

From: "Parsons, Andrew" <[redacted] GRO >
To: Brian Altman <[redacted] GRO >
Cc: "Prime, Amy" <[redacted] GRO >, "Porter, Tom" <[redacted] GRO >

Subject: RE: Letter of Response to the Group Litigation - subject to litigation privilege [BD-4A.FID26859284]

Date: Fri, 22 Jul 2016 11:50:04 +0000

Importance: Normal

Inline-Images: image001.jpg; image002.jpg; image003.jpg

Brian

Thank you (and for your other comments on the LOR). Very helpful.

I'm not particularly worried about releasing the investigation guidelines - their content is pretty benign. I just wanted to make sure that we were not waiving some form of privilege. In this regard, your advice is just what was needed.

Kind regards
Andy

Andrew Parsons
Partner



Direct: [redacted] GRO
Mobile: [redacted]

Follow Bond Dickinson:



www.bonddickinson.com

From: Brian Altman [mailto:[redacted] GRO]
Sent: 22 July 2016 10:50
To: Parsons, Andrew
Cc: Prime, Amy; Porter, Tom
Subject: Re: Letter of Response to the Group Litigation - subject to litigation privilege [BD-4A.FID26859284]

Andy

I have realised you didn't call me about this yesterday. I am available for a chat today if you wish. It may help however if I set out some thoughts here for you:

1. I do not think that investigation guidelines can attract privilege (advice or litigation) for the simple reason that these are not communications between a client and his lawyer made under conditions of confidentiality for the purposes of enabling the client to seek, or the lawyer to give, legal advice or assistance in a relevant legal context, or advice or assistance given in the context of litigation.
2. If CK gave advice about "privilege" attaching to "investigative techniques" then I suspect they may have been speaking about public interest immunity (PII). It was for this reason I asked for the source of the advice.
3. In the criminal environment, disclosure is subject to the single test in s.3 of the CPIA which I set out for you in my email this morning on the topic of the LOR. If the material doesn't pass the test then it is not disclosable (subject to application being made by the defence and the judge ruling upon it).

4. If in civil litigation the test for disclosure is also, in effect, relevance/materiality to the issues in the case, then challenging the relevance/materiality of such guidelines may, I suppose, be one way, *pro tem*, of withholding disclosure of them.
5. I am unsure if I have read the investigation guidelines you are referring to; it is possible I read them a long time ago when advising about such guidelines in one of my 2013 review documents. Either way I'd be surprised if in the criminal arena, if relevant and *prima facie* disclosable, they would be regarded as so sensitive as to indicate that could be withheld from disclosure on grounds they reveal matters relating to an important public interest, namely, POL's security team's investigative techniques.
6. At all events, I seriously doubt that POL could make a PII application in such circumstances as the first question that arises is whether a private prosecutor can invoke public interest immunity. I'd be interested to know if POL has ever made a PII application in any case. Be that as it may, the issue is really whether the material is so sensitive that disclosure would damage a public interest.

I am sorry that this will not assist you in holding off a disclosure request for now by claiming privilege. But I hope that my other thoughts about it may do so, such as asserting (if it is correct to do so in the civil arena) that the guidelines are not material to any known or anticipated issue in the case.

Brian

Brian Altman QC
Chambers of William Clegg QC
2 Bedford Row
London WC1R 4BU
personal website: www.brianaltmanqc-barrister.com
chambers website: www.2bedfordrow.co.uk
email: GRO
tel: GRO

This message is confidential and intended solely for the person to whom it is addressed. It may contain privileged and confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient you must not read, copy, distribute, discuss or take any action in reliance on it. If you have received this information in error, please notify me as soon as possible on the above telephone number. Additionally, it is the responsibility of the recipient that this email is virus-free and no responsibility is accepted for any loss or damage arising in any way from receipt or use of it.

From: Parsons, Andrew <GRO>
Sent: 18 July 2016 18:16
To: Brian Altman
Cc: Prime, Amy; Porter, Tom
Subject: RE: Letter of Response to the Group Litigation - subject to litigation privilege [BD-4A.FID26859284]

Brian

Apologies – forgot one point.

We've been asked to disclose "Post Office's investigation guidelines" which we presume to be a reference to any investigation guidelines followed by the Security Team when looking into suspected criminal activity. I recall someone (probably CK) saying that information about investigative techniques are generally privileged.

We are not obliged to give disclosure of documents at this stage. If the above understanding is broadly applicable, my preferred approach would be to say that documents of this type might be be privileged and therefore we are not disclosing them.

If you have 5 minutes at some point this week, please could we discuss whether such documents might be covered by privilege?

Kind regards

Andy

Andrew Parsons
Partner

Bond Dickinson

Direct: **GRO**
Mobile:

Follow Bond Dickinson:



www.bonddickinson.com

From: Brian Altman [mailto:**GRO**]
Sent: 18 July 2016 17:26
To: Parsons, Andrew
Cc: Prime, Amy
Subject: Re: Letter of Response to the Group Litigation - subject to litigation privilege [BD-4A.FID26859284]

Will do

Sent from my iPhone

On 18 Jul 2016, at 17:23, Parsons, Andrew <**GRO**> wrote:

Brian

As mentioned previously, would you mind reviewing our draft Letter of Response (**LOR**) that we have prepared for the Group Litigation with the postmasters?

The LOR is long, so please do not review the whole thing. We have highlighted below all the references to prosecutions or criminal law matters – please could you review these sections?

- 5(F): Factual Allegations: criminal investigations and prosecutions (paragraphs 5.48 to 5.79)
- 6(D): Misfeasance in public office (paragraphs 6.30 to 6.32)
- 6(E): Malicious Prosecution (paragraphs 6.33 to 6.42)
- 8(B): Barred claims: criminal cases (paragraphs 8.8 to 8.12)
- Schedule 4: Section 8: False accounting (8.1 – 8.6)

Some of these sections mention factual matters that are not within your knowledge so we're not asking for your sign off of these sections. I should however be grateful if you could flag whether we've misstated any of the criminal law concepts. All other comments of course welcomed.

Just in case you need it, I've attached the Letter of Claim to which our letter responds. No need to review the LOC but you've got it just in case.

If possible, comments / amendments by the end of this week would be appreciated.

Kind regards
Andy

Andrew Parsons
Partner

Bond Dickinson

Direct: **GRO**
Mobile:

Follow Bond Dickinson:



www.bonddickinson.com

Please consider the environment! Do you need to print this email?

The information in this e-mail and any attachments is confidential and may be legally privileged and protected by law. [baltman](#) [GRO](#) only is authorised to access this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not [baltman](#) [GRO](#), please notify [andrew.parson](#) [GRO](#) as soon as possible and delete any copies. Unauthorised use, dissemination, distribution, publication or copying of this communication or attachments is prohibited and may be unlawful.

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

Content of this email which does not relate to the official business of Bond Dickinson LLP, is neither given nor endorsed by it.

This email is sent by Bond Dickinson LLP which is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales under number OC317661. Our registered office is 4 More London Riverside, London, SE1 2AU, where a list of members' names is open to inspection. We use the term partner to refer to a member of the LLP, or an employee or consultant who is of equivalent standing. Our VAT registration number is GB123393627.

Bond Dickinson LLP is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority.

<_DOC_33380020(1)_DRAFT Letter of Response 16 July 2016.docx>

<28.04.16 - Letter of Claim (8).pdf>