

Monday, 18 December 2023

(10.45 am)

**MR BEER:** Good morning, sir, can you see and hear us?

**SIR WYN WILLIAMS:** Yes, I can, thank you and can I apologise for keeping everybody waiting.

**MR BEER:** Thank you, sir.

May I call Duncan Atkinson KC, please.

**SIR WYN WILLIAMS:** Yes.

**RICHARD DUNCAN ATKINSON KC (sworn)**

**Questioned by MR BEER**

**MR BEER:** Good morning, again, Mr Atkinson. As you know, my name is Jason Beer and I ask questions on behalf of the Inquiry. Can you remind us of your full name, please?

**A.** Yes, Richard Duncan Atkinson.

**Q.** Thank you for coming to give evidence to the Inquiry on a second occasion. Since you last gave evidence on 5 and 6 October this year, you've provided two reports to the Inquiry described as your Volumes 2 and 2A.

**A.** Yes.

**Q.** Can I start with Volume 2, please, that's EXPG000004R. This is a 243-page report, excluding its appendices, revised recently to

1

**A.** That's right.

**Q.** Then, secondly, Volume 2A, EXPG0000005. That's a 28-page report, again excluding the appendices, addressing two case studies, that of Janet Skinner and Julian Wilson. Does the same expert witness declaration apply to that report?

**A.** Yes, it does.

**Q.** Are the contents of that report true to the best of your knowledge and belief?

**A.** Yes, they are.

**Q.** Thank you very much.

In terms of your background and experience, has that changed in any material respect since we last saw you at the beginning of October?

**A.** No.

**Q.** By way of recap, in Volumes 1 and 1A of your earlier reports, and in your evidence on 5 and 6 October 2023, you considered, is this right, the legal and policy framework for the investigation and prosecution by the Post Office of criminal offences and, more broadly, the framework relating to the responsibilities of prosecuting authorities, investigating authorities, in making in particular charging decisions and disclosure?

3

take into account a small number of additional documents provided to you by the Inquiry. Are the contents of that report true to the best of your knowledge and belief?

**A.** Yes.

**Q.** Have you included in that report -- it needn't come up now, it's appendix A2 at page 243, an expert witness's declaration?

**A.** Yes.

**Q.** Does that set out your understanding of your duties in writing the report and in giving evidence?

**A.** Yes.

**Q.** Does it set out whether you have any conflict of interest of any kind?

**A.** Yes.

**Q.** Does it set out your understanding of your instructions?

**A.** Yes.

**Q.** Does it set out whether the matters about which you've expressed opinions are within your field of expertise?

**A.** Yes.

**Q.** That report, I think, addresses 20 case studies; is that right?

2

**A.** Yes.

**Q.** The task you've undertaken for us now, leading to your Volumes 2 and 2A reports, concerns the extent to which, is this right, the legal and policy framework that you previously described was or was not complied with in the cases of the 22 case studies that we're looking at?

**A.** Yes, in so far as that was possible to identify that from the material that I had.

**Q.** I'm going to come on in a moment to the limitations of the material that you have been provided with. Is this right, that, in terms of a sort menu of issues, you focused on, firstly, investigations. Was that principally on the duties of an Investigator to pursue reasonable lines of inquiry?

**A.** Yes.

**Q.** Secondly, in relation to the Horizon system specifically, the application of that duty where a suspect either does not assert a problem with Horizon, either in their interview, in a defence statement or otherwise, and in those cases where a suspect does indicate an issue or a question over the integrity of Horizon data?

**A.** Yes.

4

1 Q. Secondly, did you look at prosecutions and was  
 2 that split into charging decisions --  
 3 A. Yes.  
 4 Q. -- and, in particular, the test that  
 5 a prosecutor seemingly applied when making  
 6 a charging decision?  
 7 A. Yes.  
 8 Q. The evidence that the prosecutor seemingly  
 9 considered when making such a charging decision?  
 10 A. Yes.  
 11 Q. The extent to which such charging decisions  
 12 appeared to be thorough and diligent agent --  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. -- or conscientious.  
 15 Then lastly, the approach taken to charging  
 16 theft and false accounting, in particular as  
 17 alternatives?  
 18 A. Yes.  
 19 Q. Did you look at, under the heading of  
 20 prosecution, issues concerning the commencement  
 21 of proceedings?  
 22 A. Yes, although in terms of summonses and what lay  
 23 behind the summons, I don't think I saw anything  
 24 that helped me on that topic.  
 25 Q. No, that material was particularly lacking --

5

1 A. Yes.  
 2 Q. Did you look, lastly, at the reliance by the  
 3 Post Office on expert evidence?  
 4 A. Yes.  
 5 Q. You tell us in paragraph 6 of your report, in  
 6 terms of the material available, that it varied  
 7 considerably as between cases; is that right?  
 8 A. Yes.  
 9 Q. In some cases, it was extensive; is that right?  
 10 A. Yes.  
 11 Q. In others, the material was very sparse  
 12 indeed --  
 13 A. Very much so.  
 14 Q. -- with no material relating to some of the  
 15 topics that I've just described?  
 16 A. That's right.  
 17 Q. Where that is the case I think you tell us so in  
 18 your expert reports?  
 19 A. Yes, I hope so.  
 20 Q. I think you've been provided with a document  
 21 entitled "Gareth Jenkins Chronology", prepared  
 22 by the solicitors acting on behalf of the Post  
 23 Office?  
 24 A. Yes.  
 25 Q. You have been instructed, is this right, that

7

1 A. Yes.  
 2 Q. -- how proceedings were commenced and what  
 3 material was lodged with the Magistrates  
 4 Court --  
 5 A. Absolutely.  
 6 Q. -- in order to commence process.  
 7 A. Yes.  
 8 Q. Did you look at the approach taken to  
 9 disclosure --  
 10 A. Yes.  
 11 Q. -- and, in particular, whether there was  
 12 an identified Disclosure Officer and whether  
 13 that was also the Investigating Officer?  
 14 A. Yes.  
 15 Q. The extent to which prosecutors reviewed the  
 16 disclosure given, whether in the unused schedule  
 17 of material or otherwise?  
 18 A. Well, the extent to which I could see that they  
 19 had reviewed it.  
 20 Q. And the extent of any duties of cross-disclosure  
 21 between prosecutions?  
 22 A. Yes.  
 23 Q. Did you look at, lastly, prosecutorial practice  
 24 and, in particular, the practice of plea  
 25 bargaining?

6

1 the "Gareth Jenkins Chronology" is not being  
 2 treated by the Inquiry as evidence --  
 3 A. That's right.  
 4 Q. -- or as a source of evidence, and you have not  
 5 done so either; is that right?  
 6 A. I took notes where it referred to  
 7 a communication to the existence of that  
 8 communication, particularly if I hadn't seen it  
 9 before. In the wealth of material that I've  
 10 received in the last week, I have now seen a lot  
 11 of the communications that were referred to but  
 12 that was the extent to which I took note of that  
 13 document.  
 14 Q. Thank you. In particular, in your report, you  
 15 were careful to state, is this right, when the  
 16 underlying material should be consulted --  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 Q. -- in order to see whether what is suggested in  
 19 the chronology is accurate or inaccurate?  
 20 A. Yes, and I did not proceed on the basis that it  
 21 was a complete record of all communication or  
 22 assume anything of that sort.  
 23 Q. Thank you very much. Are you able to confirm,  
 24 in terms of your methodology and approach, that  
 25 you've not been asked to look at either the

8

1 witness statements or the oral evidence of any  
 2 of the witnesses who have given evidence in  
 3 Phase 4 of the Inquiry?  
 4 **A.** No, that's right.  
 5 **Q.** Instead, you have been asked to, and you have  
 6 yourself, confined yourself to looking at the  
 7 documents, the contemporaneous documents with  
 8 which you have been provided?  
 9 **A.** Yes.  
 10 **Q.** Is it right that the majority of those documents  
 11 relate to the investigations and prosecutions of  
 12 each of the case studies, ie they're  
 13 contemporaneous to the events to which they  
 14 relate?  
 15 **A.** Yes.  
 16 **Q.** You say in paragraph 32 of your report that in  
 17 considering the actions and decisions of Post  
 18 Office Investigators and Post Office lawyers,  
 19 the question that you have asked yourself is  
 20 whether the actions and decisions were  
 21 reasonably open to the decision maker on the  
 22 material then available?  
 23 **A.** Yes.  
 24 **Q.** Is that right?  
 25 **A.** Absolutely.

9

1 refer to records of calls to call centres that  
 2 had been made by the postmaster in question.  
 3 That material, which had not been sought at the  
 4 time of the investigation, so far as I could see  
 5 from the contemporaneous documentation, but the  
 6 fact that at the Second Sight stage they were  
 7 able to look at it showed that it existed and,  
 8 again, therefore, it existed at the time that it  
 9 was not sought during the investigation.  
 10 **Q.** So it's subsequent materials that reflect back  
 11 to either the existence of documents or a state  
 12 of affairs, contemporaneous to the matters that  
 13 you're looking at?  
 14 **A.** Yes, and I should add, in relation to the Court  
 15 of Appeal, I have taken account of the  
 16 assessment of the Court of Appeal of their view  
 17 of what should or should not have been disclosed  
 18 because it seemed to me that they're a fairly  
 19 safe body to take into account in that, given  
 20 that they are the Court of Appeal.  
 21 But I have, nevertheless, come to my own  
 22 assessment of what I consider the  
 23 contemporaneous documentation shows was or was  
 24 not done and what should or should not have been  
 25 done but it's a comfort to know that they and

11

1 **Q.** On occasions in your report you refer to  
 2 documents arising subsequently to those events,  
 3 either to the investigation or indeed after  
 4 conviction, for example accounts given by people  
 5 to the Second Sight investigation --  
 6 **A.** Yes.  
 7 **Q.** -- or in civil proceedings or what the Court of  
 8 Appeal Criminal Division said in the *Hamilton*  
 9 appeals?  
 10 **A.** Yes.  
 11 **Q.** Do you consider that in referring to such  
 12 material, Second Sight, civil proceedings and,  
 13 for example, concessions made by the Post Office  
 14 in the *Hamilton* appeals, you are at risk of  
 15 judging matters with hindsight?  
 16 **A.** No. To take an example, where, in the Court of  
 17 Appeal, the Post Office conceded that they had  
 18 not obtained ARQ data in a particular case,  
 19 I took that as a basis to conclude that they had  
 20 not sought the ARQ data in that case. That was  
 21 something that, therefore, they had not done at  
 22 the time and I took it as evidence of what had  
 23 or had not been done at the time.  
 24 In the same way, in the Second Sight  
 25 reviews, in some cases they were able there to

10

1 I are of the same view.  
 2 **Q.** At various points in your report you recognise  
 3 that your ability properly to assess what  
 4 happened at the time is limited by the fact that  
 5 there are only limited papers available to you?  
 6 **A.** Yes.  
 7 **Q.** Do you consider that care should be taken in  
 8 relation to your conclusions in general terms,  
 9 in that they may be based on incomplete  
 10 information or incorrect assumptions?  
 11 **A.** They may, particularly in the older of the  
 12 cases, be based on incomplete material. I've  
 13 made that clear in those cases. My conclusions,  
 14 certainly by the time one reaches the end of my  
 15 report, are based on a consideration of the  
 16 cases across the piece and, clearly, there is  
 17 the possibility that, in the cases where there  
 18 isn't the material, for example, on disclosure,  
 19 that that was a completely different disclosure  
 20 position than in the ones where I have seen the  
 21 material in relation to disclosure.  
 22 But it was all of the same kind, in the  
 23 cases where I saw it, and it didn't seem to me  
 24 unreasonable to draw conclusions based on what  
 25 I had seen on that basis.

12

1 Q. Thank you. In reaching your conclusions, did  
2 you measure the conduct of the Post Office  
3 Investigators and the Post Office lawyers  
4 against the standards that you would have  
5 generally expected to exist at the time in  
6 practice or against what the law required under  
7 codes, rules and guidance?

8 A. Certainly under the latter but because, as we  
9 examined when last I was here, those codes and  
10 rules had been accepted by the Post Office at  
11 the time to apply to them and their  
12 investigations and their charging decisions and  
13 so on. But, clearly, having been in practice  
14 myself through that period, I have an awareness  
15 of how such cases were dealt with by, in  
16 particular, the police and the CPS, and so that  
17 will have also informed by view.

18 But I tried, insofar as I could, to judge  
19 what was done by reference to what the law  
20 required and what the codes under the law  
21 required.

22 Q. Is that on the basis that it's not unreasonable  
23 to expect a prosecutor to comply with the law?

24 A. Absolutely.

25 Q. In terms of the approach that I'm going to take,

13

1 for it to come up on the screen. Page 218.

2 If we can start at paragraph 620, please.

3 You say in the second line:

4 "At this stage, I seek to draw the strands  
5 together of that analysis [ie the analysis of  
6 the then 20 case studies] by topic. I should  
7 emphasise, however, that these broader  
8 conclusions are to be properly understood by  
9 reference to the case-by-case analysis I have  
10 set out above. Each case is individual, in that  
11 each involved an individual who gave an account  
12 to address an audit shortfall, and whose case  
13 was then investigated and reviewed for  
14 prosecution at different times by different  
15 investigators and lawyers and by reference to  
16 different evidence."

17 Then you say this:

18 "That said, a number of themes emerge clear  
19 and strong across the 20 cases. Indeed, in  
20 a number of respects it is unsettling how the  
21 same issues were arising in the latter cases,  
22 such as Sefton and Nield and Ishaq in 2012, as  
23 have raised their heads in early cases, such as  
24 Brennan and Yates in 2003."

25 You use the word "unsettling" there. What

15

1 I'm going to start at the end, as it were, ie by  
2 examining the issues, topic by topic, one after  
3 the other, rather than case study by case study,  
4 and then drawing conclusions from that  
5 examination of the case studies?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. So I'm going to ask you to express your overall  
8 conclusions in relation to each topic, explore  
9 the reasons for those conclusions, and then  
10 involve you in some illustrative dipping into  
11 the materials to see whether we can exemplify  
12 some of the points that you make by reference to  
13 the contemporaneous materials?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. That will take all of today and some of  
16 tomorrow. Then tomorrow, or what time is left  
17 of tomorrow, I am going to take you through so  
18 many of the case studies, the 22 case studies,  
19 time will allow; do you understand?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Thank you. Can we start, please, at page 218 of  
22 your report, please --

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. -- if that can be displayed. This the Volume 2  
25 report, EXPG000004R. If we just wait a moment

14

1 was the nature and extent of your concern?

2 A. Clearly the rules that the law had developed  
3 between 2003 and 2012, the Post Office's own  
4 policies had developed with that, so that, for  
5 example, they acknowledged the Code for Crown  
6 Prosecutors as the basis for their charging  
7 decisions, they had, albeit belatedly,  
8 identified the requirement to pursue all  
9 reasonable lines of inquiry under the CPIA Code,  
10 and those changes had not resulted in changes in  
11 relation to the approach. Charging decisions  
12 were still made in a way that had great concern  
13 about, and the pursuit of reasonable lines of  
14 inquiry continued to evade those inquiries in  
15 2012, as it had in 2003.

16 Perhaps the other area of concern was that  
17 it became clear to me, just on what I had read,  
18 that issues with Horizon and concerns about  
19 various aspects of its operation were developing  
20 over that period of time, and one might have  
21 expected a more obvious change in the approach  
22 of the Post Office to those issues over that  
23 period of time, rather than continuing to  
24 approach them, in many respects, in the same  
25 ways 10 years on from the earlier cases that

16

1 I looked at.

2 **Q.** Thank you. Can we start, then, with the topic  
3 of investigation -- I'm not going to take them  
4 in precisely the same order as you have, I have  
5 rejigged them slightly but, in fact, we do start  
6 with investigation -- and look at paragraph 621,  
7 if we just scroll down, please.

8 Is a summary of what you found in relation  
9 to investigation the following: firstly, you  
10 found no document which identified which  
11 personnel were undertaking the role of  
12 Investigator and which personnel were  
13 undertaking the role of Disclosure Officer?

14 **A.** No, and, as I say in the report, that may on one  
15 level have just been a recording problem that  
16 one had to try and work out who was carrying out  
17 these vital roles under the CPIA, rather than  
18 finding anywhere where it said so. But the  
19 concern I had that flowed on from that was,  
20 where it wasn't identified, it was more  
21 difficult to know what they appreciated as to  
22 their role and who was supervising them in doing  
23 it.

24 **Q.** That's the second issue. You say that the roles  
25 played were not in accordance with the division

17

1 both Investigator and Disclosure Officer, and  
2 the Post Office position, which recognised that  
3 they normally would be the same?

4 **A.** Yes.

5 **Q.** That was in their policy documents?

6 **A.** Yes.

7 **Q.** You said you recognise that that will often be  
8 the case in smaller scale investigations by the  
9 police and others, ie that they would, in fact,  
10 as a matter of practice, be the same person?

11 **A.** Yes.

12 **Q.** But you so:

13 "My concern ... was that a check and balance  
14 in the system, with 2 different viewpoints on  
15 investigative and disclosure steps, was  
16 routinely not being incorporated into Post  
17 Office cases. That has been borne out by the  
18 materials [that you have now seen]."

19 What checks and balances do you consider  
20 were missing here that might not also be missing  
21 from equivalent levels of police investigations  
22 at the time?

23 **A.** So, so far as the Investigation Team are  
24 concerned and the Disclosure Officer's role,  
25 clearly the intention, as it seems to me, of the

19

1 of responsibilities set out in the CPIA and the  
2 Attorney General's Guidelines on Disclosure, in  
3 that they were, I think, always undertaken by  
4 the same person?

5 **A.** Yes.

6 **Q.** You say, thirdly, that it was unclear who was  
7 supervising or directing the Disclosure Officer  
8 and does that mean that there was no evidence  
9 that you saw of such supervision or direction?

10 **A.** Yes, there was -- in many, but not all, the  
11 cases there were investigation summaries or  
12 investigation reports prepared by  
13 an Investigator, which was addressed to Contract  
14 Managers and persons of that sort. It was not  
15 clear who was providing a supervision to the  
16 investigation process in the case. There was no  
17 material coming from them, for example, that  
18 I saw giving instruction to the Investigator as  
19 to reasonable lines of inquiry by way of  
20 example.

21 **Q.** If we go over the page to paragraph 622, please.  
22 You say that, in your first report -- it was  
23 paragraph 108 -- you observe that there was  
24 a distinction between the CPIA Code which  
25 recognised that the same person could act as

18

1 CPIA Code is that you have your Investigator and  
2 your Disclosure Officer separate so that there  
3 is a degree of independence to the disclosure  
4 assessment from the investigative one. So that  
5 the person making the decisions as to disclosure  
6 is not, inevitably, the person who has had to  
7 come to an assessment of whether there is --  
8 whether the suspect is correctly to be charged  
9 within the investigation process.

10 There was no cross-discussion between such  
11 persons in these cases, because they would have  
12 been talking to themselves, and so the person  
13 who had interviewed the suspect, who had  
14 acquired the evidence that they considered  
15 necessary to prosecute the suspect, was then the  
16 person who was deciding whether there was  
17 material that undermined the case that they had  
18 built in order to disclose it and there was no  
19 one that they were talking to within the  
20 investigation in relation to that.

21 I appreciate that may not happen either in  
22 smaller scale cases investigated by the police  
23 and prosecuted by the CPS, but what there is  
24 then, in those cases, is a reviewing lawyer  
25 within the CPS who has an independent oversight

20

of what that investigation has done and what disclosure is necessary and raises issues in relation to that. Here, of course, it was done by the same organisation, albeit the Criminal Law Division at the Post Office and my concern there was that I saw, in many of these cases, very little evidence of any such oversight by them, of identifying reasonable lines of inquiry, identifying things that needed to be disclosed, contrary to a view having been expressed by the Investigator/Disclosure Officer.

So there wasn't that -- more than one person looking at it, more than one organisation looking at it, which, to an extent, the CPIA Code envisaged.

**Q.** What do you understand the purpose or the rationale for that division of labour, division of responsibility, to be in the CPIA Code and in the AG's Guidelines on Disclosure?

**A.** Well, it provides a degree of scrutiny of the process. If it is just done by the Investigator, who then decides whether the material they've -- there's any material they've obtained that they think undermines the case

21

**Q.** -- and in the third case something that Mrs Henderson said. You say:  
"It is a concern if that same settled conclusion informed the disclosure process as it did the interview."

So you're saying, is this right, that these are real world examples of where an Investigator appears to have displayed, in the course of an interview, a settled conclusion as to the guilt of the suspect, and yet that person is then asked to review disclosure and give disclosure of documents that might undermine the prosecution case or assist that of the defendant.

**A.** Yes. So to take Ms Brennan as an example, the interviewing officer said to her:

"I think it's a question of not whether you've done it but why you've done it. I think you've done it deliberately. No one else is making mistakes like you."

That was the person who was also then required to consider what reasonable lines of inquiry had to be pursued that might lead away from the person he believed had done it and then to undertake the disclosure process to identify

23

that they have built, then there's no one to stand back and ask those very important questions.

There is a responsibility for the lawyer who becomes involved in the case to do that and, in some of these cases, that was done. But it just seems to me that the CPIA Code regime envisages more than two people being involved in that conversation, and certainly more than one.

**Q.** Thank you. If we go on to paragraph 623, please. You say -- and you give three examples here, from the cases of Lisa Brennan, David Blakey and Allison Henderson -- that:

"... the interviewing officer demonstrated a very clear, settled conclusion adverse to the defendant at the time of interview. In the case of Ms Brennan she was told that the officer believed she had done it, Mr Blakey was told his account was 'ridiculous' and Mrs Henderson believed that the Investigator had already drawn his own conclusions."

So there you're referring to, I think in the first two cases, your reading of the transcripts of interview --

**A.** Yes.

22

what undermined his conclusion that she had done it, and that, where the other checks and balances weren't there to guard against that, gave at least the risk that reasonable lines of inquiry would not be identified and/or disclosure would not be made.

**Q.** So that Investigator said in interview to Ms Brennan "No one is making mistakes like you", essentially?

**A.** Yes.

**Q.** That was also the person who had the responsibility then to investigate whether or not anyone was making mistakes like Lisa Brennan?

**A.** Yes, and, I have to say, on the material from that case that I've seen -- and it's one of the early cases and so the material is limited -- there wasn't the evidence that checks had been made before that interview or after that interview, to identify whether there were other people making the same mistakes and/or whether the system was generating similar problems.

**Q.** Thank you. Can I turn to topic 2, please, the Post Office's investigative and prosecutorial focus.

24

1 In your Volume 1 report you said that  
 2 a number of Post Office policies drew attention  
 3 to financial and business related factors in  
 4 making prosecutorial decisions.  
 5 **A.** Yes.  
 6 **Q.** You said that that was your reading of the  
 7 documents that did not instill confidence in the  
 8 independence, fairness or transparency of those  
 9 decisions?  
 10 **A.** Yes.  
 11 **Q.** At various points your Volume 2 report, you  
 12 refer to the approach of the Post Office  
 13 seemingly being driven by a desire to protect  
 14 Horizon --  
 15 **A.** Yes.  
 16 **Q.** -- that arising in particular in the context of  
 17 disclosure decisions and in pleas --  
 18 **A.** Yes.  
 19 **Q.** -- consideration of pleas?  
 20 **A.** Yes.  
 21 **Q.** You tell us -- there's no need to turn it up --  
 22 for example that -- this is paragraph 414 -- the  
 23 prosecution of Mrs Misra had become a battle for  
 24 the reputation of the Horizon system with the  
 25 prosecution determined to destroy the attacks on

25

1 **Q.** -- or the reliability of the evidence on which  
 2 the prosecution was founded?  
 3 **A.** Yes.  
 4 **Q.** The cross-references there are paragraphs 217,  
 5 423 and 438 of your second report.  
 6 Did you observe a pattern or a common theme,  
 7 through some or all of the case studies, of  
 8 a prosecutorial or investigative approach being  
 9 driven by a desire to protect the Horizon  
 10 system?  
 11 **A.** In a number of respects, just to give examples  
 12 which I suspect we'll come back to in relation  
 13 to the acceptance of pleas in a number of cases,  
 14 the acceptance of those pleas was explicitly  
 15 made, conditional on there being no criticism of  
 16 the system.  
 17 When in 2012, I think, a form of words was  
 18 put together to address the fact that issues  
 19 with Horizon had come up in a number of cases  
 20 around the country, there was a significant part  
 21 of that asserting that there were no problems,  
 22 and there was, on the face of the disclosure, in  
 23 cases, very little that did identify faults  
 24 along the way, even where faults were being  
 25 understood.

27

1 the system?  
 2 **A.** Yes, and destroy was the word used, albeit after  
 3 her conviction, in a memo by someone in the Post  
 4 Office talking about her trial.  
 5 **Q.** You told us in Volume 1 of your reports that  
 6 an Investigator was under a duty to pursue all  
 7 reasonable lines of inquiry for the duration of  
 8 the relevant period we're looking at, including  
 9 those that pointed away from the suspect?  
 10 **A.** Yes.  
 11 **Q.** But that was not spelt out in any Post Office  
 12 policy explicitly until 2010?  
 13 **A.** Yes.  
 14 **Q.** That would include, is this right,  
 15 consideration, ie the duty would include  
 16 consideration, of whether accounting shortfalls  
 17 at Horizon terminals might be caused by or lie  
 18 with the computer system itself?  
 19 **A.** Yes.  
 20 **Q.** In your Volume 2 report, you identified some  
 21 instances where individuals in the Post Office  
 22 were "rebutting" or were focused upon rebutting  
 23 the defence, rather than testing the prosecution  
 24 case --  
 25 **A.** Yes.

26

1 **Q.** Did you form a view as to whether that desire to  
 2 protect the Horizon system affected the  
 3 independence and fairness of the Post Office  
 4 Post Office's investigations and prosecutions?  
 5 **A.** Well, certainly in the majority, at least, of  
 6 these cases, enquiries were not made, for  
 7 example, by the obtaining of ARQ data and  
 8 looking at it, to identify whether there were  
 9 faults in the system, and whether that was  
 10 because those investigating did not appreciate  
 11 that they needed to, or whether it was because  
 12 they chose not to, the fact is that they didn't.  
 13 In relation to charging decisions and the  
 14 supervision by prosecutors of the system, in the  
 15 majority of these cases, although if they were  
 16 applying the Code for Crown Prosecutors they  
 17 were expressly advised to consider the  
 18 reliability of the evidence on the basis of  
 19 which they were making charging decisions, they  
 20 did not raise any question about whether there  
 21 was any question as to the reliability of the  
 22 Horizon material, which was the basis for their  
 23 prosecution decisions, and that's either because  
 24 they did not consider they needed to, or they  
 25 weren't aware there was any issue with it, or

28

1 they chose not to.

2 But the fact is they didn't and, where  
3 issues were coming up, as they did increasingly  
4 with postmasters in interview, in defence  
5 statements and, thereafter, raising issues, the  
6 approach was to say, "You need to tell us  
7 exactly what you say happened, when it happened,  
8 in relation to what transaction it happened, and  
9 then we'll look at it", rather than proactively  
10 identifying "This is the evidence that we are  
11 relying on. We have to be satisfied that it is  
12 reliable and we have to demonstrate that it's  
13 reliable and that's for us to do, not for us to  
14 ask you to do it for us".

15 Q. So if I were to summarise that, you would say  
16 that you can't -- or you won't -- say what the  
17 motivation was because that's probably for  
18 others to judge?

19 A. Absolutely.

20 Q. Your expert evidence is limited to the fact that  
21 the issues that you've identified, the steps  
22 that you've mentioned, were not undertaken.  
23 Would it be right that, irrespective of the  
24 motivation, whether it was because of a lack of  
25 understanding, a lack of interest, or something

29

1 people] we were able to destroy to the criminal  
2 standard of proof ... every single suggestion  
3 made by the defence."

4 I think this was the email to which you were  
5 referring earlier --

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. -- the language of destruction or destroy?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. It concludes:

10 "It is to be hoped that the case will set  
11 a marker to dissuade other defendants from  
12 jumping on the Horizon bashing bandwagon."

13 Did you see these kind of sentiments  
14 reflected elsewhere?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Do they reflect, in your view, a disinclination  
17 to test the reliability of the evidence on which  
18 the prosecutions are founded?

19 A. Certainly a disinclination, on one view it  
20 speaks of a complacency about the system, that  
21 the system must be right and that this is the  
22 desperate attempt of someone, who the computer  
23 is saying has stolen our money, to identify that  
24 as just a defence tactic which needs to be  
25 stamped on.

31

1 more malign, what was done was not in accordance  
2 with the Post Office's duties as Investigator  
3 and prosecutor?

4 A. No, absolutely.

5 Q. Can I look at some of the material that after  
6 goes to motivation and can we start, please, by  
7 looking at -- it'll come up on the screen --  
8 POL00055590. If we could look at the top half  
9 of the page, please. Thank you.

10 This is, for shorthand, known as the  
11 "Horizon bashing bandwagon" email, which has  
12 been referred to a number of times in the  
13 Inquiry, and is a document that I think you saw.

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. It's post-trial in the case of Seema Misra.

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. The title of the document is -- or the subject  
18 line of the email is "Seema Misra -- Guildford  
19 Crown Court -- Trial -- Attack on Horizon".

20 You'll see the contents in there and I think  
21 you'll be familiar with them.

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. It refers to an unprecedented attack on the  
24 Horizon system and:

25 "... through the ... work of [a number of  
30

1 Or it's an appreciation that, if these lines  
2 are pursued, it will generate at least the risk  
3 of doubt on the part of a jury about the  
4 reliability of this material, and so it's better  
5 to stamp on it from the outset, rather than have  
6 that risk.

7 Q. What about --

8 A. Rather than -- sorry, to identify -- because  
9 we're here in 2010, and we have people who are  
10 copied into this email who'd been making  
11 investigative and charging decisions for quite  
12 some time by then. Rather than identifying this  
13 keeps coming up, this is something we need to  
14 look at to be satisfied that we are prosecuting  
15 on the basis of reliable evidence.

16 Q. What about the view that this is to be regarded  
17 as the kind of email that many of us may have  
18 seen in practice, a back-slapping email after  
19 we've won a case?

20 A. I think, going back to what I was just saying,  
21 to view a recurrent issue arising in cases  
22 through completely separate suspects saying  
23 things about the system and saying that there  
24 must be something going on here, because I don't  
25 understand this, through those various different

32



1 systems, to categorise that as a "Horizon  
2 bashing bandwagon" is not, in my view, just  
3 being pleased that you've got a good result in  
4 Guildford. That's a very protective stance  
5 about the source of the evidence that is being  
6 used to prosecute people across the country.

7 Q. Thank you. If we can move on, please. No need  
8 to turn it up, but in paragraph 567 of your  
9 report, your Volume 2 report, you refer to  
10 a disclosure form of words --

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. -- about Horizon issues, which was described in  
13 the contemporaneous material as a story --

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. -- and which appears to have been partially  
16 prepared by the Post Office's Head of Public  
17 Relations and Media.

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. I wonder whether we could look at that document,  
20 please. POL00058155. If we can start with  
21 page 3, please. It's an email from Jarnail  
22 Singh to Hugh Flemington, so lawyer to lawyer.  
23 "2nd Sight review draft" is the title:  
24 "After a number of meetings between Post  
25 Office Management and Members of Parliament in

33

1 used up and down the country, when the system  
2 has been challenged in criminal courts, it has  
3 been successfully defended."

4 If we scroll up, please, we can see that the  
5 lawyer, Hugh Flemington, sends the document on  
6 to Susan Crichton, Alwen Lyons -- she was then  
7 the Company Secretary:

8 "This is the story ... which J [I think  
9 that's Jarnail] put together following our  
10 meeting last week. Any comments please before  
11 we release it?"

12 Then up, please. The Company Secretary  
13 sends it on:

14 "Can you go to Alana [who I believe is  
15 a person within the Media and Communications  
16 Department] as they are the experts with this  
17 request for the 'story'."

18 Alana is asked by Simon Baker:

19 "Please can you help us craft our message  
20 around the Second Sight review. We need to  
21 combat the assertion that the review is  
22 an acknowledgement that there is a problem with  
23 Horizon.

24 "Jarnail has drafted some words below. Do  
25 they strike the right tone?"

35

1 relation to the court cases, it was agreed that  
2 the Post Office would undertake a review of the  
3 cases which had been raised by the Member's  
4 constituents.

5 "In order to provide assurance to the  
6 interested parties, Post Office Management  
7 proposed the use of independent auditors, 2nd  
8 Sight. The review to be undertaken will be  
9 specifically restricted to the cases raised by  
10 the MPs as well as reviewing the accounting  
11 procedures, processes and reconciliations  
12 undertaken in relation to the cases in question.  
13 Before formal instructions are given to the  
14 independent auditors, agreements will be sought  
15 from all interested parties, namely the MPs and  
16 Justice for Subpostmasters. The subpostmasters  
17 have requested a forensic accountant of their  
18 choice to be appointed to oversee the cases  
19 being reviewed by 2nd Sight.

20 "All the above is accepted based on the  
21 terms of the review being carried out, but it  
22 must be stressed that this is not  
23 an acknowledgement by Post Office Limited that  
24 there is an issue with Horizon. The Horizon  
25 system is working properly, robust and is being

34

1 Then further up, please. Then further up.  
2 We can see Mr Kelleher's reply, if we go further  
3 up, back to Simon Baker:

4 "As this message will most probably find its  
5 way into the media, we do need to get the  
6 message across from the start that we continue  
7 to have full confidence in the robustness of the  
8 Horizon system and then reinforce it so  
9 I suggest the following tweaking to the proposed  
10 wording from Jarnail ..."

11 We can see, then, that there are three  
12 paragraphs, two on that page -- I'm not going to  
13 do a track changes comparison. The last one is  
14 a significant amendment:

15 "All the above is accepted based on the  
16 terms of the review being carried out, but this  
17 is in no way an acknowledgement by the Post  
18 Office that there is an issue with the Horizon.  
19 Over the past ten years, many millions of branch  
20 reconciliations have been carried out with  
21 trains and balances accurately recorded by more  
22 than 25,000 different subpostmasters and the  
23 Horizon system continues to work properly in  
24 post offices across the length and breadth of  
25 the UK. When the system has been challenged in

36

1 the criminal courts, it has been successfully  
 2 defended."  
 3 Then scroll up, please. Mr Baker says:  
 4 "That works. Thanks."  
 5 Then it's passed back down to the lawyers:  
 6 "You have seen the final draft of 'Our  
 7 story'. Can this now be relieved to our agents  
 8 and counsel for consistent approach and  
 9 submissions when there is challenges to the  
 10 Horizon."  
 11 I think we can understand the sense of what  
 12 Mr Jarnail Singh is referring to there.

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. So did you understand this to be a story that  
 15 was to be reflected in the approach taken by  
 16 lawyers, including when submissions are made  
 17 about challenges to Horizon.

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Did you understand that this was to be reflected  
 20 in evidence in any way?

21 A. I certainly understood it was to be reflected in  
 22 disclosure or response to disclosure. This  
 23 email I saw, in the context of the case of  
 24 Ms Sefton and Ms Nield, and it's not altogether  
 25 clear if and if so when it reached them but,

37

1 of material I'd seen from 2010, in the context  
 2 of the case of Ms Misra, there was material  
 3 that, from a disclosure point of view, did raise  
 4 issues about the reliability of Horizon, at  
 5 least potentially, and this document would not  
 6 have told you any of that --

7 Q. Thank you.

8 A. -- quite the opposite.

9 Q. Can I show you a document that you may not have  
 10 seen before. It's something that I snuck in  
 11 over the weekend and so, if you need time to  
 12 think about it, then do say so. POL00120723.  
 13 You'll see this is a letter dated 19 February  
 14 2013, in relation to the *Post Office v Kim*  
 15 *Wylie*. That's not one of the cases you have  
 16 been asked to look at.

17 A. No.

18 Q. You'll see that it's from Cartwright King to  
 19 McKeag & Co Solicitors, who were the defence  
 20 solicitors for Kim Wylie. If we scroll down,  
 21 please, it's a reply to a letter. I can say  
 22 that that letter enclosed some expert evidence,  
 23 some defendant expert evidence. Cartwright King  
 24 say:

25 "Thank you for your letter dated 14 February

39

1 certainly, it was a topic of requests from them  
 2 for disclosure, that it was in that context that  
 3 this seems to arise in that case. So I took it,  
 4 at the very least as being a statement that was  
 5 going to be provided as disclosure where issues  
 6 about Horizon arose.

