38/7	shared [3] 7/19 22/5
running [1] 118/5	119/10 122/8 126/2	Secretary [3] 9/13	sentient [1] 103/19	125/8
S	128/8 128/20 133/16	11/19 40/21	separate [5] 15/13	shareholder [3] 11/20
sad [1] 104/23	138/9 138/17 140/21	section [11] 40/20	56/3 82/18 122/23	93/20 103/4
sadly [1] 133/3	saying [12] 2/10	40/22 42/2 44/14	132/15	shareholders [1] 50/3
safe [2] 134/18	34/23 48/11 49/1	59/24 70/9 78/20	separately [1] 43/8	sharing [2] 61/2 61/6
0410 [2] 10-7/10			• • • • •	
				(G4) required the site of the
				(61) resulted - sharing

Shazia [1] 107/12 she [21] 107/4 107/4	81/10 82/4 83/18	104/22 105/6	59/15 62/13 88/7	32/5 34/7 62/22 74/23
she [21] 107/4 107/4	00/04/04/0 05/40			
	83/24 84/9 85/19	Sinead [7] 134/6	88/10 88/10 88/13	80/13 85/20 89/17
107/4 107/5 107/6	85/20 86/6 86/17	134/11 134/13 134/17	89/2 118/9 123/12	117/6 120/19
117/3 123/6 123/9	87/13 87/14 88/9	134/22 135/14 135/16	so [158]	sort [1] 49/10
128/6 128/6 134/9	88/11 91/4 91/5 92/19	single [1] 20/9	so I will [1] 8/24	sorts [1] 39/23
134/10 135/3 135/4	98/19 99/23 99/24	sir [93] 2/19 3/5 5/16	so-called [1] 118/11	sought [1] 100/8
135/9 135/10 135/23	100/2 104/3 104/9	8/20 9/5 14/10 25/17	sold [1] 106/16	sound [1] 129/20
136/2 136/3 136/6	110/21 110/23 111/13	26/18 26/25 27/5 27/8	sole [2] 11/20 103/4	source [1] 132/1
136/11	113/2 113/22 115/15	31/5 32/1 35/4 38/8	solely [4] 22/21 23/4	speak [1] 112/22
l l	116/1 118/17 118/19	38/12 38/18 39/11	52/10 100/18	speaking [2] 46/19
shifting [2] 102/23	118/21 120/24 122/18	40/17 41/9 41/25	solicitor [1] 36/18	49/21
140/22	122/21 125/18 126/6	42/21 43/23 44/7	solicitors [20] 3/4	specialist [3] 43/14
shop [3] 135/9 135/18	126/8 126/17 127/8	44/13 49/4 49/5 52/2	6/23 12/17 13/6 17/17	43/15 43/15
136/7	127/25 127/25 128/4	52/15 57/11 57/12	20/13 35/20 36/17	species [1] 29/23
short [13] 1/25 10/22	129/16 131/10 131/25	58/9 58/21 59/2 60/16	37/1 81/14 82/3 96/4	specific [5] 22/21
23/14 24/17 24/19	132/21 137/12 137/12	61/12 63/25 64/11	102/15 105/13 111/4	40/9 52/11 100/23
37/14 38/22 71/16	shouldn't [1] 89/15	64/25 65/3 65/8 67/13	112/3 124/4 124/22	108/11
92/11 106/23 132/21	showed [1] 136/5	69/2 70/22 71/17 72/5	125/4 133/5	specifically [1] 46/7
139/23 140/4	showing [2] 31/1	73/16 73/21 73/23	solution [1] 130/8	specify [1] 19/14
short-dated [1]	136/1	74/11 74/18 78/20	solve [1] 132/3	spectrum [1] 17/2
106/23	shows [1] 26/2	84/4 87/17 88/19	some [55] 1/10 4/19	speed [3] 5/2 76/6
shortfall [47] 3/8 3/25	shut [2] 58/20 129/16	91/24 92/15 96/3 96/3	5/7 5/22 9/10 26/6	89/12
4/2 // 1/ 0/3 13/21	Siddiq [1] 107/12	97/11 99/7 99/16	29/4 30/10 31/2 35/23	speedy [1] 66/16
14/9 14/11 14/14	side [1] 139/7	99/18 100/22 100/24	35/24 41/13 55/10	spend [1] 5/21
14/16 14/18 14/21	sideways [1] 129/16	101/1 102/8 102/24	55/14 60/6 72/18	split [1] 1/18
14/24 16/14 16/15	sign [3] 52/1 118/4	103/2 104/15 105/23	73/12 74/9 75/8 76/7	SPMs [2] 112/20
17/5 18/18 18/20 19/2	118/5	107/25 108/5 108/9	77/9 78/13 80/4 81/9	113/25
19/13 19/16 19/21	signed [1] 138/4	108/11 110/13 112/13	83/10 84/9 84/13	spoke [1] 134/9
19/23 20/6 21/11	significant [7] 4/21	112/25 113/12 113/18	84/15 92/10 94/5 95/9	spring [3] 5/5 39/25
21/15 27/20 40/23	4/24 17/23 43/16	114/22 116/7 118/4	98/4 104/1 104/13	84/19
41/22 41/24 42/5 43/1	67/16 73/6 99/11	120/8 120/10 122/12		staff [1] 111/8
45/9 45/20 54/19 55/8	significantly [4]	124/18 127/7 128/9		stage [14] 31/14
70/5 71/20 73/12	16/16 16/20 78/4	129/22 133/1 139/4	111/12 112/13 113/7	31/14 51/19 64/16
73/17 77/10 77/19	95/21	139/23	113/8 114/5 115/17	69/18 72/12 73/5
79/19 80/4 80/22			116/21 120/5 124/6	76/25 84/25 103/16
135/25 138/7	signpost [1] 51/12	sister [2] 135/9 135/18	127/3 128/21 131/16	113/9 124/14 133/3
shortfall' [1] 18/21	siloing [1] 101/17			
