

Message

---

**Sent:** 18/10/2023 11:20:21  
**Subject:** FW: NFSP piece

On 16 Nov 2018, at 13:24, Lynn Eccles [GRO](#) wrote:

Thanks Amanda, Calum the ongoing court case line doesn't entirely stand-up because not all of these questions are linked directly to what's happening in court.

Still, I don't think we should provide a detailed comment, it'll give the discussion around our independence legs. I think there is also a risk if we just step up and defend the NFSP it gives support to the perception that we only really care about the Fed and not the SPMRs which are part of this class action.

Nick will criticise us for hiding behind court process but given that we are no longer firmly coming down on one side or the other I think that's the best we can do for now.

Suggest something like this:

*Thanks for sharing the blog and giving us a right to reply. We welcome the opportunity for these matters to be explored fully in court and respect the court's process. We do not wish to contribute to a running commentary on the case and won't be making any comment until all matters have been aired in court.*

FYI – he will come back to us for a comment when it is all done and dusted so you will need to be ready for that.

Best wishes  
Lynn

---

**From:** Amanda Cox  
**Sent:** 16 November 2018 12:58  
**To:** Calum Greenhow [GRO](#)  
**Cc:** Lynn Eccles [GRO](#)  
**Subject:** FW: NFSP piece

Amanda Cox  
General Office Supervisor and Receptionist  
The National Federation of SubPostmasters

<image001.jpg>

Evelyn House, 22 Windlesham Gardens  
Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5AZ

T:  
E:  
W: [www.nfsp.org.uk](http://www.nfsp.org.uk)

**GRO**

<image002.jpg> <image003.jpg> <image004.png>

This email (and any attachment) is confidential, may be legally privileged and is intended for the addressee only. If you have received it in error please inform us immediately by email responding to the sender and then delete this message. Please do not copy it, disclose its contents to any other person or use it for any purpose. Thank you for your cooperation.

We have taken reasonable precautions to ensure that this email and any attachments have been scanned for software viruses. We cannot accept liability for any damage sustained as a result of software viruses and would advise you to carry out your own virus checks before opening any attachment.

You can view our privacy policy online at [www.nfsp.org.uk/privacy](http://www.nfsp.org.uk/privacy)

National Federation of SubPostmasters is a company limited by guarantee (incorporated in England, company number 09771284)

---

**From:** Nick Wallis [GRO] **On Behalf Of** Nick Wallis  
**Sent:** 16 November 2018 12:57  
**To:** Amanda Cox [GRO]  
**Subject:** NFSP piece

Hi

I am a journalist covering the Bates v Post Office high court trial and yesterday, as you may know, the NFSP's independence was queried in court.

I have covered this as a reporter and published a separate piece for my blog outlining the NFSP's historic refusal to get behind claims that Horizon is not fit for purpose.

My separate piece is a piece of comment and I am very hard on the NFSP - focusing on its contractual inability to criticise the Post Office on this issue and the decision it appears to have taken as an organisation that it is better to let its members hang out to dry if they are having problems with Horizon, in order to protect the integrity of the brand to clients and other Subpostmasters (as explained by George Thomson in his evidence to parliament on 3 Feb 2015).

It is both right and fair to offer you the opportunity to have your position acknowledged and incorporated into the piece.

You could do this in one of two ways - issue a statement or have the right of reply.

If you want to issue a statement I would you to comment on:

- 1) your refusal to effectively support the claimants when they were having problems and during this litigation
- 2) your independence from the Post Office, or lack of it
- 3) your inability to do anything which could materially damage the post office as part of the terms of your funding agreement
- 4) whether your position on Horizon has evolved since George Thomson's comments to parliament in 2015
- 5) whether, as the Post Office infer, you support their assertion that this case is without merit

If the CEO of the NFSP would prefer to write a right of reply piece for publication on my blog, he would be more than welcome.

The blog piece is here: <https://www.postofficetrial.com/2018/11/bates-v-post-office-nfsp.html> the write up of yesterday in court is here: <https://www.postofficetrial.com/2018/11/day-6-write-up-post-office-speaks.html> the live tweets unroll is here: <https://www.postofficetrial.com/2018/11/day-6-live-tweets.html>

Many thanks

Nick

Nick Wallis

GRO

[@nickwallis](https://twitter.com/nickwallis)

[www.nickwallis.com](http://www.nickwallis.com)