7 So, as it said there, "released to our  
 8 agents and counsel", that's the people who are  
 9 doing the prosecuting for them, so that this  
 10 would be what they would be saying, what they  
 11 would be disclosing, what they would be  
 12 submitting when a defendant sought to raise any  
 13 issues with the operation of Horizon.

14 Q. What concern did you have, if any, over this?

15 A. Well, it was a press release, rather than  
 16 a disclosure note. It didn't particularise what  
 17 issues had arisen in earlier cases, how often  
 18 they had arisen, in what circumstances they had  
 19 arisen, over what time period they had arisen,  
 20 what people were saying in those other cases had  
 21 happened, what expert evidence had been obtained  
 22 on either side in relation to them. It  
 23 certainly does not address whether any actual  
 24 bugs or problems or flaws had been identified,  
 25 and this is 2012, and so certainly, on the basis

38

1 2013. Please find enclosed a notice of  
 2 Additional Evidence ..."

3 Amongst those is a statement from Stephen  
 4 Bradshaw -- and I think you know him to be one  
 5 of the Post Office Investigators --

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. -- dated 20 November. Then paragraph 2 we can  
 8 skip over. Then paragraph 3, Cartwright King  
 9 say:

10 "The Crown's position on the integrity of  
 11 the Horizon system is set out in Steve's  
 12 Bradshaw's statement dated 20 November 2012",  
 13 ie it's set out in the witness statement that  
 14 we're serving on a you as an NAE, a notice of  
 15 additional evidence.

16 Can we look, please, at that witness  
 17 statement that was attached to this letter.  
 18 It's page 5.

19 Thank you. We can see Mr Bradshaw's witness  
 20 statement of 20 November 2012. So that's the  
 21 NAE that's being served and, if you just read it  
 22 to yourself, and see whether it starts to become  
 23 familiar to you.

24 A. Yes, it does.

25 Q. If we scroll down. Then, over the page, please.

40

1 I think you'll recognise that --

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. -- as the text of the email --

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. -- drafted by the Head of Public Relations and  
6 Media of the Post Office, and it's now become  
7 a witness statement.

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. If I was to tell you that Mr Kelleher, the Head  
10 of Public Relations and Media, had not only been  
11 cut and pasted into this witness statement but  
12 had been cut and pasted into other witness  
13 statements, what would your view be?

14 A. Given the timing of this, it's profoundly  
15 disturbing that both as evidence in cases, which  
16 is advanced to be true to the best of the  
17 author's belief, and as the extent of disclosure  
18 in 2012 in these cases --

19 Q. This is February 2013 --

20 A. -- yes --

21 Q. -- it's being served, yes?

22 A. -- that that is it. That is all that  
23 a defendant would be informed as to that which  
24 was capable of undermining the prosecution case  
25 or assisting them in relation to the operation

41

1 experienced in their use of Horizon, it doesn't  
2 really reflect, I'd have thought, his own  
3 experience, let alone that of the Post Office  
4 that he was working for.

5 Q. Thank you. That can come down.

6 You tell us in your Volume 2 report -- the  
7 cross-references are paragraphs 278 and 458, and  
8 paragraphs 34, 35 and 76 of your Volume 2A  
9 report -- about focus or seeming focus on the  
10 recovery of money by the Post Office.

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Did you form a view on whether a focus on the  
13 recovery of money was an example of the Post  
14 Office acting in a manner that was consistent or  
15 inconsistent with its duties as a prosecutor?

16 A. As a starting point, clearly where the evidence  
17 demonstrated that someone had taken their money,  
18 and had been convicted of theft on that basis,  
19 then for them to seek to recover that money was  
20 entirely consistent with the normal operation of  
21 the system. That's what the confiscation  
22 process is usually used for. And, equally,  
23 voluntary repayments of monies that have been  
24 taken and/or have been lost as a result of the  
25 action of a defendant, will be a factor that

43

1 of Horizon, that was an assertion from,  
2 effectively, a press release that the system  
3 works well, and that where others have tried to  
4 challenge it, they have failed.

5 That last bit, sadly, is true, on the basis  
6 of the cases that I've seen but the fact remains  
7 that this is not a proper approach to the  
8 disclosure on these topics. It's certainly not  
9 a proper approach as to the extent of disclosure  
10 on these topics and it's a rather disquieting  
11 approach to the use of a witness statement.

12 Q. Why is it a rather surprising approach to the  
13 use of a witness statement?

14 A. Well, it's -- clearly, witness statements can be  
15 drafted not just by the person who signs them  
16 and I'm aware of that. But to sign up to this,  
17 unless you really did think this was all that  
18 one could say on the topic of the operation of  
19 Horizon, it is disquieting, and someone, such as  
20 Mr Bradshaw, whose name comes up in a number of  
21 the cases I've seen, over a period of time that  
22 I'd seen, for him to be signing up to that,  
23 knowing that this is -- what issues had come up  
24 in cases, what had been said by these completely  
25 independent people about what they had

42

1 will be taken into account in deciding whether  
2 you're going to prosecute them and also in  
3 assessing the appropriate level of their  
4 sentence for the court to assess that at the end  
5 of the process.

6 But here, in a number of cases, pleas were  
7 being taken to false accounting, the basis that  
8 was advanced from interview on, usually, by the  
9 suspect, was that they hadn't taken the money,  
10 they didn't know where the money had gone. They  
11 couldn't explain why the computer was saying the  
12 money had gone but, for various reasons, they  
13 had chosen or felt compelled to adjust the  
14 records to effectively stave off the day when  
15 the accounting errors were held against them by  
16 their contracts at the end of the day.

17 And so there was an acceptance of a plea  
18 that did not involve financial loss that was  
19 caused by the suspect, and yet the suspect was  
20 pursued for that financial loss, both on  
21 occasions by it being made a condition of the  
22 acceptance of their plea, and also through the  
23 use of confiscation as a means to get the money  
24 back from them.

25 Q. Did you form a view as to whether it was a form

44

1 of abuse of process to seek confiscation in  
2 circumstances where the Post Office could not  
3 prove that the money was stolen by the accused  
4 and a plea to false accounting had therefore  
5 been taken?

6 **A.** Well, on the one hand, I'm conscious that, at  
7 least in one of these cases, an argument was put  
8 forwarded on behalf of the defendant that it was  
9 an abuse of process to and that argument was not  
10 successful.

11 **Q.** Yes.

12 **A.** But, equally, I am aware that the Court of  
13 Appeal expressed, at the very least, concerns  
14 about the tying of the recovery of funds from  
15 someone who had pleaded to false accounting  
16 rather than theft, that that was a concern that  
17 they had in those cases as to whether that was  
18 appropriate.

19 I share that concern. It's perhaps a use of  
20 the levers of the prosecution process to obtain  
21 repayment of the money, where, otherwise,  
22 insofar as I understand the contract position --  
23 as we touched on last time, I don't understand  
24 that very much -- that, rather than using civil  
25 recovery under the contract, they were using the

45

1 consider that the Post Office complied with its  
2 Police and Criminal Evidence Act and the Codes',  
3 issued thereunder, obligations in relation to  
4 ensuring that the interviewee knew their rights  
5 and were given a proper opportunity to be  
6 represented if they wanted to?

7 **A.** Yes. My only hesitation on that was one case,  
8 and I'm afraid off the top of my head I can't  
9 remember, which was, where --

10 **Q.** Was it Thomas?

11 **A.** -- yes -- where Mr Thomas asked to have  
12 a particular solicitor and the decision was  
13 taken not to wait for the solicitor and they  
14 therefore arrested him or got the police to  
15 arrest him so that they could carry on with the  
16 interview, but with -- but I think, in his case,  
17 ultimately he did have his solicitor by the time  
18 he was interviewed. So with that one wrinkle,  
19 yes, they complied with their PACE obligations.

20 **Q.** In paragraph 623 of your report, which is on  
21 page 219, we looked at it earlier, you note,  
22 I think critically, the comments and expressions  
23 of disbelief by some Investigators in the course  
24 of the interviews. In your experience as  
25 a prosecutor, looking regularly at interviews in

47

1 criminal process and the levers of the criminal  
2 process, such as confiscation, such as it being  
3 a condition of the acceptance of a plea to get  
4 the money back, when they hadn't actually proved  
5 that the money had gone in the first place.

6 **MR BEER:** Thank you very much.

7 Sir, given the time we started this morning,  
8 I propose to take the morning break now until  
9 12.00 and then sit from 12.00 until 1.00.

10 **SIR WYN WILLIAMS:** Yes, that's fine Mr Beer.

11 **MR BEER:** Thank you very much, sir.

12 **SIR WYN WILLIAMS:** 12.00.

13 ( 11.45 am)

(A short break)

14  
15 (12.00 pm)

16 **MR BEER:** Good afternoon, sir. Can you continue to  
17 see and hear us?

18 **SIR WYN WILLIAMS:** Yes, thank you, yes.

19 **MR BEER:** Thank you.

20 Mr Atkinson, can we move on. We've looked  
21 at topic 1, investigation. Topic 2, the  
22 investigative and prosecutorial focus.

23 Can we turn to topic 3, which is interviews.

24 **A.** Yes.

25 **Q.** From the case studies that you reviewed, do you

46

1 the period 2000 to 2012, would you agree that  
2 such comments and expressions of disbelief, even  
3 if inappropriate, would nonetheless often be  
4 seen from police officers or HMRC officers in  
5 interview?

6 **A.** I can certainly think of occasions when I've  
7 seen them. I wouldn't say it was a routine  
8 thing. I can think of cases where such  
9 expressions have resulted in applications to  
10 exclude the interview in those cases. And the  
11 point I was seeking to make here was not  
12 a quality check on the quality of interviewing  
13 questioning; it was more that this was the  
14 person who was making the investigative and  
15 disclosure decisions in the case, who was saying  
16 this, and that was why I thought it worth  
17 identifying.

18 **Q.** Thank you. The Inquiry has heard that  
19 pre-interview disclosure was given to  
20 an interviewee's legal representative, prior to  
21 the interview but that, if the interviewee was  
22 not legally represented, then they wouldn't be  
23 provided with pre-interview disclosure. Was  
24 that in accordance or not in accordance with  
25 practice as you understood it?

48

1 A. Home Office guidance, which I was given a copy  
 2 of, amongst many other things last week, did  
 3 quote from a police approach, which was to that  
 4 end: that the -- when not represented, documents  
 5 wouldn't be handed over to a suspect, albeit  
 6 that the same guidance made clear that the  
 7 suspect should nevertheless be put in a position  
 8 to understand why they were being interviewed,  
 9 what they were being interviewed about. So,  
 10 even if they didn't get physical documents in  
 11 the way that a solicitor would, they did get  
 12 an understanding of what was going on.  
 13 Q. I think the guidance that you're mentioning --  
 14 there's no need for us to turn it up -- is Home  
 15 Office guidance --  
 16 A. Yes.  
 17 Q. -- dated 31 August 2023 --  
 18 A. Yes.  
 19 Q. -- ie from this year --  
 20 A. Yes.  
 21 Q. -- quoting from a national police document --  
 22 A. Yes.  
 23 Q. -- that tends to suggest that the purpose of the  
 24 provision of pre-interview disclosure is to  
 25 allow the legal representative to understand the

49

1 would quote the key parts in full.  
 2 Q. Is it right that, as part of disclosure in  
 3 a police and CPS case, what ought to be given is  
 4 an interview transcript, if one is available,  
 5 and the tape recording or digital recording of  
 6 the interview --  
 7 A. Yes.  
 8 Q. -- if available?  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 Q. The defence would, therefore, have the  
 11 opportunity to check the accuracy of the  
 12 transcript of interview?  
 13 A. Yes.  
 14 Q. Is it right that one of the standard forms of  
 15 directions that courts would issue in  
 16 a contested case would be for the parties to  
 17 agree interview edits in advance of trial?  
 18 A. Yes, and certainly there was a stage at which  
 19 the form that was completed at the first  
 20 substantive hearing in the Crown Court of the  
 21 case -- and its acronym changed over time -- but  
 22 at that hearing, one of the questions on the  
 23 form was whether the tapes had been provided to  
 24 the defence, and then a follow-on question as to  
 25 the agreeing of an accurate transcript between

51

1 nature of the case --  
 2 A. Yes.  
 3 Q. -- and provide appropriate advice to the  
 4 suspect, in particular on whether to answer  
 5 questions or not?  
 6 A. Yes, and certainly, within my experience well  
 7 before 2023, I'm aware that, where a suspect was  
 8 unrepresented, they were not given copies of  
 9 documentation, albeit that they were then asked  
 10 about that documentation during interview, and  
 11 that would accord with the approach in the Home  
 12 Office document.  
 13 Q. Thank you. Was it your experience in police and  
 14 CPS cases that, following an interview conducted  
 15 under PACE, following a charging decision, it  
 16 would be normal for a full transcript to be  
 17 prepared of the interview, so that a CPS lawyer  
 18 could review it?  
 19 A. Certainly at the very least, the reviewing  
 20 lawyer would have more than a paragraph's worth  
 21 of summary of an interview before making  
 22 a charging decision. I certainly can think of  
 23 cases, particularly the smaller end of cases,  
 24 where the document that you would have would be  
 25 more of a summary than a full transcript but it

50

1 the parties.  
 2 Q. That process would include checking whether the  
 3 transcript is accurate versus the tape --  
 4 A. Yes.  
 5 Q. -- agreeing if possible any summaries of parts  
 6 of the interview --  
 7 A. Yes.  
 8 Q. -- and excluding any material that it was agreed  
 9 to be inadmissible or identifying if there was  
 10 a dispute over the admissibility of dispute  
 11 material?  
 12 A. Yes.  
 13 Q. Would there then be an attempt to agree between  
 14 counsel the edits?  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. Was that, so far as you can see, an approach  
 17 that was adopted in the Post Office  
 18 prosecutions?  
 19 A. I can't, off the top of my head, think of  
 20 an example of seeing discussion in the  
 21 paperwork, which is all I can go on, about that,  
 22 one way or the other.  
 23 Q. In the case of Mr Brennan -- I'm not going to  
 24 ask for these to be turned up -- but there are  
 25 two versions available to us of the ROTI, the

52

1 Record of Taped Interview.  
 2 A. Yes.  
 3 Q. The first, POL00047322, contains the expressions  
 4 of incredulity that you mentioned. The second,  
 5 POL00047320, has them excised, and the metadata  
 6 from that second version appears to suggest that  
 7 it was created shortly before trial?  
 8 Would you expect that sort of comment from  
 9 an interviewing officer to be excised at before  
 10 interview at the request of the defence?  
 11 A. At the request of the defence, yes.  
 12 Q. But do I understand that the point you were  
 13 making in paragraph 623 to have a different  
 14 object or different target?  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. It wasn't about the editing of interviews?  
 17 A. No.  
 18 Q. It was about the identity of the investigating  
 19 and then Disclosure Officer?  
 20 A. It was to the mindset of the investigating and  
 21 Disclosure Officer, particularly the Disclosure  
 22 Officer.  
 23 Q. Thank you. Can we move on to topic 4, please,  
 24 which is a substantial topic: charging  
 25 decisions. If we can split this up, please, and

53

1 actually looked at.  
 2 Q. And what reasoning was included in that decision  
 3 maker's record --  
 4 A. Yes.  
 5 Q. -- of decision making?  
 6 A. Yes. If any, yes.  
 7 Q. Over the page to paragraph 633. You say:  
 8 "The advices relating to charge that I have  
 9 seen produced in the main by lawyers working for  
 10 the Post Office Criminal Law Division do give  
 11 rise to real concerns."  
 12 So I think the closest you came to  
 13 a reasoning for charge, even if it was not the  
 14 decision to charge -- and I'm using "charge" as  
 15 a shorthand for initiating process by summons --  
 16 A. Yes.  
 17 Q. -- were these advices from Criminal Law Team  
 18 members?  
 19 A. Yes.  
 20 Q. You say they gave rise to real concerns. Can  
 21 you explain why these advices gave rise to real  
 22 concerns, please?  
 23 A. They were always very short, and brevity is  
 24 a fine quality but not where it means you cannot  
 25 actually discern from the charging advice what

55

1 start with some general points about charging  
 2 decisions. I'm at page 223 of your report.  
 3 A. Yes, thank you.  
 4 Q. Paragraph 632. I think it's right that, in  
 5 relation to charging decisions, you struggled to  
 6 identify who had taken the final decision in any  
 7 case to charge a suspect with a criminal offence  
 8 or offences?  
 9 A. Yeah, and this follows on from the concern  
 10 I expressed when last I was here that there were  
 11 a number of documents, policy documents from the  
 12 Post Office that at least suggested that  
 13 business managers or, indeed, I think in  
 14 a couple of cases, HR personnel, would be making  
 15 decisions in relation to prosecution. So I was  
 16 very keen to see evidence of who actually made  
 17 the decision and who they were and what their  
 18 position was. I didn't see anything like that.  
 19 I saw advices from lawyers, internal advices in  
 20 the first instance, but it was not clear who  
 21 acted on those advices.  
 22 Q. So that's an identity of decision maker issue?  
 23 A. Yes, and whether the person who was making the  
 24 decision was applying the Code for Crown  
 25 Prosecutors, for example, what factors they

54

1 the basis for the conclusion reached in that  
 2 advice is, what test has been applied, what  
 3 factors have been taken into account, what  
 4 evidence it is -- has been identified as  
 5 underlying the conclusion.  
 6 In the main, the documents set out the  
 7 conclusion and that was it. So they didn't show  
 8 their workings in any way and where,  
 9 particularly, decisions were being made to  
 10 charge an offence of theft where, on what I had  
 11 seen, it was far from clear what basis there was  
 12 for reaching a conclusion that there was  
 13 a realistic prospect of a conviction for theft,  
 14 the lack of any such analysis was troubling.  
 15 Q. You mentioned in paragraph 633, as well, that  
 16 they took as read the evidential position set  
 17 out in the Investigator's summary.  
 18 A. That was my assumption, on the basis that there  
 19 was nothing else and that it was -- the advice  
 20 was usually addressed to the person who'd  
 21 written the summary and so an Investigator had  
 22 put together their assessment of the evidence,  
 23 had sent it, as far as I could see, to a lawyer  
 24 in the Criminal Law Division and the Criminal  
 25 Law Division lawyer had sent it back with the

56

1 conclusion as to whether they considered there  
 2 was a realistic prospect of a conviction,  
 3 without anything else. There was no suggestion  
 4 in any of these that they had seen anything  
 5 else, before making their -- giving their  
 6 advice.

7 **Q.** Just concentrating on the question of what  
 8 information was included in that charging  
 9 advice, rather than the merits of the decision  
 10 reached, based on your knowledge of the Crown  
 11 Prosecution Service and bringing into account  
 12 the fact that I think your practice, even in  
 13 2000 to 2012, might have been concentrating on  
 14 cases of significance or unusual complexity. If  
 15 you were to review a sample of CPS charging  
 16 decisions made by CPS lawyers in that period, in  
 17 the ordinary run of criminal cases of  
 18 an equivalent seriousness to these, do you think  
 19 you would find, on the file, an advice which set  
 20 out or which explained how the evidence met the  
 21 Code evidential test?

22 **A.** Clearly, they -- those that I saw varied in the  
 23 degree of analysis but, even in the period 2000  
 24 to 2013, I saw charging decisions across a whole  
 25 range of offences and there was a real adherence

57

1 **A.** I don't think I am at all. I think,  
 2 particularly once the Post Office had expressly  
 3 said that it was going to apply the Code for  
 4 Crown Prosecutors, that then I don't think it's  
 5 unreasonable to expect to see an analysis by  
 6 reference to that test. Long or short, but  
 7 an analysis, and where you are making a decision  
 8 about particular offences that involve  
 9 particular elements that are the elements that  
 10 you'll need to consider. So for example, in  
 11 relation to the offences we are generally  
 12 concerned with in these cases, a question of  
 13 dishonesty, there ought, in my view, to be at  
 14 least a reference to the fact that you need to  
 15 prove it, and perhaps the evidence that you rely  
 16 on to do so.

17 **Q.** You wouldn't say that's not asking too much?  
 18 **A.** No.

19 **Q.** What about in a theft case, identifying that  
 20 you've got to prove an appropriation and asking  
 21 oneself the question: how do we prove  
 22 an appropriation?

23 **A.** Absolutely.

24 **Q.** What is the evidence of appropriation?  
 25 **A.** Yes, what is the evidence that the money has

59

1 to the Code for Crown Prosecutors, in that they  
 2 would set out "These are the things we have to  
 3 go through, and these are how we have gone  
 4 through them", and that did usually -- I'm not  
 5 going to say always but usually -- involve  
 6 an analysis of the evidence.

7 There would be reference, for example, to  
 8 the account in interview. There'd be reference  
 9 to the loser statement, if that was the type of  
 10 offence, or the complainant's statement. There  
 11 would be an analysis of the -- anything that  
 12 might undermine the credibility of the  
 13 complainant.

14 Those things would be there. Whether they  
 15 would be all there, whether they were in  
 16 themselves always sufficient is perhaps  
 17 a separate question, but there would certainly,  
 18 in those that I saw, be an analysis of the  
 19 evidence. There would at least be a reference  
 20 to aspects of the evidence in those decisions.

21 **Q.** Put shortly, are you holding the Post Office to  
 22 an ideal standard, rather than reflecting the  
 23 reality of the standards that were applied by  
 24 other prosecutors, in making the criticism of  
 25 these charging decisions that you have?

58

1 gone and has gone to the --

2 **Q.** And gone at the hands of this person?

3 **A.** Yes, yes.

4 **Q.** If we turn up, please, page 224 of your report.

5 EXPG000004R, thank you, page 224. If we  
 6 look at the last three sentences on the  
 7 substance of paragraph 633 there, you say:

8 "In particular, this involved consideration  
 9 of the evidential basis to establish dishonesty,  
 10 evidence to show where the money had gone, and  
 11 whether the evidence was reliable."

12 I think you told us last time that all  
 13 iterations of the Code for Crown Prosecutors  
 14 directed the CPS lawyers, or those who were  
 15 applying the Code, to consider reliability; is  
 16 that right?

17 **A.** Yes.

18 **Q.** You say:

19 "By way of example:

20 "In the case of Lisa Brennan, she was  
 21 charged with theft even though the internal  
 22 memorandum sent by the lawyer to the  
 23 Investigator account whether there was evidence  
 24 of stealing as opposed to the covering up of  
 25 shortages, and whether there was evidence that

60

1 she was dishonest rather than incompetent."

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. I think if we track that document down -- we're  
4 not going to do it now -- we'll find that that  
5 was the very advice that said there's  
6 a realistic prospect?

7 A. It was as near as I could find to one, in that  
8 case, and that -- again, it was an early case  
9 but there was nothing to suggest that there was  
10 anything else, and so it wasn't that the  
11 investigator provided evidence to show evidence  
12 of stealing, as opposed to covering up shortages  
13 or evidence of dishonesty, rather than  
14 incompetence, before any decision was made to  
15 charge; it appeared that the decision was made  
16 when there was no answer to those questions.

17 Q. How concerning is that -- well, I should say: is  
18 that concerning?

19 A. Yes, it is, because the lawyer in that case  
20 identified the right questions. They were  
21 absolutely the things to ask before you charge  
22 someone with theft but they went ahead and  
23 charged, as far as I could see, not knowing what  
24 the answers were and that seems the wrong way  
25 round to me.

61

1 report to come to their view on charge, in that  
2 case, they were being told that the offence  
3 couldn't be proved and then they charged it.

4 Q. Was that a concern?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. The Inquiry has heard evidence from a range of  
7 Investigators and prosecuting lawyers who have  
8 told the Chairman that they believed at the time  
9 that the evidence showed that Horizon was  
10 reliable. If that was their state of mind --  
11 and putting aside the fact that we now know that  
12 to have been incorrect -- would that make any  
13 difference to your view as to the reasonableness  
14 of the charging decisions?

15 A. It would almost certainly depend on the  
16 particular case. If it were a case where  
17 nothing had been said by the suspect to give  
18 rise to any concern about the accuracy of the  
19 Horizon data being relied on, and you -- you had  
20 evidence -- as opposed to a belief, you had  
21 evidence that the system was working properly,  
22 then that would -- to charge on that basis,  
23 providing everything else was made out, would  
24 not be inappropriate.

25 But if you had a suspect who was raising

63

1 Q. "In the case of Oyeteju Adedayo [you say at (b)]  
2 the lawyer correctly identified dishonesty as  
3 the likely defence, but didn't address what  
4 evidence there was to prove that element of the  
5 false accounting offences" --

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. -- "that she [nonetheless] advised be  
8 prosecuted."

9 A. Yes, and under the Code the lawyer is enjoined  
10 to identify what likely defences are and what  
11 evidence there is that addresses those defences,  
12 and it wasn't just a defence, it's an element of  
13 the offence that had to be proved and so, both  
14 in assessing whether the elements of the offence  
15 were proved on the evidence and whether any  
16 defence that was raised was likely to succeed or  
17 not, that was the right question to ask, but you  
18 needed the answer to it before you could come to  
19 a conclusion.

20 Q. Then, lastly, in the case of Josephine Hamilton,  
21 she was, you say, charged with theft on the  
22 basis of an investigation report which said,  
23 "I was unable to find evidence of theft".

24 A. Yes, and so, if my understanding was correct and  
25 the lawyer was looking at the investigating

62

1 issues in relation to their post office and the  
2 Horizon system in their post office, then you  
3 the fact that you might have evidence that the  
4 system generally was operating properly would  
5 not absolve you of the need at least to consider  
6 whether there may have been a problem at that  
7 post office and its operation there, that needed  
8 to be investigated because it may be that the  
9 evidence, in relation to the system at that post  
10 office, was not reliable, even if the system  
11 more generally was.

12 Q. Can I summarise it that a generalised belief in  
13 the mind of the lawyer, based on rumour, chatter  
14 or messages from senior management, would in no  
15 case be sufficient?

16 A. No. You would --

17 Q. You needed evidence?

18 A. You needed evidence. Absolutely.

19 Q. The nature of that evidence might differ, is  
20 that right, between a case where a subpostmaster  
21 had raised Horizon reliability as an issue, as  
22 against the case where they had not?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. You draw these threads together over the page,  
25 please, in paragraph 634, and it's the first

64



1 sentence. You say:  
 2 "As a result, to adopt the wording of the  
 3 Inquiry's question ..."  
 4 We had asked whether the charging decisions  
 5 were thorough and/or conscientious. You have  
 6 said that:  
 7 "... they were neither thorough nor  
 8 conscientious."  
 9 **A.** No, they were brief and, in some cases,  
 10 perfunctory.  
 11 **Q.** Can I turn to the second issue, please, which is  
 12 the test that was applied by the charging  
 13 lawyer, the reviewing lawyer?  
 14 **A.** Yes.  
 15 **Q.** You picked this up in paragraph 635, which is  
 16 further down the page. Thank you. You say:  
 17 "The test that was applied by the lawyer in  
 18 giving such advice varied."  
 19 As you said in your first report the Code  
 20 was not acknowledged as the basis for charge  
 21 until 2007 -- that's adopted or acknowledged by  
 22 the Post Office until 2007 -- when it was said  
 23 that that the sufficiency of evidence to  
 24 prosecute and the public interest would be  
 25 considered by reference to the Code.

65

1 **Q.** Can we go over the page to page 226, please, and  
 2 look at paragraph 637. You say:  
 3 "Even more concerning is the evidence in  
 4 a number of cases that [you] reviewed that the  
 5 test of a realistic prospects of a conviction  
 6 ... was not the test or the only test, being  
 7 applied ...  
 8 "In the case of Mr Blakey in 2005, whilst  
 9 the realist particular prospects of success for  
 10 charges of theft and false accounting were  
 11 asserted, they were accompanied by the  
 12 assessment that there was a low prospect of  
 13 success for theft, but a high prospect of  
 14 success for false accounting.  
 15 "In the case of [Mr Thomas] in 2006,  
 16 a different lawyer considered there to be  
 17 a realistic prospect of success for charges of  
 18 theft and false accounting, but this was  
 19 accompanied by the assessment that there was  
 20 a medium prospect of success.  
 21 "In the case of Peter Holmes in 2008, the  
 22 same medium prospects of success test was added  
 23 to the assessment of the realistic prospects of  
 24 conviction."  
 25 **A.** Just to add to that the case of Mrs Skinner, in

67

1 You observed in your first report there was  
 2 little assistance provided in the Post Office  
 3 documents until 2013 as to how the Code was to  
 4 apply to the cases prosecuted by the Post  
 5 Office, in relation to either limb of the test.  
 6 Then you say this:  
 7 "In fact, on my review of these 20 cases  
 8 I confess to not having identified any  
 9 significant change in the way that charging  
 10 decisions appear to have been approached before  
 11 2007 and after, or as the Code for Crown  
 12 Prosecutors developed with new editions in 2004  
 13 and 2010."  
 14 **A.** Yes.  
 15 **Q.** Can we extend that to the 22 cases that you  
 16 looked at?  
 17 **A.** Yes.  
 18 **Q.** It didn't improve in the case of Janet Skinner  
 19 or Julian Wilson?  
 20 **A.** No, there continued to be no analysis of the  
 21 factors identified under the Code, particularly  
 22 in relation to the public interest, and there  
 23 was still cases, across the piece, where the  
 24 test was set out in ways that didn't reflect the  
 25 test.

66

1 my Volume 2A, the same issue of medium prospects  
 2 of success was -- appeared there, as well.  
 3 **Q.** Would you agree that the evidential limb of the  
 4 Full Code Test is simply whether there's  
 5 a realistic prospect of conviction or not?  
 6 **A.** Yes.  
 7 **Q.** Is it right that some cases may pass the  
 8 evidential limb of the Full Code Test, ie there  
 9 is a greater than 50 per cent prospect of  
 10 a conviction but, nonetheless, have a relatively  
 11 low prospect of conviction?  
 12 **A.** In the sense that they're nearer 50 per cent  
 13 than not, yes.  
 14 **Q.** Some who have passed the 51 per cent threshold  
 15 may have a very high prospect of conviction,  
 16 ie near the 99 per cent?  
 17 **A.** Yes.  
 18 **Q.** For the purposes of the Code test, does it  
 19 matter whether it's 51 per cent or 99 per cent?  
 20 **A.** Not so far as the evidential test is concerned.  
 21 That may have an impact at the public interest  
 22 stage but not at the evidential stage.  
 23 **Q.** Why might it have an impact at the public  
 24 interest stage of the assessment?  
 25 **A.** Because if it is a borderline case and there are

68

1 other public interest considerations that might  
 2 tend against prosecution, then the fact that the  
 3 case is a weak one will add to the weight of  
 4 those public interest considerations.

5 **Q.** In a private prosecution where a prosecutor is  
 6 not obliged to prosecute, even if both the  
 7 evidential threshold is met and the public  
 8 interest test is met, might the relative  
 9 strength of the evidential case be a factor that  
 10 the prosecutor would take into account in  
 11 deciding to commit time and resources to  
 12 prosecuting?

13 **A.** Yes.

14 **Q.** Is that how you read these memoranda?

15 **A.** No, I confess I wasn't really very sure as to  
 16 how I should read these memoranda because there  
 17 were so few clues in their brevity as to how  
 18 I was meant to read them, and that it may have  
 19 also puzzled anyone who was receiving them at  
 20 the time as their advice.

21 On the one hand, taking the case of  
 22 Mr Blakey as an example, it was saying there's  
 23 a realistic prospect of conviction for theft but  
 24 a low prospect of success for theft and, on one  
 25 reading, those two things cancel each other out.

69

1 **Q.** In any of the 22 cases that you looked at, did  
 2 you see any analysis of that kind?

3 **A.** No. Well, in fairness, in very few of the cases  
 4 did I see any reference to the public interest  
 5 at all.

6 **Q.** That's the third topic under this heading that  
 7 I was going to turn to, the public interest  
 8 test. Before we move to that, in paragraph 638  
 9 at the foot of the page there, you said that you  
 10 expressed a concern in your first report about  
 11 the lack of assistance for prosecutors as to the  
 12 tests to apply.

13 **A.** Yes.

14 **Q.** You referred, I think, to policy documents that  
 15 there was an incantation of the adherence to the  
 16 Code for Crown Prosecutors but nothing that  
 17 helped individuals to carry that into effect in  
 18 the context of the likely offences being  
 19 prosecuted by the Post Office.

20 **A.** Yes.

21 **Q.** You say that those examples would tend to show  
 22 that concern to be well founded. Are you  
 23 drawing a link there between the absence of Post  
 24 Office policy and guidance with decisions made  
 25 in practice?

71

1 **Q.** Were you concerned that the gloss that was put  
 2 may have undermined or vitiated the assessment  
 3 that there was a realistic prospect of  
 4 a conviction for theft?

5 **A.** Yes, especially when considered against what  
 6 evidence there was of the elements of theft in  
 7 that case. If it were intended as a "You could  
 8 but I wouldn't if I were you", then it needed to  
 9 be spelt out in terms, rather than left to the  
 10 intuition or guesswork of someone else. If it  
 11 were seeking to address, "It's made out but you  
 12 may not want to prosecute because the prospects  
 13 of success are low and, therefore, the public  
 14 interest factors might outweigh it", then it  
 15 would have been helpful if it had said any of  
 16 that, but it didn't.

17 And so it just suggested to me a lack of  
 18 confidence in there being a realistic prospect  
 19 of conviction and, if that were the case, in  
 20 coming to a decision on an offence that would,  
 21 on the face of it, involve theft in breach of  
 22 trust by an employee of long record and previous  
 23 good character, then it really needed to set it  
 24 all out, rather than just say "low prospect",  
 25 whatever that meant.

70

1 **A.** Yes, so the concern I expressed last time was  
 2 that simply telling someone that there was  
 3 another thing that they could go away and look  
 4 at that would help them make their decisions did  
 5 put the onus on them to correctly understand  
 6 what that meant and what it required of them,  
 7 whereas if it was spelt out in terms for them in  
 8 the policy by the Post Office, then there was  
 9 less risk of them getting it wrong and a greater  
 10 chance of there being a consistent application  
 11 of the policy.

12 Just pausing there and going back to the  
 13 last topic, if you'll forgive me for a moment,  
 14 it's interesting that I found, when I was  
 15 preparing Volume 1, that there were more policy  
 16 documents on interviews and the appropriate way  
 17 of dealing with an interview than almost  
 18 anything else, and it's interesting that the  
 19 Investigators, generally speaking, complied with  
 20 their obligations under PACE in relation to  
 21 interviews when they had lots of policy help as  
 22 to how to do that.

23 Here, we have prosecutors who were just told  
 24 "Apply the Code for Crown Prosecutors", full  
 25 stop, and we have these charging advices where

72

1 the guidance given in the Code for Crown  
 2 Prosecutors, as to the things you need to  
 3 consider in relation to each stage of the test,  
 4 are not referred to and you have a number of  
 5 cases where the test that is set out in the Code  
 6 has a gloss on it that is not explained by the  
 7 Code or indeed anything else.

8 **Q.** Thank you. Can we then turn to the third  
 9 subtopic, then, the public interest. At  
 10 paragraph 639 at the foot of the page there, you  
 11 express concern that the charging memoranda  
 12 rarely addressed the public interest at all.  
 13 You said that they were disturbingly few in  
 14 number; is that right?

15 **A.** Yes.

16 **Q.** You say that the 2004 iteration of the Code  
 17 identified 17 public interest factors favouring  
 18 prosecution, nine to the contrary; and the 2010  
 19 iteration identified 19 factors favouring  
 20 prosecution -- then over the page -- and 11 to  
 21 the contrary.

22 I think in none of the 22 cases that you saw  
 23 was there any analysis of those features at all.

24 **A.** No. Indeed, in the majority of them, the words  
 25 "public" and "interest" together didn't appear

73

1 this was an aberration in an otherwise  
 2 distinguished career.

3 These wouldn't necessarily trump the fact  
 4 that they had stolen from their employer but  
 5 they would be things that would be thought about  
 6 in deciding whether it was in the public  
 7 interest to prosecute or not and, here, there  
 8 was no analysis of that at all.

9 **Q.** In any of the cases that you looked at, had you  
 10 been satisfied that the evidential test had been  
 11 satisfied for a charge of theft by an employee  
 12 in breach of trust, were there, nonetheless,  
 13 factors which would have led you to conclude  
 14 that the public interest was not met or weren't  
 15 you in a position to say one way or the other?

16 **A.** I think because I struggled in many of these  
 17 cases to identify what the basis for concluding  
 18 that there was a realistic prospect of  
 19 conviction for theft, how they had got there,  
 20 I'm not sure that I got beyond that to consider  
 21 the public interest but, clearly, where you have  
 22 the suspect in interview, and this was then  
 23 relied on as the basis or for prosecuting them,  
 24 saying that this was not deliberate financial  
 25 benefit that was driving them: this was things

75

1 at all.

