

From: Andrew Parsons [GRO]
To: Anthony de Garr Robinson [GRO], Simon Henderson [GRO]
Cc: Gavin Matthews [GRO], Jonathan Gribben [GRO], Lucy Bremner [GRO], Emma Campbell-Danesh [GRO]
Subject: RE: Scope of Horizon [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]
Date: Fri, 7 Sep 2018 10:24:35 +0000
Importance: Normal
Attachments: GARETH_JENKINS_ADVICE_15-7-2013.pdf; _DOC_151742197(1)_Horizon_-_areas_to_cover_FJ.DOCX
Inline-Images: image001.png; image002.png; image003.png; image91ab43.PNG; imagef3ec40.PNG; imagedb2fed.PNG

Will do.

The meeting with the criminal guys has just been confirmed for 11am at OEC.

It will be Simon Clarke - <https://cartwrightking.co.uk/profile/simon-clarke-P309/> and Martin Smith, solicitor.

Rod Williams from POL will also be there.

Simon and Martin have done lots of prosecutions for Post Office over the years so understand how branches work and the role of Horizon. I've attached an advice note Simon did 5 years ago about why POL should be wary about relying on Gareth Jenkins, which sets the context for the meeting.

In terms of what we may need from GJ, it covers broadly two things:

Information about remote access – see attached note that was sent to FJ to start the discussions about this evidence

Evidence responding to particular bugs in the system that GJ directly dealt with.

A

Andrew Parsons
Partner
Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP

d: [GRO]
m:
t:
e:

[Stay informed: sign up to our e-alerts](#)

womblebond Dickinson.com

WBD_001185.000001



From: Anthony de Garr Robinson [mailto:[GRO]]
Sent: 07 September 2018 10:01
To: Andrew Parsons; Simon Henderson
Cc: Gavin Matthews; Jonathan Gribben; Lucy Bremner; Emma Campbell-Danesh
Subject: RE: Scope of Horizon [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]

I'd forgotten about them – I should have looked at my diary before responding. Maybe Simon and I could put our heads together after that meeting – assuming it happens – before having a discussion with you.

In his email of a few minutes ago, Simon expresses the view that, before deciding what to do about the proper scope of Horizon and whether the Horizon issues can be determined without a consideration of other systems such as POLSAP, it would be helpful if Robert could articulate his views. I agree with that. Might it be possible for Robert to produce something in writing for us to reflect on before we discuss this further? On Monday, perhaps?

The more time we have for this the better. But one of the things we need to factor into our deliberations is when and how to raise any points we decide to raise. In that regard, the date of the forthcoming CMC on 19/09 complicates matters somewhat.

Best wishes,

Tony

From: Andrew Parsons [mailto:[GRO]]
Sent: 07 September 2018 09:49
To: Simon Henderson [mailto:[GRO]]; Anthony de Garr Robinson [mailto:[GRO]]
Cc: Gavin Matthews [mailto:[GRO]]; Jonathan Gribben [mailto:[GRO]]; Lucy Bremner [mailto:[GRO]]; Emma Campbell-Danesh [mailto:[GRO]]
Subject: RE: Scope of Horizon [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]

And yes, this one isn't urgent.

I'm still trying to get confirmation of whether the criminal lawyers are coming into Chambers on Monday...

A

Andrew Parsons

Partner
Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP

d: [GRO]
m:
t:
e:

[Stay informed: sign up to our e-alerts](#)



womblebond Dickinson.com



From: Simon Henderson [[mailto:](#) [GRO]]
Sent: 07 September 2018 09:48
To: 'Anthony de Garr Robinson'; Andrew Parsons
Cc: Gavin Matthews; Jonathan Gribben; Lucy Bremner; Emma Campbell-Danesh
Subject: RE: Scope of Horizon [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]

Hi Tony

Our emails crossed: but yes I'm happy to discuss on Monday morning

Best

Simon

From: Anthony de Garr Robinson [[mailto:](#) [GRO]]
Sent: 07 September 2018 09:47
To: 'Andrew Parsons' <[GRO]>; Simon Henderson <[GRO]>
Cc: Gavin Matthews <[GRO]>; Jonathan Gribben <[GRO]>
[GRO]>; Lucy Bremner <[GRO]>; Emma Campbell-Danesh <[GRO]>
Subject: RE: Scope of Horizon [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]

Bearing in mind the other things going on at the moment, I'd like a little time to reflect on this point and on the essay plan you sent over earlier, if that is possible.

Could we aim to respond on Monday afternoon, Andy? If so, would you be free to talk about this with me on Monday morning, Simon?

Best wishes,

Tony

From: Andrew Parsons <[GRO]>
Sent: 07 September 2018 08:07
To: Anthony de Garr Robinson <[GRO]>; Simon Henderson
<[GRO]>
Cc: Gavin Matthews <[GRO]>; Jonathan Gribben <[GRO]>
<[GRO]>; Lucy Bremner <[GRO]>; Emma Campbell-Danesh <[GRO]>
<[GRO]>
Subject: FW: Scope of Horizon [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]

Tony, Simon.

