NFSP00000710

Message

From: Jon Follenfant [GRO]
Sent: 14/11/2018 11:00:50
To: thesubpostmaster [GRO]
CC: Jim Nott [GRO]; Kevin Whitlock [GRO]; Calum Greenhow [GRO]; Peter Hall [GRO]
Subject: Re: Articles for the Magazine?

Hi all
Whilst I concur with Kevin's suggestion and agree that the reporting is paid for by crowd funding, the case before the high court is the first of I believe three and thus it would be unwise to pass any NFSP opinion at this time.
However I do feel that as an organisation we should establish whether we, through reductions in remuneration or having any improvements withheld, are footing the bill for the very expensive legal costs and if the outcome is eventually not in POLs favour any compensation.
With a basically flat income stream the only way POL can pay is by reducing costs - us.
Sorry to bang on
Jon
Sent from my iPhone

On 14 Nov 2018, at 09:32, thesubpostmaster <GRO> wrote:

> I support Kevin's approach and I think we should report the bare facts in the news pages as he suggests (absolutely neutrally). We will lose credibility if we just pretend it isn't happening.
>
> Just for clarity, Nick Wallis crowdfunded his reporting of the case rather than being paid by CWU – of course those who support the case will have donated to his crowdfund.
>
> **From:** Jim Nott
> **Sent:** 14 November 2018 09:21
> **To:** Kevin Whitlock <GRO>; Calum Greenhow <GRO>; thesubpostmaster <GRO>; Jon Follenfant <GRO>
> **Cc:** Peter Hall <GRO>
> **Subject:** Re: Articles for the Magazine?
>
> Hi Kevin
>
> I think that would be the best way to approach this action
>
> Thanks
>
> Jim
>
> Get Outlook for iOS
>
> **From:** Kevin Whitlock <GRO>
> **Sent:** Tuesday, November 13, 2018 6:08 pm
> **To:** Calum Greenhow; thesubpostmaster; Jon Follenfant

NFSP00000710

Cc: Peter Hall; Jim Nott
Subject: Re: Articles for the Magazine?

Hi all

My tuppenceworth with a journalistic hat on. As others have said, it would be extremely unwise to make any comment, especially as we are a monthly magazine.

The Horizon case has always been a tricky one for the magazine. I can understand the sensitivities of the case and the NFSP's relationship with PO, but I do think we need to - carefully - acknowledge that it is happing when and as appropriate.

It was reported by BBC Radio 4 and the FT last week and I'm sure that some members will wonder why the national media has reported the case but their magazine has not even mentioned it.

I don't think it is appropriate for it to appear in Letters (at least, not until the present High Court case is completed) but I do feel it is appropriate to report the bare facts in the news pages, especially as (at least as I understand it) it focusses on the contractual relationship between POs and subpostmasters.

I also understand that this hearing (due to finish at the end of the month) will not be the end of things - there's another hearing in March 2019, when the judge will listen to complaints from individual claimants.

I don't think we should ignore it - especially as the likes of CWU will be all over this like a rash - maybe a short (and punctilliously neutral) Q&A/explanation of the nuts and bolts with a timeline, explaining the bare bones of the case to those not involved but with an interest?

What does everyone think?

K

On Thursday, 8 November 2018, 17:24:48 GMT, Jon Follenfant <GRO> wrote:

Thanks Calum

If I remember correctly POL put a few million pounds aside in the recent accounts for legal fees and as this trial and subsequent related trials will run for some time they will end up spending much more. Without any prejudice to the final result, unless these fees, and if they lose any compensation/fines, are separately underwritten by HM Government the only place that they can get this money is from us. I wonder if this could be clarified with POL as I am sure our present members sympathise with the claimants they will be very unhappy if we have to pay for legal fees and past mistakes by POL.

Regards

NFSP00000710

Jon

From: Calum Greenhow <GRO>
Sent: 08 November 2018 16:45
To: thesubpostmaster <GRO>
Cc: Jon Follenfant <GRO>; Kevin Whitlock <GRO>; Peter Hall <GRO>; Jim Nott <GRO>
Subject: Re: Articles for the Magazine?

Hi Jon,

My view point is that as individuals with personal interest in this case, we want to know the verdict of the Judge but it would be unwise for us to make any comment at this stage.

I was present today. I would say that we are still at the opening credits of the case so it is way too early to ascertain which way it will go.

As Lynn suggests acknowledging that the case is being heard and we await the judgement with interest is the best we should do via the Subpostmaster.

For interest, we received an email yesterday in respect of the case, which was probably the vilest I have seen in all my working life. I'm sure it won't be the last but we will not be drawn or respond until the Judge has made his decision.

Calum

Sent from my iPad

On 8 Nov 2018, at 16:28, thesubpostmaster <GRO> wrote:

> Thanks Jon, straight court reporting is difficult as a monthly magazine reporting on an ongoing court case what we say quickly becomes out of date. Previously our public stance has been to support PO's position. I think an acknowledgement it is happening but a neutral position whilst the case is being heard is the most sensible but Calum has been there today so cc'd to him.

NFSP00000710

We are aware of the forum you mention – it is perhaps something we could cover as part of the new bimonthly NC updates cc'd to Jim for a view.

Finally, please send anything magazine related to Peter – next week is my last week!

Best wishes

Lynn

From: Jon Follenfant [mailto GRO
Sent: 08 November 2018 16:23
To: thesubpostmaster <GRO>; Kevin Whitlock <GRO>
Subject: Articles for the Magazine?

Hi

Two things:

There is a Forum of POL people and Subpostmasters which meets to outline new proposals, new kit etc – perhaps a report is needed in the magazine

I have been following the initial High Court case about Horizon problems and the disciplinary action taken by POL over the years – quite interesting and potentially a major issue for the POL in the future. It must be costing POL and thus the network a lot of money in legal fees. Whether we can be that critical in a magazine funded by POL is an interesting point.

Regards

Jon