2 **Q.** So an entire absence of evidence that that had  
 3 been considered on the face of the papers?

4 **A.** Yes.

5 **Q.** You say that you recognise -- this is the third  
 6 line:  
 7 "... where a prosecutor was satisfied there  
 8 was a realistic prospect of proving there had  
 9 been theft by an employee in breach of trust,  
 10 that would be a strong factor in favour of there  
 11 being a public interest in prosecution.  
 12 However, the nuances to that test, by reference  
 13 to the list of factors for and against ...  
 14 underline that such an analysis may be  
 15 oversimplistic."

16 Can you explain why, please?

17 **A.** Clearly, where the evidence demonstrates that  
 18 an employee has stolen from their employer in  
 19 breach of trust, that is the type of situation  
 20 where it would often be in the public interest  
 21 to prosecute, but it would not necessarily  
 22 follow that that were the case if, for example,  
 23 it was clear that the person had been acting  
 24 under duress at the time that they had done  
 25 that, if they were ill, if they were old, if

74

1 coming up in the system that they couldn't  
 2 explain and sought to cover up -- so more of  
 3 a mistake rather than premeditated -- that's the  
 4 kind of thing that the Code would tell you that  
 5 you need to take into account in the public  
 6 interest, weighing against prosecution,  
 7 potentially, the fact that someone has a good  
 8 record is a factor that is taken in account in  
 9 assessing the public interest weighing against  
 10 prosecution.

11 And, indeed, I appreciate it's a very  
 12 different document, but the audit guidance, the  
 13 approach to audit shortages that Contract  
 14 Managers were asked to consider with a whole  
 15 list of factors, including record, whether this  
 16 was a one-off, et cetera, whether there'd been  
 17 voluntary repayment, and so on, those are the  
 18 kind of things that I would have taken into  
 19 account if I'd been making one of these  
 20 decisions as weighing against the public  
 21 interest being in favour of prosecution, even if  
 22 I were satisfied that there was evidence of  
 23 theft.

24 **Q.** So even if you'd been able to -- suspending  
 25 disbelief for a moment, that there was evidence

76

1 of theft, you would nonetheless have found, or  
 2 potentially found, the factors that pointed  
 3 against, in the public interest, prosecution?  
 4 **A.** Yes, and where I would have ended up it's rather  
 5 difficult to say because it would have depended  
 6 on my assessment of what the evidence of theft  
 7 was. But, certainly, there would have been  
 8 factors going both ways that needed to be  
 9 thought about, not least because that's what the  
 10 Code told you to.  
 11 **Q.** You mentioned just now voluntary repayment and,  
 12 in your paragraph 639 here, in the last four  
 13 lines, you say "factors such as ... whether they  
 14 have made reparation" were relevant, albeit they  
 15 were rarely addressed.  
 16 So the extent to which a suspect had made  
 17 reparation, would you agree, was a relevant  
 18 factor to be considered in relation to the  
 19 prosecutorial assessment of the public interest  
 20 limb?  
 21 **A.** Yes.  
 22 **Q.** I think in the 2010 edition of the Code, amongst  
 23 the public interest factors that were listed,  
 24 was the extent to which the suspect had put  
 25 right the loss or harm --

77

1 than that, ie in primary or secondary  
 2 legislation?  
 3 **A.** I'm not sure I'm following you.  
 4 **Q.** Yes. In order to impose a caution, was some  
 5 legal basis setting up the machinery necessary  
 6 to do so or, if that wasn't an issue that you  
 7 looked at, then please do say?  
 8 **A.** I don't think it was. I'm sure there must be  
 9 but I can't think of it off the top of my head.  
 10 **Q.** Can you recall, as a result of the Criminal  
 11 Justice Act 2003, in the context of public  
 12 prosecutions, a mechanism, a vehicle, known as  
 13 conditional cautioning?  
 14 **A.** Yes, yes, and there was -- I know there was, for  
 15 example, CPS guidance in relation to how they  
 16 should approach that.  
 17 **Q.** Could such conditions attached to a conditional  
 18 caution include repayment of money, ie the  
 19 payment of compensation?  
 20 **A.** Yes.  
 21 **Q.** Did you examine whether that legislative scheme  
 22 was one that was available to the Post Office?  
 23 **A.** No.  
 24 **Q.** Thank you.  
 25 Can we turn to topic 5, please -- that can

79

1 **A.** Yes.  
 2 **Q.** -- albeit it noted that a suspect should not  
 3 avoid prosecution solely because they had repaid  
 4 a loss?  
 5 **A.** No, absolutely.  
 6 **Q.** In the context of a case where there that  
 7 already been a finding, an assessment, there was  
 8 sufficient evidence to prosecute for  
 9 a dishonesty offence, and a prosecutor is  
 10 considering whether a prosecution is in the  
 11 public interest or whether a caution might be  
 12 sufficient and proportionate disposal, would the  
 13 fact that the suspect has repaid the amount be  
 14 a legitimate factor to take into consideration?  
 15 **A.** Yes, it could be, yes.  
 16 **Q.** You noted in the case study of Bailey that the  
 17 administering of a caution was made conditional  
 18 on the undertaking to make repayment when funds  
 19 became available?  
 20 **A.** Yes.  
 21 **Q.** Did you identify any legal basis for the  
 22 imposition of cautions by the Post Office?  
 23 **A.** There was a Post Office policy that dealt with  
 24 cautioning.  
 25 **Q.** Yes. I'm thinking about something higher level

78

1 come down from the screen -- which is reasonable  
 2 lines of inquiry and, in particular, how they  
 3 impacted on the disclosure that it was necessary  
 4 for the Post Office to give.  
 5 **A.** Yes.  
 6 **Q.** Back in your first report, the cross-reference  
 7 is paragraphs 366 to 370, you set out some  
 8 conclusions in relation to the requirement to  
 9 pursue all reasonable lines of inquiry. I'm  
 10 just going to remind you of them.  
 11 **A.** Thank you.  
 12 **Q.** Firstly, you said:  
 13 "In the present circumstances, the  
 14 requirement in the particular circumstances  
 15 involved consideration of whether the  
 16 investigation included whether accounting  
 17 shortfalls at Horizon terminals might lie with  
 18 the computer system, either as a matter of  
 19 course or where such a possibility was raised by  
 20 a suspect in interview."  
 21 In Volume 2 of your report, you identify  
 22 some failures on the part of the Post Office to  
 23 pursue such reasonable lines of inquiry and  
 24 resulting in disclosure failings. Can we look,  
 25 please, at page 219 of your second report,

80

1 starting at paragraph 624 --

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. -- so page 219. Thank you.

4 It's the fourth line at the end there. You  
5 say:

6 "In my review of these 20 cases there were,  
7 consistently, failures by the Investigators to  
8 identify and pursue a number of reasonable lines  
9 of inquiry."

10 Can we expand that to in the 22 cases that  
11 you reviewed, there were consistently failures  
12 by the investigators to identify and pursue  
13 a number of reasonable lines of inquiry?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. So, in relation to the "consistently", do you  
16 mean by that that it didn't depend on the  
17 identity of the Investigator or the lawyer?

18 A. No. That's right.

19 Q. Do you mean consistently by reference to the  
20 fact that it remained the case across the piece?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. I think you tell us about that in the next  
23 sentence:

24 "That remained the position, without any  
25 obvious or significant change, after the 2010

81

1 Q. You give three examples of what you call a trend  
2 there: the absence of financial investigation;  
3 the absence of investigation of training and  
4 calls to helplines; and the absence of  
5 investigations into the operations of Horizon.

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. I want to deal with each of those in turn,  
8 please. The absence of investigation into  
9 financial records or financial issues. You  
10 address this in your paragraph 625. You tell us  
11 that:

12 "... where a suspect denied in interview  
13 that he or she had taken the money, and/or had  
14 sought to make good unexplained losses  
15 identified by [Horizon], it would be  
16 a reasonable line of inquiry to obtain their  
17 financial information to see if there is  
18 evidence of unexplained monies appearing in bank  
19 accounts, or payments out of those accounts to  
20 cover shortfalls. Such evidence is of direct  
21 relevance to the question of whether they have  
22 appropriated ... money, for the purposes of  
23 theft, and whether they have acted dishonestly  
24 for both theft and false accounting."

25 So following the money, if I can call it

83

1 amendment to the Post Office disclosure policy  
2 document."

3 A. Yes, and that meant expressed the duty to pursue  
4 all reasonable lines of inquiry, which had been  
5 absent from the earlier version of the  
6 disclosure policy. Even though it was  
7 acknowledged in writing, it was not reflected in  
8 the approach, as I saw it, in these cases.

9 Q. You tell us that:

10 "There were lines of inquiry common to these  
11 cases, the relevance of which was repeatedly  
12 engaged by the explanations advanced interview  
13 by suspects and/or by the circumstances of the  
14 shortfall being investigated, which were either  
15 not pursued at all, were only pursued in  
16 a limited or supervision manner, or were only  
17 pursued as a result of requests ... by reviewing  
18 lawyers or, much more commonly, by the defence.  
19 The following are examples of this trend."

20 So, irrespective of the circumstances,  
21 whether it was a defendant raising it, whether  
22 the circumstances of the case demanded it, there  
23 was a failure, in your view, to pursue  
24 reasonable lines of inquiry.

25 A. Yes.

82

1 that, is relevant in a case of alleged theft, to  
2 both the appropriation question and the  
3 dishonesty question.

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Can you explain why it's relevant to both the  
6 appropriation question and the dishonesty  
7 question?

8 A. It's relevant to appropriation for evidence that  
9 they have appropriated the money, they have got  
10 the money and taken the money. It's relevant to  
11 dishonesty because, if the evidence of their  
12 bank account, firstly, shows they haven't taken  
13 the money and, secondly, shows that they were  
14 not in a financial position where they needed to  
15 take the money and, thirdly, where it was  
16 appropriate, where it showed they had sought to  
17 try to repay losses that had been identified by  
18 the system in accordance with their contracts  
19 until a point where, as they explained in their  
20 interview, they couldn't afford to do it any  
21 more, and that that in turn was borne out by  
22 their bank accounts, then those factors would  
23 all be relevant to the assessment of whether  
24 they'd been dishonest or not, because they would  
25 bear them out in their explanation of what had

84

1 happened, insofar as they understood it.

2 **Q.** What about the suggestion that it was always  
3 open to the defendant to say, at trial, "Well,  
4 look, there's no evidence adduced by the  
5 prosecution of me having a speed boat on my  
6 drive, or a holiday in the Bahamas or  
7 unexplained entries into my bank account. The  
8 prosecution hasn't shown any of those things".

9 **A.** They can say that. They can say that with a far  
10 greater degree of emphasis, if the jury know  
11 that the prosecution have looked and where they  
12 have looked and what they have found or what  
13 they haven't found.

14 **Q.** So is that why it's a reasonable line of inquiry  
15 to pursue, amongst others?

16 **A.** It's one of the reasons but it's not the only  
17 one.

18 **Q.** How serious an omission or failing did you  
19 regard this?

20 **A.** In the first of the cases I considered, that of  
21 Lisa Brennan, the lawyer absolutely rightly  
22 asked the question of the Investigator as to  
23 whether there was any evidence to show that she  
24 had stolen the money before then going on to  
25 charge her with theft anyway. But the fact that

85

1 same approach taken on the same evidence by the  
2 Post Office.

3 **Q.** In relation to a case of false accounting, what  
4 relevance does the financial enquiry that you're  
5 suggesting ought to have been made, potentially  
6 have?

7 **A.** You would want to consider why the suspect had  
8 done what they admitted doing, where they  
9 admitted doing it, in relation to the accounting  
10 records. And where they were explaining that  
11 they had -- a loss had come up on the system  
12 that they couldn't explain, that they knew they  
13 were ultimately going to be reliable for, but it  
14 was nothing to do with them, in the sense they  
15 hadn't benefited from it, they couldn't afford  
16 to pay it back, all of that would be addressed  
17 by their financial records that would show  
18 whether those things were correct or not.

19 And that would weigh both on whether the  
20 elements of the offence were made out but also  
21 on the public interest in that kind of case.

22 **Q.** In any of the 22 cases that you looked at, did  
23 you see any written explanation in the papers as  
24 to why that line of inquiry was not pursued?

25 **A.** No, and, in fairness, in some of the cases they

87

1 that question was raised does underline how  
2 fundamental a question it was to raise because,  
3 if you are accusing someone of appropriating  
4 money, then it is, it seems to me, incumbent  
5 upon you to see whether they have or not.

6 And a good place to look for that, not the  
7 only one, but a good place to look for that  
8 would be to see if there's any evidence that  
9 they've got it.

10 **Q.** Did you see any explanation in the papers that  
11 you saw as to why this line of inquiry was not  
12 pursued?

13 **A.** No. I think it was the case, if I remember  
14 rightly, of Carl Page, which started out as  
15 an investigation with other investigators,  
16 I think the police and Customs were both  
17 involved at one point, if I'm remembering the  
18 case correctly, and the police investigation, in  
19 relation to what was then an allegation of  
20 a conspiracy in relation to funds from the Post  
21 Office, did investigate whether they could find  
22 any evidence of the money.

23 They couldn't and the police concluded that  
24 they weren't going to take the matter any  
25 further because they couldn't. That was not the

86

1 asked the suspect at the time of interview  
2 whether they could have access to their bank  
3 accounts, whenever they asked, they were told  
4 that they could and, in some of those cases they  
5 did obtain some financial material, but it was  
6 never a very deep dive into the finances.

7 And that perhaps was illustrated in some of  
8 the cases where confiscation followed on, that  
9 a lot of the investigation of the suspect's  
10 finances came about at the stage after they'd  
11 been convicted, with a view to getting the money  
12 from them, rather than earlier.

13 **Q.** Thank you. Can we turn to the second example  
14 that you give of a reasonable line of inquiry  
15 not being pursued, and that's paragraph 626.  
16 You tell us about training and calls to  
17 helplines:

18 "... Where a suspect described issues with  
19 their operation of the Horizon system, by  
20 reference to their training, and/or recounts  
21 their attempts to get help at earlier stages  
22 [you say] it would be reasonable to make  
23 enquiries as to their level of training, and to  
24 ascertain whether, how often and in what  
25 circumstances they had contacted the relevant

88

1 helplines."

2 **A.** Yes.

3 **Q.** What issues might that go to in a prosecution?

4 **A.** Again, to take the analysis from the lawyer in

5 the case of Lisa Brennan, the other question

6 that she asked of the Investigator in that case

7 was whether this was deliberate or the result of

8 incompetence and, to put that in a slightly

9 different way, you would want to understand

10 whether that which was being done to the system

11 was being done because the person knew what they

12 were doing, or whether it was, at least,

13 possible that it was the result of them not

14 knowing what they were doing, and a way of

15 assessing that would be to identify how much

16 training they'd had to know what they were doing

17 or not.

18 And that would be all the more necessary,

19 where, as was often the case in these cases, the

20 person being interviewed said that they'd had

21 limited training or no particular training in

22 relation to Horizon. And, in either situation,

23 but certainly in the latter, it would be

24 a reasonable line of inquiry to ascertain what

25 training they'd had -- relevant training, they'd

89

1 you had evidence that they had called to ask

2 what they should do, it underlined the fact that

3 this was a problem that they were having to deal

4 with that they didn't understand, and that would

5 be relevant to an assessment of whether they

6 were acting dishonestly or not, whether this was

7 accidental or deliberate, and so on.

8 **MR BEER:** Thank you very much. I was going to move

9 on to the third subtopic here, but it's 1.00.

10 Sir, I wonder whether we might come back at

11 1.50, please.

12 **SIR WYN WILLIAMS:** All right, 1.50.

13 **MR BEER:** Thank you very much, sir.

14 **(1.00 pm)**

15 **(The Short Adjournment)**

16 **(1.50 pm)**

17 **MR BEER:** Good afternoon, sir. Can you continue to

18 see and hear me?

19 **SIR WYN WILLIAMS:** Yes, thank you.

20 **MR BEER:** Thank you very much.

21 Good afternoon, Mr Atkinson.

22 Can we turn to the third subtopic of the

23 fifth topic. The fifth topic was reasonable

24 lines of inquiry and the third subtopic was

25 Horizon and obtaining from Fujitsu data, in

91

1 had, as to whether this may be the result of

2 mistake, rather than dishonesty.

3 **Q.** So in both theft and false accounting

4 allegations, it went directly to the issue of

5 dishonesty?

6 **A.** Yes.

7 **Q.** Can I turn to the third reasonable line of

8 inquiry that you identify, and that's over the

9 page, please.

10 **A.** Sorry, just in relation to the second half of

11 paragraph 626 and the calls to helplines.

12 Again, the managing shortage at audit guideline

13 identified that, whether the person had earlier

14 been seeking help in relation to what had gone

15 wrong, was a relevant factor for a contract

16 manager in deciding what to do with the person

17 who -- where there was an issue on an audit.

18 It was identified as relevant in a number of

19 these cases, but only a few of them, to

20 understand whether the type of problems that had

21 been thrown up in -- as a description in

22 interview were ones that had been borne out at

23 the time. So where you had suspect saying,

24 "This problem kept arising when I was using the

25 system and I called to ask what I should do", if

90

1 particular ARQ data. You address this on

2 page 221 of your report at paragraph 628.

3 **A.** Yes.

4 **Q.** If we scroll down to 628, thank you, you say:

5 "Where a suspect described issues with the

6 Horizon system, unexplained losses, recurrent

7 error notices or simply asserted that they could

8 not explain what had happened when confronted

9 with a Horizon record of a shortfall, then

10 a reasonable line of inquiry is to identify what

11 the root cause of that shortfall is ... That

12 involved firstly the obtaining underlying data,

13 and its assessment for bugs, errors or issues."

14 You say that:

15 "The failure to undertake such enquiries was

16 almost routinely identified by the Court of

17 Appeal in *Hamilton* as a serious investigative

18 deficiency ... In these, and many other cases,

19 there was no enquiry for bugs or errors, and the

20 ARQ data was not obtained."

21 I think earlier in your report you say that,

22 in some cases, the failure to pursue this

23 reasonable line of inquiry was picked up by

24 a prosecution lawyer but the prosecution lawyer

25 did not wait for the outcome of the

92

1 investigative steps before positively finding or  
2 advising that a prosecution should be pursued;  
3 is that right?

4 **A.** Yes.

5 **Q.** That was paragraph 230 of your report.

6 Can I seek to exemplify some of those  
7 conclusions in relation to specific case studies  
8 and this will take a while but I'm going to  
9 devote some time to it because of the  
10 importance, potentially, of the issue.

11 In paragraphs 37 to 50 of your report,  
12 I think that starts at page 21 -- if we scroll  
13 down -- 37 onwards, you're addressing here the  
14 investigation and charging decision in relation  
15 to Lisa Brennan?

16 **A.** Yes.

17 **Q.** If we go forwards to 43 and 44 -- that's  
18 paragraphs 43 and 44 -- on page 23, you say that  
19 there was some engagement by the reviewing  
20 lawyer with the identification and pursuit of  
21 reasonable lines of inquiry?

22 **A.** Yes.

23 **Q.** Yes? You cross-refer us, in footnote 30, to  
24 POL00047331. Then you tell us, over the page at  
25 page 24, in paragraphs 45 and 46, that the

93

1 errors or defects in the Horizon system?

2 **A.** No.

3 **Q.** Nor contacting Fujitsu with regard to the  
4 integrity of Horizon data?

5 **A.** No.

6 **Q.** Then, if we can look to the response,  
7 POL00047335, Mr Bradshaw's reply, as you say,  
8 about a fortnight later, "Your memo [Teresa  
9 Berridge] refers", and then a series of  
10 responses to the questions that she asked, all  
11 numbered paragraph 1 but I think we can see, if  
12 we compare them side by side that they are  
13 responses to her paragraphs.

14 None of those lines of inquiry involved the  
15 reviewing of Horizon data, including ARQ data --

16 **A.** No.

17 **Q.** -- the identification of bugs, errors or defects  
18 in the Horizon system, nor contact with Fujitsu  
19 in relation to the integrity of Horizon data?

20 **A.** Yes, and the second paragraph down, in relation  
21 to error notices, was perhaps as near as it got  
22 to considering whether there had been issues  
23 with the system that had been flagged up but  
24 that was -- that's not the same thing as what  
25 you've just been asking.

95

1 Investigator, and it's Mr Bradshaw again,  
2 responded to what the reviewing lawyer had said  
3 two weeks later, indicating that further  
4 investigations had been conducted but that you  
5 conclude, in 46, that there was no evidence that  
6 any enquiries were made as to whether the  
7 Horizon system on which the case depended was  
8 operating correctly?

9 **A.** Yes.

10 **Q.** Can we just look, please, then at the two  
11 documents that found those conclusions, to start  
12 with POL00047331.

13 I think this is the memorandum that you were  
14 referring to.

15 **A.** Yes.

16 **Q.** If we just scroll down a little bit further, we  
17 can see what Ms Berridge, a senior lawyer in the  
18 Criminal Law Division was advising, "I would  
19 like to know", and then 1 to 10.

20 I think it's right, isn't it, that none of  
21 those lines of inquiry identified by the  
22 reviewing lawyer address expressly reviewing  
23 Horizon data or obtaining ARQ data --

24 **A.** No, that's right.

25 **Q.** -- identifying the potential for any bugs,

94

1 **Q.** No. Was there any evidence in Lisa Brennan's  
2 case that Fujitsu were contacted for information  
3 or provision of data that you saw?

4 **A.** No.

5 **Q.** I don't think any witnesses from Fujitsu were  
6 ever called in Ms Brennan's trial; is that  
7 right?

8 **A.** No.

9 **Q.** Can we move on, then, to your report, so back to  
10 the main report, please, at page 30 and  
11 paragraphs 63 to 69. You're here dealing with  
12 David Yates' case, yes?

13 **A.** Yes.

14 **Q.** You note in paragraph 69, which is on page 32,  
15 if we scroll down, there is no evidence that any  
16 checks were made on the Horizon system for  
17 evidence of faults or other errors that might  
18 have impinged on the records that Mr Yates'  
19 described in his interview, or otherwise?

20 **A.** No, that's right. That was a case where  
21 Mr Yates was describing errors appearing on what  
22 he was doing that he couldn't understand.

23 **Q.** The Court of Appeal concluded that there was  
24 nothing to indicate that any ARQ data was  
25 obtained at the time of the criminal proceedings

96



1 in Mr Yates' case?

2 A. No, that's right.

3 Q. That's *Hamilton* at paragraphs 330 and 331. Was

4 that observation or finding one that accorded

5 with your review of the papers?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Again, was there any evidence that you saw that

8 Fujitsu was ever contacted for the provision of

9 data or information in relation to Mr Yates'

10 case?

11 A. No.

12 Q. Was there any evidence that any witness

13 statements from Fujitsu employees were ever

14 prepared or provided to the Post Office prior to

15 Mr Yates' guilty plea?

16 A. No.

17 Q. Thank you. Can we move in to David Blakey's

18 case, please, and that's relevantly paragraph 87

19 onwards on page 38 of your report. You address

20 the investigation between paragraphs 87 and 94.

21 If we go to paragraph 94, which is on page 40,

22 at the foot of the page, you say:

23 "... despite Mr Blakey's account of issues

24 with its operation [that's Horizon's operation]

25 there were no enquiries made of Horizon data, or

97

1 to Mr Blakey as part of the investigation?

2 A. No, not that I've seen, no.

3 Q. Can we look, please -- because this is a case in

4 which Jarnail Singh advised -- at POL00044820.

5 Can we see that this is a memorandum in the case

6 of the prosecution of Mr Blakey, if we go to the

7 second page, please, and just scroll down.

8 We'll see that it's signed off by Jarnail Singh.

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. If we go back to page 1, please, and if we just

11 scroll down so we can see the body of the text,

12 thank you. Mr Singh says:

13 "In my opinion there is sufficient evidence

14 to afford a realistic prospect of conviction of

15 Mr Blakey for an offence with theft with a low

16 prospect of success and for false accounting

17 with a high prospect of success."

18 We've addressed that issue this morning.

19 Is that kind of sentence that we see there

20 the bald statement of the sufficiency of

21 evidence that you saw in many charging memos?

22 A. They usually stopped after identifying the

23 offence. The low prospect of success part is

24 something that is less common.

25 Q. So a bald statement, in my submission, "There's

99

1 the operation of the Horizon system, to see if

2 this could explain the issues that Mr Blakey

3 described. This significant limitation to

4 investigation was well identified by the Court

5 of Appeal", and you set out a citation from the

6 Court of Appeal's judgment in *Hamilton* at

7 paragraph 351.

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. So, again, was there any evidence that Fujitsu

10 was ever even contacted for information for

11 assistance or anything else in relation to

12 Mr Blakey's case?

13 A. No, and, in his case, he did identify that there

14 were discrepancies arising in the system that he

15 couldn't explain. He was clear that he was not

16 responsible for them; he was clear that his

17 staff were not responsible for them; he couldn't

18 explain how they had happened. He was told by

19 the Investigator that what he was saying sounded

20 ridiculous and no check was made to understand

21 what it was he was saying, to the extent that he

22 was able to describe it.

23 Q. I think this is a case in which there is no

24 evidence that any witness statements from

25 Fujitsu employees were ever prepared or provided

98

1 sufficient evidence to afford a realistic

2 prospect of conviction"?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Full stop?

5 A. Yes, and it's of note, in just taking this as

6 an example, that the lawyer here identified that

7 a reasonable line of inquiry would be to rule

8 out that others working in the branch had been

9 responsible, and so he asked for statements to

10 be taken from them. He didn't go on to consider

11 whether statements needed to be taken to deal

12 with whether it could have been a computer

13 error, rather than the responsibility of

14 Mr Blakey.

15 Q. So, in this case, would you agree that Mr Singh

16 did not advise or failed to advise as to

17 reviewing of Horizon data including ARQ data --

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. -- and that he ought to have done?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Identifying the potential for any bugs, errors

22 or defects in the Horizon system, and that he

23 ought to have done?

24 A. Yes, and, even if Mr Singh didn't understand ARQ

25 data or what it was, one would have looked to

100

1 see, as a reasonable line of inquiry, that  
 2 checks ought to be made to understand that the  
 3 material that was being relied on -- namely the  
 4 Horizon records -- was reliable, given that the  
 5 defendant in his interview was raising issues  
 6 with the operation of the system.  
 7 **Q.** So, even though he, Mr Singh, might not have  
 8 broken it down as I have, a question to Fujitsu,  
 9 "Can you assure us as to the operation of the  
 10 integrity of the system, can you supply us with  
 11 ARQ data, can you identify whether there are any  
 12 bugs, errors or defects that might impinge on  
 13 the reliability of the data", you would expect,  
 14 am I understanding this correctly, some general  
 15 statement of request that was focused on the  
 16 reliability of the material that the --  
 17 **A.** Yes.  
 18 **Q.** -- prosecution was relying on?  
 19 **A.** Yes, and how detailed it was would depend on how  
 20 much he knew and you might then expect to see  
 21 a discussion between Investigator and lawyer as  
 22 to what needed to be done about that and that  
 23 would be an entirely appropriate dialogue to  
 24 have.  
 25 **Q.** Did you see any of that healthy dialogue between  
 101

1 contacted for information or assistance in  
 2 relation to Mr Mahmood's case?  
 3 **A.** No.  
 4 **Q.** Was there any evidence that any witness  
 5 statements from Fujitsu employees were deployed  
 6 in Mr Mahmood's case?  
 7 **A.** No.  
 8 **Q.** Can we look at how the reviewing lawyer  
 9 approached it, POL0052884. We can see, if we go  
 10 to the second page, if we scroll down -- sorry  
 11 third page -- this is signed by Juliet  
 12 McFarlane, a principal lawyer in the Criminal  
 13 Law Division?  
 14 **A.** Yes.  
 15 **Q.** If we go back to the first page, we will see  
 16 it's dated 27 May 2005. We can see how she  
 17 advises:  
 18 "In my opinion the evidence is sufficient to  
 19 afford a realistic prospect of conviction of the  
 20 above named on the charges set out on the  
 21 attached Schedule."  
 22 Is that the more common formulation?  
 23 **A.** Yes.  
 24 **Q.** I think, without reading this in detail, would  
 25 you agree that Ms McFarlane did not advise as to  
 103

1 lawyer and Investigator on Horizon reliability  
 2 in any of the cases?  
 3 **A.** No.  
 4 **Q.** Can we turn, please, to page 46 of your report.  
 5 Between paragraphs 109 and 115 of your report  
 6 you address the investigation of Tahir Mahmood?  
 7 **A.** Yes.  
 8 **Q.** In paragraph 114, which is on page 48, you note  
 9 that there is no evidence or awareness of issues  
 10 with Horizon in the investigation?  
 11 **A.** No. The only place that questions of any errors  
 12 in Horizon arose was in the interviews of  
 13 Mr Mahmood, where he described, as best he  
 14 could, the problems that he was encountering and  
 15 what they had led to.  
 16 **Q.** The Court of Appeal observed in *Hamilton*, it was  
 17 paragraph 322 of the court's judgment, that:  
 18 "There is nothing of any ARQ data to  
 19 indicate that any ARQ data was obtained at the  
 20 time of the criminal proceedings", in  
 21 Mr Mahmood's case.  
 22 Did that accord with your examination of the  
 23 materials?  
 24 **A.** Yes.  
 25 **Q.** Was there any evidence that Fujitsu was  
 102

1 any reasonable lines of inquiry that required to  
 2 be pursued, relating to reviewing ARQ data or  
 3 any other Horizon data --  
 4 **A.** No.  
 5 **Q.** -- identifying the potential for any errors,  
 6 bugs or defects in the system, or contacting  
 7 Fujitsu in relation to the reliability or  
 8 integrity of Horizon data upon which reliance  
 9 was to be placed?  
 10 **A.** She took account of the fact that the error  
 11 notices that have been obtained didn't accord  
 12 with this all being the result of a mistake.  
 13 She then went on to consider that theft was not  
 14 to be pursued because there were other  
 15 candidates who could have carried out the theft  
 16 and to rely, instead, on false accounting on the  
 17 basis of a covering up of losses in the records,  
 18 whether they'd been caused by Mr Mahmood or not,  
 19 without having actually carried out or advising  
 20 that there should be carried out any checks  
 21 either, as to where the money that gone or as to  
 22 what had happened on the computer.  
 23 **Q.** Was that adequate or not adequate?  
 24 **A.** No. It wasn't adequate.  
 25 **Q.** Thank you.  
 104

1 Can we turn to the case of Carl Page,  
2 please, that's page 59 of your report. Between  
3 paragraphs 149 and 152 of your report, you look  
4 at Horizon issues in relation to the prosecution  
5 of Mr Page, and you note that, in the course of  
6 the retrial, a defence expert report from  
7 Timothy Taylor of KPMG was served on behalf of  
8 the defence, which raised the prospect that the  
9 £282,000 deficiency "could in practice be the  
10 result of unidentified errors or differences in  
11 Horizon" and that the prosecution case depended  
12 on Horizon "working correctly throughout the  
13 indictment period".

14 Yes?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. In the light of that defence expert report  
17 suggesting that the £282,000 could, in practice,  
18 be the result of unidentified errors or  
19 deficiencies in Horizon, was there any evidence  
20 that the Post Office sought to investigate the  
21 existence of any such unidentified errors or  
22 deficiencies?

23 A. No, and the -- taking on board all the need to  
24 be careful about material generated after the  
25 event, the Second Sight review didn't point to

105

1 please, at what the reviewing lawyer advised at  
2 POL00052990. 10 March 2006, in the case of  
3 Suzanne Lesley Palmer. If we go to the second  
4 page, please, we'll see this is one of  
5 Mr Jarnail Singh's charging advices.

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Then back to page 1:

8 "I am of the opinion there is sufficient  
9 evidence to afford a realistic prospect of  
10 conviction of Ms Palmer for the offences of  
11 false accounting."

12 Then, if you look at the remainder of the  
13 page, and then over the page, is it right that  
14 Mr Singh did not advise when he ought to as to  
15 any further reasonable lines of inquiry,  
16 including reviewing Horizon data --

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. -- identifying the potential for bugs, errors or  
19 defects in the Horizon system --

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. -- and, lastly, contact with Fujitsu regarding  
22 Horizon integrity?

23 A. Yes. On the contrary, he said that there was  
24 nothing further that needed to be done.

25 Q. We can see that, if we go back a page, please --

107

1 any which accorded with the lack of any evidence  
2 of contemporaneous material in that regard.

3 Q. The Court of Appeal observed, it's paragraph 284  
4 of the Court of Appeal's judgment, that there is  
5 nothing in the Post Office case papers to  
6 indicate that any ARQ data was obtained at the  
7 time of the criminal proceedings in Mr Page's  
8 case, whether at the initial trial or upon  
9 retrial. Did that observation accord with your  
10 examination of the case papers?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Can we turn, please, to paragraph 223 onwards in  
13 your report, that's page 85, where you're  
14 addressing the investigation in relation to  
15 Suzanne Palmer. This is paragraph 223 to 227.  
16 In relation to that case, Ms Palmer's case, did  
17 you see any evidence that Fujitsu was ever  
18 contacted for information or evidence in  
19 relation to Ms Palmer's case?

20 A. No.

21 Q. Was there any evidence that any witness  
22 statements from Fujitsu employees were ever  
23 served on Ms Palmer?

24 A. No.

25 Q. Therefore none called at trial. Can we look,

106

1 if we scroll down -- the line "No further  
2 statements need to be obtained at this stage".

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. But then, conditionally, if there's an election  
5 for trial or refusal of jurisdiction, or if  
6 a not guilty plea is entered, then the following  
7 statements are necessary, but none of those  
8 address the three points that I've asked you  
9 about?

10 A. No, and the statements that are listed there are  
11 all tidying up the evidence for presentation to  
12 a jury. I don't read number 4 there, "Any other  
13 statements the Officers consider relevant", to  
14 be identifying to an Investigator that they  
15 needed to go and obtain ARQ data.

16 Q. Page 114, please -- sorry, my mistake.

17 Yes, page 114 of your report, please.

18 You're dealing here, between paragraphs 312 and  
19 320, with the investigation concerning Mr Peter  
20 Holmes?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. In paragraph 316, please, which is on page 116,  
23 you're addressing, in 316, the interview and you  
24 summarise what happened in the course of the  
25 interview.

108

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. He asserted, second line, that:

3 "... shortages could be an issue with

4 Horizon or with malfunctioning equipment."

5 Then fourth line:

6 "... believed that the shortfall on each

7 occasion was something that the computer had

8 done, or failed to do."

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Seventh line:

11 "He also raised specifically issues with the

12 Horizon system for three months about nine

13 months previously."

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Tenth line:

16 "He denied, emphatically, stealing the money

17 ..."

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. I think, if we look, at POL00052178, we can see

20 his defence statement, "Name of Accused: Peter

21 Holmes", his solicitors and the date of it.

22 Then if we scroll down to what his defence

23 statement said, second sentence:

24 "I believe that either the Horizon system

25 has on occasion been at fault and ultimately

109

1 results of any such contact or, indeed, any

2 document that set out such contact.

3 Q. Let's look at this in more detail then because

4 you're rightly pointing out that there is some

5 mention of the possible pursuit of an enquiry as

6 a result of something mentioned in interview --

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. -- or defence statement. Can we see how that

9 came about and can we start please with whether

10 it was the reviewing lawyer that caused this

11 enquiry to be made. POL00046488.

12 That's the wrong document. That's

13 Ms Rudkin's.

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. There's obviously a ghost in the machine at my

16 end here. I'll skip that and come back in

17 a moment, if we can. If we go to your report at

18 page 117.

19 A. The document might be POL00050912, that's the

20 reference I give in the report for the charging

21 decision but I was grappling with a lot of POL

22 references.

23 Q. Thank you. POL00050912. Thank you.

24 This is the memorandum in the case of

25 Mr Holmes, dated 16 February 2009. If we look

111

1 created the shortfall by creating incorrect

2 entries."

3 Would you agree that, both in interview and

4 in his defence statement, Mr Holmes was squarely

5 raising the operation of the Horizon system as

6 being responsible for the shortfalls?

7 A. Absolutely.

8 Q. Is there any evidence that Fujitsu was ever

9 contacted for information or evidence in

10 relation to Mr Holmes' case?