shortfalls [13] 3/25	similar [5] 12/13	sit [2] 26/16 46/18	132/7 140/2 140/9	135/17
15/18 16/3 16/5 18/14	37/17 98/13 117/23	sitting [1] 92/2	somebody [2] 9/2 9/4	stages [4] 63/6 100/3
19/11 19/18 20/1	138/2	situation [5] 56/22	someone [2] 58/6	100/6 119/8
50/23 51/8 55/16	simple [6] 15/20	77/22 120/25 128/19	129/12	stand [4] 34/25 92/5
74/13 106/21	71/12 109/25 110/1	131/3	something [6] 8/25	128/20 135/19
shortly [2] 69/11	116/11 116/13	situations [1] 133/11	37/17 45/21 53/19	standard [2] 24/9
90/13	simpler [1] 73/16	six [7] 6/12 19/14	54/22 104/19	26/19
should [76] 1/17 2/5	simply [13] 37/10	81/4 82/21 99/10	sometimes [1] 53/8	standing [1] 75/2
5/21 8/16 8/18 8/21	43/4 48/16 48/25 51/3	109/11 114/24	somewhat [1] 128/10	starkly [1] 136/24
9/3 9/24 14/5 23/23	54/24 79/1 79/25	size [1] 20/6	somewhere [2] 128/7	start [6] 38/20 40/22
31/3 33/23 39/20	80/12 84/4 85/1	slightly [3] 46/14	135/12	92/18 123/14 139/6
41/14 47/7 48/24 49/2	119/19 137/5	79/21 99/4	soon [4] 11/17 72/24	139/6
49/8 54/10 58/1 58/8	simultaneous [1]	slow [1] 59/1	90/12 109/21	started [2] 104/23
61/20 73/23 75/16	99/5	slower [1] 99/4	sooner [2] 5/8 39/21	137/5
	since [7] 12/3 25/9	small [1] 134/11	sorry [15] 2/14 8/23	starting [3] 2/7 48/8
			ı	

C	109/20	131/18 138/12 139/4	10/10 21/0 21/11 20/1	15/17
S	strongest [1] 129/4	139/25 140/2 140/4	18/18 21/9 21/11 28/4 29/25 31/20 32/19	suits [1] 79/4
starting [1] 62/1	strongly [1] 97/9	140/7 140/20	32/23 33/13 36/11	sum [10] 6/22 7/25
starts [1] 65/23	structure [1] 67/24	submit [1] 89/7	43/20 44/3 44/4 45/6	23/17 29/16 31/3
state [5] 9/13 14/5	structured [2] 36/5	submitted [3] 88/6	46/1 46/7 46/11 46/24	77/24 78/2 80/9 85/9
17/18 39/11 40/21	77/3	119/8 125/17	49/15 50/10 50/25	132/7
State's [1] 11/19	sub [2] 77/10 116/17	subparagraphs [1]	53/11 55/15 57/8	sums [12] 4/24 15/21
stated [6] 28/25 97/4	sub-accounts [1]	19/15	59/23 64/13 68/19	15/23 17/23 32/16
105/13 118/7 125/23	116/17	subpostmaster [9]	71/13 75/18 76/2	36/2 36/10 78/8 79/13
131/2	sub-scheme [1]	20/16 21/16 23/14	76/11 77/19 78/7	85/6 96/20 107/21
statement [12] 9/19	77/10	23/19 23/20 96/5	78/12 78/13 78/15	supermarket [1]
11/4 11/7 12/21 19/12	subcategories [1]	122/5 125/24 126/2	79/24 80/21 80/23	106/22
25/14 40/3 40/12 66/1	12/2	subpostmasters [60]	81/17 84/14 87/7	supplemented [1]
97/3 110/15 119/18	subcommittee [1]	2/22 3/23 4/4 4/13	88/23 89/8 91/10 99/1	54/10
statements [3] 101/4	93/22	5/19 8/8 9/17 11/5	101/10 101/12 105/1	support [9] 21/7
115/6 137/3	subject [11] 7/8 62/3	12/19 13/14 13/23	110/5 115/12 116/8	27/17 42/16 44/23
states [4] 21/22	63/24 85/23 86/20	15/22 15/23 15/25	122/5 122/6 122/19	62/16 72/16 72/20
115/23 122/16 130/21	90/18 90/24 91/23	17/10 17/18 17/20	127/9 127/13 130/1	89/21 139/17
statistics [2] 73/22 74/10	108/19 127/3 128/17	17/24 18/11 20/21	131/7 131/9 137/6	supporting [5] 22/5
status [2] 11/20 86/2	subjects [1] 92/6	24/6 28/17 30/5 31/12	139/12	61/2 61/6 94/19 95/2
statutory [3] 67/22	submission [13] 2/18	32/2 32/12 32/17	suffered [8] 4/6 8/9	supportive [1] 87/7
97/8 104/17	39/10 60/9 92/25 96/2	33/12 33/20 39/17	20/19 21/10 24/9	suppose [1] 6/15
staving [1] 112/15	97/10 101/13 102/14	67/12 90/15 93/10	27/20 50/3 114/4	sure [7] 38/1 112/18
stay [1] 128/10	127/7 142/2 142/3	96/21 99/13 101/17	suffering [3] 49/8	114/3 121/3 122/22
Stein [9] 3/3 92/12	142/4 142/5	102/4 104/18 110/18	114/5 116/3	139/21 140/15
96/1 96/2 99/3 100/17	submissions [98]		suffice [1] 69/6	surprise [1] 58/6
128/2 140/8 142/5	1/15 1/24 2/11 2/20	114/15 116/5 116/5	sufficient [5] 5/24	surprises [1] 57/24
steps [2] 5/16 52/4	2/24 5/12 5/13 11/25	116/25 117/22 118/25	20/20 21/7 22/1 95/18	survive [1] 104/21
stigma [3] 17/1 53/16	12/15 13/18 14/7 15/5	124/1 124/4 124/11	suggest [23] 9/2	Susan [1] 107/2
