



Date: 15 November 2019  
 Director General: Justin Manson  
 Lead Official: Joshua Scott / Tom Aldred  
 Lead Official Telephone: GRO

Recipient	To Note / Comment	To Approve / Decide
Andrea Leadsom	X	
Kelly Tolhurst		X
Special Advisors		
Permanent Secretary		X
Tom Taylor		X

**OFFICIAL SENSITIVE AND SUBJECT TO LEGAL PRIVILEGE – DO NOT FORWARD OR SHARE WITHOUT SEEKING LEGAL ADVICE**

### **APPROVAL FOR SETTLEMENT OFFER IN POST OFFICE LTD. (POL) LITIGATION**

#### **Summary**

1. POL is preparing for a mediation meeting with the Claimants in the Horizon litigation case to begin on 27 November. In order to enter mediation POL must have agreed how much it is prepared to offer to settle the case, and this figure must have prior approval from BEIS Ministers and CST. This note seeks your approval to a proposal from the POL Board to authorise settlement at a figure up to £65m. CST approval is being sought in parallel by HMT. Kelly Tolhurst has a phone call with officials on Monday 18<sup>th</sup> November to discuss.
2. The settlement working group of BEIS/UKGI/HMT officials met on 14<sup>th</sup> November and agreed to support the POL board's proposal for settlement at a figure up to £65m.

#### **Timing**

3. Urgent - A decision is required by 22 November.
4. Perm Sec's Office have confirmed that this issue is classed as 'essential business' which should be allowed to continue during the pre-election period. The scheduled mediation cannot reasonably be delayed until after the General Election without posing significant risks to POL's business. There is also a risk that, should POL ask to re-schedule the mediation to a later date, this would be looked upon unfavourably, including by the Court, and could ultimately lead to increased costs to the taxpayer.

#### **Recommendation**

5. We recommend that you:
  - **Approve** the POL Board's proposal for a settlement of up to £65m.
  - **Note** POL's mediation strategy, in particular noting the difficulties in settling claims of claimants who have been convicted of criminal offences

#### **Background**

6. Our submission of 8<sup>th</sup> November 2019 (attached **Annex A**) provided the background to this litigation and POL's mediation strategy. We advised that a decision seeking approval to a settlement range would be required by 22 November 2019. Since then POL's

UK Government  
InvestmentsDepartment for  
Business, Energy  
& Industrial Strategy

application for permission to appeal the first Common Issues judgment was heard by a Court of Appeal Judge on 12<sup>th</sup> November. The Judge is aware his decision on whether or not to grant permission to appeal is likely to have a bearing on the parties mediation strategy and has indicated that his decision will be sent to the parties next week. If permission is granted and POL's appeal is successful, POL will still be liable for damages. The recovery expected by the Claimants would fall but the eventual outcome would still be expected to be higher than the proposed settlement amount, particularly after taking account of the cost of additional trials.

7. POL's articles require them to have shareholder approval for any spend over £50m but as advised in our 8 November submission given the novel and contentious nature and Managing Public Money principles, any settlement amount will require approval by CST as well as by BEIS Ministers.

### **Mediation**

8. The POL Board sub-committee with oversight of the litigation and delegated authority to decide a settlement range met on 13<sup>th</sup> November and considered the attached advice (**Annex B and C**) from their lawyers Herbert Smith Freehills (HSF) on possible settlement ranges and criminal cases. That sub-committee agreed that HSF should be given authority to settle at up to £48m but that if a full and final settlement with all the claimants could be achieved for up to £65m then HSF could seek swift approval for a figure up to that limit from the sub-committee.
9. The BEIS/HMT/UKGI settlement working group also meet on 14<sup>th</sup> November to consider that advice and the settlement range agreed by the POL Board sub-committee. HSF also attended the initial part of that meeting to answer queries about their advice. The working group agreed that POL should have authority to settle up to £48m but that if a full and final settlement with all the claimants could be achieved for up to £65m then POL could seek further BEIS/HMT agreement to that. It is proposed that Carl Creswell (BEIS) will be the official authorised to consider, and if satisfied agree, a request from POL to settle at a figure beyond £48m and up to £65m.
10. POL have provided written confirmation to BEIS that on the basis of current forecasts it will be able to fund the proposed settlement range up to £65m (Annex B).
11. HSF have confirmed that their likely strategy at the mediation will be to make a first offer significantly below £48m and they will only look to increase it if there is a realistic prospect of achieving a final settlement with all the claimants at the mediation.