11 A. It's not absolutely clear. There was a degree

12 of Horizon material that the investigation did

13 obtain, and transaction logs, for example,

14 although it wasn't clear where those had come

15 from and they may have come from the branch,

16 rather than from anywhere else. And the

17 Investigator's report, there were two versions

18 of it in this case, and the updated version made

19 reference to faulty equipment and asserted that

20 "This has been checked and the allegations are

21 unfounded". It wasn't clear from the report how

22 they'd been checked or with whom.

23 So I can't say positively that nothing was

24 done in terms of contacting Fujitsu. What I can

25 say is I didn't see any the evidence of the

110

1 over the page, please, and scroll down, and

2 page 3. It's a Juliet McFarlane case.

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. If we go back to the beginning, please. She

5 advises:

6 "In my opinion the evidence is sufficient to

7 afford a realistic prospect of conviction ... on

8 the charges set out in the Schedule. There is

9 a medium prospect of success."

10 I suppose the second paragraph might be

11 a nod to the public interest test, might it?

12 A. Yes. Though not an analysis of it.

13 Q. So it doesn't mention the words "public

14 interest"?

15 A. No.

16 Q. Nor does it explain how that position has been

17 arrived at?

18 A. No.

19 Q. "No further statements need to be attained at

20 this stage", in the sixth paragraph.

21 Then, if we scroll down, if those conditions

22 are met, the following statements should be

23 obtained.

24 Then, over the page. Is there anything in

25 there that suggests that the reviewing lawyer

112

1 advised as to a reasonable line of inquiry  
2 relating to the operation of the Horizon system?  
3 **A.** No.

4 **Q.** Can we go back to your report, please, and look  
5 at the case of Lynette Hutchings. That is  
6 page 152. At paragraph 423 at the foot of  
7 page 152, you tell us that:

8 "... Jarnail Singh ... advised that it was  
9 likely that the defence would assert that  
10 Horizon was not working, and therefore 'it would  
11 be more prudent for the officer to complete his  
12 enquiries and further investigations and produce  
13 the evidence' ... listed in the advice  
14 [including] 'evidence rebutting the allegations  
15 and criticisms made in the pre-prepared  
16 statement' and 'statements dealing with the  
17 integrity of the Horizon and call logs to the  
18 Horizon Support desks'."

19 Then you say:

20 "It is of note that it identified approach  
21 was to rebut the assertions ... not to  
22 investigate whether or not those assertions  
23 might be true."

24 **A.** Yes.

25 **Q.** Are you focusing on the formulation of the  
113

1 King on 4 January 2012. Then back to the  
2 beginning. If we just scroll through and look  
3 at what Mr Smith says. The audit, in his first  
4 paragraph:

5 "... very strong evidence to support the  
6 allegation that Mrs Hutchings had inflated the  
7 amount of cash held in the branch, usually by  
8 inflating the figure for cash held in £50  
9 notes."

10 Third paragraph, if we scroll down:

11 "In interview ... a prepared statement was  
12 read out ... she admitted to altering the cash  
13 declarations and suggested she had done so only  
14 since the migration to Horizon Online ..."

15 Over the page:

16 "Furthermore she said that at the time of  
17 migration, all accounts balanced which was  
18 clearly untrue. She also gave problems which  
19 she alleged she had experienced with the Horizon  
20 system ... Whilst Mrs Hutchings has denied  
21 stealing any money, she has not put forwards any  
22 explanation as to how the deficit has arisen."

23 Then further down, "Defence Case":

24 "It is not known whether [she] will admit or  
25 deny wrongdoing ... However given the evidence  
115

1 request --

2 **A.** Yes.

3 **Q.** -- the phraseology used?

4 **A.** Yes.

5 **Q.** What do you take from that?

6 **A.** Well, in terms of identifying a reasonable line  
7 of inquiry, that's a line of inquiry that leads  
8 to or from, that implicates or exculpates, and  
9 this was effectively saying "The defendant said  
10 he was encountering problems on the system, we  
11 need to disprove that". And that's not -- I'm  
12 not saying that it was wrong to say we need to  
13 pursue that, because clearly they did need to --  
14 that was a reasonable line of inquiry to pursue,  
15 but I found the way it was put, perhaps less  
16 than helpful.

17 **Q.** In paragraph 425 of your report, further down  
18 the page, please, you tell us that on 4 January  
19 2012 Martin Smith of Cartwright King produced  
20 a charging advice recommending that Ms Hutchings  
21 be charged?

22 **A.** Yes.

23 **Q.** If we can look at that, please, POL00057341, and  
24 if we go to the last page, please, we can see  
25 this is produced by Martin Smith of Cartwright  
114

1 and the admissions ... it is difficult to see  
2 how she could successfully argue that her  
3 actions had not been dishonest and that she had  
4 not the intention to make a gain ...

5 "I have seen the [memorandum] of 17 June  
6 2011 ..."

7 That's the one in which Mr Singh has advised  
8 Horizon related integrity issues should be  
9 pursued.

10 **A.** Yes.

11 **Q.** He says:

12 "[I have seen] numerous statements have ...  
13 been taken. No further statements need to be  
14 taken at the present time", and that she should  
15 be charged, in the last paragraph on the page.

16 **A.** Yes.

17 **Q.** Would you agree that the statements which  
18 Mr Singh had recommended be obtained were not,  
19 in fact obtained, going to the Horizon integrity  
20 issue?

21 **A.** Not that I saw.

22 **Q.** Mr Smith in this memorandum dismisses  
23 Ms Hutchings' allegations concerning the Horizon  
24 system, which he says they "do not appear to be  
25 of any reliance"?  
116

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Is that a view with which you agreed or  
3 disagreed?

4 A. Disagreed.

5 Q. By reference to the fact that the lines of  
6 inquiry that Mr Singh had recommended be pursued  
7 and what was said in this charging memorandum,  
8 was it appropriate or inappropriate for  
9 a charging decision to be taken in Ms Hutchings'  
10 case without the Post Office having, at that  
11 stage, obtained statements "dealing with the  
12 integrity of Horizon"?

13 A. One of the things that she had said in her  
14 prepared statement was that she had not been  
15 responsible for the loss, that the loss had  
16 arisen on the system and that what she had been  
17 doing was to adjust the figures in the hope that  
18 it would balance out in itself in due course,  
19 that the system that had created a problem would  
20 sort the problem out, and that clearly was  
21 relevant to the assessment of her honesty or  
22 otherwise, which was dismissed by Mr Smith in  
23 his advice.

24 And so just testing that alone required  
25 an understanding of whether these were

117

1 was -- did not have glitches and, in her second  
2 interview, told her that any issues with Horizon  
3 were down to carelessness or incompetence by the  
4 operator, and then carried out no investigations  
5 that I could identify to test whether what she  
6 was doing her best to describe might be an error  
7 in the system.

8 Q. Thank you. Can we move on to page 170 of your  
9 report please. From paragraphs 483 -- in fact  
10 it's over the page, thank you -- to 488 of your  
11 report you address the investigation undertaken  
12 in Ms Allison Henderson's case?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. The Court of Appeal observed in the *Hamilton*  
15 appeals -- their paragraph 158 -- that there was  
16 nothing to suggest that any ARQ data was  
17 obtained in Ms Henderson's case. Did that  
18 observation accord with your examination of the  
19 case papers?

20 A. Yes, it's right to note that this was one of the  
21 cases where I didn't have a report from the  
22 Investigator but, on what I did have, I didn't  
23 see anything that rang contrary to the finding  
24 the Court of Appeal had reached.

25 Q. Was there any evidence that you saw that Fujitsu

119

1 regularities as a result of the system and the  
2 way it was operating or not. But, beyond that,  
3 there was the wider need to test the reliability  
4 of the evidence being relied on rather than to  
5 proceed from the basis that Mr Smith did, that  
6 it was reliable, without more.

7 Q. Thank you. Can we turn to Joan Bailey's case,  
8 please. This is page 159 of your report.

9 Between, if we scroll down, paragraphs 444  
10 and 452, you address the investigation that was  
11 undertaken in the case of Joan Bailey.

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Was there any evidence that Fujitsu was  
14 contacted for information or assistance in  
15 relation to Joan Bailey's case?

16 A. No.

17 Q. Were there any witness statements obtained from  
18 Fujitsu served on Mrs Bailey before she accepted  
19 a caution?

20 A. No, and it's right to say in her case she, in  
21 interview, did raise the question of, and her  
22 belief that there were, problems in the Horizon  
23 system that were giving rise to issues. The  
24 Investigator, Mr Bradshaw again, in her first  
25 interview reassured her that the Horizon system

118

1 was contacted for information or evidence in  
2 relation to Ms Henderson's case?

3 A. No.

4 Q. Can we look, please, at the reviewing lawyer's  
5 advice, POL00047159. 21 May 2010, Allison  
6 Henderson. If we go over the page, please, and  
7 scroll down, we can see that it's the Head of  
8 Criminal Law, Mr Wilson's, advice memo?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Back to page 1, please. We can see the  
11 formulation that he uses:

12 "In my opinion the evidence is sufficient to  
13 afford a realistic prospect of conviction of the  
14 above named on a charge of theft as set out on  
15 the attached Schedule. I have not drafted  
16 a commencement date in the theft as I am not  
17 clear when we are saying that the losses  
18 started. Can you fill in such a date and  
19 explain to me your rationale for relying on this  
20 particular date.

21 "... it does not seem appropriate to  
22 consider false accounting charges. It would be  
23 helpful if we could obtain some evidence to  
24 refute the possibility that the money she  
25 alleges must have gone missing was not, in fact,

120

1 in the account during the last accounting period  
2 prior to the audit."

3 Do you understand what that means?

4 **A.** Not altogether, no.

5 **Q.** In any event, in this advice -- we can scroll  
6 down the rest of the page and look over to  
7 page 2 -- do you agree that Mr Wilson did not  
8 advise as to a line of inquiry existing  
9 concerning the review of data, including ARQ  
10 data --

11 **A.** No, that's right.

12 **Q.** -- the potential for bugs, errors or defects in  
13 Horizon to be investigated or, indeed, any  
14 contact with Fujitsu in relation to the  
15 integrity of Horizon data?

16 **A.** I have a vague memory that there was  
17 a suggestion at one stage in Ms Henderson's case  
18 that they might, if the matter went to trial,  
19 need to get a statement from Mr Jenkins, who  
20 they had started to get statements from by then,  
21 but it never got that far. But, certainly, in  
22 the time that this was being investigated,  
23 I didn't see any issue with -- any steps being  
24 taken to get such ARQ data, for example, or  
25 contacting Fujitsu more generally.

121

1 "It is not clear whether there were  
2 enquiries as to calls to the Horizon Helpdesk or  
3 the NBSC as would be a standard line of inquiry  
4 in these cases."

5 Do you mean by that "as should be a standard  
6 line of inquiry"?

7 **A.** Yes, yes.

8 **Q.** "There was no evidence of awareness of Horizon  
9 issues in the course of the investigation, and  
10 there does not appear to be any context on the  
11 accuracy of Horizon information relied on" --

12 **A.** No.

13 **Q.** -- "or checks as to whether there had been any  
14 faults."

15 **A.** The Court of Appeal observed that they couldn't  
16 see any suggestion that ARQ data had been  
17 obtained.

18 **Q.** Thank you. Can we move on, please, to the case  
19 of Khayyam Ishaq, which is page 211 of your  
20 report. If we scroll down to "Disclosure",  
21 turning to a slightly different issue here,  
22 which is where there has been some  
23 investigation. Because we've looked at a slew  
24 of cases now where there has not, I want to look  
25 at some cases where there has been

123

1 **Q.** If we look at page 172 of your report, you  
2 address the interview in paragraph 484. In 485,  
3 you say:

4 "The interview was ... combative and was  
5 indicative of a disciplinary approach as opposed  
6 to an investigative [approach]."

7 Just whilst we're on that, taking it out of  
8 turn, what do you mean by "it was indicative of  
9 an disciplinary approach"?

10 **A.** It was -- it read as if this was a case of prove  
11 a misconduct that Ms Henderson was being asked  
12 to justify, rather than an investigation with  
13 her of how it was that losses identified by  
14 Horizon might have arisen, and I -- certainly  
15 she felt it to be that because she said so, that  
16 she felt that the investigators had drawn their  
17 own conclusions before they'd spoken to her.

18 **Q.** You tell us in 486 that bank statements were  
19 obtained. Can you recall what the reason was  
20 for the obtaining of bank statements in this  
21 case, as opposed to others?

22 **A.** That, I think, was to see whether there was any  
23 evidence that the money had gone to her, and  
24 there wasn't.

25 **Q.** You say in the third line:

122

1 an investigation of sorts.

2 **A.** Yes.

3 **Q.** Between paragraphs 602 and 606, you tell us  
4 about the approach that was taken by a lawyer at  
5 Cartwright King, called Rachael Panter, to  
6 disclosure in the case. Is this a fair summary:  
7 that she advised that it was sufficient for  
8 Mr Jenkins to address Horizon integrity issues  
9 on a generic basis because the subpostmaster had  
10 not raised a specific issue with the Horizon  
11 system itself; they've all been generic to date?

12 **A.** Yes.

13 **Q.** If we look at that underlying document, please,  
14 POL00059402 and, if we go to the last page in  
15 this chain, please, we can see this email is  
16 signed off -- if we scroll up, please -- by  
17 Rachael Panter -- if we scroll up, keep going.  
18 It's an email to Mr Jenkins of 16 November 2012,  
19 and she says:

20 "As you may already be aware, your expert  
21 report detailing the reliability of the Horizon  
22 system has been served as evidence in a number  
23 of Post Office cases that are at various stages  
24 of the court process, most of which are listed  
25 for trial in the early part of next year.

124

"It should be noted that to date, most, if not all cases raising the Horizon system as an issue, have been unable/not willing to particularise what specific issues that they have with the system, and how that shapes the nature of their defence.

"As we already have your detailed report, I would like to serve it in each case listed below. All of the following cases have raised issues with the reliability of the Horizon system."

Then Khayyam Ishaq's is listed:

"I would like to serve your report in the remaining cases and have attached a case summary of each case listed above so that you may familiarise yourself with the facts of each case.

"I ... stress that I do not anticipate that all of the above cases will reach trial ... could you read the case summaries attached, and send 5 original signed and dated copies of your report to me as soon as possible."

Then some other material.

Can we go back to your report, please, at page 213. At page 213, you tell us at

125

it wasn't necessary for Mr Jenkins to address the data in a particular case, such as that as of Mr Ishaq, because defendants, such as Mr Ishaq, had not spelt out what it was that had caused the problem on Horizon in their case, why the losses had been shown on the system in their case.

But that, of course, required the defendant to understand why the errors had arisen in their case and, certainly by this point, at the end of 2012, it had been repeatedly clear from repeated suspects that they didn't understand what the problem was, they just knew there was a problem and they described what they had encountered in their interview, as Mr Ishaq did here.

And so, rather than testing the reliability of the evidence that the case was founded on, and where they had someone who could do that testing for them in the shape of Mr Jenkins, asking Mr Jenkins to test it, to understand whether the system had been working properly in this branch at this time, instead, because the postmaster couldn't give chapter and verse as to what was causing the problem, it was deemed sufficient to have a generic report that simply

127

paragraph 605 that Mr Jenkins replied asking if his existing report from Patel could not be used, raising the question of whether contact with him should be by the Post Office rather than their solicitors:

"Ms Panter commented to a colleague at Cartwright King, 'I can clarify with Gareth that it doesn't matter that specific cases are not quoted in his report as not one of them has raised a specific issue with the Horizon system itself, they have all been generic to date'."

Then you offer your view in paragraph 606 as to this.

**A.** Yes.

**Q.** You say:

"As an approach to disclosure, the obvious difficulty with it is that it makes disclosure dependent on a defendant understanding what has gone wrong, what issue with the Horizon system had led to according imbalances, when a reason for the defendant seeking to cover unexplained losses was that they did not understand why they were happening."

Can you explain what you mean there, please?

**A.** So the approach that Ms Panter adopted was that

126

asserted that the system was all right.

**Q.** You make that point that you've just made there in the last two sentences of paragraph 606:

"As his approach in the case of Gareth Allen shows, it was possible for Mr Jenkins to access Horizon data for a particular post office to check if there were any issues. The approach identified by Ms Panter did not facilitate such an approach, and yet it was that approach that was required."

Would you agree that, in addition to having the effect of restricting the analysis which Mr Jenkins might undertake, the effect of the approach that Ms Panter adopted to disclosure was that, in many of the cases you have reviewed, including this one, Fujitsu were never asked to analyse the transaction data at all?

**A.** That's right, and the case of Mr Allen that I referred to there was a case where Mr Jenkins has said that it was possible to look at ARQ data in relation to Mr Allen and see what it showed. So it was made clear to him, in his discussions with the lawyers who were dealing with these cases, that this was something that could be done.

128



1 Q. The Court of Appeal observed that ARQ data was  
 2 provided for the indictment period to the  
 3 defence on the 26 October 2012, shortly before  
 4 trial was due, but that it was unclear what, if  
 5 any, analysis was performed on it and that there  
 6 was no examination of that data for bugs, errors  
 7 or defects, or indeed for evidence of theft?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Did that accord with your own observations --

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. -- of the case papers here?

12 A. And as other cases where experts were instructed  
 13 on behalf of the defence demonstrated, the  
 14 difficulty of just giving a collection of data  
 15 to the defence is that, unless they had the  
 16 necessary expert understanding of how Horizon  
 17 worked, it was a very large job for them to  
 18 analyse, to understand, even begin to understand  
 19 how the system worked, let alone how it wasn't  
 20 working, whereas someone with knowledge of the  
 21 system had that advantage, and a subpostmaster  
 22 I wouldn't include on what I read in that  
 23 category to understand the technical aspects of  
 24 the Horizon system.

25 Q. Just going back to paragraph 532 of your report,  
 129

1 Office Investigator and/or lawyer decided that  
 2 it was sufficient to serve a general statement  
 3 in place of Mr Jenkins examining the underlying  
 4 data?

5 A. There were various reasons given in various  
 6 different cases. Insofar as Mr Allen's case is  
 7 concerned, I'm not sure that I did see a reason  
 8 beyond the position which had already been  
 9 stated, that it was for the defendant to  
 10 identify what had gone wrong and that they would  
 11 then look at it, rather than for them to  
 12 investigate whether the system had been reliable  
 13 or not.

14 What was interesting, just while we're on  
 15 this paragraph and in this case, is that another  
 16 lawyer involved, Andrew Bolc, did appear here to  
 17 be noting that the retrieval of the data from  
 18 Fujitsu for these purposes would not cost the  
 19 Post Office anything and, in other cases, cost  
 20 was given as a reason for not doing things, but  
 21 that -- what Mr Bolc, was saying here did tend  
 22 to suggest that that wasn't right.

23 Q. It wasn't operative, at least in this case?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. What view, if any, did you take of the fact that  
 131

1 as you mentioned Mr Allen's case, it's on  
 2 page 188, you tell us in this context that the  
 3 failure to examine detailed data logs in order  
 4 to investigate the specific issue was, to quote  
 5 you, "an unfortunate failure in the evidence"  
 6 but that appeared to be a Post Office decision;  
 7 would that be right?

8 A. Yes. Yes, he'd -- he, meaning Mr Jenkins, had  
 9 indicated that it could be done but he wasn't  
 10 asked to do it.

11 Q. So Mr Jenkins was offering to examine the data,  
 12 in addition to making a general statement about  
 13 Horizon reliability?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. But the Investigator and the prosecutor decided  
 16 that the general statement was enough; is that  
 17 right?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Would the course of action that Mr Jenkins was  
 20 offering to undertake have been more in line  
 21 with the Post Office's duties as a prosecutor,  
 22 both in terms of reasonable lines of inquiry and  
 23 disclosure?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Did you ascertain why it was that the Post  
 130

1 a witness was suggesting the possibility of  
 2 a line of inquiry being pursued, identifying  
 3 that examination of the underlying data, the  
 4 logs, might be the appropriate course of action,  
 5 but the Investigator and the prosecution were  
 6 saying not to?

7 A. Well, it goes slightly further than that. This  
 8 is the expert, as they perceived him to be, that  
 9 they had gone to for his expert knowledge of the  
 10 system, saying to them that this would be the  
 11 appropriate way forwarded and for the  
 12 Investigator and lawyer to say no to that which  
 13 their expert was telling them would be the  
 14 logical next thing to do, which, in any event,  
 15 it should have been clear to them needed to be  
 16 done.

17 Q. Was that of concern?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. In that paragraph, 532, and indeed elsewhere in  
 20 your report -- other paragraphs include 545 and  
 21 663 -- you are critical of the use of so-called  
 22 generic statements concerning the reliability of  
 23 Horizon being presented as expert evidence, and  
 24 as a collateral point placing an obligation on  
 25 a defendant to specify particular issues with  
 132

1 Horizon before any further investigation of  
2 those issues would take place?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Have I summarised --

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. -- that concern correctly?

7 Did you form a view who was controlling this  
8 exercise, the extent to which specific enquiries  
9 were made: on the one hand, the Post Office,  
10 and, on the other, Fujitsu, including  
11 Mr Jenkins?

12 A. Insofar as I could see from what I had, there  
13 was this instance here of Mr Jenkins  
14 volunteering that something further could be  
15 done in relation to the ARQ data and, in this  
16 instance, it was the Investigator and the lawyer  
17 who said that that wasn't required.

18 In other instances, it was lawyers such as  
19 Ms Panter, who were saying a generic statement  
20 will do, and so, insofar as I could judge from  
21 what I could see, it was the Post Office side of  
22 things saying "This is enough", rather than  
23 their expert or the company that he worked for  
24 telling them that it didn't need to be done.

25 Q. I think you're nonetheless critical of the  
133

1 case of Ms Misra, he was identified an expert.  
2 An expert is someone who is expressing their  
3 opinion on a matter that is outwith the  
4 knowledge of the jury. He was being called to  
5 express his opinion as to the operation of  
6 a computer system that had been produced by the  
7 company that he worked for and about the  
8 operation of which the jury were unlikely to  
9 know anything at all.

10 Q. In the light of that fact, did you identify --  
11 again this is generally -- any instructions in  
12 any case to Mr Jenkins, which instructions  
13 identified to him the duties of an expert  
14 witness?

15 A. No, none at all and I should say, in relation to  
16 that, that I'm not, in that sense, relying on  
17 the "Gareth Jenkins Chronology" document.  
18 I have been fortified since 4.00 on Friday, when  
19 I received them, by two lever-arch files of  
20 correspondence between the Post Office and  
21 Gareth Jenkins, which shows a lot of contact  
22 between them, in not a single one of which were  
23 his duties as an expert hinted at.

24 Q. Was that of concern to you?

25 A. Oh, yes.

135

1 failure to make reference within the generic  
2 statement of material directly relevant to  
3 Horizon reliability that Mr Jenkins was aware of  
4 at the time that he made the October 2012  
5 generic statement?

6 A. Yes, because, as an expert, and bound by the  
7 rules in relation to what was required of expert  
8 evidence, he was required to identify that which  
9 was relevant to and potentially undermining of  
10 any opinion he expressed and, if he was  
11 expressing an opinion that the system worked  
12 properly and he was aware of material that might  
13 suggest to the contrary, then he had a duty to  
14 disclose that in his report, even if he hadn't  
15 been asked to.

16 Q. You began that sentence with the words "As  
17 an expert"?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Can I ask you please an open question as to why  
20 you described Mr Jenkins as an expert --

21 A. Firstly --

22 Q. -- and what you mean by that?

23 A. Firstly, that was how he was treated in the  
24 sense that, when his statements were served in  
25 these various cases, when he was called in the  
134

1 Q. What level was the concern that you felt?

2 A. Well, as I touched on in my Volume 1A, the  
3 responsibility of someone instructing an expert,  
4 as to what they have to tell their expert, has  
5 evolved over time. Certainly now, and for  
6 a period of years before now, it's very clear  
7 from, for example, the CPS or the Health and  
8 Safety Executive that they recognise the  
9 importance of making clear to an expert what  
10 their duties are, the rules now make clear that  
11 they should do that.

12 But the rules for an expert have been clear  
13 for quite some time, and the duty on a party to  
14 make sure that others involved, such as  
15 an expert they're instructing, comply with the  
16 rules, made it, in my view, obvious that they  
17 ought to have told someone who they were  
18 instructing as an expert what their duties were,  
19 particularly where they were aware, not least  
20 because he told them, that he hadn't done this  
21 kind of thing before.

22 Q. We're going to come perhaps tomorrow to the  
23 detail of that. You're referring, I think, to  
24 an email where he asks expressly for help --

25 A. Yes.

136

1 Q. -- and says, "I've not done this before" --  
 2 A. Yes.  
 3 Q. -- "what should happen?"  
 4 A. Yes.  
 5 Q. "What do I need to do?"  
 6 A. Yes.  
 7 Q. In this context, the present context I'm asking  
 8 you, which is the preparation of the generic  
 9 statement, do you agree that it was important  
 10 for the Post Office prosecutors to tell  
 11 Mr Jenkins, remind him of his duties to the  
 12 court, in particular in relation to the  
 13 disclosure of any information that undermined  
 14 the views that he was expressing, when proposing  
 15 that he should provide a generic statement  
 16 concerning Horizon?  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 Q. That didn't happen?  
 19 A. No.  
 20 Q. Can we look, please, at POL00026567. You'll see  
 21 from the first page here that this is a case  
 22 concerning Kim Wylie. Again, it's not one of  
 23 the case studies but it's the beginning of the  
 24 trail, which leads to the generic statement,  
 25 I think. We'll see that this is an advice by  
 137

1 proof system. We can expect this to go viral in  
 2 that any competent defence solicitor advising in  
 3 a case such as this will raise the integrity of  
 4 the Horizon system and put us to proof as to its  
 5 integrity. As all of our cases depend on the  
 6 system to compute the alleged losses this is  
 7 likely to affect a considerable percentage of  
 8 our cases.  
 9 "4. The extra evidence which we will be  
 10 obliged to gather will be as nothing in  
 11 comparison to the potential disclosure problems  
 12 we may face. Until the Second Sight ... is  
 13 concluded we will be in limbo. It is essential  
 14 that this ... is completed as soon as possible  
 15 and we can live by its findings. We will have  
 16 to find out when this enquiry will report in  
 17 order that we choose our strategy. If it is  
 18 a matter of weeks, then cases can be put over  
 19 until after it reports. If we are talking  
 20 months then the courts will not wear such  
 21 delays.  
 22 "I assume we will contend that the system is  
 23 foolproof in which ... we should defend it  
 24 aggressively. I understand the manufacturers  
 25 have not been helpful up until now. My  
 139

1 Harry Bowyer of Cartwright King?  
 2 A. Yes.  
 3 Q. It's after Second Sight have been announced as  
 4 investigators and, if we just scroll through it,  
 5 please, paragraph 1:  
 6 "In my earlier advice I advised we would  
 7 need to prove the integrity of Horizon as there  
 8 was apocryphal evidence on the Internet and  
 9 elsewhere that the system was leading to  
 10 injustice.  
 11 "The position of the Post Office has, up  
 12 until now, always been very robust. When the  
 13 system has been challenged in the criminal  
 14 courts the system has always been successfully  
 15 defended."  
 16 Second Sight has been announced:  
 17 "Whether this announcement was well  
 18 considered or not is not an area that I intend  
 19 to address but the bell cannot be unrung and  
 20 there will be consequences ..."  
 21 Then if we scroll on, please:  
 22 "... we have now given ammunition to those  
 23 attempting to discredit the Horizon system. The  
 24 argument will be there is no smoke without fire  
 25 and we would not have needed to audit a bomb  
 138

1 understanding is they will not provide expert  
 2 evidence without large fees being sought. This  
 3 will not do. If the integrity of the system is  
 4 compromised then the consequences will be  
 5 catastrophic for all of us including them. The  
 6 financial consequences of convictions and  
 7 confiscation orders being overturned and  
 8 confidence in the Post Office bookkeeping being  
 9 restored for future prosecutions will be  
 10 astronomical. They should be made to understand  
 11 that this is a firefighting situation and it is  
 12 not just our house that will be burned down if  
 13 the system were compromised."  
 14 Then on to 6, please.  
 15 "... we should attend to the following:  
 16 "... identify the contested cases, both  
 17 criminal and civil, in which Horizon has been  
 18 challenged ... identify areas of challenge and  
 19 how we neutralised them. Any expert report  
 20 should be retained for evaluation. An expert  
 21 should be identified and instructed to prepare  
 22 a generic statement which confirms the text of  
 23 the system and why the attacks so far have been  
 24 unfounded. This expert should be deployed in  
 25 all cases where the Horizon system is challenged  
 140

1 and he should be prepared to be called to reply  
 2 to defence experts on a case-by-case basis."  
 3 Just stopping there, and putting aside  
 4 Mr Bowyer's turns of phrase, did you identify  
 5 anything problematic with the approach set out.  
 6 **A.** Well, the first point that occurs is that  
 7 Mr Bowyer is there identifying a need to  
 8 consider earlier cases, where issues with  
 9 Horizon had arisen with a view to an expert now  
 10 explaining how -- why those earlier attacks had  
 11 been unfounded, rather than there being any  
 12 consideration here of whether the material  
 13 generated by earlier cases where Horizon had  
 14 come into attack was material that was capable  
 15 of undermining the prosecution case, assisting  
 16 that of another defendant and, therefore, it  
 17 being material that ought to have been disclosed  
 18 to them.  
 19 And the other point is that this, as it  
 20 describes, is a generic statement to confirm the  
 21 integrity of the system, rather than asking  
 22 an expert to examine the integrity of the system  
 23 in relation to any case that is going to be  
 24 prosecuted. So it's a bit like the press  
 25 release that asserted that the system worked

141

1 it may be worth I share his view."  
 2 Yes?  
 3 **A.** Yes.  
 4 **Q.** Then further up the page, please. Mr Singh  
 5 distributes it:  
 6 "Hugh -- Cartwright King's lawyer in the  
 7 case of Wylie has advice on evidence and also  
 8 how to progress Horizon challenges, in view of  
 9 its content can this be forwarded to case  
 10 officer and Dave Pardoe.  
 11 "[Jarnail Singh]."  
 12 So it has been distributed around the  
 13 organisation?  
 14 **A.** Yes.  
 15 **Q.** Do you view what had been advised, its adoption  
 16 by Mr Cash and its promulgation on to the Post  
 17 Office, as consistent with the duty on  
 18 solicitors who have the conduct of private  
 19 prosecutions to discharge their duties to act as  
 20 ministers of justice?  
 21 **A.** No, because it didn't identify, nor did anyone  
 22 who had received Mr Bowyer's advice identify,  
 23 that it was advising on a bandage, rather than  
 24 on an investigation of what the illness was, or  
 25 what the injury was. It was looking at how to

143

1 well, that Mr Singh and others had been working  
 2 on in 2012, rather than meeting the  
 3 prosecution's obligations, both in relation to  
 4 the reliability of their evidence or disclosure  
 5 in relation to their case of material that might  
 6 undermine that, or at least to look whether it  
 7 was reliable or not, on a case-by-case basis,  
 8 rather than through a generic statement.  
 9 **Q.** So if we go to the last page of this document,  
 10 if we just scroll on a bit. We'll see it's  
 11 dated 11 July 2012, and that seems to be the  
 12 origin of the idea of a generic statement --  
 13 **A.** Yes.  
 14 **Q.** -- prepared by an expert. Mr Bowyer doesn't  
 15 identify that the expert should come from  
 16 Fujitsu --  
 17 **A.** No.  
 18 **Q.** -- or the identity of the expert?  
 19 **A.** No.  
 20 **Q.** Can we go to POL00141396. Can we see at the  
 21 foot of the page, or halfway down, Mr Cash,  
 22 a solicitor at Cartwright King, sending that  
 23 advice over to Jarnail Singh from Mr Bowyer  
 24 saying:  
 25 "I know it will be unpalatable, but for what

142

1 protect the system, rather than to assess the  
 2 reliability of the fundamental evidence in the  
 3 prosecution of subpostmasters.  
 4 **Q.** I should have said that Mr Bowyer was in-house  
 5 counsel, rather than a solicitor.  
 6 **A.** Yes.  
 7 **Q.** Did you regard the advice and its adoption and  
 8 promulgation as consistent with the proper  
 9 approach to disclosure, in accordance with the  
 10 CPIA and the Code of Practice issued thereunder?  
 11 **A.** No, it's effectively, rather than identifying  
 12 a reasonable line of inquiry, on the one hand,  
 13 and material capable of undermining the  
 14 prosecution case or that, if it was in their  
 15 possession, might undermine the prosecution  
 16 case, on the other, it was seeking a statement  
 17 that would obviate the need for either.  
 18 So rather than checking whether the system  
 19 was reliable, they would have a statement that  
 20 they could just add to the bundle that will  
 21 assert it was fine without checking and they  
 22 would have a statement that would close off  
 23 enquiries of -- on the part of the defendants,  
 24 or disclosure requests from defendants, in  
 25 relation to the operation of the system, rather

144

1 than identifying there would be material that  
2 needed to be investigated as to whether the  
3 system was working properly.

4 **Q.** Just before the break, can we look at  
5 POL00141416, please. An email -- sorry, if we  
6 scroll down, please -- back to the top, please.  
7 Can we see this is an email, if you scroll down  
8 a little bit you'll see I think it's from  
9 Mr Bowyer, Harry, yes?

10 **A.** Yes.

11 **Q.** Then to the top, this is its cut off but it's  
12 dated 6 August. The advice we'd seen was July,  
13 if you remember.

14 **A.** Yes.

15 **Q.** "This appears to be what we want.

16 "Hopefully Helen will confirm that the  
17 Horizon system has never been successfully  
18 challenged. I have yet to see any sign of any  
19 experts briefed on behalf of the defence.

20 "When she has completed her exercise she  
21 should prepare a summary of those cases where  
22 there is a proper attack on the system rather  
23 than a gripe that the system is at fault  
24 (although she should record those cases so that  
25 we can say that they have been kept under

145

1 If we stop there, remember those four  
2 questions, and then come back after the break to  
3 see what happened to them and what ended up  
4 being produced, as a result of them.

5 Sir, can we break until 3.30, please.

6 **SIR WYN WILLIAMS:** Yes, of course.

7 **MR BEER:** Thank you.

8 (3.16 pm)

9 (A short break)

10 (3.30 pm)

11 **MR BEER:** Sir, can you see and hear us?

12 **SIR WYN WILLIAMS:** Yes, thank you.

13 **MR BEER:** Thank you.

14 Mr Atkinson, we had just looked at the four  
15 questions that Mr Bowyer had prepared in his  
16 email of 6 August. Can we move on to September  
17 2012 and look at POL00020489. If we scroll to  
18 the second email down there. Mr Singh says:

19 "Andy [that's Andy Cash]

20 "Thinking about choice of expert in this  
21 case. I have in the past instructed Gareth  
22 Jenkins of Fujitsu in the case of *Misra* which  
23 incidental was the only challenge on Horizon, he  
24 provided expertise in dealing with defences  
25 boundless enquiry into the whole Horizon system.

147

1 review -- they will become more numerous as the  
2 bandwagon and pikes up speed)."

3 Then this:

4 "The expert will need to address the report  
5 to the following issues ..."

6 And then four issues are identified; can you  
7 see that?

8 **A.** Yes.

9 **Q.** "A description of the Horizon system;

10 "A declaration that it is yet to be attacked  
11 successfully;

12 "A summary of the basic attacks made on the  
13 system concentrating on any expert reports  
14 served in past cases. If there are none, then  
15 state that no expert has yet been found by any  
16 defence team, civil or criminal, to attack the  
17 system (at the moment there seems to be little  
18 more than griping by defendants that the system  
19 must be at fault without saying how).

20 "4. Plainly, like all accounting systems,  
21 there is room for human error (Keying in the  
22 wrong amounts etc) but the expert should be able  
23 to state that innocent human error is unlikely  
24 to produce the types of discrepancies of many  
25 thousands of pounds over many months."

146

1 Perhaps we need to reconsider whether to  
2 instruct him as he may be viewed too close to  
3 the system but instruct

4 "Somebody entirely independent? Your  
5 thoughts please and also whether you or Harry  
6 have anybody in mind.

7 "Thank you."

8 Then further, up the page, Mr Bowyer says:

9 "I would have preferred somebody entirely  
10 independent but this is such a specialist area  
11 that we would be hard pushed to get a report in  
12 the timescale we require -- we might open our  
13 expert up to allegations of partiality but his  
14 expertise will be unlikely to be challenged."

15 Then there's some timing issues.

16 In the light of that exchange, the Post  
17 Office internal lawyers, on the one hand, and  
18 the Cartwright King lawyer, on the other, were  
19 seemingly aware, would you agree, of Mr Jenkins  
20 not being functionally independent?