121/9	15/9 17/19 18/15	124/24 126/5 126/18	29/21 42/23 84/9	suspect [2] 103/25
still [12] 18/20 25/15	24/14 24/24 26/7	126/22 126/23 127/20	101/15 115/5 116/13 116/24 117/15 118/1	114/19
26/13 106/19 107/5	28/24 29/7 30/9 30/10 32/21 33/9 33/12	131/12 131/14 133/10 subpostmasters' [1]	118/15 119/24 121/23	suspending [1] 114/13
111/14 116/23 119/24	33/14 34/4 34/8 34/9	131/24	123/2 126/18 128/3	suspension [1] 60/14
126/19 131/11 133/9	34/13 38/25 39/13	subpostmistresses		suspicion [1] 101/10
133/25	39/15 40/5 40/8 40/14	[1] 96/6	133/13 136/25 138/13	
stop [1] 64/23	40/18 42/12 50/17	subsequent [1] 90/22		98/1
stories [1] 26/16	52/19 56/13 57/13	subsequently [4]	suggested [22] 23/20	
story [5] 39/3 110/17	59/16 65/4 65/6 65/7	6/16 25/3 58/11	29/24 31/20 42/6	sympathetic [1] 57/5
111/19 111/22 119/13	65/12 68/14 68/25	109/17		system [15] 4/15 6/9
straightforwardly [1]	71/14 73/8 79/2 81/1	substantial [3] 7/21	54/16 61/5 67/13	103/8 103/11 103/18
75/11	85/2 86/25 88/5 90/3	61/8 119/9	71/11 73/22 74/1	103/18 103/19 103/20
Strategy [2] 9/14 103/5	90/19 92/4 93/3 93/5	substantially [2] 8/1	75/15 81/10 85/19	103/23 113/3 114/6
	93/7 93/16 94/5 94/11	126/19	86/6 86/16 87/11	114/7 133/25 136/1
stress [4] 45/19 50/2 64/6 104/22	94/15 94/21 95/3 95/5	substantive [2] 26/21	89/14 129/12	136/23
stress-related [1]	95/9 97/5 102/13	33/17	suggesting [1] 64/11	systems [1] 103/12
104/22	108/20 109/12 109/18	substitute [1] 39/22	suggestion [13]	T
strict [1] 55/17	110/11 113/13 113/17	succeed [1] 44/17	51/10 55/13 55/23	
strictly [1] 46/19	115/24 117/5 117/17	succeeding [1]	56/5 60/1 75/19 78/10	tab [32] 8/20 9/21
strike [1] 51/15	118/6 119/9 119/25	101/17	79/10 83/7 83/15	11/7 12/6 12/22 13/18
strong [2] 11/22		such [67] 10/21 16/18		14/11 14/12 14/15
	130/18 130/21 131/17	17/10 17/11 18/3	suggests [2] 10/24	14/16 14/18 14/22
				(63) starting tab

T	tell [3] 39/2 64/15	42/22 43/9 43/21	135/5 135/20 135/21	89/5 90/2 95/6 95/19
	66/6	43/23 45/11 46/21	135/21 139/5	98/18 99/10 100/9
tab [20] 16/2 16/4	telling [1] 47/22	48/8 52/14 54/12 55/2	theme [1] 79/8	101/9 101/19 102/22
16/7 16/9 16/18 18/15	tells [1] 114/21	60/21 60/24 61/8 62/1		103/9 105/10 107/18
19/7 20/24 22/11	tempting [1] 39/2	66/5 70/2 71/10 71/14	33/12 38/10 44/3	111/23 112/11 115/24
24/23 25/23 30/8 31/9	ten [4] 74/16 75/1	75/1 79/4 79/16 80/2	50/16 83/8 125/15	117/11 117/22 118/1
31/10 32/1 36/18	75/3 92/11	80/10 81/5 81/21 83/6	then [66] 10/8 11/6	119/5 119/9 119/14
42/23 52/15 61/11	tense [1] 37/22	84/3 84/18 86/8 87/22	11/6 12/3 13/12 14/22	1
95/1	term [1] 67/18	87/24 124/8 127/2	14/25 15/9 16/16	125/18 127/3 130/6
tab 17 [1] 42/23	terminal [3] 30/18	129/19	19/14 19/17 19/23	130/14 131/10 131/16
tab 2 [1] 13/18	31/1 76/4	their [79] 1/22 1/23	20/7 21/21 24/12 25/8	1
tab 3 [1] 36/18	terminate [1] 88/9	2/22 4/13 12/10 12/13	28/20 35/2 38/19	134/19 134/20 135/19
tab 7 [1] 18/15	terms [48] 2/5 2/8 3/5	13/10 17/18 17/19	38/19 40/22 41/18	136/21 137/1 140/15
tailored [1] 116/1	5/15 6/16 6/18 7/4 7/9	18/15 21/7 21/17	44/1 48/10 48/13	there' [1] 136/16
take [23] 22/23 23/5	8/5 14/12 14/13 16/2	21/18 22/2 22/6 27/7	53/14 59/3 59/21 62/7	there's [6] 1/10 79/24
38/15 39/25 47/4	16/6 16/11 17/8 18/13	29/17 30/15 31/15	63/9 64/13 64/18 65/2	
48/18 49/11 52/12	22/12 23/8 25/22 41/6	32/9 32/12 32/21	65/24 65/25 67/24	136/16
56/20 57/25 58/17	41/21 43/2 43/22	33/15 36/5 44/23 46/9	68/1 73/21 77/11	thereafter [5] 5/11
59/21 65/19 68/17	44/13 47/14 49/2 52/8	60/13 72/20 72/23	78/23 79/7 80/7 80/18	
71/24 72/6 89/10	58/9 59/24 61/10 63/7	73/16 76/1 76/15 78/9	83/10 89/13 90/4	90/12
120/8 120/18 121/15	69/9 81/6 84/12 84/13	85/12 88/5 95/5 95/17	92/19 95/20 97/19	therefore [20] 5/20
122/3 129/20 134/9	84/23 88/20 89/9	95/17 96/24 96/25	98/24 101/8 104/17	7/22 12/10 43/16