### **Settlement advice**

12. In broad summary the advice from HSF (Annex C) confirms their view that POL is likely to be unsuccessful in its defence of most of the 555 claims brought as part of this litigation and that a settlement level of between £40 and £65 million would be a good result for POL.
13. The key considerations around liability are:
  - a. Whether Post Office was entitled to hold the Claimants accountable for shortfalls;
  - b. Whether Post Office was entitled to suspend Postmasters without pay;
  - c. Whether Post Office was entitled to terminate the Claimants' contracts with or without notice;



UK Government  
Investments



Department for  
Business, Energy  
& Industrial Strategy

- d. Whether Post Office was in breach of its "good faith" duties and, if so, whether that has a bearing on (a), (b) and (c) or otherwise caused the Claimants any loss.
14. Against the background of the judgement in the Common Issues trial which was heavily critical of POL, the expectation of another adverse and critical judgement in the Horizon trial due imminently, HSF advise that while they can identify some weak claims, if the litigation runs its full course POL will be held liable and will have to pay damages to a large number of claimants.
15. On quantum HSF advise that in general terms the claims comprise:
  - a. Claims in contract for the recovery of shortfalls, loss of earnings and capital losses.
  - b. Claims in tort or for breach of statutory duty (e.g. for harassment, stress-related personal injury, stigma damages and malicious prosecution); and
  - c. Claims in restitution (e.g. for the recovery of shortfalls repaid by Claimants without a contractual relationship with Post Office).
16. HSF have done both a "ground-up" recoverability analysis (considering the heads of loss claimed and likely recoverability) and a "cost of fighting and losing analysis" (looking to put numbers around worst-case scenarios).
17. So far, the claimants have quantified their claims total £205.6m. This figure is likely to be understated because the claimants have not quantified all their losses and have expressly reserved their right to amend the values claimed. On a "ground-up" recoverability analysis the most significant driver of value is the period for which the claimants may be able to recover lost earnings resulting from the termination of their contracts. On the claimants calculations they account for circa £148m of their claim. HSF consider that for the purposes of their settlement advice a 1-2 year loss of earnings period is the best proxy. Applying that to the non-convicted claimants (494) indicates a figure of between £30-38m (including recoverable costs to date). Interest would also be recoverable which, depending on the rate awarded by the court, could bring the total value to £37m - £48m.
18. For the convicted claimants (61 cases) then assuming all succeed in having their convictions overturned HSF estimate their total claim value could range from £10.4m to £51m. This range could increase significantly if generous awards were made in favour of the 7 claimants who received custodial sentences – bringing the value recoverable across the convicted claimants to £40.7m - £133.7m.
19. On a "cost of fighting and losing analysis" HSF consider there is a clear risk that POL would be worse off financially fighting the litigation all the way and losing than they would by settling at the levels they propose. If the claimants succeeded on all their quantified claims two years down the line POL's liability would be in the order of between £253.8m and £309.4m. If POL succeeded in confining post-termination losses to 2 years its liability might be in the order of between £104.7m and £124.5m.
20. HSF have also advised around the difficulties with settling with the convicted claimants. They have produced a separate note (Annex D) specifically covering this cohort. Broadly their advice is to leave it to the claimants to decide how to divide any settlement sum between them. They advise there are significant risks in offering settlement sums to

UK Government  
InvestmentsDepartment for  
Business, Energy  
& Industrial Strategy

convicted claimants as that will undermine the convictions. Assuming the mediation is unsuccessful HSF advise that individual offers should be made to each non-convicted claimant which if that claimant does not better at trial means they are at risk of paying POL's costs incurred after the offer was made. We consider further thought needs to be given to this strategy, particularly because it is likely POL could refuse to settle with convicted claimants who, apart from a conviction, are factually in exactly the same position as non-convicted claimants i.e. they got into difficulty because of problems with Horizon and/or other breaches of duty owed by POL and when faced with a prosecution by POL felt they had to plead guilty to a charge of false accounting to avoid a more serious charge of theft. HSF has advised that their approach is likely to be unacceptable for the convicted Claimants and therefore reduces the chances that the mediation will succeed. UKGI has challenged HSF to re-consider whether settling with the convicted Claimants is a viable option and to advise POL as to what the consequences would be.

### **Next Steps**

21. Mediation is scheduled for 27/28 November. At this stage it is considered unlikely that the settlement amount proposed will be acceptable to the claimants. However, POL cannot enter the mediation without an agreed and approved settlement strategy – specifically a starting position and a ceiling beyond which it will not be willing to go in the initial mediation.
22. Although no precise figure has been put forward, the indications are that the Claimants will be starting at a level very substantially higher than the level that POL's advisers believe could be achieved if the litigation runs its full course. POL's primary objective in the mediation is to obtain a better understanding of the Claimants' negotiating position, better understand the full extent of the claims and to make arguments to the Claimants to support its offer in order to reduce the Claimants' expectations to a more realistic level. This will inform the approach to likely subsequent mediation prior to the next trial in March 2020 or any settlement talks that take place in the meantime.

### **Comms Handling**

23. As noted in our 8<sup>th</sup> November submission, this litigation has attracted significant media attention in the past. Given that we are now in Purdah, the BEIS Press Office will be restricted in its ability to comment if approached by media. As far as possible, we will point any enquiries to existing PQ responses setting out the government's position and direct media to published Purdah guidance for an explanation as to why government can approve spend of this nature during the election. Outside of Purdah, we will prepare full reactive media handling working closely with POL, though are likely to be somewhat constrained by ongoing legal proceedings and mediation.

### **Contributors**

24. BEIS POL policy and finance colleagues have been consulted on this advice and are content with its contents. BEIS and UKGI Legal have also been consulted on the content of this submission. Note, BEIS Legal have not advised on or given a view on the litigation strategy proposed by HSF.