21 **A.** Yes.

22 **Q.** Given the breathless tones in which Mr Bowyer's  
23 memo had earlier been written, as to this being  
24 a potential moment of crisis, do you agree that,  
25 given that significance that was being attached

148

1 to the issue of the instruction of an expert,  
2 and this recognition that Mr Jenkins was not  
3 functionally independent, it was important that,  
4 if Mr Jenkins was instructed, that he should be  
5 made to understand that he was subject to a wide  
6 range of duties --

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. -- as an expert witness?

9 A. Yes, and, in particular, a requirement that he  
10 be independent.

11 Q. What do you mean by that?

12 A. Well, it was essential that he were -- he  
13 understood that he was being asked to give his  
14 independent opinion about these things, rather  
15 than to provide evidence that was mapped out for  
16 him or to give an opinion that he was being told  
17 to give, in effect.

18 Q. Can we turn to POL00096978. We can see this is  
19 an email of 1 October 2012 to Mr Singh -- sorry,  
20 from Mr Singh to Mr Jenkins. Also included in  
21 the distribution list is Penny Thomas of  
22 Fujitsu, Hugh Flemington of the Post Office,  
23 Martin Smith of Cartwright King. Subject  
24 "Horizon Fujitsu Report Very Urgent":  
25 "Welcome from your annual leave and your  
149

1 our report.

2 "You will need to consider the Disclosure  
3 officers document/spreadsheet (see attachments)  
4 and need to address in your report the following  
5 issues ..."

6 Then cut and pasted into this email is the  
7 Harry Bowyer 6 August list of four.

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Yes?

10 To the extent that it's possible to  
11 understand what Mr Singh was asking to be done  
12 by this email, do you agree that the email, on  
13 any view, omitted any instructions or guidance  
14 to Mr Jenkins as to his duties as an expert?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. I think it also omitted reference to any  
17 specific prosecution, any specific defendant,  
18 any specific branch, nor did it refer to any  
19 Horizon data that might be analysed in order to  
20 reach conclusions?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. The email says that the report, or Mr Jenkins,  
23 will need to address the following issues and  
24 there are four of them set out. Was this  
25 an appropriate means of instructing Mr Jenkins?  
151

1 assistance advice in the past prosecution cases  
2 and I understand you are assisting my colleagues  
3 at present. I need your urgent assist judge has  
4 this morning ordered the prosecution to have the  
5 following report ready to be served within Seven  
6 days. On advise Post Office Limited have  
7 appointed one of their investigators, Helen  
8 Rose, as disclosure officer dealing with Horizon  
9 challenges. She has prepared a document/spread  
10 sheet detailing all such cases, past and  
11 present, approximately 20 in total, although  
12 none thus far successfully argued in court.  
13 Post Office Limited have been advised to obtain  
14 an experts report from Fujitsu UK, the Horizon  
15 system developers, confirming the system is  
16 robust."

17 Just stopping there, is that the antithesis  
18 to the type of instruction that you just  
19 mentioned?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. "Post Office Limited maintain the system is  
22 robust, but in the light of adverse publicity,  
23 from legal viewpoint is that defence should be  
24 given opportunity to test the system, should  
25 they still wish to do so, on consideration of  
150

1 A. As an email as a whole, it was far from  
2 an appropriate way to instruct an expert. It  
3 didn't set out what Mr Jenkins' responsibilities  
4 and duties as an expert were, as we've already  
5 touched on. It didn't remind him of his duty of  
6 independence, that he owed his duty to the court  
7 and not to those who were instructing him.

8 In terms of the four Bowyer points, as cut  
9 and pasted into this, the first one, no  
10 difficulty with that, and asking him to give  
11 a description of the system in layman's terms  
12 was not an issue. A declaration that it has yet  
13 to be attacked successfully, on the one hand,  
14 sounds as if it is telling him what he has to  
15 say, which, given that he is being instructed as  
16 an independent expert, would not be  
17 appropriate --

18 Q. It is also false.

19 A. -- and that never helps -- and underlines the  
20 viewpoint that he's meant to be coming from,  
21 which had already been set out rather too  
22 clearly in the first large paragraph on the  
23 page.

24 A summary of the basic attacks made on the  
25 system, and drawing a difference between griping  
152

1 and anything else, again, was telling him what  
2 to say and how to approach it.

3 And the last, point 4, is almost a script  
4 for him of what to say.

5 So what would have been appropriate would  
6 have been to identify a series of areas on which  
7 they were asking for his opinion, as  
8 an independent expert rather than telling him  
9 what his opinion was on a series of areas and,  
10 effectively, telling him that he was being  
11 instructed to defend the system and to assert  
12 that it didn't have issues.

13 **Q.** Are you able to say whether a person in receipt  
14 of such an instruction, if they knew of issues  
15 or defects that fell outside the four corners of  
16 the four issues that are mentioned, ought  
17 nonetheless to have set them out in any written  
18 document that was a reply to this email?

19 **A.** Yes, at the very least, you would have expected  
20 anyone who was aware of issues with the system  
21 to say, "These are the issues with the system  
22 that I ought to address in this context". And  
23 so if, by way of example, you were aware of the  
24 bug in the system that you had had meetings  
25 about in 2010, you ought to have been flagging

153

1 incomplete or perhaps misleading.

2 **Q.** Would you agree that, in any event, the four  
3 specific questions do not ask Mr Jenkins to  
4 provide a general overview of software issues?

5 **A.** They're asking him to provide a generic  
6 statement about the system. Certainly, my  
7 reading of it, I wouldn't see that as excluding  
8 software issues but, if it was unclear, then one  
9 could ask.

10 **Q.** What about hardware issues: same answer?

11 **A.** Same answer.

12 **Q.** What would you say to the suggestion that the  
13 focus of this email requires Mr Jenkins himself  
14 to focus on defence-led challenges, in the  
15 course of previous litigation, and nothing else?

16 **A.** Well, the -- he was clearly being asked to deal  
17 with defence-led issues in relation to question  
18 3, but these was also being asked more generally  
19 to provided support for the Post Office view  
20 that the system was robust. That's clear from  
21 the paragraph at the top of the page.

22 He would also, by this point in 2012, have  
23 been aware of how wide-ranging defence  
24 questioning in relation to the operation of the  
25 system could be, because he had been questioned

155

1 that up in 2012.

2 **Q.** Even if that wasn't a bug which constituted  
3 a successful attack by a defendant upon the  
4 system or a bug that had been mentioned in  
5 an expert report served in a past civil or  
6 criminal case?

7 **A.** Well, at the very least, if you're being asked  
8 to put together a report that would go to court  
9 and which you would potentially have to answer  
10 to, in court, you would be asking for guidance  
11 as to what, if anything, you needed to say about  
12 X that you were aware of, that was an issue with  
13 the system, that was beyond a typing error or  
14 griping.

15 **Q.** What would you say to the suggestion that, to  
16 the extent that this was an instruction to  
17 a witness, it was to produce a report that  
18 addressed and only addressed the four specific  
19 questions as narrowly formulated by Mr Bowyer?

20 **A.** I think I would say to that that, if you were  
21 putting your name to a declaration of truth in  
22 relation to this, at the very least, you would  
23 be questioning whether a statement that just  
24 answered those four points and said nothing  
25 else, when you knew there was more, was

154

1 in the case of Ms Misra and that had been  
2 wide-ranging questioning.

3 So, at the very least, he would have had  
4 questions in his mind as to what needed -- this  
5 needed to cover, I would have thought.

6 **Q.** Taking a step back, however, for a person that  
7 was not, by training or profession, an expert  
8 witness, would you agree that, as a letter or  
9 document of instruction, this was woefully  
10 inadequate?

11 **A.** Yes.

12 **Q.** Mr Jenkins duly produced a draft report  
13 responding to the four Bowyer questions, and  
14 this was circulated, amongst others, at  
15 Cartwright King on 2 October. If we look,  
16 please, at POL00096997. If we scroll down,  
17 please. Keep scrolling, please. If we just  
18 scroll up to get the date. Harry Bowyer to  
19 Martin Smith and Andy Cash, so internal to  
20 Cartwright King at the moment:

21 "At first sight this/these look like a good  
22 base upon which are reports can be based (as  
23 most are fishing expeditions they will do in  
24 their current form).

25 "I have edited the last report ... because

156

as it currently stands it is an invitation for requests for further disclosure ... Can you put this past Mr Jenkins.

"Can you draft generic Section 9 statements for the witness to produce the report(s). This must set out his expertise to comment on the system both the old and new -- we have to establish his right to speak an expert.

"I am in favour of the descriptive words being added to the diagram ...

"Beyond that keep it simple -- the secret here will be to respond to the defence expert report rather than try to anticipate every rock to be thrown at us -- unless they be obvious from the defence statement/interviews.

"If there is a specific challenge in a case then the statement and the report can be tweaked to cover the eventuality.

"My view is that most challenges to the Horizon system should now vanish away before trial."

This seems to involve a discussion amongst the Cartwright King lawyers that defence cases that had raised Horizon issues were fishing expeditions?

157

perhaps you could look at your previous statement and let me have your qualifications, credentials, experiences, knowledge, expertise of the Horizon system. On receipt I will forward draft statement for your approval."

So a request to put this in statement format?

**A.** Yes.

**Q.** Can we look, please, at POL00097008. Then scroll down, please, foot of the page, keep going, please. If we just scroll up to catch the date, please, 4 October. Mr Jenkins to Mr Singh.

"Sorry for the delay. I've been in meetings ...

"I've made some changes ... to tidy up formatting and add in some text below the diagrams -- mainly pasted from the Referenced [Documents].

"In the [document] you sent me you were asking what the 2 [documents] referenced in Section 3 were. They are the 2 brief documents on Horizon integrity and Horizon Online integrity I sent you on Tuesday. I think it is clearer to keep these as separate stand alone

159

**A.** Yes.

**Q.** It appears to proceed on the basis that the only point that needed to be established still further was Mr Jenkins' qualification to give an expert report?

**A.** Yes.

**Q.** It doesn't ensure or suggest "We now need to ensure that Mr Jenkins was properly instructed as an expert"?

**A.** No, and doesn't refer to the need for him to provide a declaration of the kind envisaged by the rules in relation to his duties as an expert, either.

**Q.** Can we look, please, at POL00096999. If we scroll down, please, and still further.

Mr Jenkins:

"Dear Jarnail,

"Attached are the two existing reports I mentioned regarding Horizon and Horizon Online integrity."

They're a separate issue. Then further up, Mr Singh:

"Thank you for forwarding your report. As in previous cases you kindly assisted in your report needs to be put in a statement format,

158

[documents] which can presumably be presented as part of the witness statement ... You have [also] removed my explicit reference to the *Misra* witness statement. Presumably this will also be available since that is where the main rebuttal of [Professor] McLachlan's hypotheses is covered."

Do you understand this to be Mr Jenkins saying, "Although you're making out my references in my witness statement to other documents, I presume that those documents are going to be available" --

**A.** Yes.

**Q.** -- "in the prosecution in court"?

**A.** Yes.

**Q.** Then scroll up, please. Martin Smith to Mr Singh:

"... I have deleted the first paragraph of Section 3. If the report is served in its [current] form the Defence will ask for copies of the [documents]. However if Gareth, as an expert, feels that the [documents] should be provided, he will need to give them exhibit numbers ..."

Scroll up, Gareth:

160



1 "I would prefer to present the [documents]  
 2 as Exhibits, so can the wording of section 3 be  
 3 changed accordingly."  
 4 So it appears that Mr Jenkins is saying,  
 5 "I want the documents that I previously  
 6 prepared, the two reports, to be revealed" --  
 7 A. Yes.  
 8 Q. -- "and as exhibits to my witness statement"?  
 9 A. Yes.  
 10 Q. Can we look, please, at FUJ00153812.  
 11 "Please find draft statement ..."  
 12 This the 4th now at 11.43:  
 13 "... for you to consider, amend and return  
 14 ..."  
 15 Then, lastly, FUJ00123982. The 5th,  
 16 Ms Jennings:  
 17 "Please find attached the Section 9 witness  
 18 statement. It was not as simple as just cutting  
 19 and pasting ..."  
 20 In that final draft of the witness statement  
 21 that was sent across, the words "I understand  
 22 that my role is to assist the court" had been  
 23 added by either the Post Office or Cartwright  
 24 King. Would you agree that those words, without  
 25 more, were insufficient to satisfy the

161

1 "I'm not aware of any outstanding cases  
 2 which I might be involved in."  
 3 Further up the page, Ms Jennings replies:  
 4 "This is the one that you supplied the  
 5 expert report and witness statement for the week  
 6 before last."  
 7 I think that's a reference to the generic  
 8 witness statement:  
 9 "Apologies for not explaining that properly  
 10 in the previous email. It was a blanket email  
 11 for all witnesses! It is unclear at this stage  
 12 who will be required as witnesses and which  
 13 evidence will be accepted without the need for  
 14 attendance."  
 15 Then the rest of it is concerned with Andy,  
 16 and then scroll up the page, please:  
 17 "[Thank you] for the clarification. I had  
 18 not understood that that related to a specific  
 19 case ..."  
 20 I think that's the generic witness  
 21 statement:  
 22 "... I thought that was a general statement.  
 23 If I am required to go to court for that,  
 24 I think I need to have some more background on  
 25 the specific case and exactly what is being

163

1 requirements arising on an expert report, either  
 2 at common law or under the Criminal Procedure  
 3 Rules.  
 4 A. Yes.  
 5 Q. The statement as served did not include  
 6 a statement that Mr Jenkins had complied with  
 7 his duty to the court to provide independent  
 8 assistance by way of objective and unbiased  
 9 opinion, in relation to matters within his  
 10 expertise. Was that cured by the inclusion of  
 11 the words "I understand that my role is to  
 12 assist the court"?  
 13 A. No.  
 14 Q. Can we look, please, at POL00097061, and scroll  
 15 down, please.  
 16 This is a generic email, it seems, that goes  
 17 out from Sharron Jennings to a series of  
 18 witnesses in the Patel case, including  
 19 Mr Jenkins: the case is up for trial at  
 20 Peterborough Crown Court but has been put back  
 21 until 14 January and is listed for a seven-day  
 22 trial.  
 23 Then scroll up, please. Mr Jenkins replies:  
 24 "Sorry, but I'm not aware of this case or  
 25 what might be required of me ...

162

1 alleged. I appreciate that is not covered by my  
 2 statement, but if I need to be an expert  
 3 witness, I need to understand what is happening.  
 4 "Please note that if I am required to do  
 5 anything further on this, some commercial  
 6 arrangements will need to be made to cover my  
 7 time and costs since I am not covered by the  
 8 normal Security Service that [the Post Office]  
 9 pays for. Perhaps you can sort out the  
 10 details", et cetera.  
 11 Then up the page, please, we can see that  
 12 Ms Jennings replies to Mr Jenkins amongst  
 13 a large collection of other people, but most  
 14 specifically addresses her reply to Post Office  
 15 Security, the generic email address:  
 16 "There appears to have been some sort of  
 17 confusion regarding the trail of emails below.  
 18 Gareth was asked to supply an expert report on  
 19 Horizon integrity by the Legal Team and I was  
 20 asked to input this onto a Section 9 statement  
 21 in order to produce it in court. Gareth was not  
 22 aware that this related to a specific case and  
 23 was also not aware that he would be required in  
 24 court. I have spoken to Gareth and he is happy  
 25 to attend but as explained below it is over and

164

1 above the [Business As Usual] arrangements that  
2 we have with Fujitsu so some extra arrangements  
3 are required in order to cover extra costs and  
4 time ..."

5 Putting aside for the moment the parts of  
6 the emails that concern the extent of the BAU  
7 arrangements and the provision of extra costs  
8 and time, do you agree that this is a concerning  
9 exchange of emails involving Mr Jenkins?

10 A. In the sense of his apparently not having  
11 understood what he was providing the generic  
12 statement for, yes, it is.

13 Q. He, would you agree, appears to be under a state  
14 of some confusion as to the role that he is  
15 performing?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. He says:

18 "I thought this was a general statement. If  
19 I'm going to come back to court for a specific  
20 case, I need more background on the specific  
21 case and what is being alleged in that case."

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. In your oral evidence to the Inquiry back on  
24 6 October, you stated that the cost of obtaining  
25 material was not a relevant consideration in

165

1 in which the lawyers adopted the view that it  
2 was for the defence to identify what the problem  
3 was with Horizon?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Did you form a view as to the appropriateness of  
6 that approach?

7 A. Yes, I thought it wasn't appropriate at all.

8 Q. Can we look, please, at POL00059404. If we go  
9 down the page, please, and scroll down, please.  
10 We get, if we just scroll up a little bit,  
11 an email of 16 November 2012, from Rachael  
12 Panter, yes?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. If we scroll down, please, she says that:

15 "... most, if not all cases raising the  
16 Horizon system as an issue, have been unable/not  
17 willing to particularise what issues they may  
18 have with the system, and how that shapes the  
19 nature of their defence."

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. That's similar to the language I think we saw  
22 earlier from Mr Bowyer?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Is that consistent or not consistent with the  
25 proper approach of a prosecutor to the issue

167

1 deciding whether to seek material from a third  
2 party?

3 A. In general terms, that's right, yes.

4 Q. You identify in various places across your  
5 Volume 2 report instances where cost appears to  
6 have been a factor in decision making?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Was this exchange amongst those areas of  
9 concern?

10 A. I don't think I had seen -- in fact, I'm looking  
11 at how they're described, I hadn't seen this  
12 exchange and so, no, it wasn't.

13 Q. That can come down. Thank you.

14 During your oral evidence to the Inquiry,  
15 again back on 6 October, you stated that, when  
16 making decisions on disclosure, the prosecutor  
17 should not restrictively analyse the case of  
18 a defendant, not least because the defence might  
19 not be able to identify something that they  
20 don't know anything about.

21 A. No, and the Attorney General's Guidelines, by  
22 way of example, make that clear.

23 Q. You, I think, have seen a range of  
24 correspondence amongst Post Office lawyers and  
25 between Post Office lawyers and Investigators,

166

1 that you're presently addressing, namely whether  
2 it's for the defendant to, in these Horizon  
3 cases, identify an issue with Horizon before the  
4 prosecutor investigates it?

5 A. It's putting the onus on the defence to identify  
6 the specific respect in relation to which the  
7 Horizon system was not reliable, rather than  
8 recognising the obligation on the prosecution to  
9 satisfy itself and then others as to the  
10 reliability of the system that underpinned its  
11 prosecution.

12 Q. If we scroll up, please -- thank you.

13 Mr Jenkins says:

14 "Can't you use the report I have already  
15 sent you? There is no mention of the case  
16 [that's Khayyam Ishaq] on the report.

17 "You should really be addressed such  
18 requests through Post Office Limited rather than  
19 directly to myself.

20 "... there is no commercial cover in place  
21 for me to spend ... time on such activities ..."

22 Then up, please. James Davidson, a delivery  
23 executive at Fujitsu, says:

24 "I am concerned at the engagement approach  
25 being taken here, we are fully on board to

168

1 support but all approaches must come through  
 2 Post Office by the correct change process."  
 3 Then up, keep going, please, then a reply to  
 4 both James Davidson and Gareth Jenkins:  
 5 "Apologies if I have approached this in  
 6 an unconventional way."  
 7 Second paragraph:  
 8 "In response to your email Gareth, I do  
 9 intend to use the report that you have already  
 10 provided."  
 11 Then this:  
 12 "It doesn't matter that you have not  
 13 mentioned a specific case in your report, as  
 14 there has not been any specific criticisms  
 15 raised by any of the defendants provided in my  
 16 list of cases. It would be a different scenario  
 17 if there had been specific criticisms made, as  
 18 your report would have to respond to that  
 19 particular issue."  
 20 Does that approach evidence the advice that  
 21 you were managing a moment ago?  
 22 **A.** Yes, because in any one case a postmaster, while  
 23 being interviewed, may have identified that they  
 24 were experiencing problems. They may even have  
 25 said something about the circumstances in which

169

1 disclosure. It's paragraph 666 of your second  
 2 report, which is on page 238. You say:  
 3 "... there was no real discussion that  
 4 I have seen, beyond this discussion as to cost  
 5 ..."  
 6 This discussion as to cost is referring back  
 7 to some previous paragraphs, in particular  
 8 concerning the Seema Misra case, where the cost  
 9 of obtaining disclosure was a topic of  
 10 discussion.  
 11 **A.** Yes.  
 12 **Q.** "... there was no real discussion that I have  
 13 seen, beyond this discussion as to cost, of the  
 14 relationship between the Post Office and  
 15 Fujitsu, in relation to the obtaining and  
 16 disclosure of material held by Fujitsu that was  
 17 potentially relevant to the Post Office's  
 18 prosecutions."  
 19 Are you identifying here that you would have  
 20 expected to see some written exchanges, some  
 21 communications, between the prosecutor and this  
 22 third-party provider of material, about how the  
 23 third party is going to provide material?  
 24 **A.** Two stages. That is the second stage. The  
 25 first stage is, I would have expected to see

171

1 they were identifying those problems or the  
 2 period during which they were experiencing those  
 3 problems and there was then a responsibility on  
 4 the investigation and the prosecution to test  
 5 that to see if there was something that explains  
 6 how that might have been, either to rebut it, or  
 7 to identify material that was capable of  
 8 supporting it. That is a specific exercise for  
 9 a specific case, based on specific facts and  
 10 based more particularly on specific data.  
 11 It is not something that doesn't matter  
 12 because the subpostmaster wasn't able to give  
 13 technical chapter and verse as to exactly what  
 14 had gone on.  
 15 **Q.** Would you consider this to be a further example  
 16 of the Post Office restricting its evidence and  
 17 its disclosure obligations by reference to the  
 18 way in which the defence case was put?  
 19 **A.** Yes.  
 20 **Q.** Thank you. That can come down.  
 21 **A.** It was not identifying a reasonable line of  
 22 inquiry and it was not grappling with their  
 23 disclosure obligations.  
 24 **Q.** Thank you. Can we turn to topic 6, please,  
 25 which is a wider issue of third-party

170

1 discussion between Investigator and prosecutor,  
 2 as recognising the need to obtain material from  
 3 the third party, Fujitsu, because it was  
 4 potentially relevant, either as evidence or as  
 5 disclosure, as to the reliability of the system  
 6 that was operated by Fujitsu.  
 7 **Q.** Did you identify any examples or occasions on  
 8 which the Post Office made clear to Fujitsu the  
 9 nature and scope of its, the Post Office's,  
 10 disclosure obligations?  
 11 **A.** No.  
 12 **Q.** As to its, the Post Office's, obligations to  
 13 obtain material from third parties such as  
 14 Fujitsu?  
 15 **A.** No.  
 16 **Q.** As to the categories of material that Fujitsu  
 17 held and which were potentially relevant for at  
 18 least consideration for disclosure in  
 19 a prosecution?  
 20 **A.** No, and, as part of that, under the Attorney  
 21 General's Guidelines, there was a requirement on  
 22 the prosecutor and investigation to notify  
 23 a third party that might have material that it  
 24 might need to seek, to ask it to retain the  
 25 material, at the very least.

172

1 Q. Well, that's where I was going next, given that  
2 requirement of notification under the AG's  
3 Guidelines, did you see any communications that  
4 at least put Fujitsu on notice as to its  
5 retention policies, given that the data that it  
6 was producing may be needed in a prosecution?

7 A. No.

8 Q. Thank you. Can we turn to topic 7, please,  
9 disclosure and unused material. Way back in  
10 paragraph 17 of your report, which is on  
11 page 12, you say:

12 "In procedural terms" --

13 Sorry:

14 "There was, in particular, failures of  
15 disclosure in relation to Horizon data. This  
16 included the failure to close it underlying  
17 material to that relied on, including ARQ data,  
18 either at all or to the extent necessary. The  
19 attitude that appears to have informed  
20 disclosure was the belief that the defence  
21 should identify with clear focus what the  
22 problems [were]."

23 I'm sorry I'm reading from 18.

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. "That was a flawed approach."

173

1 defence case and, therefore, necessarily  
2 involved consideration of material that might  
3 undermine a prosecution?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Would you agree that, in the light of those  
6 requirements of the Code, it's difficult to see  
7 how a prosecutor could apply the Full Code Test,  
8 if they haven't seen a Schedule of Unused  
9 Material, at the point at which they're deciding  
10 on charge?

11 A. Ordinarily, you would expect that they would,  
12 and the alternative would be for them to be  
13 provided with all the unused material, instead  
14 of a schedule of it. But they'd have to have  
15 one or the other.

16 Q. Would you, in that alternative way, agree that  
17 that would necessarily involve some rigorous  
18 means of ensuring that an appropriate search had  
19 been carried out by the Investigator, with  
20 appropriate diligence, and that the material  
21 which might undermine the prosecution case or  
22 assist the defence had itself been provided to  
23 the prosecutor?

24 A. You would expect them to check what they were  
25 given and, if it didn't fulfil the requirements

175

1 Then going back to 17:

2 "In procedural terms, the Disclosure  
3 Officer, who was usually also the Investigator,  
4 usually did prepare Schedules of Unused  
5 Material. These were often inadequate in terms  
6 of their content and description, and there is  
7 little evidence that they were reviewed, as ...  
8 required, by the prosecutor. Decisions as to  
9 disclosure from the schedules were flawed or  
10 overly restrictive. In some cases this position  
11 was improved by action from trial counsel."

12 The Full Code Test, under the Code for Crown  
13 Prosecutors required, is this right,  
14 a prosecutor to consider whether reasonable  
15 lines of inquiry had been pursued?

16 A. Yes, the Code in that respect evolved over time,  
17 and that requirement became clearer with each  
18 iteration.

19 Q. It required the prosecutor to consider whether  
20 any further evidence or material was likely to  
21 affect the application of the Full Code Test,  
22 whether in favour or against the prosecution?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. The evidential stage -- and I think this applied  
25 at all times -- required a consideration of the

174

1 that you've just set out, then they should be  
2 going back to the Investigator requiring it,  
3 rather than making a decision without it.

4 Q. So the point I'm exploring with you is that, at  
5 the point of deciding on charge, advising on  
6 charge, and we looked at a run of --

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. -- advices on charge earlier, at that point,  
9 should the prosecutor either have material  
10 equivalent to unused material or a Schedule of  
11 Unused Material?

12 A. Yes, or should be asking for it if it's not been  
13 provided.

14 Q. And shouldn't advise without it?

15 A. Certainly shouldn't -- yes -- advise as to  
16 charge without it. No.

17 Q. Can we look, please, at POL00052884. This is  
18 the charging memorandum in relation to the  
19 prosecution of Tahir Mahmood. It's dated 27 May  
20 2005 and we go to the second page again. Scroll  
21 down, and the third page, Juliet McFarlane. If  
22 we scroll up, please, paragraph 1 says there's  
23 sufficient evidence, yes?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. But then, if we scroll down, if we see under the

176

1 numbered paragraphs, two paragraphs on,  
 2 beginning "You will be aware"?  
 3 A. Yes.  
 4 Q. "You will be aware of the provisions of the  
 5 [CPIA] concerning disclosure ... paragraph 4.10  
 6 of the Security Community Codes of Practice and  
 7 also paragraph 5(5.1-5.3) of the Codes. Please  
 8 let me have the necessary information on forms  
 9 [C, D and E]. The schedules must be signed."  
 10 That refers, amongst other things, to the  
 11 Schedule of Unused Material, Non-Sensitive,  
 12 Schedule of Unused Material Sensitive and the  
 13 Disclosure Officer's report, those three form  
 14 references?  
 15 A. Yes.  
 16 Q. So it appears, in this case, that advice was  
 17 being given as to sufficiency of evidence before  
 18 unused material schedules had been provided to  
 19 the reviewing lawyer?  
 20 A. Yes.  
 21 Q. We've heard evidence from Mr Utting, that was on  
 22 17 November this year, at page 104 of the  
 23 transcript, and from Ms Brander, Ruth Brander,  
 24 on 29 November 2023 at pages 25 and 26 and 158  
 25 to 160, that unused material schedules were only

177

1 Hamilton case, I'm going to pick some other  
 2 examples here, POL00064235. We can see  
 3 a Disclosure Officer's report, if we scroll  
 4 down. I think this should be dated 3 January  
 5 2007. Ms Hamilton's first appearance in the  
 6 Magistrates Court was 6 December 2006, and so it  
 7 post-dates it by a month or so.  
 8 So acceptable from a service upon defence  
 9 perspective but not good practice in relation to  
 10 a prosecutor; is that right?  
 11 A. That's right, yes.  
 12 Q. You helped us in your first report about  
 13 a common law duty of disclosure, which arose  
 14 prior to the initial duty of first stage  
 15 disclosure under section 3 of the CPIA. Do you  
 16 remember a cross-reference to the case of Lee --  
 17 A. Yes.  
 18 Q. -- namely a prosecutor needing to be alive to  
 19 the need to make advance disclosure of material  
 20 of which he is aware, which might enable  
 21 a defendant to make a pre-committal application,  
 22 including a pre-committal application to  
 23 dismiss. Was there any evidence in the cases  
 24 that you saw that that duty was recognised?  
 25 A. No.

179

1 ever prepared after committal and then only in  
 2 the event that a not guilty plea was indicated.  
 3 Is that approach consistent or inconsistent with  
 4 what the law required?  
 5 A. It would be --  
 6 Q. I should ask that question in a better way.  
 7 A. Yes.  
 8 Q. In terms of provision of the Schedules of Unused  
 9 Material, is it right that the law only required  
 10 those to be provided to a defendant,  
 11 post-committal?  
 12 A. To a defendant, yes.  
 13 Q. In relation to the prosecution approach to  
 14 whether there was a sufficiency of evidence, was  
 15 that in accordance with or a departure from good  
 16 practice?  
 17 A. Sorry, for them to be provided to the  
 18 prosecutor?  
 19 Q. Yes.  
 20 A. Good practice would require that they were  
 21 provided to the prosecutor, either the schedules  
 22 or the material that would otherwise be on the  
 23 schedule before a charging decision was made,  
 24 rather than after that point in time.  
 25 Q. If we look, for example at the Josephine

178

1 Q. Was there any evidence in the cases that you saw  
 2 that any common law pre-committal disclosure was  
 3 given?  
 4 A. It wasn't very clear to me what was provided  
 5 pre-committal at all, in terms of what was  
 6 provided at the first appearance, if that was  
 7 a separate hearing, for example. So, no,  
 8 I can't say what was given.  
 9 Q. Is that a cross-reference back to a point you  
 10 made very early on, that the material was  
 11 relatively lacking in terms of what was created  
 12 and served at the point of the initiation of  
 13 process against the defendant?  
 14 A. Yes, so there was no material in any of these  
 15 cases that I saw as to what was provided to the  
 16 Magistrates Courts when the application was made  
 17 for a summons or what was provided to the  
 18 defence pre-the service of a committal bundle.  
 19 Q. In terms of what the schedules, in fact, looked  
 20 like when they were served, you tell us in  
 21 paragraph 654 of your report on page 233, you  
 22 say:  
 23 "Such schedules, for example of  
 24 non-sensitive unused material (equivalent to  
 25 an MG6C) ..."

180

1 That's a cross-reference to the Manual of  
 2 Guidance series of forms --  
 3 A. Yes.  
 4 Q. -- used by the police service and the Crown  
 5 Prosecution Service?  
 6 A. Yes.  
 7 Q. "... were drawn up by the Disclosure Officer  
 8 who, where named, was also the Investigator.  
 9 Such schedules were quite short, and mainly  
 10 included correspondence and documentation  
 11 relating to the interview process. They lacked  
 12 any reference to the underlying raw accounts  
 13 data (to the extent that this was not included  
 14 in the served evidence) ... usually no reference  
 15 to any previous complaints or discussions by the  
 16 defendants with managers or helplines. This  
 17 applied in cases where the defendant complained  
 18 about the system, or referred to such complaints  
 19 and discussions as much as where they had not."  
 20 So schedules were short.  
 21 A. Yes.  
 22 Q. The preponderance of material, is this right,  
 23 was about the interview process?  
 24 A. And correspondence at the time of the interview,  
 25 yes.

181

1 But it was a continuum of missed opportunity in  
 2 that respect.  
 3 Q. Thank you.  
 4 In terms of review by a prosecuting lawyer,  
 5 you address this further down the page in your  
 6 paragraph 656. You say:  
 7 "In the main, the unused schedules I have  
 8 seen did not show on their face any evidence of  
 9 a review by the prosecutor having occurred.  
 10 This makes it difficult to be satisfied this  
 11 important task was undertaken. [You] accept  
 12 that this may, at least in some cases, have been  
 13 an omission of annotation rather than of  
 14 review."  
 15 Are you saying there that this may be a case  
 16 where reviewing lawyers had reviewed the  
 17 schedules but hadn't marked them in a way to  
 18 show that they had done so, ie counter signing  
 19 them?  
 20 A. So it varies. There were some cases, in  
 21 fairness, where there were annotations on the  
 22 face of the schedule that showed that the lawyer  
 23 had reviewed it and come to a view as to  
 24 disclosure, which is what was required under the  
 25 CPIA Code, under the Attorney General's

183

1 Q. Overall, were the contents of the schedules as  
 2 you would have expected?  
 3 A. That which was there, generally speaking, was  
 4 correctly there but there was an awful lot that  
 5 wasn't there that should have been.  
 6 Q. Was it a short distance or a very longer way  
 7 from what you expected?  
 8 A. The difficulty in answering that is that it may  
 9 well have been that things were not listed as  
 10 material in the prosecution's possession that  
 11 were not being relied on in evidence, so unused  
 12 material that was not being listed because it  
 13 didn't exist because they hadn't followed  
 14 through the reasonable lines of inquiry that  
 15 would have led to them having it. So the two  
 16 really are connected.  
 17 So for example, they would not include  
 18 reference to ARQ data on the unused schedule  
 19 because they hadn't asked for the ARQ data, and  
 20 so they didn't have the ARQ data, as unused  
 21 material but, clearly, they should have followed  
 22 that reasonable line of inquiry, therefore they  
 23 should have had the data, therefore they should  
 24 have included it on the unused schedule and  
 25 therefore the unused schedule was deficient.

182

1 Guidelines. There were other cases where there  
 2 was evidence that the lawyer had looked at the  
 3 schedule through other documentation, be it, in  
 4 the case of Mr Mahmood, there was a memorandum  
 5 from the lawyer asking the Investigator what was  
 6 disclosable from the schedule, which was  
 7 an interesting approach but at least showed that  
 8 they had registered they had the schedule.  
 9 And there were cases where there was  
 10 an accompanying letter that I saw that was sent  
 11 to the defence with the schedule that told the  
 12 defence that there was nothing on the schedule  
 13 that was disclosable, which I took to be  
 14 an indication that the lawyer had reviewed it  
 15 and come to that conclusion.  
 16 But in the majority of cases, there was none  
 17 of that and nothing on the face of the schedule  
 18 to show, one way or the other, whether they had  
 19 reviewed it or not. But, clearly, they should  
 20 have done.  
 21 Q. You say, over the page in paragraph 657, that:  
 22 "The stance [that's the stance in the  
 23 Josephine Hamilton case that nothing was  
 24 disclosable] appears to have been adopted in  
 25 a number of other cases, whether on the schedule

184

1 itself, or more often accompanying  
 2 correspondence indicated that everything listed  
 3 in the schedule was clearly not disclosable  
 4 ('CND')."  
 5 You say:  
 6 "In my view, such an assessment was often in  
 7 error ..."  
 8 Why was that so?  
 9 **A.** I identify, when I have a schedule and  
 10 conclusion in the individual cases, there were  
 11 instances of material that was within  
 12 an all-embracing, clearly not disclosable,  
 13 decision that, seemed to me, on my, I accept,  
 14 limited reading of the material, clearly was  
 15 disclosable because it was, on the face of it,  
 16 material that undermined the prosecution case or  
 17 assisted the defence case. It included things  
 18 that now are recognised within the present  
 19 version of the Attorney General's Guidelines are  
 20 standard disclosure, for example interview  
 21 tapes.  
 22 **Q.** Did this position change across the relevant  
 23 period, ie did the 2010 policy change have any  
 24 effect on the practice adopted of saying  
 25 everything is not disclosable?