taken [26] 15/21	89/11 94/20 98/3	100/12 102/4 104/19	104/20 110/10 113/10	1
19/22 23/11 23/19	105/25 121/17 121/20	105/20 106/5 106/13	114/9 114/24 118/9	78/1 88/2 94/11 98/8
24/21 36/9 44/14	125/2 125/14 126/17	109/7 109/18 111/8	118/10 125/15 129/14	i
45/22 45/24 46/2	129/4	111/17 112/12 112/16	129/19 130/20 136/14	
48/14 49/16 49/21	terrible [1] 110/20	113/17 114/8 114/8	136/21 140/1	124/17 130/8 137/25
52/7 52/21 54/4 55/15	tests [1] 42/4	114/12 115/9 115/9	theory [1] 17/7	these [57] 1/21 5/8
56/2 60/17 61/12 67/6	than [32] 5/9 8/1	117/5 117/21 121/11	there [119] 1/12 2/7	5/10 8/21 17/21 18/11
94/18 98/9 115/25	15/20 21/9 24/1 26/5	121/12 121/12 122/23	3/9 5/19 8/20 9/7 11/1	1
122/14 131/25	34/6 34/17 39/21 40/9	124/18 125/19 125/24	16/21 19/7 19/14	32/14 34/20 35/4
takes [3] 65/20 66/8	45/25 50/19 51/5 55/8	126/24 131/5 131/8	19/19 19/20 20/7 23/9	
111/2	E0/40 E0/49 E4/4	131/12 133/7 135/6	23/16 23/21 23/22	52/20 64/8 70/18
taking [6] 25/13 40/12	64/10 70/11 76/18	136/20 137/23 138/3	25/18 26/24 30/23	77/20 82/16 88/4 92/6
63/6 96/15 133/6	76/24 77/12 77/16	138/12 139/7 140/6	33/4 33/13 33/19	93/5 93/9 93/15 94/6
139/22	78/8 84/8 92/14	them [58] 1/5 1/22	35/10 37/18 38/2	94/9 94/12 94/12 95/3
takings [2] 135/10	126/20 129/7 133/25	4/15 4/17 4/18 4/21	38/25 39/5 39/5 41/23	i
135/10	138/9 140/5 140/25	12/3 15/8 22/7 22/8	42/4 42/15 43/15 45/9	1
talking [1] 129/15	thank [20] 1/6 9/4	24/7 24/16 26/16 27/4	46/25 47/9 50/12 51/1	1
tallying [1] 134/12	38/14 39/11 49/4 49/4	29/16 32/24 34/21	51/25 53/8 53/16	112/1 113/14 119/25
target [2] 66/21 98/23	52/18 63/18 64/25	45/14 45/15 53/8	54/18 54/20 55/2	121/16 121/19 122/24
targeted [3] 110/2	75/7 92/7 92/15 92/20	53/14 65/10 68/14	55/23 55/23 56/3 56/7	123/9 127/1 127/6
137/16 140/4	93/1 95/12 95/14	71/2 71/17 72/14	57/22 58/3 59/13	129/6 133/1 133/6
tax [10] 28/10 69/23	95/24 95/25 140/8	74/13 74/16 75/1	59/16 61/22 62/5	135/21 136/19 137/1
70/1 70/6 70/7 70/9	140/23	77/12 79/13 99/1	63/11 63/18 64/6 67/8	138/24 140/12
70/11 70/14 70/15	Thanks [1] 2/19	100/19 100/19 101/18	67/10 67/15 68/4	they [104] 2/12 4/6
86/2	that [870]	102/6 104/20 105/8	69/23 71/20 72/18	6/21 7/20 8/1 9/3 13/7
team [6] 14/3 14/6	that i can [1] 1/4	106/11 108/24 111/10	73/5 73/18 74/19	13/18 13/20 17/3
67/24 68/6 106/5	that's [46] 1/24 15/2	112/4 112/4 112/11	74/21 75/12 77/3	20/17 20/19 22/6 22/7
118/9	18/4 23/11 24/9 26/10	114/13 114/16 117/13	78/13 80/7 80/13	24/9 31/14 31/15
technically [3] 49/13 49/23 50/5	32/15 32/15 33/1	121/11 124/20 131/1	80/20 81/22 83/20	31/16 33/7 34/16
78/23 30/3	34/12 34/23 38/7	132/4 133/8 134/25	87/18 87/19 88/22	34/22 34/23 34/24
				(64) tab they

T those [125] 1/15 3/3 54/15 59/4 85/17 told [13] 2/4 26/18 132/21 5/19 6/10 6/13 8/8 91/21 100/4 123/23 63/11 63/13 63/13 trying [4] 64/4 64/10 they... [81] 35/20 42/3 9/10 10/13 10/18 through [21] 10/7 87/20 104/9 105/8 65/22 122/5 42/4 47/13 49/19 33/6 36/20 42/1 65/10 10/19 11/2 12/12 114/22 120/15 122/20 tuppences [1] 135/1 49/20 50/22 50/24 13/12 13/22 14/1 14/7 76/24 77/4 80/9 80/24 130/12 135/25 turn [13] 8/20 13/19 51/11 52/9 53/3 54/1 17/6 23/1 26/15 26/15 85/10 93/20 96/22 too [2] 18/14 75/2 15/9 16/9 19/6 20/24 54/2 60/14 61/8 62/5 took [6] 41/25 52/4 30/12 31/5 33/3 36/25 96/23 102/3 103/6 31/25 35/2 42/23 63/13 66/16 70/15 37/2 37/10 37/24 38/6 106/7 110/22 114/9 56/19 68/6 96/14 54/13 75/21 130/20 70/17 73/16 76/12 38/12 44/3 48/6 48/16 117/13 126/1 127/23 114/16 139/7 79/13 85/5 86/10 88/8 48/20 50/14 52/23 throughout [3] 49/10 tooth [1] 103/15 Turning [2] 24/12 88/10 88/13 91/23 53/7 54/5 55/19 55/20 68/7 103/14 tortuous [1] 5/16 62/7 95/4 97/23 99/15 throwing [1] 38/5 total [5] 57/1 81/4 56/15 57/5 58/20 tutted [1] 135/20 105/20 106/22 109/18 58/22 62/11 65/6 65/9 tied [1] 105/15 82/21 116/18 