

**From:** Jane MacLeod <jane.macleod [GRO]>  
**To:** Patrick Bourke <patrick.bourke [GRO]>  
**Cc:** Mark Underwood1 <mark.underwood1 [GRO]>, Rodric Williams <rodric.williams [GRO]>  
**Subject:** Re: Subject to Legal Privilege: Tim/Minister  
**Date:** Fri, 8 Jul 2016 15:36:57 +0000  
**Importance:** Normal

---

Thanks

I think Tom W needs to be aware of the proposal given Laura's earlier email to him.

If Laura thinks we should brief BIS on the litigation, then fine, although frankly they should be trying to distance themselves from it, and any briefing must be verbal. Suggest Andy Parsons should be involved in any such briefing as well as Rod.

Jane MacLeod  
General Counsel  
The Post Office  
[GRO]

Sent from my iPad

On 8 Jul 2016, at 13:58, Patrick Bourke <patrick.bourke [GRO]> wrote:

Jane

As promised, I spoke to Laura Thompson about any developments she might have to report on how best to communicate the shift in focus to the litigation and away from the review. This follows her catch up with BNR yesterday and an exchange between Richard and Tim.

The necessary shift towards the litigation was raised with her at yesterday's meeting with other matters in a general catch up. Perhaps inevitably, she expressed a wish to hear about this from TP direct at their meeting on 19/7, to better understand the reasons underpinning the legal advice from TRQC, and more generally get his take on the way forward.

I did not sense there was a likelihood of challenge as such and that actually what is being sought at that meeting is a) a sense of 'involvement' on the part of BNR rather than simply being the recipient of a notification; and b) some reassurance that the business remains across this issue. This chimes with what BIS have previously suggested works for BNR. She did apparently ask whether we had made an assessment of the chances of success of the claims against us but Laura told her it was too early which must fortuitously be right.

The suggestion is that a decision on whether or not a letter should be sent to confirm the move could be taken at, or in the light of, that meeting.

Laura reports Tim as having been relaxed about the choreography when speaking or emailing with Richard, and I think it's therefore ok to assume proceeding as above would 'suit' all parties.

Separately, Laura has suggested that it might be useful for a briefing meeting to take place between PO legal (inc as necessary external) and one of the BIS lawyers. I think they are just wanting to gain as much visibility of where things stand which is understandable, though we are, of course, independent of BIS.

With that in mind, I said that I could see there might be value in this but that a useful precursor to any meeting

might involve a conversation between, eg, Rod and the BIS lawyer so that we might at least know the ground they'd like to cover and take a view from there.

If you agree on both, can I suggest that Rod (and Andy P) and Mark work on a short brief for the TP/BNR meeting which can feed into whoever is pulling it all together (suspect Mike Granville); and that Rod email Laura so that an introduction can be made to the relevant BIS lawyer ?

Do you want to copy Tom W into this exchange at this stage ?

Best wishes

Patrick

Sent from my Windows Phone