185

1 **A.** Not that I could see, no.  
 2 **MR BEER:** Sir, thank you. I'm about to move to  
 3 topic 8, cross-disclosure of Horizon issues.  
 4 I wonder whether that might be an appropriate  
 5 moment to break for the day?  
 6 **SIR WYN WILLIAMS:** Certainly.  
 7 All right, thank you very much for answering  
 8 all those questions, Mr Atkinson. I will see  
 9 you in the morning, 10.00 tomorrow?  
 10 **MR BEER:** Yes, please, sir. Thank you very much.  
 11 **SIR WYN WILLIAMS:** Fine.  
 12 **MR BEER:** Thank you.  
 13 **(4.31 pm)**  
 14 **(The hearing adjourned until 10.00 am**  
 15 **on the following day)**  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25

186

# INDEX

RICHARD DUNCAN ATKINSON KC (sworn) .....	1
Questioned by MR BEER .....	1

<p><b>MR BEER:</b> [17] 1/3 1/7 1/12 46/6 46/11 46/16 46/19 91/8 91/13 91/17 91/20 147/7 147/11 147/13 186/2 186/10 186/12 <b>SIR WYN WILLIAMS:</b> [11] 1/5 1/9 46/10 46/12 46/18 91/12 91/19 147/6 147/12 186/6 186/11</p> <hr/> <p>'<b>CND</b>' [1] 185/4 '<b>evidence</b>' [1] 113/14 '<b>I</b>' [1] 126/7 '<b>I can</b>' [1] 126/7 '<b>it</b>' [1] 113/10 '<b>Our</b>' [1] 37/6 '<b>ridiculous</b>' [1] 22/19 '<b>statements</b>' [1] 113/16 '<b>story</b>' [1] 35/17</p> <hr/> <p><b>1</b></p> <p><b>1 October 2012</b> [1] 149/19 <b>1.00</b> [3] 46/9 91/9 91/14 <b>1.50</b> [3] 91/11 91/12 91/16 <b>10</b> [1] 94/19 <b>10 March 2006</b> [1] 107/2 <b>10 years</b> [1] 16/25 <b>10.00</b> [2] 186/9 186/14 <b>10.45</b> [1] 1/2 <b>104</b> [1] 177/22 <b>108</b> [1] 18/23 <b>109</b> [1] 102/5 <b>11</b> [1] 73/20 <b>11 July 2012</b> [1] 142/11 <b>11.43</b> [1] 161/12 <b>11.45</b> [1] 46/13 <b>114</b> [3] 102/8 108/16 108/17 <b>115</b> [1] 102/5 <b>116</b> [1] 108/22 <b>117</b> [1] 111/18 <b>12</b> [1] 173/11 <b>12.00</b> [4] 46/9 46/9 46/12 46/15 <b>14 February</b> [1] 39/25 <b>14 January</b> [1] 162/21 <b>149</b> [1] 105/3 <b>152</b> [3] 105/3 113/6 113/7 <b>158</b> [2] 119/15</p>	<p>177/24 <b>159</b> [1] 118/8 <b>16 February 2009</b> [1] 111/25 <b>16 November</b> [2] 124/18 167/11 <b>160</b> [1] 177/25 <b>17</b> [3] 73/17 173/10 174/1 <b>17 June</b> [1] 116/5 <b>17 November</b> [1] 177/22 <b>170</b> [1] 119/8 <b>172</b> [1] 122/1 <b>18</b> [1] 173/23 <b>18 December 2023</b> [1] 1/1 <b>188</b> [1] 130/2 <b>19</b> [1] 73/19 <b>19 February</b> [1] 39/13 <b>1A</b> [2] 3/16 136/2</p> <hr/> <p><b>2</b></p> <p><b>2 October</b> [1] 156/15 <b>20</b> [6] 2/24 15/6 15/19 66/7 81/6 150/11 <b>20 November</b> [2] 40/7 40/12 <b>20 November 2012</b> [1] 40/20 <b>2000</b> [3] 48/1 57/13 57/23 <b>2003</b> [4] 15/24 16/3 16/15 79/11 <b>2004</b> [2] 66/12 73/16 <b>2005</b> [3] 67/8 103/16 176/20 <b>2006</b> [3] 67/15 107/2 179/6 <b>2007</b> [4] 65/21 65/22 66/11 179/5 <b>2008</b> [1] 67/21 <b>2009</b> [1] 111/25 <b>2010</b> [10] 26/12 32/9 39/1 66/13 73/18 77/22 81/25 120/5 153/25 185/23 <b>2011</b> [1] 116/6 <b>2012</b> [23] 15/22 16/3 16/15 27/17 38/25 40/12 40/20 41/18 48/1 57/13 114/19 115/1 124/18 127/11 129/3 134/4 142/2 142/11 147/17 149/19 154/1 155/22 167/11 <b>2013</b> [5] 39/14 40/1 41/19 57/24 66/3 <b>2023</b> [5] 1/1 3/18 49/17 50/7 177/24 <b>21</b> [1] 93/12 <b>21 May</b> [1] 120/5</p>	<p><b>211</b> [1] 123/19 <b>213</b> [2] 125/25 125/25 <b>217</b> [1] 27/4 <b>218</b> [2] 14/21 15/1 <b>219</b> [3] 47/21 80/25 81/3 <b>22</b> [7] 4/7 14/18 66/15 71/1 73/22 81/10 87/22 <b>221</b> [1] 92/2 <b>223</b> [3] 54/2 106/12 106/15 <b>224</b> [2] 60/4 60/5 <b>226</b> [1] 67/1 <b>227</b> [1] 106/15 <b>23</b> [1] 93/18 <b>230</b> [1] 93/5 <b>233</b> [1] 180/21 <b>238</b> [1] 171/2 <b>24</b> [1] 93/25 <b>243</b> [1] 2/7 <b>25</b> [1] 177/24 <b>25,000</b> [1] 36/22 <b>26</b> [1] 177/24 <b>26 October</b> [1] 129/3 <b>27 May</b> [1] 176/19 <b>27 May 2005</b> [1] 103/16 <b>278</b> [1] 43/7 <b>282,000</b> [2] 105/9 105/17 <b>284</b> [1] 106/3 <b>29 November 2023</b> [1] 177/24 <b>2A</b> [5] 1/21 3/2 4/3 43/8 68/1 <b>2nd</b> [3] 33/23 34/7 34/19</p> <hr/> <p><b>3</b></p> <p><b>3 January</b> [1] 179/4 <b>3.16</b> [1] 147/8 <b>3.30</b> [2] 147/5 147/10 <b>30</b> [2] 93/23 96/10 <b>31 August 2023</b> [1] 49/17 <b>312</b> [1] 108/18 <b>316</b> [2] 108/22 108/23 <b>32</b> [2] 9/16 96/14 <b>320</b> [1] 108/19 <b>322</b> [1] 102/17 <b>330</b> [1] 97/3 <b>331</b> [1] 97/3 <b>34</b> [1] 43/8 <b>35</b> [1] 43/8 <b>351</b> [1] 98/7 <b>366</b> [1] 80/7 <b>37</b> [2] 93/11 93/13 <b>370</b> [1] 80/7 <b>38</b> [1] 97/19</p>	<p><b>4</b></p> <p><b>4 January</b> [2] 114/18 115/1 <b>4 October</b> [1] 159/12 <b>4.00</b> [1] 135/18 <b>4.10</b> [1] 177/5 <b>4.31</b> [1] 186/13 <b>40</b> [1] 97/21 <b>414</b> [1] 25/22 <b>423</b> [2] 27/5 113/6 <b>425</b> [1] 114/17 <b>43</b> [2] 93/17 93/18 <b>438</b> [1] 27/5 <b>44</b> [2] 93/17 93/18 <b>444</b> [1] 118/9 <b>45</b> [1] 93/25 <b>452</b> [1] 118/10 <b>458</b> [1] 43/7 <b>46</b> [3] 93/25 94/5 102/4 <b>48</b> [1] 102/8 <b>483</b> [1] 119/9 <b>484</b> [1] 122/2 <b>485</b> [1] 122/2 <b>486</b> [1] 122/18 <b>488</b> [1] 119/10 <b>4th</b> [1] 161/12</p> <hr/> <p><b>5</b></p> <p><b>5.1-5.3</b> [1] 177/7 <b>5.3</b> [1] 177/7 <b>50</b> [2] 93/11 115/8 <b>50 per cent</b> [2] 68/9 68/12 <b>51 per cent</b> [2] 68/14 68/19 <b>532</b> [2] 129/25 132/19 <b>545</b> [1] 132/20 <b>567</b> [1] 33/8 <b>59</b> [1] 105/2 <b>5th</b> [1] 161/15</p> <hr/> <p><b>6</b></p> <p><b>6 August</b> [3] 145/12 147/16 151/7 <b>6 December 2006</b> [1] 179/6 <b>6 October</b> [3] 3/18 165/24 166/15 <b>602</b> [1] 124/3 <b>605</b> [1] 126/1 <b>606</b> [3] 124/3 126/12 128/3 <b>620</b> [1] 15/2 <b>621</b> [1] 17/6 <b>622</b> [1] 18/21 <b>623</b> [3] 22/10 47/20 53/13 <b>624</b> [1] 81/1 <b>625</b> [1] 83/10 <b>626</b> [2] 88/15 90/11 <b>628</b> [2] 92/2 92/4</p>	<p><b>63</b> [1] 96/11 <b>632</b> [1] 54/4 <b>633</b> [3] 55/7 56/15 60/7 <b>634</b> [1] 64/25 <b>635</b> [1] 65/15 <b>637</b> [1] 67/2 <b>638</b> [1] 71/8 <b>639</b> [2] 73/10 77/12 <b>654</b> [1] 180/21 <b>656</b> [1] 183/6 <b>657</b> [1] 184/21 <b>663</b> [1] 132/21 <b>666</b> [1] 171/1 <b>69</b> [2] 96/11 96/14</p> <hr/> <p><b>7</b></p> <p><b>76</b> [1] 43/8</p> <hr/> <p><b>8</b></p> <p><b>85</b> [1] 106/13 <b>87</b> [2] 97/18 97/20</p> <hr/> <p><b>9</b></p> <p><b>94</b> [2] 97/20 97/21 <b>99 per cent</b> [2] 68/16 68/19</p> <hr/> <p><b>A</b></p> <p><b>A2</b> [1] 2/7 <b>aberration</b> [1] 75/1 <b>ability</b> [1] 12/3 <b>able</b> [10] 8/23 10/25 11/7 31/1 76/24 98/22 146/22 153/13 166/19 170/12 <b>about</b> [58] 2/20 16/13 16/18 26/4 28/20 31/20 32/3 32/7 32/16 32/23 33/5 33/12 37/17 38/6 39/4 39/12 42/25 43/9 45/14 49/9 50/10 52/21 53/16 53/18 54/1 59/8 59/19 63/18 71/10 75/5 77/9 78/25 81/22 85/2 88/10 88/16 95/8 101/22 105/24 108/9 109/12 111/9 124/4 130/12 135/7 147/20 149/14 153/25 154/11 155/6 155/10 166/20 169/25 171/22 179/12 181/18 181/23 186/2 <b>above</b> [8] 15/10 34/20 36/15 103/20 120/14 125/15 125/19 165/1 <b>absence</b> [6] 71/23 74/2 83/2 83/3 83/4 83/8 <b>absent</b> [1] 82/5 <b>absolutely</b> [12] 6/5 9/25 13/24 29/19 30/4</p>
--	---	--	--	---



<p><b>A</b></p> <p><b>absolutely... [7]</b> 59/23 61/21 64/18 78/5 85/21 110/7 110/11</p> <p><b>absolve [1]</b> 64/5</p> <p><b>abuse [2]</b> 45/1 45/9</p> <p><b>accept [2]</b> 183/11 185/13</p> <p><b>acceptable [1]</b> 179/8</p> <p><b>acceptance [5]</b> 27/13 27/14 44/17 44/22 46/3</p> <p><b>accepted [5]</b> 13/10 34/20 36/15 118/18 163/13</p> <p><b>access [2]</b> 88/2 128/5</p> <p><b>accidental [1]</b> 91/7</p> <p><b>accompanied [2]</b> 67/11 67/19</p> <p><b>accompanying [2]</b> 184/10 185/1</p> <p><b>accord [6]</b> 50/11 102/22 104/11 106/9 119/18 129/9</p> <p><b>accordance [7]</b> 17/25 30/1 48/24 48/24 84/18 144/9 178/15</p> <p><b>accorded [2]</b> 97/4 106/1</p> <p><b>according [1]</b> 126/20</p> <p><b>accordingly [1]</b> 161/3</p> <p><b>account [19]</b> 2/1 11/15 11/19 15/11 22/19 44/1 56/3 57/11 58/8 60/23 69/10 76/5 76/8 76/19 84/12 85/7 97/23 104/10 121/1</p> <p><b>accountant [1]</b> 34/17</p> <p><b>accounting [22]</b> 5/16 26/16 34/10 44/7 44/15 45/4 45/15 62/5 67/10 67/14 67/18 80/16 83/24 87/3 87/9 90/3 99/16 104/16 107/11 120/22 121/1 146/20</p> <p><b>accounts [7]</b> 10/4 83/19 83/19 84/22 88/3 115/17 181/12</p> <p><b>accuracy [3]</b> 51/11 63/18 123/11</p> <p><b>accurate [3]</b> 8/19 51/25 52/3</p> <p><b>accurately [1]</b> 36/21</p> <p><b>accused [2]</b> 45/3 109/20</p> <p><b>accusing [1]</b> 86/3</p> <p><b>acknowledged [4]</b> 16/5 65/20 65/21 82/7</p>	<p><b>acknowledgement [3]</b> 34/23 35/22 36/17</p> <p><b>acquired [1]</b> 20/14</p> <p><b>acronym [1]</b> 51/21</p> <p><b>across [11]</b> 12/16 15/19 33/6 36/6 36/24 57/24 66/23 81/20 161/21 166/4 185/22</p> <p><b>act [4]</b> 18/25 47/2 79/11 143/19</p> <p><b>acted [2]</b> 54/21 83/23</p> <p><b>acting [4]</b> 7/22 43/14 74/23 91/6</p> <p><b>action [4]</b> 43/25 130/19 132/4 174/11</p> <p><b>actions [3]</b> 9/17 9/20 116/3</p> <p><b>activities [1]</b> 168/21</p> <p><b>actual [1]</b> 38/23</p> <p><b>actually [5]</b> 46/4 54/16 55/1 55/25 104/19</p> <p><b>add [5]</b> 11/14 67/25 69/3 144/20 159/17</p> <p><b>added [3]</b> 67/22 157/10 161/23</p> <p><b>addition [2]</b> 128/11 130/12</p> <p><b>additional [3]</b> 2/1 40/2 40/15</p> <p><b>address [23]</b> 15/12 27/18 38/23 62/3 70/11 83/10 92/1 94/22 97/19 102/6 108/8 118/10 119/11 122/2 124/8 127/1 138/19 146/4 151/4 151/23 153/22 164/15 183/5</p> <p><b>addressed [9]</b> 18/13 56/20 73/12 77/15 87/16 99/18 154/18 154/18 168/17</p> <p><b>addresses [3]</b> 2/24 62/11 164/14</p> <p><b>addressing [5]</b> 3/4 93/13 106/14 108/23 168/1</p> <p><b>adduced [1]</b> 85/4</p> <p><b>Adedayo [1]</b> 62/1</p> <p><b>adequate [3]</b> 104/23 104/23 104/24</p> <p><b>adherence [2]</b> 57/25 71/15</p> <p><b>adjourned [1]</b> 186/14</p> <p><b>Adjournment [1]</b> 91/15</p> <p><b>adjust [2]</b> 44/13 117/17</p> <p><b>administering [1]</b> 78/17</p> <p><b>admissibility [1]</b> 52/10</p>	<p><b>admissions [1]</b> 116/1</p> <p><b>admit [1]</b> 115/24</p> <p><b>admitted [3]</b> 87/8 87/9 115/12</p> <p><b>adopt [1]</b> 65/2</p> <p><b>adopted [7]</b> 52/17 65/21 126/25 128/14 167/1 184/24 185/24</p> <p><b>adoption [2]</b> 143/15 144/7</p> <p><b>advance [2]</b> 51/17 179/19</p> <p><b>advanced [3]</b> 41/16 44/8 82/12</p> <p><b>advantage [1]</b> 129/21</p> <p><b>adverse [2]</b> 22/15 150/22</p> <p><b>advice [26]</b> 50/3 55/25 56/2 56/19 57/6 57/9 57/19 61/5 65/18 69/20 113/13 114/20 117/23 120/5 120/8 121/5 137/25 138/6 142/23 143/7 143/22 144/7 145/12 150/1 169/20 177/16</p> <p><b>advices [9]</b> 54/19 54/19 54/21 55/8 55/17 55/21 72/25 107/5 176/8</p> <p><b>advise [8]</b> 100/16 100/16 103/25 107/14 121/8 150/6 176/14 176/15</p> <p><b>advised [11]</b> 28/17 62/7 99/4 107/1 113/1 113/8 116/7 124/7 138/6 143/15 150/13</p> <p><b>advises [2]</b> 103/17 112/5</p> <p><b>advising [6]</b> 93/2 94/18 104/19 139/2 143/23 176/5</p> <p><b>affairs [1]</b> 11/12</p> <p><b>affect [2]</b> 139/7 174/21</p> <p><b>affected [1]</b> 28/2</p> <p><b>afford [8]</b> 84/20 87/15 99/14 100/1 103/19 107/9 112/7 120/13</p> <p><b>afraid [1]</b> 47/8</p> <p><b>after [17]</b> 10/3 14/2 24/19 26/2 30/5 32/18 33/24 66/11 81/25 88/10 99/22 105/24 138/3 139/19 147/2 178/1 178/24</p> <p><b>afternoon [3]</b> 46/16 91/17 91/21</p> <p><b>AG's [2]</b> 21/20 173/2</p> <p><b>again [15]</b> 1/12 3/3 11/8 61/8 89/4 90/12 94/1 97/7 98/9 118/24</p>	<p>135/11 137/22 153/1 166/15 176/20</p> <p><b>against [14]</b> 13/4 13/6 24/3 44/15 64/22 69/2 70/5 74/13 76/6 76/9 76/20 77/3 174/22 180/13</p> <p><b>agent [1]</b> 5/12</p> <p><b>agents [2]</b> 37/7 38/8</p> <p><b>aggressively [1]</b> 139/24</p> <p><b>ago [1]</b> 169/21</p> <p><b>agree [22]</b> 48/1 51/17 52/13 68/3 77/17 100/15 103/25 110/3 116/17 121/7 128/11 137/9 148/19 148/24 151/12 155/2 156/8 161/24 165/8 165/13 175/5 175/16</p> <p><b>agreed [3]</b> 34/1 52/8 117/2</p> <p><b>agreeing [2]</b> 51/25 52/5</p> <p><b>agreements [1]</b> 34/14</p> <p><b>ahead [1]</b> 61/22</p> <p><b>Alana [2]</b> 35/14 35/18</p> <p><b>albeit [7]</b> 16/7 21/4 26/2 49/5 50/9 77/14 78/2</p> <p><b>alive [1]</b> 179/18</p> <p><b>all [59]</b> 8/21 12/22 14/15 16/8 18/10 26/6 27/7 34/15 34/20 36/15 41/22 42/17 52/21 58/15 59/1 60/12 70/24 71/5 73/12 73/23 74/1 75/8 80/9 82/4 82/15 84/23 87/16 89/18 91/12 95/10 104/12 105/23 108/11 115/17 124/11 125/2 125/9 125/19 126/11 128/1 128/17 135/9 135/15 139/5 140/5 140/25 146/20 150/10 163/11 167/7 167/15 169/1 173/18 174/25 175/13 180/5 185/12 186/7 186/8</p> <p><b>allegation [2]</b> 86/19 115/6</p> <p><b>allegations [5]</b> 90/4 110/20 113/14 116/23 148/13</p> <p><b>alleged [5]</b> 84/1 115/19 139/6 164/1 165/21</p> <p><b>alleges [1]</b> 120/25</p> <p><b>Allen [3]</b> 128/4 128/18 128/21</p> <p><b>Allen's [2]</b> 130/1 131/6</p>	<p><b>Allison [3]</b> 22/13 119/12 120/5</p> <p><b>allow [2]</b> 14/19 49/25</p> <p><b>almost [4]</b> 63/15 72/17 92/16 153/3</p> <p><b>alone [4]</b> 43/3 117/24 129/19 159/25</p> <p><b>along [1]</b> 27/24</p> <p><b>already [9]</b> 22/20 78/7 124/20 125/7 131/8 152/4 152/21 168/14 169/9</p> <p><b>also [24]</b> 6/13 13/17 19/20 23/21 24/11 44/2 44/22 69/19 87/20 109/11 115/18 143/7 148/5 149/20 151/16 152/18 155/18 155/22 160/3 160/5 164/23 174/3 177/7 181/8</p> <p><b>altering [1]</b> 115/12</p> <p><b>alternative [2]</b> 175/12 175/16</p> <p><b>alternatives [1]</b> 5/17</p> <p><b>although [6]</b> 5/22 28/15 110/14 145/24 150/11 160/9</p> <p><b>altogether [2]</b> 37/24 121/4</p> <p><b>always [7]</b> 18/3 55/23 58/5 58/16 85/2 138/12 138/14</p> <p><b>Alwen [1]</b> 35/6</p> <p><b>am [14]</b> 1/2 14/17 45/12 46/13 59/1 101/14 107/8 120/16 157/9 163/23 164/4 164/7 168/24 186/14</p> <p><b>amend [1]</b> 161/13</p> <p><b>amendment [2]</b> 36/14 82/1</p> <p><b>ammunition [1]</b> 138/22</p> <p><b>amongst [10]</b> 40/3 49/2 77/22 85/15 156/14 157/22 164/12 166/8 166/24 177/10</p> <p><b>amount [2]</b> 78/13 115/7</p> <p><b>amounts [1]</b> 146/22</p> <p><b>analyse [3]</b> 128/17 129/18 166/17</p> <p><b>analysed [1]</b> 151/19</p> <p><b>analysis [19]</b> 15/5 15/5 15/9 56/14 57/23 58/6 58/11 58/18 59/5 59/7 66/20 71/2 73/23 74/14 75/8 89/4 112/12 128/12 129/5</p> <p><b>Andrew [1]</b> 131/16</p> <p><b>Andy [4]</b> 147/19 147/19 156/19 163/15</p> <p><b>annotation [1]</b></p>
---	---	--	--	--

<b>A</b>	169/15 169/22 172/7 173/3 174/20 179/23 180/1 180/2 180/14 181/12 181/15 183/8 185/23	150/7	158/18 159/22 160/11 165/3 168/25 171/19 182/16 183/15 185/18 185/19	176/12 184/5
<b>annotation...</b> [1] 183/13		<b>appreciate</b> [4] 20/21 28/10 76/11 164/1		<b>asks</b> [1] 136/24
<b>annotations</b> [1] 183/21		<b>appreciated</b> [1] 17/21	<b>area</b> [3] 16/16 138/18 148/10	<b>aspects</b> [3] 16/19 58/20 129/23
<b>announced</b> [2] 138/3 138/16	<b>anybody</b> [1] 148/6 <b>anyone</b> [4] 24/13 69/19 143/21 153/20	<b>appreciation</b> [1] 32/1 <b>approach</b> [46] 5/15 6/8 8/24 13/25 16/11 16/21 16/24 25/12 27/8 29/6 37/8 37/15 42/7 42/9 42/11 42/12 49/3 50/11 52/16 76/13 79/16 82/8 87/1 113/20 122/5 122/6 122/9 124/4 126/16 126/25 128/4 128/7 128/9 128/9 128/14 141/5 144/9 153/2 167/6 167/25 168/24 169/20 173/25 178/3 178/13 184/7	<b>areas</b> [4] 140/18 153/6 153/9 166/8 <b>argue</b> [1] 116/2 <b>argued</b> [1] 150/12 <b>argument</b> [3] 45/7 45/9 138/24 <b>arise</b> [1] 38/3 <b>arisen</b> [9] 38/17 38/18 38/19 38/19 115/22 117/16 122/14 127/9 141/9 <b>arising</b> [7] 10/2 15/21 25/16 32/21 90/24 98/14 162/1 <b>arose</b> [3] 38/6 102/12 179/13 <b>around</b> [3] 27/20 35/20 143/12 <b>ARQ</b> [27] 10/18 10/20 28/7 92/1 92/20 94/23 95/15 96/24 100/17 100/24 101/11 102/18 102/19 104/2 106/6 108/15 119/16 121/9 121/24 123/16 128/20 129/1 133/15 173/17 182/18 182/19 182/20	<b>assert</b> [4] 4/20 113/9 144/21 153/11 <b>asserted</b> [6] 67/11 92/7 109/2 110/19 128/1 141/25 <b>asserting</b> [1] 27/21 <b>assertion</b> [2] 35/21 42/1 <b>assertions</b> [2] 113/21 113/22 <b>assess</b> [3] 12/3 44/4 144/1 <b>assessing</b> [4] 44/3 62/14 76/9 89/15 <b>assessment</b> [18] 11/16 11/22 20/4 20/7 56/22 67/12 67/19 67/23 68/24 70/2 77/6 77/19 78/7 84/23 91/5 92/13 117/21 185/6
<b>annual</b> [1] 149/25 <b>another</b> [3] 72/3 131/15 141/16 <b>answer</b> [6] 50/4 61/16 62/18 154/9 155/10 155/11 <b>answered</b> [1] 154/24 <b>answering</b> [2] 182/8 186/7 <b>answers</b> [1] 61/24 <b>anticipate</b> [2] 125/18 157/13 <b>antithesis</b> [1] 150/17 <b>any</b> [141] 2/14 2/15 3/13 6/20 9/1 21/7 21/24 26/11 28/20 28/21 28/25 35/10 37/20 38/12 38/14 38/23 39/6 52/5 52/8 54/6 55/6 56/8 56/14 57/4 61/14 62/15 63/12 63/18 66/8 70/15 71/1 71/2 71/4 73/23 75/9 78/21 81/24 84/20 85/8 85/23 86/8 86/10 86/22 86/24 87/22 87/23 94/6 94/25 96/1 96/5 96/15 96/24 97/7 97/12 97/12 98/9 98/24 100/21 101/11 101/25 102/2 102/11 102/18 102/19 102/25 103/4 103/4 104/1 104/3 104/5 104/20 105/19 105/21 106/1 106/1 106/6 106/17 106/21 106/21 107/15 108/12 110/8 110/25 111/1 111/1 115/21 115/21 116/25 118/13 118/17 119/2 119/16 119/25 121/5 121/13 121/23 121/23 122/22 123/10 123/13 123/16 128/7 129/5 131/25 132/14 133/1 134/10 135/11 135/12 137/13 139/2 140/19 141/11 141/23 145/18 145/18 146/13 146/15 151/13 151/13 151/16 151/17 151/18 151/18 153/17 155/2 163/1 169/14	<b>apocryphal</b> [1] 138/8 <b>Apologies</b> [2] 163/9 169/5 <b>apologise</b> [1] 1/6 <b>apparently</b> [1] 165/10 <b>Appeal</b> [15] 10/8 10/17 11/15 11/16 11/20 45/13 92/17 96/23 98/5 102/16 106/3 119/14 119/24 123/15 129/1 <b>Appeal's</b> [2] 98/6 106/4 <b>appeals</b> [3] 10/9 10/14 119/15 <b>appear</b> [5] 66/10 73/25 116/24 123/10 131/16 <b>appearance</b> [2] 179/5 180/6 <b>appeared</b> [4] 5/12 61/15 68/2 130/6 <b>appearing</b> [2] 83/18 96/21 <b>appears</b> [12] 23/8 33/15 53/6 145/15 158/2 161/4 164/16 165/13 166/5 173/19 177/16 184/24 <b>appendices</b> [2] 1/25 3/4 <b>appendix</b> [1] 2/7 <b>application</b> [6] 4/19 72/10 174/21 179/21 179/22 180/16 <b>applications</b> [1] 48/9 <b>applied</b> [8] 5/5 56/2 58/23 65/12 65/17 67/7 174/24 181/17 <b>apply</b> [7] 3/6 13/11 59/3 66/4 71/12 72/24 175/7 <b>applying</b> [3] 28/16 54/24 60/15 <b>appointed</b> [2] 34/18	<b>approached</b> [3] 66/10 103/9 169/5 <b>approaches</b> [1] 169/1 <b>appropriate</b> [18] 44/3 45/18 50/3 72/16 84/16 101/23 117/8 120/21 132/4 132/11 151/25 152/2 152/17 153/5 167/7 175/18 175/20 186/4 <b>appropriated</b> [2] 83/22 84/9 <b>appropriateness</b> [1] 167/5 <b>appropriating</b> [1] 86/3 <b>appropriation</b> [6] 59/20 59/22 59/24 84/2 84/6 84/8 <b>approval</b> [1] 159/5 <b>approximately</b> [1] 150/11 <b>arch</b> [1] 135/19 <b>are</b> [74] 2/2 2/21 3/8 3/10 8/23 10/14 11/20 12/1 12/5 12/15 15/8 19/23 23/7 27/4 29/10 31/18 32/2 32/9 32/14 34/13 35/16 36/11 37/16 38/8 43/7 52/24 58/2 58/3 58/21 59/7 59/9 59/11 62/10 68/25 70/13 71/22 73/4 76/17 82/19 86/3 95/12 101/11 108/7 108/10 108/10 110/20 112/22 113/25 120/17 124/23 124/24 126/8 132/21 136/10 139/19 146/6 146/14 150/2 151/24 153/13 153/16 153/21 156/22 156/23	<b>arise</b> [1] 38/3 <b>arisen</b> [9] 38/17 38/18 38/19 38/19 115/22 117/16 122/14 127/9 141/9 <b>arising</b> [7] 10/2 15/21 25/16 32/21 90/24 98/14 162/1 <b>arose</b> [3] 38/6 102/12 179/13 <b>around</b> [3] 27/20 35/20 143/12 <b>ARQ</b> [27] 10/18 10/20 28/7 92/1 92/20 94/23 95/15 96/24 100/17 100/24 101/11 102/18 102/19 104/2 106/6 108/15 119/16 121/9 121/24 123/16 128/20 129/1 133/15 173/17 182/18 182/19 182/20 <b>arrangements</b> [4] 164/6 165/1 165/2 165/7 <b>arrest</b> [1] 47/15 <b>arrested</b> [1] 47/14 <b>arrived</b> [1] 112/17 <b>as</b> [269] <b>ascertain</b> [3] 88/24 89/24 130/25 <b>aside</b> [3] 63/11 141/3 165/5 <b>ask</b> [15] 1/13 14/7 22/2 29/14 52/24 61/21 62/17 90/25 91/1 134/19 155/3 155/9 160/20 172/24 178/6 <b>asked</b> [28] 8/25 9/5 9/19 23/11 35/18 39/16 47/11 50/9 65/4 76/14 85/22 88/1 88/3 89/6 95/10 100/9 108/8 122/11 128/17 130/10 134/15 149/13 154/7 155/16 155/18 164/18 164/20 182/19 <b>asking</b> [15] 59/17 59/20 95/25 126/1 127/20 137/7 141/21 151/11 152/10 153/7 154/10 155/5 159/21	<b>assisted</b> [2] 158/24 185/17 <b>assisting</b> [3] 41/25 141/15 150/2 <b>assume</b> [2] 8/22 139/22 <b>assumption</b> [1] 56/18 <b>assumptions</b> [1] 12/10 <b>assurance</b> [1] 34/5 <b>assure</b> [1] 101/9 <b>astronomical</b> [1] 140/10 <b>at</b> [227] <b>at page 104</b> [1] 177/22 <b>At page 213</b> [1] 125/25 <b>Atkinson</b> [9] 1/8 1/10 1/12 1/16 46/20 91/21 147/14 186/8 187/2 <b>attached</b> [9] 40/17 79/17 103/21 120/15 125/14 125/20 148/25 158/18 161/17 <b>attachments</b> [1] 151/3 <b>attack</b> [6] 30/19 30/23 141/14 145/22 146/16 154/3 <b>attacked</b> [2] 146/10 152/13 <b>attacks</b> [5] 25/25

<b>A</b> <b>attacks...</b> [4] 140/23 141/10 146/12 152/24 <b>attained</b> [1] 112/19 <b>attempt</b> [2] 31/22 52/13 <b>attempting</b> [1] 138/23 <b>attempts</b> [1] 88/21 <b>attend</b> [2] 140/15 164/25 <b>attendance</b> [1] 163/14 <b>attention</b> [1] 25/2 <b>attitude</b> [1] 173/19 <b>Attorney</b> [5] 18/2 166/21 172/20 183/25 185/19 <b>audit</b> [8] 15/12 76/12 76/13 90/12 90/17 115/3 121/2 138/25 <b>auditors</b> [2] 34/7 34/14 <b>August</b> [4] 49/17 145/12 147/16 151/7 <b>author's</b> [1] 41/17 <b>authorities</b> [2] 3/23 3/24 <b>available</b> [10] 7/6 9/22 12/5 51/4 51/8 52/25 78/19 79/22 160/5 160/12 <b>avoid</b> [1] 78/3 <b>aware</b> [20] 28/25 42/16 45/12 50/7 124/20 134/3 134/12 136/19 148/19 153/20 153/23 154/12 155/23 162/24 163/1 164/22 164/23 177/2 177/4 179/20 <b>awareness</b> [3] 13/14 102/9 123/8 <b>away</b> [4] 23/23 26/9 72/3 157/20 <b>awful</b> [1] 182/4	<b>Bahamas</b> [1] 85/6 <b>Bailey</b> [3] 78/16 118/11 118/18 <b>Bailey's</b> [2] 118/7 118/15 <b>Baker</b> [3] 35/18 36/3 37/3 <b>balance</b> [2] 19/13 117/18 <b>balanced</b> [1] 115/17 <b>balances</b> [3] 19/19 24/3 36/21 <b>bald</b> [2] 99/20 99/25 <b>bandage</b> [1] 143/23 <b>bandwagon</b> [4] 30/11 31/12 33/2 146/2 <b>bank</b> [7] 83/18 84/12 84/22 85/7 88/2 122/18 122/20 <b>bargaining</b> [1] 6/25 <b>base</b> [1] 156/22 <b>based</b> [11] 12/9 12/12 12/15 12/24 34/20 36/15 57/10 64/13 156/22 170/9 170/10 <b>bashing</b> [3] 30/11 31/12 33/2 <b>basic</b> [2] 146/12 152/24 <b>basis</b> [29] 8/20 10/19 12/25 13/22 16/6 28/18 28/22 32/15 38/25 42/5 43/18 44/7 56/1 56/11 56/18 60/9 62/22 63/22 65/20 75/17 75/23 78/21 79/5 104/17 118/5 124/9 141/2 142/7 158/2 <b>battle</b> [1] 25/23 <b>BAU</b> [1] 165/6 <b>be</b> [253] <b>bear</b> [1] 84/25 <b>became</b> [3] 16/17 78/19 174/17 <b>because</b> [47] 11/18 13/8 20/11 28/10 28/11 28/23 29/17 29/24 32/8 32/24 61/19 64/8 68/25 69/16 70/12 75/16 77/5 77/9 78/3 84/11 84/24 86/2 86/25 89/11 93/9 99/3 104/14 111/3 114/13 122/15 123/23 124/9 127/3 127/22 134/6 136/20 143/21 155/25 156/25 166/18 169/22 170/12 172/3 182/12 182/13 182/19 185/15 <b>become</b> [4] 25/23	40/22 41/6 146/1 <b>becomes</b> [1] 22/5 <b>been</b> [144] 4/11 7/20 7/25 8/25 9/5 9/8 10/23 11/2 11/3 11/17 11/24 13/10 13/13 17/15 19/17 20/12 21/10 24/18 30/12 32/10 33/15 34/3 35/2 35/3 36/20 36/25 37/1 38/21 38/24 39/16 41/10 41/12 42/24 43/18 43/23 43/24 45/5 51/23 56/2 56/3 56/4 57/13 63/12 63/17 64/6 66/10 70/15 74/3 74/9 74/23 75/10 75/10 76/16 76/19 76/24 77/7 78/7 82/4 84/17 84/24 87/5 88/11 90/14 90/21 90/22 94/4 95/22 95/23 95/25 100/8 100/12 104/11 104/18 109/25 110/20 110/22 112/16 116/3 116/13 117/14 117/16 123/13 123/16 123/22 123/25 124/11 124/22 125/3 126/11 127/6 127/11 127/21 130/20 131/8 131/12 132/15 134/15 135/6 135/18 136/12 138/3 138/12 138/13 138/14 138/16 139/25 140/17 140/23 141/11 141/17 142/1 143/12 143/15 145/17 145/25 146/15 148/23 150/13 152/21 153/5 153/6 153/25 154/4 155/23 155/25 156/1 159/14 161/22 162/20 164/16 166/6 167/16 169/14 169/17 170/6 174/15 175/19 175/22 176/12 177/18 182/5 182/9 183/12 184/24 <b>BEER</b> [4] 1/11 1/13 46/10 187/4 <b>before</b> [30] 8/9 24/19 34/13 35/10 39/10 50/7 50/21 53/7 53/9 57/5 61/14 61/21 62/18 66/10 71/8 85/24 93/1 118/18 122/17 129/3 133/1 136/6 136/21 137/1 145/4 157/20 163/6 168/3 177/17 178/23 <b>began</b> [1] 134/16 <b>begin</b> [1] 129/18 <b>beginning</b> [5] 3/14 112/4 115/2 137/23	177/2 <b>behalf</b> [6] 1/14 7/22 45/8 105/7 129/13 145/19 <b>behind</b> [1] 5/23 <b>being</b> [69] 8/1 19/16 22/8 25/13 27/8 27/15 27/24 33/3 33/5 34/19 34/21 34/25 36/16 38/4 40/21 41/21 44/7 44/21 46/2 49/8 49/9 56/9 63/2 63/19 67/6 70/18 71/18 72/10 74/11 76/21 82/14 88/15 89/10 89/11 89/20 101/3 104/12 110/6 118/4 121/22 121/23 122/11 132/2 132/23 135/4 140/2 140/7 140/8 141/11 141/17 147/4 148/20 148/23 148/25 149/13 149/16 152/15 153/10 154/7 155/16 155/18 157/10 163/25 165/21 168/25 169/23 177/17 182/11 182/12 <b>belatedly</b> [1] 16/7 <b>belief</b> [7] 2/4 3/9 41/17 63/20 64/12 118/22 173/20 <b>believe</b> [2] 35/14 109/24 <b>believed</b> [5] 22/18 22/20 23/24 63/8 109/6 <b>bell</b> [1] 138/19 <b>below</b> [5] 35/24 125/9 159/17 164/17 164/25 <b>benefit</b> [1] 75/25 <b>benefited</b> [1] 87/15 <b>Berridge</b> [2] 94/17 95/9 <b>best</b> [5] 2/3 3/8 41/16 102/13 119/6 <b>better</b> [2] 32/4 178/6 <b>between</b> [25] 6/21 7/7 16/3 18/24 20/10 33/24 51/25 52/13 64/20 71/23 97/20 101/21 101/25 102/5 105/2 108/18 118/9 124/3 135/20 135/22 152/25 166/25 171/14 171/21 172/1 <b>beyond</b> [7] 75/20 118/2 131/8 154/13 157/11 171/4 171/13 <b>bit</b> [6] 42/5 94/16 141/24 142/10 145/8 167/10 <b>Blakey</b> [9] 22/13 22/18 67/8 69/22 98/2	99/1 99/6 99/15 100/14 <b>Blakey's</b> [3] 97/17 97/23 98/12 <b>blanket</b> [1] 163/10 <b>board</b> [2] 105/23 168/25 <b>boat</b> [1] 85/5 <b>body</b> [2] 11/19 99/11 <b>Bolc</b> [2] 131/16 131/21 <b>bomb</b> [1] 138/25 <b>bookkeeping</b> [1] 140/8 <b>borderline</b> [1] 68/25 <b>borne</b> [3] 19/17 84/21 90/22 <b>both</b> [18] 19/1 41/15 44/20 62/13 69/6 77/8 83/24 84/2 84/5 86/16 87/19 90/3 110/3 130/22 140/16 142/3 157/7 169/4 <b>bound</b> [1] 134/6 <b>boundless</b> [1] 147/25 <b>Bowyer</b> [14] 138/1 141/7 142/14 142/23 144/4 145/9 147/15 148/8 151/7 152/8 154/19 156/13 156/18 167/22 <b>Bowyer's</b> [3] 141/4 143/22 148/22 <b>Bradshaw</b> [4] 40/4 42/20 94/1 118/24 <b>Bradshaw's</b> [3] 40/12 40/19 95/7 <b>branch</b> [6] 36/19 100/8 110/15 115/7 127/22 151/18 <b>Brander</b> [2] 177/23 177/23 <b>breach</b> [4] 70/21 74/9 74/19 75/12 <b>breadth</b> [1] 36/24 <b>break</b> [7] 46/8 46/14 145/4 147/2 147/5 147/9 186/5 <b>breathless</b> [1] 148/22 <b>Brennan</b> [11] 15/24 22/12 22/17 23/15 24/8 24/14 52/23 60/20 85/21 89/5 93/15 <b>Brennan's</b> [2] 96/1 96/6 <b>brevity</b> [2] 55/23 69/17 <b>brief</b> [2] 65/9 159/22 <b>briefed</b> [1] 145/19 <b>bringing</b> [1] 57/11 <b>broader</b> [1] 15/7 <b>broadly</b> [1] 3/21
--	---	--	--	--