134/21 twice [1] 78/16 109/18 109/25 110/5 time [37] 1/19 2/10 two [28] 1/4 1/7 1/11 65/12 67/4 73/10 totalling [1] 13/2 111/8 111/11 111/16 73/15 74/6 74/8 74/10 5/21 10/22 24/22 touch [1] 132/8 1/12 1/18 6/13 9/10 112/8 113/16 113/22 74/16 75/11 75/21 25/14 25/24 30/15 touched [2] 5/1 79/9 11/9 14/22 15/13 23/1 115/20 116/10 116/25 75/23 76/7 77/1 77/2 39/4 43/1 54/8 55/15 towards [9] 13/5 24/7 26/21 57/22 117/17 122/21 122/23 77/4 77/25 78/16 81/9 56/15 56/22 56/25 65/14 70/16 70/25 72/14 74/7 77/1 82/20 130/25 131/13 131/13 81/20 83/2 84/9 84/23 57/6 58/5 58/7 64/5 71/9 72/12 72/13 90/18 92/13 103/9 131/23 132/7 132/13 85/1 86/11 87/19 89/4 65/6 67/16 73/24 76/1 72/22 113/15 105/7 108/13 108/19 133/14 134/12 134/13 90/2 91/1 91/6 91/9 78/22 86/18 92/8 track [2] 112/10 117/6 109/16 135/8 135/24 134/13 135/5 135/6 92/1 92/4 93/19 93/22 92/10 98/4 105/6 trail [1] 138/10 136/19 135/7 135/7 135/8 trained [1] 123/2 95/14 96/17 96/18 105/11 111/13 111/14 two-thirds [1] 77/1 135/20 136/6 136/8 96/18 96/19 96/19 122/7 129/1 129/6 trajectory [2] 65/14 type [4] 46/20 89/17 136/9 136/12 136/21 97/1 97/12 98/12 99/3 136/4 140/2 66/24 103/13 120/6 136/24 137/2 137/3 99/9 99/12 100/16 time-frame [1] 111/14 transcript [4] 74/24 types [3] 42/2 74/17 137/4 137/8 137/10 102/1 103/14 104/7 75/5 99/5 134/7 122/11 timeline [1] 69/5 137/12 138/4 138/10 104/24 112/20 117/18 times [2] 64/21 transferred [1] 126/7 typically [2] 46/21 140/19 117/25 119/7 120/5 111/17 transparency [1] 76/22 they'd [1] 66/17 125/11 125/12 125/16 | timetable [6] 2/25 37/12 **Tyson [1]** 128/23 they've [1] 122/7 125/18 125/20 126/5 5/12 100/14 101/8 transparent [7] 36/6 things [7] 2/13 3/6 88/6 100/9 127/19 126/11 126/13 126/20 101/10 113/9 3/14 26/8 102/11 **UK [3]** 3/2 93/5 103/6 127/21 127/22 130/15 timetabling [1] 110/8 128/13 128/22 137/12 129/5 140/25 **UKGI [8]** 93/6 93/7 131/25 132/5 132/9 timing [1] 69/12 transparently [1] think [21] 2/14 38/15 94/1 94/8 94/10 95/6 132/21 133/12 133/20 timings [1] 92/16 125/8 47/4 53/16 58/24 64/3 95/16 95/21 138/2 139/4 139/18 tiny [1] 29/3 transpires [1] 129/20 65/25 79/1 79/9 80/16 **UKGI's [5]** 93/15 140/5 140/13 tired [1] 107/14 trappings [1] 123/19 92/9 92/18 95/19 94/19 94/21 95/2 95/4 though [11] 20/17 title [1] 113/19 traumatised [1] 116/4 102/15 120/18 129/12 ultimately [2] 91/11 23/13 55/21 58/3 to [1168] treated [5] 15/24 40/1 129/14 130/13 130/17 118/12 65/11 75/4 87/24 today [27] 1/7 2/23 43/8 58/23 120/23 140/2 140/8 98/15 101/5 120/4 treating [1] 113/22 unable [3] 21/16 2/24 5/23 6/19 10/6 thinking [3] 25/15 109/14 115/8 125/3 11/11 40/5 43/24 treatment [3] 12/9 34/16 122/6 unacceptable [3] 66/12 69/6 90/8 93/5 thought [8] 34/11 121/7 137/22 third [6] 13/9 36/10 75/17 119/11 126/10 80/17 104/3 107/13 94/13 95/1 102/12 trial [1] 125/21 49/6 61/1 70/21 70/21 uncertain [1] 2/5 114/17 128/6 128/17 106/7 108/5 112/22 tried [1] 136/11 thirdly [6] 8/14 28/3 uncertainty [2] 55/3 141/1 117/9 119/4 120/12 triggered [1] 28/15 40/17 43/18 71/24 106/18 122/20 127/10 138/25 troubling [3] 139/8 thoughts [1] 57/23 86/16 unclear [1] 79/20 threat [1] 136/21 139/20 140/3 139/13 139/18 thirds [1] 77/1 uncles [1] 135/8 threatened [2] 96/17 today's [3] 40/1 57/1 this [188] trustee [2] 28/8 68/21 uncover [1] 110/18 96/19 93/3 thorough [2] 82/1 uncovered [2] 105/22 three [12] 12/1 13/20 together [4] 9/10 38/2 truth [1] 104/9 103/15 136/24 14/2 40/6 43/13 50/14 96/5 125/2 try [4] 8/24 9/2 132/13

(65) they ... - uncovered

