

**From:** Susan Crichton [GRO]  
**To:** "andrew.parsons;" [GRO] Rodric Williams [GRO]  
**Cc:** Hugh Flemington [GRO], Jarnail A Singh [GRO], "gavin.matthews;" [GRO]  
[GRO]

**Subject:** Re: Thoughts from the meeting this morning

**Date:** Fri, 12 Jul 2013 14:16:20 +0000

**Importance:** Normal

**Inline-Images:** image014.gif; image015.png; image016.png; image017.png; image018.png; image019.gif; image020.png; image004.jpg; image005.jpg; image006.jpg

---

These ideas come from the JFSA - I don't think SS have had a hand in this -

---

**From:** Parsons, Andrew [GRO]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 12, 2013 02:06 PM  
**To:** Susan Crichton; Rodric Williams  
**Cc:** Hugh Flemington; Jarnail A Singh; Matthews, Gavin [GRO]  
**Subject:** RE: Thoughts from the meeting this morning

Susan

Alan's approach seems similar to what we discussed yesterday, however there are some critical differences:

- SS seem to be being used as a weapon by JFSA to force POL into settlement - that is not their job.
- The approach assumes POL is liable and will offer settlements (and seems to hint at cash settlements). I'm not sure where SS have got this idea from? Any hint that POL may be considering cash settlements would encourage the toxic cases, encourage Shoosmiths and play badly in the media. I think we need to put a stop to this quickly.
- Item 2 - SS should not be reporting on the "level of damage" suffered by an SPMR - this is way outside SS' scope of work or expertise.
- Item 4 - I would remove SS from the adjudicator / mediator position. SS cannot act as mediator between POL and SPMRs - it is not independent, it will be looking for defend its own conclusions in its report.
- Item 5 (a) - agree that there should be a way to "arbitrate" if no resolution is reach between POL and the SPMRs. This however is through the courts and will not involve SS.
- Item 5(b) - SS have no role in criminal issues. That is a matter solely from the criminal courts.
- Overall, SS are still approaching their work on a "case by case" basis rather than focussing on general themes.

I wonder if rather than Paula discussing this further with SS, she should tell them that we will pick this up at our meeting on Tuesday? We (or me as the pushy external lawyer) can then be slightly more firm with them

Kind regards

Andy

**Andrew Parsons**  
Senior Associate

for and on behalf of Bond Dickinson LLP

*Bond Dickinson*

Direct: [GRO]  
Mobile: [GRO]

WBD\_000638.000001

Fax:

Follow Bond Dickinson:



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

---

**From:** Susan Crichton   
**Sent:** 12 July 2013 14:24  
**To:** Rodric Williams; Parsons, Andrew  
**Cc:** Hugh Flemington; Jarnail A Singh  
**Subject:** FW: Thoughts from the meeting this morning

Rod and Andy - this is an email chain which starts with Alan Bates - could you take a look at his

---

**From:** Alwen Lyons  
**Sent:** 12 July 2013 13:41  
**To:** Susan Crichton  
**Subject:** FW: Thoughts from the meeting this morning

Don't know if Paula has sent you this already

Thanks

Alwen

---

**Alwen Lyons** I Company Secretary



148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ



Postline:



[@postofficenews](mailto:@postofficenews)



**Thoughts from the meeting this morning**

**Reply-To:** Alan Bates

Any time after 10 am and please keep trying my mobile as I will be in the valleys and reception can be intermittent.

---

**From:** Paula Vennells  
**Sent:** 12 July 2013 12:50  
**To:** Alwen Lyons  
**Subject:** Fwd: Thoughts from the meeting this morning

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

---

**From:** Alan Bates  
  
**Date:** 11 July 2013 21:22:52 BST  
**To:** Paula Vennells  
  
**Subject:** Re:

----- Original message -----

From: Paula Vennells [GRO]  
Date:  
To: Alan Bates [GRO]  
Subject: Re: Thoughts from the meeting this morning

Alan, thank you very much indeed.

I will look at this properly, it is helpful to have a 'starter for ten'.

A question for clarification: I think 4a suggests POL may agree to some sort of apology or settlement or redress - is that right? And presumably, as you refer to convictions under 5, 4a implies an out of court agreement? If that is correct, can we talk about what that could be?