Second thing from Robert – see below.

The scope of Horizon is plainly going to be a big issue. I agree with Robert that moving the boundary to include POLSAP is a bad idea. I'm sure there are many ways that POLSAP and Horizon talk to each other, but the key one that I am aware of is TCs. In crude terms, TC information is manually loaded into POLSAP and then POLSAP sends the TCs to Horizon. This is why, I suspect, Coyne wants to include it.

In response to this:

First, I agree with Robert that this would be a massive increase in scope.

Second, we have given very little (if any?) disclosure on POLSAP.

Third, the definition of Horizon in the Horizon Issues is limited to just the Horizon system. There is no doubt in my mind (and I'm sure that Robert would back this up) that no properly informed person would say that POLSAP was part of Horizon – they are two separate systems, although part of a highly integrated IT estate.

Fourth, the Cs have no pleaded case against any system other than Horizon – see para 12 GPOC onwards that only talks about Horizon.

The challenge is whether or how to raise this with the Judge. The options I see are:

1. Raise it with the Judge before Coyne does his report. Perhaps Robert could do this under CPR 35.14? I'm not attracted to this approach:
 - o We already have enough work for the Judge to do with adding another issue (Simon – we have just made a security for costs and a strike out application on the Common Issues side – if you would like copies, please say).
 - o I think it will be difficult for the Judge to decide on this without first seeing the extent of the problem. This is a technical question about where you draw the boundary between one system and the next one: which in my experience of doing IT disputes is fertile ground for litigation in itself.

2. Raise it after we get Coyne's report, but put down a marker now in correspondence
 - This is my preferred way forward. Its pro-active but keeps our options open.
3. Stay silent and then use it as grounds to attack Coyne at trial. He's going to look pretty silly giving opinions on topics where there has been no disclosure or evidence.
 - This is a high stakes play because to make this work Robert will need to say nothing about POLSAP in his report, giving us nothing to throw back at Coyne.
 - It might irritate the Judge if we get to trial and there is a chasm between the two experts on an issue as fundamental as "what is the Horizon system?"

Thoughts?

A

Andrew Parsons

Partner
Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP

d: [GRO]
m:
t:
e:

[Stay informed: sign up to our e-alerts](#)



womblebond dickinson.com



Simon Henderson

4 Pump Court, Temple, London, EC4Y 7AN | www.4pumpcourt.com

T: [GRO]
E: | [View Profile](#)

Follow us on twitter [@4PumpCourt](#)
Connect with us on [LinkedIn](#)

Pump Court International | www.pumpcourtinternational.com

Terms of Work: Barristers at 4 Pump Court carry out services on 4 Pump Court Terms, which are available on our website, unless otherwise agreed in writing. | [View Terms](#)

Privacy: Your attention is drawn to our Privacy Notice in relation to any personal data that we may obtain and/or otherwise process about you. | [View Privacy Notice](#)

Notice of Confidentiality and Privilege: This email (including attachments) is confidential to the addressee, and may be subject to legal professional privilege. If you are not the addressee, you must not copy, distribute or otherwise use it or any information contained in this email. Please delete it, and destroy all copies

From: robert worden [[mailto:](#) [GRO]]
Sent: 06 September 2018 17:10
To: Andrew Parsons
Cc: 'Chris Emery'; Jonathan Gribben
Subject: Scope of Horizon

Andy -

In our JM meeting and in the JM itself, Coyne has clearly signalled that he will consider POLSAP to be within the boundary of Horizon.

I think there is no possibility of expert agreement here.

So it will be determined by lawyers sooner or later. We would be interested to know when you think that will be, and I can offer some expert considerations that are relevant.

In addressing robustness of Horizon - the core issue of the case - neither expert has the evidence to assess robustness of POLSAP. So issue 3 cannot be decided, if POLSAP is within Horizon. Coyne should have requested disclosure of POLSAP evidence a long time ago, if he needed to assess that.

Obviously POLSAP does all the accounting for PO - and being a SAP ERP system, probably also does a lot more as well. Accounting is just one module of SAP. So including POLSAP would be a massive increase in scope, bringing in a load of irrelevant stuff.

No doubt you will put all the arguments about proportionality, trial date, and so on.

Regards

Robert

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] only is authorised to access this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not [arobinson](#) [GRO], please notify [andrew.parsons](#) [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. Information about how we use personal data is in our [Privacy Policy](#) on our website.

Any files attached to this e-mail will have been checked by us with virus detection software before transmission. Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) 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 Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP, is neither given nor endorsed by it.

This email is sent by Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) 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.

Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP is a member of Womble Bond Dickinson (International) Limited, which consists of independent and autonomous law firms providing services in the US, the UK, and elsewhere around the world. Each Womble Bond Dickinson entity is a separate legal entity and is not responsible for the acts or omissions of, nor can bind or obligate, another Womble Bond Dickinson entity. Womble Bond Dickinson (International) Limited does not practice law. Please see

www.womblebonddickinson.com/legal notices for further details.

Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) 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>