under [49] 6/3 8/5 8/7 8/12 9/25 14/8 14/23 15/12 17/12 17/14 17/20 19/11 21/2 21/2 21/21 21/21 25/17 25/19 26/21 27/7 28/12 29/20 29/22 29/25 30/4 31/5 31/13 36/13 41/5 41/6 42/15 42/17 43/2 45/12 47/8 47/17 59/24 69/21 71/25 74/1 77/14 78/3 78/18 79/22 79/24 90/21 126/4 132/17 136/21 underlying [1] 15/2 underpin [1] 47/10 understand [11] 10/15 49/1 49/2 51/6 96/12 109/24 124/2 125/23 127/5 130/9 139/15 understanding [4]	unlawfully [1] 132/22 unless [1] 104/19 unnecessary [2] 44/2 55/5 unparticularised [1] 126/4 unreasonable [1] 60/10 unrepresented [1] 74/3 unspecified [1] 132/7 untenable [1] 123/25 until [11] 5/5 25/3 61/7 79/7 102/12 107/10 109/13 135/4 136/10 139/19 141/5 up [54] 7/22 8/20 9/16 9/20 10/8 10/9 10/11 13/19 16/9 19/6 20/24 26/8 33/14 38/15 42/23 45/11 48/16 52/4 53/23 56/10 59/3 59/4 60/11 61/3 65/5 65/11 65/20 66/3 67/25 68/6 68/15	64/19 65/1 65/10 65/21 65/21 66/20 90/4 90/8 102/10 114/21 117/8 120/4 123/16 124/13 128/24 129/15 129/22 130/11 139/23 use [8] 1/13 41/5 41/10 83/3 87/7 105/23 132/8 140/13 used [11] 18/5 23/12 28/2 39/3 41/12 51/16 80/14 99/17 106/16 108/3 115/12 useful [1] 120/7 user [3] 71/13 116/11 116/14 user-friendly [2] 116/11 116/14 using [2] 19/7 124/3 usual [1] 69/22 V valuation [3] 82/5 86/13 87/4	102/13 105/20 107/19 108/16 111/13 113/12 114/15 121/23 129/5 129/17 133/1 133/9 133/9 133/13 137/17 140/23 via [1] 3/25 victim [1] 114/5 victimsed [1] 111/8 victims [6] 100/12 103/20 104/14 113/23 131/13 136/25 view [23] 12/18 34/1 39/16 46/5 46/17 48/18 50/14 55/2 79/1 82/6 83/20 84/15 85/1 87/16 88/22 90/14 91/3 91/22 111/2 118/15 129/3 138/18 138/25 views [3] 90/18 94/17 123/5 village [1] 136/15 virtue [3] 52/24 74/10 138/16	
131/11 understood [4] 30/13 36/1 40/25 75/24 undertake [5] 85/20 85/20 85/21 85/21 99/8 undervalues [1] 30/6 underwent [1] 125/16 undeserved [1] 105/4 undiagnosed [1] 114/6 undisputed [1] 60/21 unequal [2] 12/9 137/21 unfair [7] 12/8 55/10 71/10 78/18 121/7 123/25 137/21 unfairness [1] 123/3 unfamiliar [1] 28/6 unfolded [1] 38/9 unfortunate [2] 37/16 137/14 unhelpful [1] 77/8 unilaterally [2] 57/17 58/16 unique [1] 81/25	up-to-date [1] 106/2 update [11] 8/21 26/7 29/10 51/19 65/15 72/24 95/12 97/8 109/22 124/6 129/7 updates [1] 89/1 upon [18] 3/21 5/1 6/8 8/12 8/17 22/5 43/10 66/1 101/25 112/1 112/4 119/20 121/8 127/25 131/21 133/6 136/25 138/22	33/4 73/10 73/11 74/11 74/18 74/20 75/1 81/14 86/15 97/17 109/9 value/size [1] 20/6 valuer [1] 33/24 variation [1] 79/8 various [5] 1/8 2/12 7/7 93/17 97/15 vast [4] 17/17 34/21 47/16 117/17 verge [1] 106/24 verifiable [1] 60/21 versions [5] 14/25 15/1 19/7 19/8 71/21 versions [1] 14/23 very [49] 1/6 2/19 7/21 9/4 9/5 10/22 17/2 24/6 38/14 39/1 43/16 47/3 52/24 54/12 56/16 57/13 66/16 78/22 78/23 80/12 82/10 82/11 85/23 89/10 90/4 90/6 90/13 92/4 92/11 93/8 93/12 95/25 98/4	visits [1] 106/22 vital [1] 105/19 voice [1] 35/14 W wait [3] 5/5 110/4 136/10 waited [1] 26/20 walk [1] 39/3 want [9] 39/6 64/19 65/11 70/15 73/2 99/5 128/3 129/25 131/23 wanted [3] 52/16 136/20 136/21 wanting [1] 133/16 wants [1] 94/8 was [105] 2/4 6/22 6/25 7/2 7/4 7/22 7/25 8/4 8/7 9/19 9/20 10/11 10/16 13/4 14/25 15/1 18/5 18/10 19/20 19/22 21/13 21/14 24/18 24/19 25/1 25/2 25/21 26/22 32/3 33/11 33/22 34/15 35/10 37/17 39/4 47/23 47/24 48/1	watching [1] 5/19 water [1] 131/8 way [45] 2/1 6/25 7/25 10/10 18/2 18/10 34/23 35/6 35/20 36/6 36/19 41/16 42/7 58/5 60/8 69/13 69/22 82/1 84/5 84/13 84/15 84/22 85/7 86/12 92/5 94/17 102/10 102/25 112/11 113/3 117/23 118/3 121/7 121/10 121/11 122/1 128/19 128/23 129/23 131/21 133/9 135/9 137/8 137/10 137/11 we [268] we'd [4] 38/16 42/18 47/13 89/7 we'll [3] 79/4 92/18 114/17 we're [17] 1/7 1/14 1/24 9/3 25/15 26/14 41/19 45/1 66/3 82/10 90/4 90/6 102/17 103/25 107/23 120/15 130/12

(66) under - we're

