

**From:** Andrew Parsons <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** Anthony de Garr Robinson <[REDACTED]>, "Simon Henderson" <[REDACTED]>  
**Cc:** Jonathan Gribben <[REDACTED]>, Katie Simmonds <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** FW: Worden 3 - update and recommended action [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]  
**Date:** Wed, 22 May 2019 10:20:40 +0000  
**Importance:** Normal  
**Inline-Images:** image001.png; image002.png; image003.png; imagebf6260.PNG; image8cc895.PNG; imageb7d935.PNG; imagea6cd77.PNG; imagec17add.PNG; imagecb147d.PNG

---

FYI below

**Andrew Parsons**

Partner  
Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP

d: [REDACTED]  
m: [REDACTED]  
t: [REDACTED]  
e: [REDACTED]

[Manage your e-alert preferences](#)



womblebond Dickinson.com



---

**From:** Massey, Kirsten <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 22 May 2019 11:09  
**To:** Andrew Parsons <[REDACTED]>  
**Cc:** Ben.Foat@ [REDACTED]; Watts, Alan <[REDACTED]>; Rodric Williams <[REDACTED]>; Henderson, Tom <[REDACTED]>; Jonathan Gribben <[REDACTED]>; Katie Simmonds <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Re: Worden 3 - update and recommended action [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]

Thanks Andy.

Alan and I agree with your/Counsel's proposed course of action, but are happy to discuss if Post Office wishes to do so.

Kind regards

Kirsten

On 22 May 2019, at 10:35, Andrew Parsons <[REDACTED] GRO > wrote:

All

Further to the emails below, we have now reached the point where a decision is needed on whether to apply for permission to rely on Worden 3.

#### **Update**

I have attached the latest correspondence with Freeths. They are still refusing to offer any view on their approach to Worden 3. Their correspondence does however disingenuously suggest that Worden has not provided certain information to Coyne, when in fact Coyne said on a WP basis that he did not want this information. We will address this in our response.

There has also been no substantive progress between the experts. Attached is Worden's note of a call late last night with Coyne.

#### **Advice on permission application**

Counsel's view has not changed from the advice below – it is recommend that Post Office does not apply for permission. There is a real risk of criticism from the Claimants and the Court over this situation. However, we believe that not applying will attract less criticism and risk than making an application which would inevitably prompt an interlocutory hearing before the Horizon trial re-starts.

#### **Next steps**

Worden intends to send his report to the Court today. He will explain that the report was produced of his own volition and not prompted by Post Office. He will also explain that the report reflects his updated views and that he feels obliged to update the Court pursuant to the CPR. He is not going to be seeking directions from the Judge as we believe that this will look like a tactical game by Post Office.

If you agree that Post Office should not make an application for permission, then WBD should write to Freeths promptly to make this clear. It would be ideal to do this today just in case this is raised in Court tomorrow.

This will then leave the ball with the Claimants. They will need to decide whether to raise a complaint to the Judge, which presumably will be to seek some sort of direction that Post Office / Worden cannot rely on Worden 3. Alternatively, they may do nothing and wait to see if Worden raises Worden 3 when responding to questions in cross-examination and then complain to the Judge. There is also a possibility that the Judge may pro-actively do something, such as calling the parties in to discuss the matter. The path forward from here is unpredictable, but nevertheless we believe this to be better than Post Office prompting the debate now by making an application.

The best plausible outcome is that Worden 3 has life only as a document (rather than a formal expert report), that Worden is able to answer questions under cross-examination with no or minimal reference to it and we do not rely on it in closing submissions. Essentially, that Worden 3 drifts into anonymity.

## Decision needed

I would be grateful for your instructions on whether or not to apply for permission for Worden 3. If you would like to speak to Counsel, please let me know – they are available all day.

Kind regards  
Andy

## Andrew Parsons

Partner  
Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP

d:   
m:   
t:   
e: 









[Manage your e-alert preferences](#)

[<imagebf6260.PNG>](#)

[womblebond dickinson.com](http://womblebond dickinson.com)

[<image8cc895.PNG>](#) [<imageb7d935.PNG>](#)

---

**From:** Watts, Alan < >  
**Sent:** 16 May 2019 09:08  
**To:** Andrew Parsons < >; Rodric Williams  
< >; Massey, Kirsten < >; Henderson, Tom  
< >  
**Cc:** Jonathan Gribben < >; Katie Simmonds < >  
< >  
**Subject:** RE: Worden 3 - update and recommended action [WBUDK-AC.FID26896945]

Andy

I accept that Step 1 is inevitable as despite your and Counsel's best efforts Worden doesn't appear to understand the issues with Worden 3 and has convinced himself that he needs to send it to the Court. Happy to have a call later with you and Counsel to discuss what we then do although the current plan does look like a sensible one albeit not without its risks.

Regards

Alan

---

**From:** Andrew Parsons [[mailto:](#)GRO]  
**Sent:** 16 May 2019 08:58  
**To:** Rodric Williams; Watts, Alan; Massey, Kirsten; Henderson, Tom  
**Cc:** Jonathan Gribben; Katie Simmonds  
**Subject:** Worden 3 - update and recommended action [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]

All

As mentioned on our call on Monday, please find below an update on Worden 3.

In summary, the plan is for Worden to send his report on an open basis to Coyne (not the Court) today. As discussed previously, this step is inevitable and we cannot stop it happening. The next step will be a final decision on whether to make an application for permission to rely on Worden 3. We have a few more days to make that decision.

#### **Update**

The latest correspondence with Freeths is attached. This has not materially moved the position forward - Freeths have not provided a clear indication of their intentions. The ball is currently back in Freeths' court and we await their next letter.

