

From: Anthony Grabiner [GRO]
To: "andrew.parsons@" [GRO]
Cc: David Neuberger [GRO], David Cavender [GRO], Rob Smith [GRO]

Subject: Post Office

Date: Wed, 8 May 2019 18:57:06 +0000

Importance: Normal

Dear Andrew,

I've been through the draft skeleton and I've discussed it with David N.

It's a very long document but that's a reflection of the length of the judgment, the large number of points that need to be addressed and the poor quality of the judgment. It's more difficult to deal on an appeal with a bad judgment than a good one.

David and I think the draft covers the points. We do not think that concessions should be made, eg on the implied terms, because, as previously advised, we think the co-operation and Stirling v Maitland implications are effective and would be readily implied in this case without the need to manufacture further terms which is what the Judge in his wisdom has done.

We wonder if it might be possible to incorporate a high level executive summary for the benefit of the CofA reading the document. It's always useful to give them a guide as to where the document is going and what the key points are.

We haven't addressed the bits of grammar and typos which should be sorted out before the draft is finalised.

Regards,

Tony

Lord Grabiner QC
One Essex Court
Temple
London, EC4Y 9AR

GRO

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>