W 84/24 86/14 90/20 46/3 46/23 49/19 33/25 34/20 36/21 29/10 29/20 30/20 91/1 92/2 96/14 96/18 49/20 53/3 74/21 36/25 37/2 37/21 33/7 33/16 35/18 we've [3] 52/18 68/13 96/18 96/21 98/1 75/12 78/6 78/11 37/25 38/6 39/3 39/4 36/12 36/13 36/25 112/22 101/23 103/9 107/9 79/18 87/10 95/18 44/5 44/21 51/22 37/1 37/16 37/25 website [3] 51/22 95/19 106/21 106/22 109/25 119/25 120/2 54/15 57/5 65/19 38/20 40/8 40/12 51/24 110/15 124/5 125/21 126/5 110/25 113/1 114/12 67/12 69/1 73/24 40/17 43/12 49/21 Wednesday [2] 1/1 126/13 126/13 126/20 115/16 119/25 134/11 75/24 75/25 77/4 90/8 50/5 52/12 52/13 53/5 141/5 127/9 129/7 131/3 135/9 136/20 136/22 93/6 95/14 96/18 53/7 53/8 54/13 55/18 wee'uns [1] 134/24 131/12 138/6 140/25 whenever [1] 79/4 96/18 96/20 99/13 58/16 62/5 64/3 64/9 week [13] 1/25 1/25 141/1 where [50] 11/10 12/7 103/24 105/3 107/2 64/13 66/7 67/2 68/22 25/20 56/18 90/3 90/5 what [93] 1/14 3/19 72/7 72/24 76/22 21/16 21/24 23/19 107/19 110/18 111/21 90/9 94/13 102/11 4/1 7/16 18/1 20/13 23/24 24/5 27/22 79/19 79/25 80/16 111/24 112/10 112/12 106/8 107/5 136/5 23/25 27/1 33/1 37/7 27/24 28/3 28/6 28/8 112/14 112/20 113/19 82/13 82/16 82/25 141/3 37/15 42/7 45/14 28/10 28/15 29/13 114/4 114/7 116/16 82/25 83/5 83/11 weeks [5] 10/23 25/3 47/14 47/21 48/16 31/2 36/20 37/11 38/3 117/12 117/22 117/24 85/20 85/21 86/2 56/19 67/9 68/23 48/25 49/1 50/16 43/18 44/15 45/18 120/14 121/22 122/5 86/25 89/6 89/18 90/9 weight [1] 60/19 50/21 59/2 60/21 46/11 49/21 53/25 123/8 125/16 125/18 92/11 92/13 93/6 welcome [2] 108/16 63/13 64/6 64/15 54/20 55/18 55/19 125/20 125/24 126/2 95/19 96/22 97/5 125/6 64/18 66/1 69/25 73/9 59/17 60/12 60/22 126/3 126/5 126/12 97/10 97/17 97/19 well [45] 10/25 18/20 74/17 81/23 87/12 63/10 71/2 72/4 73/5 126/13 126/20 126/23 99/3 99/7 99/7 100/19 25/6 32/19 39/14 47/3 87/20 88/6 90/23 74/20 76/5 76/11 81/5 127/5 127/22 129/13 104/19 106/25 107/2 48/5 48/11 52/9 57/22 96/12 98/20 99/6 89/14 97/4 115/7 132/21 133/21 138/20 108/19 109/4 109/5 58/24 60/20 61/4 64/3 101/6 101/15 101/18 117/19 119/1 122/18 who I asked [1] 26/17 109/8 111/24 111/24 64/20 65/9 68/17 102/5 102/19 102/24 125/21 132/13 135/15 whole [2] 21/18 112/1 113/1 114/10 70/23 72/5 72/11 80/6 104/2 104/5 104/10 136/3 137/5 115/10 114/19 116/14 117/22 80/20 88/18 92/12 106/15 108/2 110/2 whereas [1] 126/13 wholly [6] 83/12 118/8 118/25 119/15 109/16 113/17 114/5 110/13 111/9 111/25 whereby [1] 131/3 89/22 105/3 119/11 122/12 124/14 124/15 116/9 116/13 117/11 112/18 112/24 113/16 whether [42] 3/6 17/9 121/25 139/16 124/20 124/25 125/1 117/13 117/19 119/17 whom [4] 30/13 75/18 113/24 115/11 115/11 18/9 18/12 19/18 125/4 125/6 125/8 120/15 121/2 123/16 116/6 117/9 120/3 19/20 19/22 20/9 89/9 138/10 125/10 126/2 126/16 127/12 128/9 129/3 120/21 120/24 121/4 20/15 22/7 23/16 24/3 whose [10] 9/17 126/19 126/25 128/19 129/23 129/24 133/16 25/14 25/17 27/7 121/6 121/10 122/8 10/13 10/18 10/19 129/8 129/19 129/24 134/23 136/2 136/15 122/21 127/8 127/13 27/11 27/13 27/21 11/2 11/5 11/13 13/23 131/19 131/20 132/12 wellbeing [1] 104/7 127/17 127/23 128/4 29/8 29/12 30/3 30/24 32/22 78/5 133/15 134/8 134/20 went [10] 37/15 42/1 128/6 128/7 129/14 34/21 34/23 34/24 why [16] 1/18 1/24 136/5 138/1 138/14 50/18 56/16 105/3 35/14 48/7 50/22 58/7 129/19 129/20 132/5 38/7 41/9 41/15 46/6 140/3 140/4 140/16 109/16 135/2 135/5 133/2 133/21 134/5 59/7 67/14 72/21 66/23 75/10 80/2 140/18 140/21 136/14 138/8 136/5 137/10 139/1 75/19 79/13 83/8 91/5 101/12 102/24 107/22 willing [1] 91/15 were [79] 6/10 6/14 139/25 140/9 140/13 91/11 91/14 91/23 109/24 120/22 121/1 window [3] 24/18 7/5 7/8 7/10 7/13 7/19 140/17 140/17 140/18 97/6 99/23 118/18 121/5 24/19 24/21 8/6 8/9 9/7 11/2 12/23 windows [1] 139/7 141/1 which [195] wide [2] 17/2 105/24 13/2 26/24 34/1 34/11 what's [6] 1/11 37/19 which I read [1] 31/11 widely [2] 50/18 winning [1] 138/8 35/21 36/5 41/1 46/14 wish [21] 18/1 20/9 53/13 79/14 87/16 whichever [1] 66/4 105/18 47/15 48/10 48/19 wider [5] 15/20 16/1 134/5 