This is simply for discussion with no commitment either way - but it will help shape my understanding.

I am happy to call you tomorrow? Is that possible?

Paula

Sent from my iPhone

On 11 Jul 2013, at 20:06, "Alan Bates" [GRO] wrote:

Hello Paula,

Following on from the discussion this morning I drafted the following note on one possible way forward to deal with the historic cases using a number of stages. I sent it to Janet for James to see, but I understand that he will be in his constituency all tomorrow and knowing time is pressing thought I should send it to you. It is only the barebones of a scheme and much work is required if it is not unacceptable. Hence the email to find out if such a direction might work for POL.

The approach would be to assess each of the cases, in the first instance on the thematic/systemic failures/issues and secondly, the software/hardware problems. Weight would be given to each document of supporting evidence provided by the exSPMR as well as other factors surrounding their issue. By the same token, weight would be given to any supporting documentation provided by POL in reply to the assertions made by the exSPMR.

Process

1. With the aid of JFSA, 2<sup>nd</sup> Sight would batch the cases by location and arrange to interview each person in that batch at a small number of locations around the country (time assessment required + interviews to arrange; other assessor to be involved specializing in these types of issues, able to explain realities to victim).
2. 2<sup>nd</sup> Sight + specialist assessor would prepare a summary of each case measured against the systemic issues and other factors, producing a summary report to the extent of damage claimed by the treatment by POL.
3. Each case report is sent to POL for comment and assessment/agreement, then POL prepares a response and declares what they believe might be suitable (POL may wait for all reports to be completed to assess liability). 2<sup>nd</sup> Sight and JFSA would assist if required.

4. exSPMR, possibly through 2<sup>nd</sup> Sight, discusses (on telephone) response from POL, and
  - a. Accepts POL's response and implications
  - b. Refutes POL's comments, adds their own and updated report then returned to POL, starts point 3 again.
5. If victim chooses 4a, POL meets agreed settlement.

To be considered

- a. If 4b continually fails there has to be a way to arbitrate the issue.
- b. The matter of any conviction has to be addressed at some point.
- c. Timescales required for:-
  - I. Dealing with historic cases
  - II. Responses from each of the parties
  - III. Accepting new cases

Personally I think such a scheme could run quite quickly once the finer details and processes have been established.

Your initial thoughts would be welcomed, but it is one way to clear out the historic cases.

Regards

Alan

---

\*\*\*\*\*

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended for the addressee only. If you are not the named recipient, you must not use, disclose, reproduce, copy or distribute the contents of this communication. If you have received this in error, please contact the sender by reply email and then delete this email from your system. Any views or opinions expressed within this email are solely those of the sender, unless otherwise specifically stated.

POST OFFICE LIMITED is registered in England and Wales no 2154540. Registered Office: 148 OLD STREET, LONDON EC1V 9HQ.

\*\*\*\*\*

---

\*\*\*\*\*

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended for the addressee only. If you are not the named recipient, you must not use, disclose, reproduce, copy or distribute the contents of this communication. If you have received this in error, please contact the sender by reply email and then delete this email from your system. Any views or opinions expressed within this email are solely those of the sender, unless otherwise specifically stated.

POST OFFICE LIMITED is registered in England and Wales no 2154540. Registered Office: 148 OLD STREET, LONDON EC1V 9HQ.

\*\*\*\*\*

**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. susan.crichton@bond-dickinson.com **GRO** only is authorised to access this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not susan.crichton@bond-dickinson.com **GRO**, please notify andrew.parsons@bond-dickinson.com **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.

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

This email is sent for and on behalf of Bond Dickinson LLP which is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales under number OC317661. Our registered office is St Ann's Wharf, 112 Quayside, Newcastle Upon Tyne, NE1 3DX, 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.

Bond Dickinson LLP is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority.

---

\*\*\*\*\*

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended for the addressee only. If you are not the named recipient, you must not use, disclose, reproduce, copy or distribute the contents of this communication. If you have received this in error, please contact the sender by reply email and then delete this email from your system. Any views or opinions expressed within this email are solely those of the sender, unless otherwise specifically stated.

POST OFFICE LIMITED is registered in England and Wales no 2154540. Registered Office: 148 OLD STREET, LONDON EC1V 9HQ.

\*\*\*\*\*