<p><b>B</b></p> <p><b>broken [1]</b> 101/8</p> <p><b>bug [3]</b> 153/24 154/2 154/4</p> <p><b>bugs [11]</b> 38/24 92/13 92/19 94/25 95/17 100/21 101/12 104/6 107/18 121/12 129/6</p> <p><b>built [2]</b> 20/18 22/1</p> <p><b>bundle [2]</b> 144/20 180/18</p> <p><b>burned [1]</b> 140/12</p> <p><b>business [3]</b> 25/3 54/13 165/1</p> <p><b>but [117]</b> 8/11 11/5 11/21 11/25 12/22 13/8 13/13 13/18 17/5 17/18 18/10 19/12 20/23 22/6 23/18 26/11 29/2 33/8 34/21 36/16 37/25 41/11 42/6 42/16 44/6 44/12 45/12 47/16 47/16 48/21 50/25 51/21 52/24 53/12 54/20 55/24 57/23 58/5 58/17 59/6 61/9 61/22 62/3 62/17 63/25 67/13 67/18 68/10 68/22 69/23 70/8 70/11 70/16 71/16 74/21 75/4 75/21 76/12 77/7 79/9 85/16 85/25 86/7 87/13 87/20 88/5 89/23 90/19 91/9 92/24 93/8 94/4 95/11 95/23 108/4 108/7 111/21 114/15 118/2 119/22 121/21 121/21 127/8 129/4 130/6 130/9 130/15 131/20 132/5 136/12 137/23 138/19 142/25 145/11 146/22 148/3 148/10 148/13 150/22 155/8 155/18 162/20 162/24 164/2 164/13 164/25 169/1 175/14 176/25 179/9 182/4 182/21 183/1 183/17 184/7 184/16 184/19</p>	<p><b>came [3]</b> 55/12 88/10 111/9</p> <p><b>can [137]</b> 1/3 1/5 1/5 1/14 1/23 14/11 14/21 14/24 15/2 17/2 24/23 30/5 30/6 33/7 33/20 35/4 35/14 35/19 36/2 36/11 37/7 37/11 39/9 39/21 40/7 40/16 40/19 42/14 43/5 46/16 46/20 46/23 48/6 48/8 50/22 52/16 52/21 53/23 53/25 55/20 64/12 65/11 66/15 67/1 73/8 74/16 79/10 79/25 79/25 80/24 81/10 83/25 84/5 85/9 85/9 88/13 90/7 91/17 91/22 93/6 94/10 94/17 95/6 95/11 96/9 97/17 99/3 99/5 99/11 101/9 101/10 101/11 102/4 103/8 103/9 103/16 105/1 106/12 106/25 107/25 109/19 110/24 111/8 111/9 111/17 113/4 114/23 114/24 118/7 119/8 120/4 120/7 120/10 120/18 121/5 122/19 123/18 124/15 125/24 126/7 126/24 134/19 137/20 139/1 139/15 139/18 142/20 142/20 143/9 145/4 145/7 145/25 146/6 147/5 147/11 147/16 149/18 149/18 156/22 157/2 157/4 157/17 158/14 159/9 160/1 161/2 161/10 162/14 164/9 164/11 166/13 167/8 170/20 170/24 173/8 176/17 179/2</p> <p><b>can't [7]</b> 29/16 47/8 52/19 79/9 110/23 168/14 180/8</p> <p><b>cancel [1]</b> 69/25</p> <p><b>candidates [1]</b> 104/15</p> <p><b>cannot [2]</b> 55/24 138/19</p> <p><b>capable [4]</b> 41/24 141/14 144/13 170/7</p> <p><b>care [1]</b> 12/7</p> <p><b>career [1]</b> 75/2</p> <p><b>careful [2]</b> 8/15 105/24</p> <p><b>carelessness [1]</b> 119/3</p> <p><b>Carl [2]</b> 86/14 105/1</p> <p><b>carried [8]</b> 34/21 36/16 36/20 104/15</p>	<p>104/19 104/20 119/4 175/19</p> <p><b>carry [2]</b> 47/15 71/17</p> <p><b>carrying [1]</b> 17/16</p> <p><b>Cartwright [16]</b> 39/18 39/23 40/8 114/19 114/25 124/5 126/7 138/1 142/22 143/6 148/18 149/23 156/15 156/20 157/23 161/23</p> <p><b>case [193]</b></p> <p><b>cases [129]</b> 4/6 4/22 7/7 7/9 10/25 12/12 12/13 12/16 12/17 12/23 13/15 15/19 15/21 15/23 16/25 18/11 19/17 20/11 20/22 20/24 21/6 22/6 22/12 22/23 24/17 27/13 27/19 27/23 28/6 28/15 32/21 34/1 34/3 34/9 34/12 34/18 38/17 38/20 39/15 41/15 41/18 42/6 42/21 42/24 44/6 45/7 45/17 48/8 48/10 50/14 50/23 50/23 54/14 57/14 57/17 59/12 65/9 66/4 66/7 66/15 66/23 67/4 68/7 71/1 71/3 73/5 73/22 75/9 75/17 81/6 81/10 82/8 82/11 85/20 87/22 87/25 88/4 88/8 89/19 90/19 92/18 92/22 102/2 119/21 123/4 123/24 123/25 124/23 125/2 125/9 125/14 125/19 126/8 128/15 128/24 129/12 131/6 131/19 134/25 139/5 139/8 139/18 140/16 140/25 141/8 141/13 145/21 145/24 146/14 150/1 150/10 157/23 158/24 163/1 167/15 168/3 169/16 174/10 179/23 180/1 180/15 181/17 183/12 183/20 184/1 184/9 184/16 184/25 185/10</p> <p><b>cash [7]</b> 115/7 115/8 115/12 142/21 143/16 147/19 156/19</p> <p><b>catastrophic [1]</b> 140/5</p> <p><b>catch [1]</b> 159/11</p> <p><b>categories [1]</b> 172/16</p> <p><b>categorise [1]</b> 33/1</p> <p><b>category [1]</b> 129/23</p> <p><b>cause [1]</b> 92/11</p> <p><b>caused [5]</b> 26/17</p>	<p>44/19 104/18 111/10 127/5</p> <p><b>causing [1]</b> 127/24</p> <p><b>caution [5]</b> 78/11 78/17 79/4 79/18 118/19</p> <p><b>cautioning [2]</b> 78/24 79/13</p> <p><b>cautions [1]</b> 78/22</p> <p><b>cent [6]</b> 68/9 68/12 68/14 68/16 68/19 68/19</p> <p><b>centres [1]</b> 11/1</p> <p><b>certainly [26]</b> 12/14 13/8 22/9 28/5 31/19 37/21 38/1 38/23 38/25 42/8 48/6 50/6 50/19 50/22 51/18 58/17 63/15 77/7 89/23 121/21 122/14 127/10 136/5 155/6 176/15 186/6</p> <p><b>cetera [2]</b> 76/16 164/10</p> <p><b>chain [1]</b> 124/15</p> <p><b>Chairman [1]</b> 63/8</p> <p><b>challenge [4]</b> 42/4 140/18 147/23 157/16</p> <p><b>challenged [7]</b> 35/2 36/25 138/13 140/18 140/25 145/18 148/14</p> <p><b>challenges [6]</b> 37/9 37/17 143/8 150/9 155/14 157/19</p> <p><b>chance [1]</b> 72/10</p> <p><b>change [6]</b> 16/21 66/9 81/25 169/2 185/22 185/23</p> <p><b>changed [3]</b> 3/13 51/21 161/3</p> <p><b>changes [4]</b> 16/10 16/10 36/13 159/16</p> <p><b>chapter [2]</b> 127/23 170/13</p> <p><b>character [1]</b> 70/23</p> <p><b>charge [19]</b> 54/7 55/8 55/13 55/14 55/14 56/10 61/15 61/21 63/1 63/22 65/20 75/11 85/25 120/14 175/10 176/5 176/6 176/8 176/16</p> <p><b>charged [7]</b> 20/8 60/21 61/23 62/21 63/3 114/21 116/15</p> <p><b>charges [5]</b> 67/10 67/17 103/20 112/8 120/22</p> <p><b>charging [37]</b> 3/24 5/2 5/6 5/9 5/11 5/15 13/12 16/6 16/11 28/13 28/19 32/11 50/15 50/22 53/24 54/1 54/5 55/25 57/8</p>	<p>57/15 57/24 58/25 63/14 65/4 65/12 66/9 72/25 73/11 93/14 99/21 107/5 111/20 114/20 117/7 117/9 176/18 178/23</p> <p><b>chatter [1]</b> 64/13</p> <p><b>check [6]</b> 19/13 48/12 51/11 98/20 128/7 175/24</p> <p><b>checked [2]</b> 110/20 110/22</p> <p><b>checking [3]</b> 52/2 144/18 144/21</p> <p><b>checks [7]</b> 19/19 24/2 24/18 96/16 101/2 104/20 123/13</p> <p><b>choice [2]</b> 34/18 147/20</p> <p><b>choose [1]</b> 139/17</p> <p><b>chose [2]</b> 28/12 29/1</p> <p><b>chosen [1]</b> 44/13</p> <p><b>chronology [4]</b> 7/21 8/1 8/19 135/17</p> <p><b>circulated [1]</b> 156/14</p> <p><b>circumstances [9]</b> 38/18 45/2 80/13 80/14 82/13 82/20 82/22 88/25 169/25</p> <p><b>citation [1]</b> 98/5</p> <p><b>civil [6]</b> 10/7 10/12 45/24 140/17 146/16 154/5</p> <p><b>clarification [1]</b> 163/17</p> <p><b>clarify [1]</b> 126/7</p> <p><b>clear [29]</b> 12/13 15/18 16/17 18/15 22/15 37/25 49/6 54/20 56/11 74/23 98/15 98/16 110/11 110/14 110/21 120/17 123/1 127/11 128/22 132/15 136/6 136/9 136/10 136/12 155/20 166/22 172/8 173/21 180/4</p> <p><b>clearer [2]</b> 159/25 174/17</p> <p><b>clearly [19]</b> 12/16 13/13 16/2 19/25 42/14 43/16 57/22 74/17 75/21 114/13 115/18 117/20 152/22 155/16 182/21 184/19 185/3 185/12 185/14</p> <p><b>close [3]</b> 144/22 148/2 173/16</p> <p><b>closest [1]</b> 55/12</p> <p><b>clues [1]</b> 69/17</p> <p><b>Co [1]</b> 39/19</p> <p><b>Code [40]</b> 16/5 16/9 18/24 20/1 21/16 21/19 22/7 28/16</p>
--	---	--	---	---

<b>C</b>	<b>compare</b> [1] 95/12 <b>comparison</b> [2] 36/13 139/11 <b>compelled</b> [1] 44/13 <b>compensation</b> [1] 79/19 <b>competent</b> [1] 139/2 <b>complacency</b> [1] 31/20 <b>complainant</b> [1] 58/13 <b>complainant's</b> [1] 58/10 <b>complained</b> [1] 181/17 <b>complaints</b> [2] 181/15 181/18 <b>complete</b> [2] 8/21 113/11 <b>completed</b> [3] 51/19 139/14 145/20 <b>completely</b> [3] 12/19 32/22 42/24 <b>complexity</b> [1] 57/14 <b>complied</b> [5] 4/6 47/1 47/19 72/19 162/6 <b>comply</b> [2] 13/23 136/15 <b>compromised</b> [2] 140/4 140/13 <b>compute</b> [1] 139/6 <b>computer</b> [8] 26/18 31/22 44/11 80/18 100/12 104/22 109/7 135/6 <b>conceded</b> [1] 10/17 <b>concentrating</b> [3] 57/7 57/13 146/13 <b>concern</b> [23] 16/1 16/12 16/16 17/19 19/13 21/5 23/3 38/14 45/16 45/19 54/9 63/4 63/18 71/10 71/22 72/1 73/11 132/17 133/6 135/24 136/1 165/6 166/9 <b>concerned</b> [7] 19/24 59/12 68/20 70/1 131/7 163/15 168/24 <b>concerning</b> [13] 5/20 61/17 61/18 67/3 108/19 116/23 121/9 132/22 137/16 137/22 165/8 171/8 177/5 <b>concerns</b> [6] 4/3 16/18 45/13 55/11 55/20 55/22 <b>concessions</b> [1] 10/13 <b>conclude</b> [3] 10/19 75/13 94/5 <b>concluded</b> [3] 86/23 96/23 139/13 <b>concludes</b> [1] 31/9	<b>concluding</b> [1] 75/17 <b>conclusion</b> [12] 22/15 23/4 23/9 24/1 56/1 56/5 56/7 56/12 57/1 62/19 184/15 185/10 <b>conclusions</b> [14] 12/8 12/13 12/24 13/1 14/4 14/8 14/9 15/8 22/21 80/8 93/7 94/11 122/17 151/20 <b>condition</b> [2] 44/21 46/3 <b>conditional</b> [4] 27/15 78/17 79/13 79/17 <b>conditionally</b> [1] 108/4 <b>conditions</b> [2] 79/17 112/21 <b>conduct</b> [2] 13/2 143/18 <b>conducted</b> [2] 50/14 94/4 <b>confess</b> [2] 66/8 69/15 <b>confidence</b> [4] 25/7 36/7 70/18 140/8 <b>confined</b> [1] 9/6 <b>confirm</b> [3] 8/23 141/20 145/16 <b>confirming</b> [1] 150/15 <b>confirms</b> [1] 140/22 <b>confiscation</b> [6] 43/21 44/23 45/1 46/2 88/8 140/7 <b>conflict</b> [1] 2/14 <b>confronted</b> [1] 92/8 <b>confusion</b> [2] 164/17 165/14 <b>connected</b> [1] 182/16 <b>conscientious</b> [3] 5/14 65/5 65/8 <b>conscious</b> [1] 45/6 <b>consequences</b> [3] 138/20 140/4 140/6 <b>consider</b> [25] 10/11 11/22 12/7 19/19 23/22 28/17 28/24 47/1 59/10 60/15 64/5 73/3 75/20 76/14 87/7 100/10 104/13 108/13 120/22 141/8 151/2 161/13 170/15 174/14 174/19 <b>considerable</b> [1] 139/7 <b>considerably</b> [1] 7/7 <b>consideration</b> [13] 12/15 25/19 26/15 26/16 60/8 78/14 80/15 141/12 150/25 165/25 172/18 174/25	175/2 <b>considerations</b> [2] 69/1 69/4 <b>considered</b> [11] 3/18 5/9 20/14 57/1 65/25 67/16 70/5 74/3 77/18 85/20 138/18 <b>considering</b> [3] 9/17 78/10 95/22 <b>consistent</b> [9] 37/8 43/14 43/20 72/10 143/17 144/8 167/24 167/24 178/3 <b>consistently</b> [4] 81/7 81/11 81/15 81/19 <b>conspiracy</b> [1] 86/20 <b>constituents</b> [1] 34/4 <b>constituted</b> [1] 154/2 <b>consulted</b> [1] 8/16 <b>contact</b> [7] 95/18 107/21 111/1 111/2 121/14 126/3 135/21 <b>contacted</b> [9] 88/25 96/2 97/8 98/10 103/1 106/18 110/9 118/14 120/1 <b>contacting</b> [4] 95/3 104/6 110/24 121/25 <b>contains</b> [1] 53/3 <b>contemporaneous</b> [8] 9/7 9/13 11/5 11/12 11/23 14/13 33/13 106/2 <b>contend</b> [1] 139/22 <b>content</b> [2] 143/9 174/6 <b>contents</b> [4] 2/3 3/8 30/20 182/1 <b>contested</b> [2] 51/16 140/16 <b>context</b> [12] 25/16 37/23 38/2 39/1 71/18 78/6 79/11 123/10 130/2 137/7 137/7 153/22 <b>continue</b> [3] 36/6 46/16 91/17 <b>continued</b> [2] 16/14 66/20 <b>continues</b> [1] 36/23 <b>continuing</b> [1] 16/23 <b>continuum</b> [1] 183/1 <b>contract</b> [5] 18/13 45/22 45/25 76/13 90/15 <b>contracts</b> [2] 44/16 84/18 <b>contrary</b> [6] 21/10 73/18 73/21 107/23 119/23 134/13 <b>controlling</b> [1] 133/7 <b>conversation</b> [1] 22/9 <b>convicted</b> [2] 43/18	88/11 <b>conviction</b> [20] 10/4 26/3 56/13 57/2 67/5 67/24 68/5 68/10 68/11 68/15 69/23 70/4 70/19 75/19 99/14 100/2 103/19 107/10 112/7 120/13 <b>convictions</b> [1] 140/6 <b>copied</b> [1] 32/10 <b>copies</b> [3] 50/8 125/21 160/20 <b>copy</b> [1] 49/1 <b>corners</b> [1] 153/15 <b>correct</b> [3] 62/24 87/18 169/2 <b>correctly</b> [9] 20/8 62/2 72/5 86/18 94/8 101/14 105/12 133/6 182/4 <b>correspondence</b> [5] 135/20 166/24 181/10 181/24 185/2 <b>cost</b> [8] 131/18 131/19 165/24 166/5 171/4 171/6 171/8 171/13 <b>costs</b> [3] 164/7 165/3 165/7 <b>could</b> [47] 6/18 11/4 13/18 18/25 30/8 33/19 42/18 45/2 47/15 50/18 56/23 61/7 61/23 62/18 70/7 72/3 78/15 79/17 86/21 88/2 88/4 92/7 98/2 100/12 102/14 104/15 105/9 105/17 109/3 116/2 119/5 120/23 125/20 126/2 127/18 128/25 130/9 133/12 133/14 133/20 133/21 144/20 155/9 155/25 159/1 175/7 186/1 <b>couldn't</b> [13] 44/11 63/3 76/1 84/20 86/23 86/25 87/12 87/15 96/22 98/15 98/17 123/15 127/23 <b>counsel</b> [5] 37/8 38/8 52/14 144/5 174/11 <b>counter</b> [1] 183/18 <b>country</b> [3] 27/20 33/6 35/1 <b>couple</b> [1] 54/14 <b>course</b> [13] 21/3 23/8 47/23 80/19 105/5 108/24 117/18 123/9 127/8 130/19 132/4 147/6 155/15 <b>court</b> [38] 6/4 10/7 10/16 11/14 11/16 11/20 30/19 34/1 44/4
----------	---	---	--	---

<p><b>C</b></p> <p><b>court... [29]</b> 45/12 51/20 92/16 96/23 98/4 98/6 102/16 106/3 106/4 119/14 119/24 123/15 124/24 129/1 137/12 150/12 152/6 154/8 154/10 160/14 161/22 162/7 162/12 162/20 163/23 164/21 164/24 165/19 179/6</p> <p><b>court's [1]</b> 102/17</p> <p><b>courts [6]</b> 35/2 37/1 51/15 138/14 139/20 180/16</p> <p><b>cover [8]</b> 76/2 83/20 126/21 156/5 157/18 164/6 165/3 168/20</p> <p><b>covered [3]</b> 160/7 164/1 164/7</p> <p><b>covering [3]</b> 60/24 61/12 104/17</p> <p><b>CPIA [12]</b> 16/9 17/17 18/1 18/24 20/1 21/15 21/19 22/7 144/10 177/5 179/15 183/25</p> <p><b>CPS [11]</b> 13/16 20/23 20/25 50/14 50/17 51/3 57/15 57/16 60/14 79/15 136/7</p> <p><b>craft [1]</b> 35/19</p> <p><b>created [4]</b> 53/7 110/1 117/19 180/11</p> <p><b>creating [1]</b> 110/1</p> <p><b>credentials [1]</b> 159/3</p> <p><b>credibility [1]</b> 58/12</p> <p><b>Crichton [1]</b> 35/6</p> <p><b>criminal [27]</b> 3/21 10/8 21/4 31/1 35/2 37/1 46/1 46/1 47/2 54/7 55/10 55/17 56/24 56/24 57/17 79/10 94/18 96/25 102/20 103/12 106/7 120/8 138/13 140/17 146/16 154/6 162/2</p> <p><b>crisis [1]</b> 148/24</p> <p><b>critical [2]</b> 132/21 133/25</p> <p><b>critically [1]</b> 47/22</p> <p><b>criticism [2]</b> 27/15 58/24</p> <p><b>criticisms [3]</b> 113/15 169/14 169/17</p> <p><b>cross [10]</b> 6/20 20/10 27/4 43/7 80/6 93/23 179/16 180/9 181/1 186/3</p> <p><b>cross-disclosure [2]</b> 6/20 186/3</p> <p><b>cross-discussion [1]</b> 20/10</p>	<p><b>cross-refer [1]</b> 93/23</p> <p><b>cross-reference [2]</b> 80/6 179/16</p> <p><b>cross-references [2]</b> 27/4 43/7</p> <p><b>Crown [16]</b> 16/5 28/16 30/19 51/20 54/24 57/10 58/1 59/4 60/13 66/11 71/16 72/24 73/1 162/20 174/12 181/4</p> <p><b>Crown's [1]</b> 40/10</p> <p><b>cured [1]</b> 162/10</p> <p><b>current [2]</b> 156/24 160/20</p> <p><b>currently [1]</b> 157/1</p> <p><b>Customs [1]</b> 86/16</p> <p><b>cut [5]</b> 41/11 41/12 145/11 151/6 152/8</p> <p><b>cutting [1]</b> 161/18</p> <hr/> <p><b>D</b></p> <p><b>data [61]</b> 4/24 10/18 10/20 28/7 63/19 91/25 92/1 92/12 92/20 94/23 94/23 95/4 95/15 95/15 95/19 96/3 96/24 97/9 97/25 100/17 100/17 100/25 101/11 101/13 102/18 102/19 104/2 104/3 104/8 106/6 107/16 108/15 119/16 121/9 121/10 121/15 121/24 123/16 127/2 128/6 128/17 128/21 129/1 129/6 129/14 130/3 130/11 131/4 131/17 132/3 133/15 151/19 170/10 173/5 173/15 173/17 181/13 182/18 182/19 182/20 182/23</p> <p><b>date [8]</b> 109/21 120/16 120/18 120/20 124/11 125/1 156/18 159/12</p> <p><b>date' [1]</b> 126/11</p> <p><b>dated [12]</b> 39/13 39/25 40/7 40/12 49/17 103/16 111/25 125/21 142/11 145/12 176/19 179/4</p> <p><b>dates [1]</b> 179/7</p> <p><b>Dave [1]</b> 143/10</p> <p><b>David [3]</b> 22/12 96/12 97/17</p> <p><b>Davidson [2]</b> 168/22 169/4</p> <p><b>day [5]</b> 44/14 44/16 162/21 186/5 186/15</p> <p><b>days [1]</b> 150/6</p> <p><b>deal [4]</b> 83/7 91/3 100/11 155/16</p>	<p><b>dealing [8]</b> 72/17 96/11 108/18 113/16 117/11 128/23 147/24 150/8</p> <p><b>dealt [2]</b> 13/15 78/23</p> <p><b>Dear [1]</b> 158/17</p> <p><b>December [2]</b> 1/1 179/6</p> <p><b>decided [2]</b> 130/15 131/1</p> <p><b>decides [1]</b> 21/23</p> <p><b>deciding [8]</b> 20/16 44/1 69/11 75/6 90/16 166/1 175/9 176/5</p> <p><b>decision [26]</b> 5/6 5/9 9/21 47/12 50/15 50/22 54/6 54/17 54/22 54/24 55/2 55/5 55/14 57/9 59/7 61/14 61/15 70/20 93/14 111/21 117/9 130/6 166/6 176/3 178/23 185/13</p> <p><b>decisions [34]</b> 3/25 5/2 5/11 9/17 9/20 13/12 16/7 16/11 20/5 25/4 25/9 25/17 28/13 28/19 28/23 32/11 48/15 53/25 54/2 54/5 54/15 56/9 57/16 57/24 58/20 58/25 63/14 65/4 66/10 71/24 72/4 76/20 166/16 174/8</p> <p><b>declaration [6]</b> 2/8 3/6 146/10 152/12 154/21 158/11</p> <p><b>declarations [1]</b> 115/13</p> <p><b>deemed [1]</b> 127/24</p> <p><b>deep [1]</b> 88/6</p> <p><b>defects [9]</b> 95/1 95/17 100/22 101/12 104/6 107/19 121/12 129/7 153/15</p> <p><b>defence [52]</b> 4/21 26/23 29/4 31/3 31/24 39/19 51/10 51/24 53/10 53/11 62/3 62/12 62/16 82/18 105/6 105/8 105/16 109/20 109/22 110/4 111/8 113/9 115/23 125/6 129/3 129/13 129/15 139/2 141/2 145/19 146/16 150/23 155/14 155/17 155/23 157/12 157/15 157/23 160/20 166/18 167/2 167/19 168/5 170/18 173/20 175/1 175/22 179/8 180/18 184/11 184/12 185/17</p> <p><b>defence-led [2]</b></p>	<p>155/14 155/17</p> <p><b>defences [3]</b> 62/10 62/11 147/24</p> <p><b>defend [2]</b> 139/23 153/11</p> <p><b>defendant [26]</b> 22/16 23/14 38/12 39/23 41/23 43/25 45/8 82/21 85/3 101/5 114/9 126/18 126/21 127/8 131/9 132/25 141/16 151/17 154/3 166/18 168/2 178/10 178/12 179/21 180/13 181/17</p> <p><b>defendants [7]</b> 31/11 127/3 144/23 144/24 146/18 169/15 181/16</p> <p><b>defended [3]</b> 35/3 37/2 138/15</p> <p><b>deficiencies [2]</b> 105/19 105/22</p> <p><b>deficiency [2]</b> 92/18 105/9</p> <p><b>deficient [1]</b> 182/25</p> <p><b>deficit [1]</b> 115/22</p> <p><b>degree [5]</b> 20/3 21/21 57/23 85/10 110/11</p> <p><b>delay [1]</b> 159/14</p> <p><b>delays [1]</b> 139/21</p> <p><b>deleted [1]</b> 160/18</p> <p><b>deliberate [3]</b> 75/24 89/7 91/7</p> <p><b>deliberately [1]</b> 23/19</p> <p><b>delivery [1]</b> 168/22</p> <p><b>demand [1]</b> 82/22</p> <p><b>demonstrate [1]</b> 29/12</p> <p><b>demonstrated [3]</b> 22/14 43/17 129/13</p> <p><b>demonstrates [1]</b> 74/17</p> <p><b>denied [3]</b> 83/12 109/16 115/20</p> <p><b>deny [1]</b> 115/25</p> <p><b>Department [1]</b> 35/16</p> <p><b>departure [1]</b> 178/15</p> <p><b>depend [4]</b> 63/15 81/16 101/19 139/5</p> <p><b>depended [3]</b> 77/5 94/7 105/11</p> <p><b>dependent [1]</b> 126/18</p> <p><b>deployed [2]</b> 103/5 140/24</p> <p><b>describe [2]</b> 98/22 119/6</p> <p><b>described [12]</b> 1/21 4/5 7/15 33/12 88/18 92/5 96/19 98/3 102/13 127/14 134/20 166/11</p> <p><b>describes [1]</b> 141/20</p>	<p><b>describing [1]</b> 96/21</p> <p><b>description [4]</b> 90/21 146/9 152/11 174/6</p> <p><b>descriptive [1]</b> 157/9</p> <p><b>desire [3]</b> 25/13 27/9 28/1</p> <p><b>desks' [1]</b> 113/18</p> <p><b>desperate [1]</b> 31/22</p> <p><b>despite [1]</b> 97/23</p> <p><b>destroy [4]</b> 25/25 26/2 31/1 31/7</p> <p><b>destruction [1]</b> 31/7</p> <p><b>detail [3]</b> 103/24 111/3 136/23</p> <p><b>detailed [3]</b> 101/19 125/7 130/3</p> <p><b>detailing [2]</b> 124/21 150/10</p> <p><b>details [1]</b> 164/10</p> <p><b>determined [1]</b> 25/25</p> <p><b>developed [3]</b> 16/2 16/4 66/12</p> <p><b>developers [1]</b> 150/15</p> <p><b>developing [1]</b> 16/19</p> <p><b>devote [1]</b> 93/9</p> <p><b>diagram [1]</b> 157/10</p> <p><b>diagrams [1]</b> 159/18</p> <p><b>dialogue [2]</b> 101/23 101/25</p> <p><b>did [79]</b> 5/1 5/19 6/8 6/23 7/2 8/20 13/1 23/5 25/7 27/6 27/23 28/1 28/10 28/20 28/24 29/3 31/13 37/14 37/19 38/14 39/3 42/17 43/12 44/18 44/25 47/17 49/2 49/11 58/4 71/1 71/4 72/4 78/21 79/21 85/18 86/10 86/21 87/22 88/5 92/25 98/13 100/16 101/25 102/22 103/25 106/9 106/16 107/14 110/12 114/13 118/5 118/21 119/1 119/17 119/22 121/7 126/22 127/15 128/8 129/9 130/25 131/7 131/16 131/21 131/25 133/7 135/10 141/4 143/21 144/7 151/18 162/5 167/5 172/7 173/3 174/4 183/8 185/22 185/23</p> <p><b>didn't [33]</b> 12/23 28/12 29/2 38/16 44/10 49/10 54/18 56/7 62/3 66/18 66/24 70/16 73/25 81/16 91/4 100/10 100/24 104/11 105/25 110/25 119/21 119/22 121/23 127/12 133/24 137/18</p>
---	--	---	---	--