while [2] 21/25 22/7 24/10 25/12 50/14 50/23 52/23 27/21 29/12 30/3 whatever [6] 55/9 116/19 41/3 57/14 83/3 53/11 59/20 61/12 56/24 64/8 99/4 whilst [6] 29/23 31/3 will [140] 2/3 2/11 30/24 33/16 34/18 64/12 64/15 69/3 69/4 134/20 135/22 49/12 109/20 115/18 2/12 2/24 8/21 8/24 34/24 37/6 45/1 86/9 73/10 73/10 73/15 whatsoever [1] 110/8 139/21 9/6 9/22 11/15 11/22 87/11 110/4 126/24 73/16 73/24 73/24 when [37] 1/22 9/3 who [81] 1/21 2/3 12/11 14/6 15/7 15/17 127/15 128/14 130/4 74/13 74/16 74/19 17/19 18/4 22/4 22/6 6/24 8/5 8/8 8/9 13/1 17/15 19/9 22/3 22/5 wished [1] 59/21 75/1 77/20 78/7 78/12 28/14 31/14 34/16 13/12 17/17 24/17 22/9 22/21 22/23 wishes [1] 57/3 79/2 80/7 82/6 84/12 39/1 41/7 45/20 45/22 26/17 30/14 32/12 22/24 23/6 24/23 wishing [1] 124/20

W	13/19 14/1 20/2 22/18	132/9	99/1 101/3 105/15	
	36/3 36/16 39/11 41/2	wrong-headed [1]	105/17 105/17 105/24	
with [156]	44/2 44/5 44/5 45/22	114/16	106/5 108/13 109/25	
withdrew [1] 135/6	45/24 46/2 46/15	wrongdoer [1] 58/7	110/14 113/6 124/15	
within [32] 3/7 3/19	46/24 47/15 47/25	wronged [1] 5/18	128/20 134/7 138/11	
10/22 10/23 20/15	48/3 48/5 49/24 50/24	wrongful [2] 4/18 6/7	138/18 138/25 141/1	
24/17 28/14 39/23	51/23 53/14 53/20	wrongfully [1] 15/21	yours [1] 96/1	
46/18 50/7 62/6 76/8	54/3 54/3 55/5 55/9	wrongly [4] 15/22		
77/10 79/3 84/11 86/7	55/16 57/25 59/12	15/24 85/12 96/18		
90/25 96/10 97/13	59/22 63/25 64/12	wrongs [1] 4/5		
97/18 101/6 101/25	64/16 64/19 66/16	wrote [4] 51/18 86/3		
115/18 117/19 118/2	67/13 67/21 69/4 73/9	105/7 105/13		
124/21 125/11 125/13	73/15 76/12 76/15			
133/23 138/14 138/20	77/8 77/20 77/23	Υ		
139/3	78/13 78/24 80/8	year [16] 4/8 5/5 26/1		
without [14] 31/19	83/11 83/11 84/20	39/17 40/12 67/2 77/7		
33/7 39/7 44/17 77/21	87/20 88/14 89/10	97/4 98/16 104/15		
80/24 82/9 82/19	90/4 91/25 95/21	104/23 105/12 106/20		
88/21 102/5 105/20	95/21 98/5 98/11	108/12 117/7 118/20		
119/21 123/16 123/17		years [9] 26/21 29/14		
witness [3] 69/1	99/18 101/6 101/11	60/11 101/24 103/8		
114/20 116/16	102/6 102/9 102/25	107/4 107/10 114/24		
witnesses [1] 136/20	102/25 103/22 105/22	116/21		
women [1] 32/22	107/10 110/9 112/24	yes [15] 18/7 20/2		
won't [3] 1/15 2/1	116/6 118/22 120/25	34/17 38/3 63/2 63/16		
61/7	121/3 121/23 123/1	66/2 66/14 73/7 92/24		
wonder [1] 113/19	126/10 126/24 127/16	95/23 100/22 100/24		
wonderful [1] 92/17	128/24 128/25 129/5	129/10 129/22		
word [2] 1/13 2/14	130/2 130/14 132/14	yesterday [8] 65/16		
wording [2] 119/17	133/19 136/15 137/13	65/17 65/18 74/5		
124/18	140/9 140/12	85/25 85/25 86/3		
words [3] 49/20 101/11 140/13	wouldn't [11] 45/8	124/10		
work [14] 2/1 34/15	47/12 48/3 48/9 50/11	yet [5] 33/7 35/11		
36/24 37/9 37/24	68/9 76/16 80/7 92/13	109/11 123/18 126/4		
39/24 48/6 77/3 93/13	136/9 136/12	you [268]		
116/6 123/24 125/10	write [3] 61/16 64/21	you'd [1] 1/18		
129/12 129/13	124/10	you'll [2] 136/2 136/6		
worked [2] 32/19	writing [4] 64/9 75/4	you've [7] 107/25		
120/1	90/5 99/8	119/4 120/17 124/18		
workers [1] 104/10	written [30] 5/11	134/17 134/19 140/24		
working [5] 11/14	11/25 14/4 20/23	you,sir [1] 136/13		
13/4 68/18 88/7	36/17 39/13 40/7	your [57] 3/5 3/13 4/9		
109/19	40/13 40/18 42/11	5/20 8/20 9/21 12/15		
works [1] 107/5	60/9 64/8 93/3 93/7	12/22 13/17 13/19		
worries [1] 106/25	94/11 94/21 95/3	14/3 14/6 15/4 22/11		
worry [2] 66/13	97/14 109/12 113/13	27/1 35/4 38/13 38/18		
132/24	115/24 117/5 117/16	39/14 39/15 39/18		
worse [1] 138/9	119/8 122/16 125/24	40/11 40/19 42/21		
Worsfold [1] 106/19	130/18 130/20 131/18	43/23 65/1 65/8 66/1		
would [105] 1/22 5/10	138/12	71/15 79/2 84/6 88/19		
9/15 11/6 13/6 13/9	wrong [5] 3//15	90/14 90/16 90/17 91/3 91/22 97/3 97/18		
	114/16 116/1 123/25	3113 31122 3113 31110		
				(68) with - yours