

From: "Parsons, Andrew" <[REDACTED]>
To: Anthony de Garr Robinson <[REDACTED]>
Cc: "Prime, Amy" <[REDACTED]> "Gribben, Jonathan"
<[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: Remote Access [BD-4A.FID26859284]
Date: Thu, 21 Jul 2016 06:57:59 +0000
Importance: Normal
Attachments: _DOC_33436357(1)_Remote_Access_Rider.DOCX;
_DOC_33436357(1)_Remote_Access_Rider(1).DOCX

Tony

Fair enough.

Please find attached a re-worked version of the language - now more directly and transparently explaining how Post Office can change branch accounts.

This re-draft draws a clearer distinction between:

1. The factual allegation that Post Office has been changing branch accounts and that this is the true reason for the shortfalls in branches.
2. The allegation that Post Office concealed its capabilities in this regard - which, at the moment, only goes to the limitation point.

The second is the more difficult point to address. First, it is not yet 100% clear that the Super User access does affect branch accounting, though this seems very likely. Second, the reason that Post Office made incorrect statements is that it relied on confirmations from FJ (see attached email as an example). At some point, we may well wish to disclose the attached email in order to show that Post Office did not "deliberately" mislead the Claimants. This will however need to be carefully managed with Fujitsu. From a tactical perspective, this may be better done once Freeths have more accurately stated their case on concealment.

I've got to drop my car in the garage first thing this morning (someone whacked it at the weekend...grrrr!) - would you be available for a call at 9:30? If not, would 12 noon work?

Kind regards
Andy

Andrew Parsons
Partner

Direct: [REDACTED]
Mobile: [REDACTED]

Follow Bond Dickinson:

www.bonddickinson.com

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

From: Anthony de Garr Robinson [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: 20 July 2016 20:55
To: Parsons, Andrew
Cc: Prime, Amy; Gribben, Jonathan
Subject: Re: Remote Access [BD-4A.FID26859284]

Dear Andy,

I've had a quick look at the drafting and I don't think it will wash. First of all, we appear to have ignored the second route by which I understand it is possible for data to be altered remotely - the one that involves PO and has happened only once since 2010.

Second, we boldly say that they haven't given proper particulars of our concealment of the remote data alteration facility, but for years virtually every document we submitted positively said that data could not be altered remotely. We need to say something that at least provides a basis for explaining how we came to do this, even if we can't bring ourselves actually to acknowledge that we have made false statements in the past and to explain why.

We must assume that this letter is going to be pored over for many hours at trial, at which time the court will know everything. Attempting to brush this under the carpet to avoid short term embarrassment would do profound damage to our long term credibility. In my view it would be the worst possible thing to do. It really is the case that in many cases cover ups give a much worse impression and are much more serious than the things sought to be covered up (in this case, our previous inconsistent statements).

It may well be that I have got the wrong end of the stick, but this drafting makes me very nervous indeed.

Talk tomorrow?

Tony

Sent from my iPhone

On 20 Jul 2016, at 20:06, Parsons, Andrew <[redacted]> wrote:

Tony

Please find attached the latest version of the letter – this hasn't materially changed since your amendments. I've highlighted in Blue in the attached letter where these two sections on remote access will be fit in – see pages 22 and 45.

Kind regards

Andy

Andrew Parsons


Partner

Direct: [redacted]
Mobile: [redacted]

Follow Bond Dickinson:

www.bonddickinson.com<<http://www.bonddickinson.com>>



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

From: Anthony de Garr Robinson [mailto:
Sent: 20 July 2016 19:47
To: Parsons, Andrew
Cc: Prime, Amy; Gribben, Jonathan
Subject: Re: Remote Access [BD-4A.FID26859284]

Ok. I see it's only a small section anyway. Could you send me the longer version you've taken it from? I don't want to read and review it, I just want to get the context clear in my head

Sent from my iPhone

On 20 Jul 2016, at 19:42, Parsons, Andrew

<andrew.parsons@
%3cmailto: wrote:

Push on – I'll sort out the fees.

Post Office loved our letter so we're in credit!

A

Andrew Parsons

Partner

<image001.jpg><<http://www.bondickinson.com/>>

Direct:




Mobile:

Follow Bond Dickinson:

<image002.jpg><https://twitter.com/Bond_Dickinson><image003.jpg><<http://www.linkedin.com/company/3098928?trk=tyah>>

www.bonddickinson.com<<http://www.bonddickinson.com/>><<http://www.bonddickinson.com/%3chttp://www.bonddickinson.com/>>>

From: Anthony de Garr Robinson [mailto:
Sent: 20 July 2016 19:16
To: Parsons, Andrew

Cc: Prime, Amy; Gribben, Jonathan

Subject: RE: Remote Access [BD-4A.FID26859284]

Dear Andy,

I'm more or less at my budget limit. What do I do?

Best wishes,

Tony

From: Parsons, Andrew [mailto:GRO]

Sent: 20 July 2016 19:05

To: Anthony de Garr Robinson

<GRO>
>>>

Cc: Prime, Amy

<GRO%3cmmailto:am
GRO Gribben, Jonathan
GRO
com%3cmmailto:GRO>

Subject: Remote Access [BD-4A.FID26859284]

Tony

Would you mind reviewing the attached wording on the remote access issues?

Having reviewed the Letter of Claim, the remote access point is only specifically raised in relation to limitation / s.32 concealment. It is not cited as a ground for (i) deceit or (ii) unwinding the settlement agreements – although it could in due course be used for these purposes.

We have expressly referred to balancing transactions and Super User access in the attached, without drawing specific attention to them. Is this transparent enough or should we go further?

Kind regards

Andy

Andrew Parsons

Partner

<image001.jpg><http://www.bondickinson.com/>

Direct:

Mobile:

GRO

Follow Bond Dickinson:

<image002.jpg><https://twitter.com/Bond_Dickinson><image003.jpg><http://www.linkedin.com/company/3098928?trk=tyah>

www.bonddickinson.com<http://www.bonddickinson.com/><http://www.bonddickinson.com/%3http://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.

arobinson@<GRO> <GRO>
> only is authorised to access this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not

<GRO>mailto:<GRO>>

>, please notify

andrew.parsons@<GRO> <GRO>
<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.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.

For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.

For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.

For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.

For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.

For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

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

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.

For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>
