

Mandy Talbot

27/07/2006 16:54 To: Vicky Harrison/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE
cc: Andy Bayfield/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, Area Intervention Office 4@POSTOFFICE,
Graham C Ward/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, stephen dilley
Subject: Re: P.O -v- Castleton: Transaction logs

GRO

This is a test case as far as the business is concerned so I think that Fujitsu should be invited to explain but this assumes that they understand the content of the cash accounts. Graham do you think that they have sufficient understanding of the cash accounts to do this for us recalling the rather one line responses we have had from them in the past.

Mandy Talbot
Litigation Team Leader
Company Secretary's Office
Royal Mail Legal Services
148 Old Street
London EC1V 9HQ

Postline: GRO
External Email: GRO

Vicky Harrison

27/07/2006 15:50 To: Mandy Talbot/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE
cc: Graham C Ward/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, Andy Bayfield/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE,
Area Intervention Office 4@POSTOFFICE
Subject: Re: P.O -v- Castleton: Transaction logs

Mandy I think Graham's suggestion below is the best way forward really as I could check through transaction logs and see if I could match them to the cash account but this would be a major exercise and I don't have the time to allocate to such a lengthy task right now or probably before moving onto another role as a result of OD. Plus yes Graham is right in that should I find anomalies I would not be able to explain them and also I don't have any cash accounts or other paperwork to actually check the figures against either.

Please could you let me know how you wish to proceed?

Steve please place on the EFC.
Regards

Vicky Harrison
Contracts and Services Mgr area 4
2nd Floor
Markets Bo
6-16 New York Street
Leeds
LS2 7DZ

----- Forwarded by Vicky Harrison/e/POSTOFFICE on 27/07/2006 15:46 -----

Graham C Ward

27/07/2006 15:38

To: Vicky Harrison/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE
cc:
Subject: Re: P.O -v- Castleton: Transaction logs

Vicky

Sorry for butting in & without wishing to become involved in this case myselfthis analysis could be a long exercise with each entry on the weeks transactions logs having to be thoroughly and methodically examined & cross referenced with the cash account. Presumably you are already involved in this case and have the expertise to undertake the task but I was wondering whether such an analysis might be best dealt with by someone from Fujitsu (if there were anomalies then they would be the one's who'd have to explain them !!).

Give me a call if you wish to discuss or perhaps you might like to run my suggestion via Mandy Talbot as there would no doubt be a cost implication if we were to approach Fujitsu.

Regards

Graham

Casework Manager
Post Office Ltd Investigation Team

PO BOX 1, CROYDON, CR9 1WN

Postline
GRO
External Email: GRO GRO

"Stephen Dilley"
GRO
27/07/2006 15:09
To: <vicky.harrison@postoffice.co.uk>
cc: <mandy.talbot@postoffice.co.uk> <cheryl.woodward@postoffice.co.uk>
"Tom Beezer" <tom.beezer@postoffice.co.uk> <rmorgat@postoffice.co.uk>
<graham.c.ward@postoffice.co.uk>
Subject: P.O -v- Castleton: Transaction logs

Dear Vicky,

I attach a copy letter dated 25 July from Mr Castleton's solicitors. Its long winded, but they seem to be saying that they've compared the transaction logs you sent to me with the cash accounts for week 42 (just for an initial analysis) and they don't match. They conclude that Horizon is therefore only recording half the transaction.

As you know, the P.O says its irrelevant that it doesn't have all the giro and other receipts for the relevant period when the losses occurred because it can instead rely on the electronic transaction logs which are effectively a full audit trail. However, if Castleton is correct that the transaction logs are inaccurate, this would completely undermine the P.O's claim.

I don't want to prejudge this issue, because Mr Castleton has got the maths wrong before and leapt to erroneous conclusions. However, what would be helpful is if someone at the P.O could review what Castleton is saying, compare the transaction logs with the cash accounts and let me know if he's right or wrong and explain why.

If Castleton is wrong, we should explain why. Perhaps it will dent his confidence and at last persuade him to settle. If Castleton is right, then I need to know what the implications are for the claim sooner rather than later as we are now in the period when we're incurring more costs preparing witness statements and expert reports etc for trial.

I look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible.

Kind regards.

Stephen Dilley
Solicitor
for and on behalf of Bond Pearce LLP

GRO

www.bondpearce.com

The information in this e-mail and any attachments are confidential and may be legally privileged and protected by law. The intended recipient only is authorised to access this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender as soon as possible and delete any copies. Unauthorised use, dissemination, distribution, publication or copying of this communication is prohibited.

Any files attached to this e-mail will have been checked by us with virus detection software before transmission. You should carry out your own virus checks before opening any attachment. Bond Pearce LLP accepts no liability for any loss or damage which may be caused by software viruses.

Bond Pearce LLP is a Limited Liability Partnership registered in England and Wales number OC311430.

Registered Office: 3 Temple Quay, Temple Back East, Bristol, BS1 6DZ.

A list of Members is available from our registered office. Any reference to a Partner in relation to Bond Pearce LLP means a Member of Bond Pearce LLP. Bond Pearce LLP is regulated by the Law Society.

>>>> eCopy scanned document.pdf attachment was removed from this email <<<<