As between the experts, Worden spoke to Coyne briefly yesterday afternoon. This has been the only substantive contact despite Worden chasing Coyne. Coyne has not done any material work on the report. He indicated that he would look at it over the weekend and was open to considering a joint statement. However, Coyne is on holiday for a week from Wednesday so the window is closing fast on the experts making any progress.

#### **Permission application**

Freeths' letter focuses on Worden 3 being outside the scope of the Horizon Issues. They say that the reliance on a Claimant based analysis is not permitted as the Horizon Issues are about Horizon in general and not about Claimants. We have counter-arguments to this point, not least that the Cs have put up Claimants as witnesses.

Counsel's concern is that substantial parts of Worden 1 and Worden 2 also undertake analyses related to Claimants. For example, Worden has assessed the extent of bugs by reference to the Cs having suffered £18.7m in shortfalls. If Worden 3 is rejected as being out of scope, this could set a precedent that has the consequential effect of making key parts of Worden 1 and Worden 2 potentially out of scope.

Counsel believes that Post Office has a better chance of defeating this argument (or the Judge just ignoring it) if it is addressed in closing submissions against the context of all the evidence, including the Claimants' own evidence.



Given Freeths' correspondence, an application for permission will almost certainly cause this debate to be had with the Judge before the trial resumes.

Although Counsel still believes that the "remote access" analysis of Worden 3 is valuable, the consequence of an adverse finding that parts of Worden's evidence is out of scope is so great that it outweighs the benefit of Worden 3. For this reason, our advice is that Post Office should not make an application for permission to rely on Worden 3.

### **Suggested plan**

Even if Post Office does not make an application for permission, Worden feels he has an obligation (para 2.5 PD35) to update the Court on Worden 3. We are not going to dissuade him from this. The report therefore needs to be sent on an open basis to the Cs and subsequently to the Court.

This then leaves the status of Worden 3 in an odd state. If asked about remote access or robustness in cross-examination (which is likely), Worden will need to make reference to Worden 3 as it reflects his views. It is difficult to predict how the Court and the Cs will respond to this. It is a very unusual state of affairs, and there is a substantial risk of criticism from the Judge. The alternative is to make an application for permission in the ordinary way but, for the reasons set out above, that is not recommended. We also continue to believe that such an application will more likely fail than succeed (see our previous advice).

Despite all this, there remains an outside chance that Coyne may engage with Worden 3 over the weekend. Any form of engagement is useful because it dampens down the argument that Coyne did not have time to consider it. We would therefore like to keep this opportunity open until next Wednesday when Coyne goes on holiday. Against that we need to weigh the possibility that Freeths are just running out the clock to the trial, thus increasing the force with which they can say they have been prejudiced.

In light of these considerations, our suggested plan is:

Worden send Worden 3 to Coyne today on an open basis. This is inevitably going to happen at some point and we see little benefit in delaying this. In his covering email, Worden makes clear that he intends to send Worden 3 to the Court not before next Wednesday. He says nothing about whether Post Office intends to seek permission.

Post Office says nothing for now. If we say now that Post Office is not applying for permission, Coyne will stop work and there will be no chance of any progress between the experts.

The ball is then with Freeths. If they are switched on, they will write asking us to make an application.

Post Office should then play for time until Wednesday. The pressure will mount on Coyne to engage before he goes on holiday and with Worden 3 out there on an open basis without a response.

On Wednesday next week, Worden 3 is sent to the Court and WBD writes to Freeths to confirm that Post Office is not making an application.

### **Decisions needed**

Step 1 above is inevitable and so unless anyone objects I intend to proceed with this today.

I will then set up a call with Counsel to discuss (i) the question on whether to make an application and (ii) the rest of the suggested plan above.

As always, happy to discuss.

Kind regards

Andy

**Andrew Parsons**

Partner

Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP

d:   
m:   
t:   
e: 

[Manage your e-alert preferences](#)

[womblebond Dickinson.com](http://womblebond Dickinson.com)

[<image001.png>](#)

[<image002.png>](#) [<image003.png>](#)

**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. [alan.watts@GRO](mailto:alan.watts@GRO) only is authorised to access this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not [alan.watts@GRO](mailto:alan.watts@GRO) please notify [andrew.parsons@GRO](mailto: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.womblebond Dickinson.com/legal](http://www.womblebond Dickinson.com/legal) notices for further details.

Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority.

Herbert Smith Freehills LLP and its subsidiaries and Herbert Smith Freehills, an Australian Partnership, are separate member firms of the international legal practice known as Herbert Smith Freehills.

This message is confidential and may be covered by legal professional privilege. If you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose or use the information contained in it. If you have received this email in error please notify us immediately by return email or by calling our main switchboard on +44 20 7374 8000 and delete the email.

Further information is available from [www.herbertsmithfreehills.com](http://www.herbertsmithfreehills.com), including our Privacy Policy which describes how we handle personal information.

Herbert Smith Freehills LLP is a Limited Liability Partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC310989. It is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors' Regulation Authority of England and Wales whose rules can be accessed via [www.sra.org.uk/code-of-conduct.page](http://www.sra.org.uk/code-of-conduct.page). A list of the members and their professional qualifications is open to inspection at the registered office, Exchange House, Primrose Street, London EC2A 2EG. We use the word partner of Herbert Smith Freehills LLP to refer to a member of Herbert Smith Freehills LLP, or an employee or consultant with equivalent standing and qualifications. Herbert Smith Freehills LLP's registration number for Value Added Tax in the United Kingdom is GB 927 1996 83.

<2019.05.21 Second Letter toFreeths (Horizon Issues Trial\_ Further Suppl....pdf.awsec>

<Letter to WBD - Worden Third Report.pdf.awsec>

<mime-attachment>

