Message	
From:	Jane MacLeod [jane.macleod@GRO]
Sent:	31/01/2018 18:31:17
To:	Thomas P Moran [thomas.p.moran@;; Rodric Williams [rodric.williams@]
CC:	Andrew Parsons [andrew.parsons@ <u>groj</u>]; Mark Underwood1 [mark.underwood1@ gro];
	Melanie Corfield [melanie.corfield@[GRO]
Subject:	RE: Postmaster Group Litigation - Disclosure CMC Skeleton Arguments - SUBJECT TO LEGAL PRIVILEGE - DO NOT FORWARD

I will share with Paula & Al, however just to reassure you, I had long discussions with Paula over the weekend about the hearing, and briefed the Board on it on Monday.

Jane



Jane MacLeod

Group Director of Legal, Risk & Governance Ground Floor 20 Finsbury Street LONDON EC2Y 9AQ

Mobile number: GRO

From: Thomas P Moran			
Sent: 31 January 2018 18:25			
To: Rodric Williams < rodric.williams@	GRO	>; Jane MacLeod <jane.macleod@ <b="">GRO ></jane.macleod@>	
Cc: Andrew Parsons <andrew.parsons@< td=""><td>GRO</td><td>>; Mark Underwood1 <mark.underwood1@< td=""><td></td></mark.underwood1@<></td></andrew.parsons@<>	GRO	>; Mark Underwood1 <mark.underwood1@< td=""><td></td></mark.underwood1@<>	
Melanie Corfield <melanie.corfield@< td=""><td>GRO</td><td></td><td></td></melanie.corfield@<>	GRO		
Subject: RE: Postmaster Group Litigation -	Disclosu	ure CMC Skeleton Arguments - SUBJECT TO LEGAL PRIVILEGE - DO NO)T
FORWARD			

Thanks, Rod

From a brief read this is a very helpful note, showing we are well prepared but can expect the unexpected.

I think it would be useful for you or Jane to share this with the GE/Paula and Al before Friday as it sets the context and would remind them this is happening.

Mel - do we have a statement ready?

Tom

From: Rodric Williams						
Sent: 31 January 2018 18:21						
To: Jane MacLeod <jane.macleod@[< td=""><td>GRO</td><td>); Thomas P Moran <<u>thomas.p.moran</u></td><td>@</td><td>GRO</td><td>]></td><td></td></jane.macleod@[<>	GRO); Thomas P Moran < <u>thomas.p.moran</u>	@	GRO]>	
Cc: Andrew Parsons <andrew.parsons@< td=""><td>GRO</td><td>; Mark Underwood1 <<u>mark.underw</u></td><td><u>ood1@</u></td><td>GRO</td><td></td><td>_>;</td></andrew.parsons@<>	GRO	; Mark Underwood1 < <u>mark.underw</u>	<u>ood1@</u>	GRO		_>;
Melanie Corfield < <u>melanie.corfield@</u>	GRO	>				
Subject: Postmaster Group Litigation - Di	sclosure	CMC Skeleton Arguments - SUBJECT TO	LEGAL P	RIVILEGE	E - DO) NOT
FORWARD						

SUBJECT TO LEGAL PRIVILEGE - DO NOT FORWARD

Jane, Tom,

Friday's Disclosure CMC has been listed for <u>9:15am</u>. We will be told which Courtroom before close of play tomorrow.

In advance of the CMC I attach the parties' "Skeleton Arguments", which rehearse the legal positons the barristers will be taking. The headline points are:

- Both parties acknowledge the constructive and cooperative approach taken since the last CMC, which has resulted in substantial agreement between the parties.
- This includes agreement on the following matters which we proposed:
 - The March 2019 hearing should be abandoned in favour of a Lead Cases trial in 2019/2020;
 - o Disclosure should be approached in discrete stages; and
 - Disclosure should be approached using the Court's new proposed protocols for disclosure (the scope of disclosure within those protocols remains disputed).
- Patrick Green QC does however level some criticisms at us concerning:
 - the delivery of a witness statement, "Parsons 6", which provides evidence about the practical effects of the parties' competing disclosure options (he says it's "tendentious" and calculated to ambush; we believe it was necessary and filed as soon as possible);
 - the availability of Horizon data (he says we did not inform the Claimants that only post-October 2007 data was available until *after* Lead Claimants were selected; this is not the case, and have correspondence which shows that);
 - tinkering with the court timetable (he says we were wrong to try to agree facts before disclosure, when the timetable provides for the other way around; we say we asked for an indicative draft of the facts they would want to agree to help narrow disclosure).
- David Cavender QC aims not to rise to the bait, which he does not think will impress Mr Justice Fraser or advance our cause.
- The main area of dispute will be the scope of evidence to be disclosed:
 - The Claimants continue to seek wide ranging disclosure covering matters which include (at a very general level) how postmaster contracts operate in practice.
 - They say this is necessary to determine the "true meaning" of the contract and whether it should be rewritten as they contend.
 - We say that established legal principles restrict evidence on issues of contract construction (the main purpose of the November 2018 trial) to what was known *before* the parties made their contract.
 - Nevertheless, so as to be cooperative we have also offered to disclose documents relating to how the 12 Lead Claimants dealt with us *after* the contract was made.
- This issue should turn on how far Mr Justice Fraser wants:
 - to let the Claimants develop their case on the "true meaning" of the contract, or to follow the more orthodox approach to contract construction; and/or
 - \circ $\;$ to embrace the principles of the new disclosure protocols.
- It is also possible that the Court will consider timetabling for a Lead Cases trial to follow the November 2018 trial:
 - The Claimants propose no directions to trial, except that we provide disclosure for it in October 2018 (i.e. immediately before the November 2018 trial).
 - We have proposed a timetable setting out the steps which need to be taken to a trial in May or October 2020.
 - Progress on this issue will largely depend on how much court time is available.

Please let me know if you have any questions or comments. Kind regards, Rod



Rodric Williams Head of Legal - Dispute Resolution & Brand 20 Finsbury Street

2017 Winner of the Global Postal Award for Customer	London EC2Y 9AQ
Experience	T: GRO
	E: rodric.williams@(GRO

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: Finsbury Dials, 20 Finsbury Street, London EC2Y 9AQ.
