

Message

To: Jenkins Gareth GI [redacted] **GRO**
Subject: RE: Post Office Limited v Grant Allen
Attachments: non polled report allen g06421620121205134702.pdf

Gareth,

thank you for considering the position so promptly. i can now confirm that the case has been put back to the 24th January 2012. I would appreciate if you could add your general comments at this stage regarding the safeguards in place for comms problems to your statement, and send this to me as before and i will refer back to the Post Office to consider whether we go on to request the retrieval of data for your further analysis. i say so on the assumption that the data is available for 7 years. an idea of what 2 days analysis would cost would assist in that decision. with regard to Help Desk calls i also assume that this is information available freely to POL and therefore would request that enquiry is carried out. i attach the Horizon non polling report obtained by the investigator in this case previously.

Regards

Andrew

-----Original Message-----
From: Jenkins Gareth GI [mailto:[redacted]] **GRO**
Sent: 05 December 2012 12:50
To: Andrew Bolc
Cc: Thomas Penny
Subject: RE: Post office Limited v Grant Allen

Andrew,

I've had a look at the statement here and I think it might be helpful to have a dig as to exactly what went on in the Branch at the time of the initial loss. I think I understand what he is claiming. However where there are comms problems it is normal to recover any missing data once the comms are sorted out (provided it is within 35 days), so this shouldn't be a reason for a loss. Also there are processes in place to retrieve outstanding data where there are extended comms issues lasting more than 7 days, so as to meet contractual obligations regarding passing all data to Post Office Ltd's clients within 10 days.

I could just make a general statement relating to that or if we retrieved the data from the time I could check out exactly what happened in this case.

I've checked with Penny in our prosecution support team and Post Office Ltd have not requested any audit data relating to this case (she's checked back as far as April 2010), nor have we been asked about Help Desk calls (which would probably have occurred if there were comms issues).

Is it worth asking Post Office Ltd to request such data for me to examine before putting together a specific statement for this, or is a simple generic one sufficient?

Note that the data retrieval is part of the standard service that Fujitsu provides to Post Office Ltd, but any time I spend examining the data (say a couple of days) would be chargeable to Post Office Ltd and so there are commercial considerations for you or Post Office Ltd to consider. As we are nearing the Christmas break, I can't commit to doing any such analysis before the New Year.

Regards

Gareth

Gareth Jenkins
Distinguished Engineer
Business Applications Architect
Post Office Account

FUJITSU
Love lace Road, Bracknell, Berkshire, RG12 8SN
Tel: [redacted] **GRO**
Mobile: [redacted] **GRO**
email: [redacted] **GRO**
Web: <http://uk.fujitsu.com>

Fujitsu is proud to partner with Shelter, the housing and homeless charity
Reshaping ICT, Reshaping Business in partnership with FT.com
P Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

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

From: Andrew Bolc [mailto: [REDACTED] GRO]
Sent: 04 December 2012 10:14
To: Jenkins Gareth GI
Subject: Post Office Limited v Grant Allen

Dear Gareth,

I have just spoken to the solicitor for grant allen.
she is going to ask the court to relist the hearing currently on the 10th December 2012 until Jan next
year which should take the pressure off on this case.

i attach an extract from mr Allen's interview. as in the case summary i sent you he is trying to suggest
that an initial loss of £3000 is attributable to lost data which has not reached head office because of
installation problems. are you able to comment on this scenario at all? ultimately we would need to
discredit this as an explanation that holds any water. he denies stealing the subsequent losses and
therefore by implication may be seeking to blame the system for these losses as well.

Regards

Andrew Bolc

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

From: leicsterscar [mailto: [REDACTED] GRO] [mailto: [REDACTED] GRO]
Sent: 04 December 2012 09:38
To: Andrew Bolc
Subject:

TASKalfa 420i
[00:c0:ee:7a:9e:89]

Unless otherwise stated, this email has been sent from Fujitsu Services Limited, from Fujitsu (FTS)
Limited, or from Fujitsu Telecommunications Europe Limited, together "Fujitsu".

This email is only for the use of its intended recipient. Its contents are subject to a duty of
confidence and may be privileged. Fujitsu does not guarantee that this email has not been intercepted
and amended or that it is virus-free.

Fujitsu Services Limited, registered in England No 96056, registered office 22 Baker Street, London W1U
3BW.

Fujitsu (FTS) Limited, registered in England No 03808613, registered office 22 Baker Street, London W1U
3BW.

PFU Imaging Solutions Europe Limited, registered in England No 1578652, registered office Hayes Park
Central, Hayes End Road, Hayes, Middlesex, UB4 8FE.

Fujitsu Telecommunications Europe Limited, registered in England No 2548187, registered office Solihull
Parkway, Birmingham Business Park, Birmingham, B37 7YU.