<b>D</b>	126/17 128/14 130/23 137/13 139/11 142/4 144/9 144/24 150/8 151/2 157/2 166/16 170/17 170/23 171/1 171/9 171/16 172/5 172/10 172/18 173/9 173/15 173/20 174/2 174/9 177/5 177/13 179/3 179/13 179/15 179/19 180/2 181/7 183/24 185/20 186/3 <b>discredit [1]</b> 138/23 <b>discrepancies [2]</b> 98/14 146/24 <b>discussion [11]</b> 20/10 52/20 101/21 157/22 171/3 171/4 171/6 171/10 171/12 171/13 172/1 <b>discussions [3]</b> 128/23 181/15 181/19 <b>dishonest [3]</b> 61/1 84/24 116/3 <b>dishonestly [2]</b> 83/23 91/6 <b>dishonesty [10]</b> 59/13 60/9 61/13 62/2 78/9 84/3 84/6 84/11 90/2 90/5 <b>disinclination [2]</b> 31/16 31/19 <b>dismiss [1]</b> 179/23 <b>dismissed [1]</b> 117/22 <b>dismisses [1]</b> 116/22 <b>displayed [2]</b> 14/24 23/8 <b>disposal [1]</b> 78/12 <b>disprove [1]</b> 114/11 <b>dispute [2]</b> 52/10 52/10 <b>disquieting [2]</b> 42/10 42/19 <b>dissuade [1]</b> 31/11 <b>distance [1]</b> 182/6 <b>distinction [1]</b> 18/24 <b>distinguished [1]</b> 75/2 <b>distributed [1]</b> 143/12 <b>distributes [1]</b> 143/5 <b>distribution [1]</b> 149/21 <b>disturbing [1]</b> 41/15 <b>disturbingly [1]</b> 73/13 <b>dive [1]</b> 88/6 <b>division [10]</b> 10/8 17/25 21/5 21/18 21/18 55/10 56/24 56/25 94/18 103/13 <b>do [60]</b> 10/11 12/7 14/19 17/5 19/19 21/17 22/5 29/13	29/14 31/16 35/24 36/5 36/13 39/12 46/25 53/12 55/10 57/18 59/16 59/21 61/4 72/22 79/6 79/7 81/15 81/19 84/20 87/14 90/16 90/25 91/2 109/8 114/5 116/24 121/3 121/7 122/8 123/5 125/18 127/18 130/10 132/14 133/20 136/11 137/5 137/5 137/9 140/3 143/15 148/24 149/11 150/25 151/12 155/3 156/23 160/8 164/4 165/8 169/8 179/15 <b>document [26]</b> 7/20 8/13 17/10 30/13 30/17 33/19 35/5 39/5 39/9 49/21 50/12 50/24 61/3 76/12 82/2 111/2 111/12 111/19 124/13 135/17 142/9 150/9 151/3 153/18 156/9 159/20 <b>document/spreadshe</b> <b>et [1]</b> 151/3 <b>documentation [6]</b> 11/5 11/23 50/9 50/10 181/10 184/3 <b>documents [28]</b> 2/2 9/7 9/7 9/10 10/2 11/11 19/5 23/12 25/7 49/4 49/10 54/11 54/11 56/6 66/3 71/14 72/16 94/11 159/19 159/21 159/22 160/1 160/11 160/11 160/21 160/22 161/1 161/5 <b>does [18]</b> 2/10 2/14 2/17 2/20 3/5 3/7 4/20 4/23 18/8 38/23 40/24 68/18 86/1 87/4 112/16 120/21 123/10 169/20 <b>doesn't [8]</b> 43/1 112/13 126/8 142/14 158/7 158/10 169/12 170/11 <b>doing [11]</b> 17/22 38/9 87/8 87/9 89/12 89/14 89/16 96/22 117/17 119/6 131/20 <b>don't [10]</b> 5/23 32/24 45/23 59/1 59/4 79/8 96/5 108/12 166/10 166/20 <b>done [38]</b> 8/5 10/21 10/23 11/24 11/25 13/19 21/1 21/3 21/22 22/6 22/18 23/18 23/18 23/19 23/24 24/1 30/1 74/24 87/8	89/10 89/11 100/19 100/23 101/22 107/24 109/8 110/24 115/13 128/25 130/9 132/16 133/15 133/24 136/20 137/1 151/11 183/18 184/20 <b>doubt [1]</b> 32/3 <b>down [48]</b> 17/7 35/1 37/5 39/20 40/25 43/5 61/3 65/16 80/1 92/4 93/13 94/16 95/20 96/15 99/7 99/11 101/8 103/10 108/1 109/22 112/1 112/21 114/17 115/10 115/23 118/9 119/3 120/7 121/6 123/20 140/12 142/21 145/6 145/7 147/18 156/16 158/15 159/10 162/15 166/13 167/9 167/9 167/14 170/20 176/21 176/25 179/4 183/5 <b>draft [7]</b> 33/23 37/6 156/12 157/4 159/5 161/11 161/20 <b>drafted [4]</b> 35/24 41/5 42/15 120/15 <b>draw [3]</b> 12/24 15/4 64/24 <b>drawing [3]</b> 14/4 71/23 152/25 <b>drawn [3]</b> 22/20 122/16 181/7 <b>drew [1]</b> 25/2 <b>drive [1]</b> 85/6 <b>driven [2]</b> 25/13 27/9 <b>driving [1]</b> 75/25 <b>due [2]</b> 117/18 129/4 <b>duly [1]</b> 156/12 <b>Duncan [4]</b> 1/8 1/10 1/16 187/2 <b>duration [1]</b> 26/7 <b>duress [1]</b> 74/24 <b>during [5]</b> 11/9 50/10 121/1 166/14 170/2 <b>duties [16]</b> 2/11 4/15 6/20 30/2 43/15 130/21 135/13 135/23 136/10 136/18 137/11 143/19 149/6 151/14 152/4 158/12 <b>duty [13]</b> 4/19 26/6 26/15 82/3 134/13 136/13 143/17 152/5 152/6 162/7 179/13 179/14 179/24	<b>earlier [17]</b> 3/17 16/25 31/5 38/17 47/21 82/5 88/12 88/21 90/13 92/21 138/6 141/8 141/10 141/13 148/23 167/22 176/8 <b>early [5]</b> 15/23 24/17 61/8 124/25 180/10 <b>edited [1]</b> 156/25 <b>editing [1]</b> 53/16 <b>edition [1]</b> 77/22 <b>editions [1]</b> 66/12 <b>edits [2]</b> 51/17 52/14 <b>effect [5]</b> 71/17 128/12 128/13 149/17 185/24 <b>effectively [5]</b> 42/2 44/14 114/9 144/11 153/10 <b>either [24]</b> 4/20 4/21 8/5 8/25 10/3 11/11 20/21 28/23 38/22 66/5 80/18 82/14 89/22 104/21 109/24 144/17 158/13 161/23 162/1 170/6 172/4 173/18 176/9 178/21 <b>election [1]</b> 108/4 <b>element [2]</b> 62/4 62/12 <b>elements [5]</b> 59/9 59/9 62/14 70/6 87/20 <b>else [14]</b> 23/19 56/19 57/3 57/5 61/10 63/23 70/10 72/18 73/7 98/11 110/16 153/1 154/25 155/15 <b>elsewhere [3]</b> 31/14 132/19 138/9 <b>email [30]</b> 30/11 30/18 31/4 32/10 32/17 32/18 33/21 37/23 41/3 124/15 124/18 136/24 145/5 145/7 147/16 147/18 149/19 151/6 151/12 151/12 151/22 152/1 153/18 155/13 162/16 163/10 163/10 164/15 167/11 169/8 <b>emails [3]</b> 164/17 165/6 165/9 <b>embracing [1]</b> 185/12 <b>emerge [1]</b> 15/18 <b>emphasis [1]</b> 85/10 <b>emphasise [1]</b> 15/7 <b>emphatically [1]</b> 109/16 <b>employee [4]</b> 70/22 74/9 74/18 75/11 <b>employees [4]</b> 97/13 98/25 103/5 106/22
----------	---	--	---	---



<b>E</b>	<b>established [1]</b> 158/3 <b>et [2]</b> 76/16 164/10 <b>et cetera [2]</b> 76/16 164/10 <b>etc [1]</b> 146/22 <b>evade [1]</b> 16/14 <b>evaluation [1]</b> 140/20 <b>even [20]</b> 27/24 48/2 49/10 55/13 57/12 57/23 60/21 64/10 67/3 69/6 76/21 76/24 82/6 98/10 100/24 101/7 129/18 134/14 154/2 169/24 <b>event [5]</b> 105/25 121/5 132/14 155/2 178/2 <b>events [2]</b> 9/13 10/2 <b>eventuality [1]</b> 157/18 <b>ever [9]</b> 96/6 97/8 97/13 98/10 98/25 106/17 106/22 110/8 178/1 <b>every [2]</b> 31/2 157/13 <b>everybody [1]</b> 1/6 <b>everything [3]</b> 63/23 185/2 185/25 <b>evidence [149]</b> 1/17 1/19 2/12 3/17 5/8 7/3 8/2 8/4 9/1 9/2 10/22 15/16 18/8 20/14 21/7 24/18 27/1 28/18 29/10 29/20 31/17 32/15 33/5 37/20 38/21 39/22 39/23 40/2 40/15 41/15 43/16 47/2 54/16 56/4 56/22 57/20 58/6 58/19 58/20 59/15 59/24 59/25 60/10 60/11 60/23 60/25 61/11 61/11 61/13 62/4 62/11 62/15 62/23 63/6 63/9 63/20 63/21 64/3 64/9 64/17 64/18 64/19 65/23 67/3 70/6 74/2 74/17 76/22 76/25 77/6 78/8 83/18 83/20 84/8 84/11 85/4 85/23 86/8 86/22 87/1 91/1 94/5 96/1 96/15 96/17 97/7 97/12 98/9 98/24 99/13 99/21 100/1 102/9 102/25 103/4 103/18 105/19 106/1 106/17 106/18 106/21 107/9 108/11 110/8 110/9 110/25 112/6 113/13 115/5 115/25 118/4 118/13 119/25 120/1 120/12 120/23 122/23 123/8 124/22	127/17 129/7 130/5 132/23 134/8 138/8 139/9 140/2 142/4 143/7 144/2 149/15 163/13 165/23 166/14 169/20 170/16 172/4 174/7 174/20 176/23 177/17 177/21 178/14 179/23 180/1 181/14 182/11 183/8 184/2 <b>evidential [11]</b> 56/16 57/21 60/9 68/3 68/8 68/20 68/22 69/7 69/9 75/10 174/24 <b>evolved [2]</b> 136/5 174/16 <b>exactly [3]</b> 29/7 163/25 170/13 <b>examination [6]</b> 14/5 102/22 106/10 119/18 129/6 132/3 <b>examine [4]</b> 79/21 130/3 130/11 141/22 <b>examined [1]</b> 13/9 <b>examining [2]</b> 14/2 131/3 <b>example [32]</b> 10/4 10/13 10/16 12/18 16/5 18/17 18/20 23/15 25/22 28/7 43/13 52/20 54/25 58/7 59/10 60/19 69/22 74/22 79/15 88/13 100/6 110/13 121/24 136/7 153/23 166/22 170/15 178/25 180/7 180/23 182/17 185/20 <b>examples [8]</b> 22/11 23/7 27/11 71/21 82/19 83/1 172/7 179/2 <b>exchange [4]</b> 148/16 165/9 166/8 166/12 <b>exchanges [1]</b> 171/20 <b>excised [2]</b> 53/5 53/9 <b>exclude [1]</b> 48/10 <b>excluding [4]</b> 1/25 3/3 52/8 155/7 <b>exculpates [1]</b> 114/8 <b>executive [2]</b> 136/8 168/23 <b>exemplify [2]</b> 14/11 93/6 <b>exercise [3]</b> 133/8 145/20 170/8 <b>exhibit [1]</b> 160/23 <b>exhibits [2]</b> 161/2 161/8 <b>exist [2]</b> 13/5 182/13 <b>existed [2]</b> 11/7 11/8 <b>existence [3]</b> 8/7 11/11 105/21	<b>existing [3]</b> 121/8 126/2 158/18 <b>expand [1]</b> 81/10 <b>expect [8]</b> 13/23 53/8 59/5 101/13 101/20 139/1 175/11 175/24 <b>expected [7]</b> 13/5 16/21 153/19 171/20 171/25 182/2 182/7 <b>expeditions [2]</b> 156/23 157/25 <b>experience [5]</b> 3/12 43/3 47/24 50/6 50/13 <b>experienced [2]</b> 43/1 115/19 <b>experiences [1]</b> 159/3 <b>experiencing [2]</b> 169/24 170/2 <b>expert [65]</b> 2/8 3/6 7/3 7/18 29/20 38/21 39/22 39/23 105/6 105/16 124/20 129/16 132/8 132/9 132/13 132/23 133/23 134/6 134/7 134/17 134/20 135/1 135/2 135/13 135/23 136/3 136/4 136/9 136/12 136/15 136/18 140/1 140/19 140/20 140/24 141/9 141/22 142/14 142/15 142/18 146/4 146/13 146/15 146/22 147/20 148/13 149/1 149/8 151/14 152/2 152/4 152/16 153/8 154/5 156/7 157/8 157/12 158/5 158/9 158/13 160/22 162/1 163/5 164/2 164/18 <b>expertise [6]</b> 2/22 147/24 148/14 157/6 159/3 162/10 <b>experts [5]</b> 35/16 129/12 141/2 145/19 150/14 <b>EXPG0000005 [1]</b> 3/2 <b>EXPG000004R [3]</b> 1/24 14/25 60/5 <b>explain [13]</b> 44/11 55/21 74/16 76/2 84/5 87/12 92/8 98/2 98/15 98/18 112/16 120/19 126/24 <b>explained [4]</b> 57/20 73/6 84/19 164/25 <b>explaining [3]</b> 87/10 141/10 163/9 <b>explains [1]</b> 170/5 <b>explanation [4]</b> 84/25 86/10 87/23 115/22 <b>explanations [1]</b>	82/12 <b>explicit [1]</b> 160/3 <b>explicitly [2]</b> 26/12 27/14 <b>explore [1]</b> 14/8 <b>exploring [1]</b> 176/4 <b>express [3]</b> 14/7 73/11 135/5 <b>expressed [8]</b> 2/21 21/11 45/13 54/10 71/10 72/1 82/3 134/10 <b>expressing [3]</b> 134/11 135/2 137/14 <b>expressions [4]</b> 47/22 48/2 48/9 53/3 <b>expressly [4]</b> 28/17 59/2 94/22 136/24 <b>extend [1]</b> 66/15 <b>extensive [1]</b> 7/9 <b>extent [19]</b> 4/4 5/11 6/15 6/18 6/20 8/12 16/1 21/15 41/17 42/9 77/16 77/24 98/21 133/8 151/10 154/16 165/6 173/18 181/13 <b>extra [4]</b> 139/9 165/2 165/3 165/7
<b>F</b>			<b>face [8]</b> 27/22 70/21 74/3 139/12 183/8 183/22 184/17 185/15 <b>facilitate [1]</b> 128/8 <b>fact [30]</b> 11/6 12/4 17/5 19/9 27/18 28/12 29/2 29/20 42/6 57/12 59/14 63/11 64/3 66/7 69/2 75/3 76/7 78/13 81/20 85/25 91/2 104/10 116/19 117/5 119/9 120/25 131/25 135/10 166/10 180/19 <b>factor [8]</b> 43/25 69/9 74/10 76/8 77/18 78/14 90/15 166/6 <b>factors [15]</b> 25/3 54/25 56/3 66/21 70/14 73/17 73/19 74/13 75/13 76/15 77/2 77/8 77/13 77/23 84/22 <b>facts [2]</b> 125/16 170/9 <b>failed [3]</b> 42/4 100/16 109/8 <b>failing [1]</b> 85/18 <b>failings [1]</b> 80/24 <b>failure [7]</b> 82/23 92/15 92/22 130/3 130/5 134/1 173/16 <b>failures [4]</b> 80/22 81/7 81/11 173/14 <b>fair [1]</b> 124/6	



<b>F</b>	144/21 186/11	103/22 113/25 120/11	174/20 183/5	177/17 180/3 180/8
<b>fairly</b> [1] 11/18	<b>fire</b> [1] 138/24	<b>fortified</b> [1] 135/18	<b>Furthermore</b> [1] 115/16	<b>giving</b> [6] 2/11 18/18 57/5 65/18 118/23 129/14
<b>fairness</b> [5] 25/8 28/3 71/3 87/25 183/21	<b>firefighting</b> [1] 140/11	<b>fortnight</b> [1] 95/8	<b>future</b> [1] 140/9	<b>glitches</b> [1] 119/1
<b>false</b> [16] 5/16 44/7 45/4 45/15 62/5 67/10 67/14 67/18 83/24 87/3 90/3 99/16 104/16 107/11 120/22 152/18	<b>first</b> [26] 18/22 22/23 46/5 51/19 53/3 54/20 64/25 65/19 66/1 71/10 80/6 85/20 103/15 115/3 118/24 137/21 141/6 152/9 152/22 156/21 160/18 171/25 179/5 179/12 179/14 180/6	<b>forwarded</b> [3] 45/8 132/11 143/9	<b>G</b>	<b>gloss</b> [2] 70/1 73/6
<b>familiar</b> [2] 30/21 40/23	<b>firstly</b> [7] 4/13 17/9 80/12 84/12 92/12 134/21 134/23	<b>forwarding</b> [1] 158/23	<b>gain</b> [1] 116/4	<b>go</b> [33] 18/21 22/10 35/14 36/2 52/21 58/3 67/1 72/3 89/3 93/17 97/21 99/6 99/10 100/10 103/9 103/15 107/3 107/25 108/15 111/17 112/4 113/4 114/24 120/6 124/14 125/24 139/1 142/9 142/20 154/8 163/23 167/8 176/20
<b>familiarise</b> [1] 125/16	<b>fishing</b> [2] 156/23 157/24	<b>forwards</b> [2] 93/17 115/21	<b>Gareth</b> [14] 7/21 8/1 126/7 128/4 135/17 135/21 147/21 160/21 160/25 164/18 164/21 164/24 169/4 169/8	<b>goes</b> [3] 30/6 132/7 162/16
<b>far</b> [13] 4/8 11/4 19/23 52/16 56/11 56/23 61/23 68/20 85/9 121/21 140/23 150/12 152/1	<b>flagged</b> [1] 95/23	<b>found</b> [10] 17/8 17/10 72/14 77/1 77/2 85/12 85/13 94/11 114/15 146/15	<b>Gareth Jenkins</b> [1] 169/4	<b>going</b> [39] 4/10 13/25 14/1 14/7 14/17 17/3 32/20 32/24 36/12 38/5 44/2 49/12 52/23 58/5 59/3 61/4 71/7 72/12 77/8 80/10 85/24 86/24 87/13 91/8 93/8 116/19 124/17 129/25 136/22 141/23 159/11 160/12 165/19 169/3 171/23 173/1 174/1 176/2 179/1
<b>fault</b> [3] 109/25 145/23 146/19	<b>flagging</b> [1] 153/25	<b>founded</b> [4] 27/2 31/18 71/22 127/17	<b>gather</b> [1] 139/10	<b>gone</b> [16] 44/10 44/12 46/5 58/3 60/1 60/1 60/2 60/10 90/14 104/21 120/25 122/23 126/19 131/10 132/9 170/14
<b>faults</b> [5] 27/23 27/24 28/9 96/17 123/14	<b>flawed</b> [2] 173/25 174/9	<b>four</b> [13] 77/12 146/6 147/1 147/14 151/7 151/24 152/8 153/15 153/16 154/18 154/24 155/2 156/13	<b>gave</b> [6] 1/19 15/11 24/4 55/20 55/21 115/18	<b>good</b> [15] 1/3 1/12 33/3 46/16 70/23 76/7 83/14 86/6 86/7 91/17 91/21 156/21 178/15 178/20 179/9
<b>faulty</b> [1] 110/19	<b>flaws</b> [1] 38/24	<b>fourth</b> [2] 81/4 109/5	<b>general</b> [10] 12/8 54/1 101/14 130/12 130/16 131/2 155/4 163/22 165/18 166/3	<b>got</b> [9] 33/3 47/14 59/20 75/19 75/20 84/9 86/9 95/21 121/21
<b>favour</b> [4] 74/10 76/21 157/9 174/22	<b>Flemington</b> [3] 33/22 35/5 149/22	<b>framework</b> [3] 3/19 3/22 4/5	<b>General's</b> [5] 18/2 166/21 172/21 183/25 185/19	<b>grappling</b> [2] 111/21 170/22
<b>favouring</b> [2] 73/17 73/19	<b>flowed</b> [1] 17/19	<b>Friday</b> [1] 135/18	<b>generalised</b> [1] 64/12	<b>great</b> [1] 16/12
<b>features</b> [1] 73/23	<b>focus</b> [8] 24/25 43/9 43/9 43/12 46/22 155/13 155/14 173/21	<b>FUJ00123982</b> [1] 161/15	<b>generally</b> [9] 13/5 59/11 64/4 64/11 72/19 121/25 135/11 155/18 182/3	<b>greater</b> [3] 68/9 72/9 85/10
<b>February</b> [4] 39/13 39/25 41/19 111/25	<b>focused</b> [3] 4/13 26/22 101/15	<b>FUJ00153812</b> [1] 161/10	<b>generate</b> [1] 32/2	<b>gripe</b> [1] 145/23
<b>February 2013</b> [1] 41/19	<b>focusing</b> [1] 113/25	<b>Fujitsu</b> [41] 91/25 95/3 95/18 96/2 96/5 97/8 97/13 98/9 98/25 101/8 102/25 103/5 104/7 106/17 106/22 107/21 110/8 110/24 118/13 118/18 119/25 121/14 121/25 128/16 131/18 133/10 142/16 147/22 149/22 149/24 150/14 165/2 168/23 171/15 171/16 172/3 172/6 172/8 172/14 172/16 173/4	<b>generated</b> [2] 105/24 141/13	<b>gripping</b> [3] 146/18 152/25 154/14
<b>feels</b> [1] 160/22	<b>follow</b> [2] 51/24 74/22	<b>fulfil</b> [1] 175/25	<b>generating</b> [1] 24/22	<b>guard</b> [1] 24/3
<b>fees</b> [1] 140/2	<b>followed</b> [3] 88/8 182/13 182/21	<b>full</b> [12] 1/15 36/7 50/16 50/25 51/1 68/4 68/8 72/24 100/4 174/12 174/21 175/7	<b>generic</b> [22] 124/9 124/11 126/11 127/25 132/22 133/19 134/1 134/5 137/8 137/15 137/24 140/22 141/20 142/8 142/12 155/5 157/4 162/16 163/7 163/20 164/15 165/11	<b>guesswork</b> [1] 70/10
<b>fell</b> [1] 153/15	<b>following</b> [17] 17/9 35/9 36/9 50/14 50/15 79/3 82/19 83/25 108/6 112/22 125/9 140/15 146/5 150/5 151/4 151/23 186/15	<b>fully</b> [1] 168/25	<b>get</b> [12] 36/5 44/23 46/3 49/10 49/11 88/21 121/19 121/20 121/24 148/11 156/18 167/10	<b>guidance</b> [12] 13/7 49/1 49/6 49/13 49/15 71/24 73/1 76/12 79/15 151/13 154/10 181/2
<b>felt</b> [4] 44/13 122/15 122/16 136/1	<b>follows</b> [1] 54/9	<b>functionally</b> [2] 148/20 149/3	<b>getting</b> [2] 72/9 88/11	<b>guideline</b> [1] 90/12
<b>few</b> [4] 69/17 71/3 73/13 90/19	<b>foolproof</b> [1] 139/23	<b>fundamental</b> [2] 86/2 144/2	<b>ghost</b> [1] 111/15	<b>Guidelines</b> [7] 18/2
<b>field</b> [1] 2/21	<b>foot</b> [6] 71/9 73/10 97/22 113/6 142/21 159/10	<b>funds</b> [3] 45/14 78/18 86/20	<b>give</b> [18] 1/17 22/11 23/11 27/11 55/10 63/17 80/4 83/1 88/14 111/20 127/23 149/13 149/16 149/17 152/10 158/4 160/23 170/12	
<b>fifth</b> [2] 91/23 91/23	<b>footnote</b> [1] 93/23	<b>further</b> [29] 36/1 36/1 36/2 65/16 86/25 94/3 94/16 107/15 107/24 108/1 112/19 113/12 114/17 115/23 116/13 132/7 133/1 133/14 143/4 148/8 157/2 158/4 158/15 158/21 163/3 164/5 170/15	<b>giving</b> [18] 1/17 22/11 23/11 27/11 55/10 63/17 80/4 83/1 88/14 111/20 127/23 149/13 149/16 149/17 152/10 158/4 160/23 170/12	
<b>figure</b> [1] 115/8	<b>forensic</b> [1] 34/17		<b>given</b> [28] 6/16 9/2 10/4 11/19 34/13 41/14 46/7 47/5 48/19 49/1 50/8 51/3 73/1 101/4 115/25 131/5 131/20 138/22 148/22 148/25 150/24 152/15 173/1 173/5 175/25	
<b>figures</b> [1] 117/17	<b>forgive</b> [1] 72/13			
<b>file</b> [1] 57/19	<b>form</b> [13] 27/17 28/1 33/10 43/12 44/25 44/25 51/19 51/23 133/7 156/24 160/20 167/5 177/13			
<b>files</b> [1] 135/19	<b>format</b> [1] 34/13			
<b>fill</b> [1] 120/18	<b>format</b> [2] 158/25 159/7			
<b>final</b> [3] 37/6 54/6 161/20	<b>formatting</b> [1] 159/17			
<b>finances</b> [2] 88/6 88/10	<b>forms</b> [3] 51/14 177/8 181/2			
<b>financial</b> [13] 25/3 44/18 44/20 75/24 83/2 83/9 83/9 83/17 84/14 87/4 87/17 88/5 140/6	<b>formulated</b> [1] 154/19			
<b>find</b> [10] 36/4 40/1 57/19 61/4 61/7 62/23 86/21 139/16 161/11 161/17	<b>formulation</b> [3]			
<b>finding</b> [5] 17/18 78/7 93/1 97/4 119/23				
<b>findings</b> [1] 139/15				
<b>fine</b> [4] 46/10 55/24				

<b>G</b> <b>Guidelines...</b> [6] 21/20 166/21 172/21 173/3 184/1 185/19 <b>Guildford</b> [2] 30/18 33/4 <b>guilt</b> [1] 23/10 <b>guilty</b> [3] 97/15 108/6 178/2	<b>having</b> [11] 13/13 21/10 66/8 85/5 91/3 104/19 117/10 128/11 165/10 182/15 183/9 <b>he</b> [81] 23/24 43/4 47/17 47/18 83/13 96/22 96/22 98/13 98/14 98/15 98/15 98/16 98/17 98/18 98/19 98/21 98/21 100/9 100/10 100/19 100/22 101/7 101/20 102/13 102/13 102/14 107/14 107/23 109/2 109/11 109/16 114/10 116/11 116/24 120/11 130/8 130/9 133/23 134/4 134/8 134/10 134/10 134/12 134/13 134/14 134/23 134/25 135/1 135/4 135/7 136/20 136/20 136/24 137/14 137/15 141/1 147/23 148/2 149/4 149/5 149/9 149/12 149/12 149/13 149/16 152/6 152/14 152/15 153/10 155/16 155/22 155/25 156/3 160/23 164/23 164/24 165/11 165/13 165/14 165/17 179/20 <b>he'd</b> [1] 130/8 <b>he's</b> [1] 152/20 <b>head</b> [7] 33/16 41/5 41/9 47/8 52/19 79/9 120/7 <b>heading</b> [2] 5/19 71/6 <b>heads</b> [1] 15/23 <b>Health</b> [1] 136/7 <b>healthy</b> [1] 101/25 <b>hear</b> [4] 1/3 46/17 91/18 147/11 <b>heard</b> [3] 48/18 63/6 177/21 <b>hearing</b> [4] 51/20 51/22 180/7 186/14 <b>held</b> [5] 44/15 115/7 115/8 171/16 172/17 <b>Helen</b> [2] 145/16 150/7 <b>help</b> [6] 35/19 72/4 72/21 88/21 90/14 136/24 <b>Helpdesk</b> [1] 123/2 <b>helped</b> [3] 5/24 71/17 179/12 <b>helpful</b> [4] 70/15 114/16 120/23 139/25 <b>helplines</b> [5] 83/4 88/17 89/1 90/11 181/16 <b>helps</b> [1] 152/19 <b>Henderson</b> [5] 22/13	22/19 23/2 120/6 122/11 <b>Henderson's</b> [4] 119/12 119/17 120/2 121/17 <b>her</b> [20] 23/16 26/3 26/4 85/25 95/13 116/2 117/13 117/21 118/20 118/21 118/24 118/25 119/1 119/2 119/6 122/13 122/17 122/23 145/20 164/14 <b>here</b> [30] 13/9 19/20 21/3 22/12 32/9 32/24 44/6 48/11 54/10 72/23 75/7 77/12 91/9 93/13 96/11 100/6 108/18 111/16 123/21 127/15 129/11 131/16 131/21 133/13 137/21 141/12 157/12 168/25 171/19 179/2 <b>hesitation</b> [1] 47/7 <b>high</b> [3] 67/13 68/15 99/17 <b>higher</b> [1] 78/25 <b>him</b> [21] 40/4 42/22 47/14 47/15 126/4 128/22 132/8 135/13 137/11 148/2 149/16 152/5 152/7 152/10 152/14 153/1 153/4 153/8 153/10 155/5 158/10 <b>himself</b> [1] 155/13 <b>hindsight</b> [1] 10/15 <b>hinted</b> [1] 135/23 <b>his</b> [43] 22/18 22/21 24/1 43/2 47/16 47/17 96/19 98/13 98/16 101/5 109/20 109/21 109/22 110/4 113/11 115/3 117/23 126/2 126/9 128/4 128/22 132/9 134/14 134/24 135/5 135/23 137/11 143/1 147/15 148/13 149/13 151/14 152/5 152/6 153/7 153/9 156/4 157/6 157/8 158/12 162/7 162/9 165/10 <b>HMRC</b> [1] 48/4 <b>holding</b> [1] 58/21 <b>holiday</b> [1] 85/6 <b>Holmes</b> [5] 67/21 108/20 109/21 110/4 111/25 <b>Holmes'</b> [1] 110/10 <b>Home</b> [3] 49/1 49/14 50/11 <b>honesty</b> [1] 117/21 <b>hope</b> [2] 7/19 117/17 <b>hoped</b> [1] 31/10	<b>Hopefully</b> [1] 145/16 <b>Horizon</b> [140] 4/18 4/21 4/24 16/18 25/14 25/24 26/17 27/9 27/19 28/2 28/22 30/11 30/19 30/24 31/12 33/1 33/12 34/24 34/24 35/23 36/8 36/18 36/23 37/10 37/17 38/6 38/13 39/4 40/11 42/1 42/19 43/1 63/9 63/19 64/2 64/21 80/17 83/5 83/15 88/19 89/22 91/25 92/6 92/9 94/7 94/23 95/1 95/4 95/15 95/18 95/19 96/16 97/25 98/1 100/17 100/22 101/4 102/1 102/10 102/12 104/3 104/8 105/4 105/11 105/12 105/19 107/16 107/19 107/22 109/4 109/12 109/24 110/5 110/12 113/2 113/10 113/17 113/18 115/14 115/19 116/8 116/19 116/23 117/12 118/22 118/25 119/2 121/13 121/15 122/14 123/2 123/8 123/11 124/8 124/10 124/21 125/2 125/10 126/10 126/19 127/5 128/6 129/16 129/24 130/13 132/23 133/1 134/3 137/16 138/7 138/23 139/4 140/17 140/25 141/9 141/13 143/8 145/17 146/9 147/23 147/25 149/24 150/8 150/14 151/19 157/20 157/24 158/19 158/19 159/4 159/23 159/23 164/19 167/3 167/16 168/2 168/3 168/7 173/15 186/3 <b>Horizon's</b> [1] 97/24 <b>house</b> [2] 140/12 144/4 <b>how</b> [48] 6/2 13/15 15/20 38/17 57/20 58/3 59/21 61/17 66/3 69/14 69/16 69/17 72/22 75/19 79/15 80/2 85/18 86/1 88/24 89/15 98/18 101/19 101/19 103/8 103/16 110/21 111/8 112/16 115/22 116/2 122/13 125/5 129/16 129/19 129/19 134/23 140/19 141/10 143/8 143/25 146/19 153/2 155/23	166/11 167/18 170/6 171/22 175/7 <b>however</b> [5] 15/7 74/12 115/25 156/6 160/21 <b>HR</b> [1] 54/14 <b>Hugh</b> [4] 33/22 35/5 143/6 149/22 <b>human</b> [2] 146/21 146/23 <b>Hutchings</b> [4] 113/5 114/20 115/6 115/20 <b>Hutchings'</b> [2] 116/23 117/9 <b>hypotheses</b> [1] 160/6 <b>I</b> <b>I accept</b> [1] 185/13 <b>I advised</b> [1] 138/6 <b>I am</b> [10] 14/17 45/12 59/1 107/8 120/16 157/9 163/23 164/4 164/7 168/24 <b>I apologise</b> [1] 1/6 <b>I appreciate</b> [3] 20/21 76/11 164/1 <b>I are</b> [1] 12/1 <b>I ask</b> [1] 1/13 <b>I assume</b> [1] 139/22 <b>I believe</b> [2] 35/14 109/24 <b>I call</b> [1] 1/8 <b>I called</b> [1] 90/25 <b>I can</b> [6] 39/21 48/6 48/8 52/21 83/25 110/24 <b>I can't</b> [5] 47/8 52/19 79/9 110/23 180/8 <b>I certainly</b> [2] 37/21 50/22 <b>I confess</b> [2] 66/8 69/15 <b>I consider</b> [1] 11/22 <b>I considered</b> [1] 85/20 <b>I could</b> [10] 6/18 11/4 13/18 56/23 61/7 119/5 133/12 133/20 133/21 186/1 <b>I did</b> [3] 8/20 119/22 131/7 <b>I didn't</b> [5] 54/18 110/25 119/21 119/22 121/23 <b>I do</b> [2] 125/18 169/8 <b>I don't</b> [9] 5/23 32/24 45/23 59/1 59/4 79/8 96/5 108/12 166/10 <b>I expressed</b> [2] 54/10 72/1 <b>I found</b> [2] 72/14 114/15 <b>I give</b> [1] 111/20 <b>I got</b> [1] 75/20
---	--	--	--	--

<b>I</b>	23/18 27/17 30/13 30/20 31/4 32/20 35/8 37/11 40/4 41/1 47/16 47/22 49/13 54/4 54/13 55/12 57/12 59/1 60/12 61/3 71/14 73/22 75/16 77/22 81/22 86/13 86/16 92/21 93/12 94/13 94/20 95/11 98/23 103/24 109/19 122/22 133/25 136/23 137/25 145/8 151/16 154/20 159/24 163/7 163/20 163/24 166/23 167/21 174/24 179/4	42/21 48/6 99/2 108/8 137/1 159/14 159/16 <b>idea</b> [1] 142/12 <b>ideal</b> [1] 58/22 <b>identification</b> [2] 93/20 95/17 <b>identified</b> [31] 6/12 16/8 17/10 17/20 24/5 26/20 29/21 38/24 56/4 61/20 62/2 66/8 66/21 73/17 73/19 83/15 84/17 90/13 90/18 92/16 94/21 98/4 100/6 113/20 122/13 128/8 135/1 135/13 140/21 146/6 169/23 <b>identify</b> [39] 4/8 23/25 24/20 27/23 28/8 31/23 32/8 54/6 62/10 75/17 78/21 80/21 81/8 81/12 89/15 90/8 92/10 98/13 101/11 119/5 131/10 134/8 135/10 140/16 140/18 141/4 142/15 143/21 143/22 153/6 166/4 166/19 167/2 168/3 168/5 170/7 172/7 173/21 185/9 <b>identifying</b> [21] 21/8 21/9 29/10 32/12 48/17 52/9 59/19 94/25 99/22 100/21 104/5 107/18 108/14 114/6 132/2 141/7 144/11 145/1 170/1 170/21 171/19 <b>identity</b> [4] 53/18 54/22 81/17 142/18 <b>ie</b> [13] 9/12 14/1 15/5 19/9 26/15 40/13 49/19 68/8 68/16 79/1 79/18 183/18 185/23 <b>ie by</b> [1] 14/1 <b>ie counter</b> [1] 183/18 <b>ie did</b> [1] 185/23 <b>ie from</b> [1] 49/19 <b>ie in</b> [1] 79/1 <b>ie it's</b> [1] 40/13 <b>ie near</b> [1] 68/16 <b>ie that</b> [1] 19/9 <b>ie the</b> [3] 15/5 26/15 79/18 <b>ie there</b> [1] 68/8 <b>ie they're</b> [1] 9/12 <b>if</b> [177] 8/8 14/24 14/25 15/2 17/7 18/21 21/22 22/10 23/3 28/15 29/15 30/8 32/1 33/7 33/20 35/4 36/2 37/25 37/25 38/14 39/11 39/20 40/21	40/25 41/9 47/6 48/3 48/21 49/10 51/4 51/8 52/5 52/9 53/25 55/6 55/13 57/14 58/9 60/4 60/5 61/3 62/24 63/10 63/16 63/25 64/10 68/25 69/6 70/7 70/8 70/10 70/15 70/19 72/7 72/13 74/22 74/25 74/25 74/25 76/19 76/21 76/24 79/6 83/17 83/25 84/11 85/10 86/3 86/8 86/13 86/17 90/25 92/4 93/12 93/17 94/16 95/6 95/11 96/15 97/21 98/1 99/6 99/10 99/10 100/24 103/9 103/10 103/15 107/3 107/12 107/25 108/1 108/4 108/5 109/19 109/22 111/17 111/17 111/25 112/4 112/21 112/21 114/23 114/24 115/2 115/10 118/9 120/6 120/23 121/18 122/1 122/10 123/20 124/13 124/14 124/16 124/17 125/1 126/1 128/7 129/4 131/25 134/10 134/14 138/4 138/21 139/17 139/19 140/3 140/12 142/9 142/10 144/14 145/5 145/7 145/13 146/14 147/1 147/17 149/4 152/14 153/14 153/23 154/2 154/7 154/11 154/20 155/8 156/15 156/16 156/17 157/16 158/14 159/11 160/19 160/21 163/23 164/2 164/4 165/18 167/8 167/10 167/14 167/15 168/12 169/5 169/17 170/5 175/8 175/25 176/12 176/21 176/25 176/25 178/25 179/3 180/6 <b>ill</b> [1] 74/25 <b>illness</b> [1] 143/24 <b>illustrated</b> [1] 88/7 <b>illustrative</b> [1] 14/10 <b>imbalances</b> [1] 126/20 <b>impact</b> [2] 68/21 68/23 <b>impacted</b> [1] 80/3 <b>impinge</b> [1] 101/12 <b>impinged</b> [1] 96/18 <b>implicates</b> [1] 114/8 <b>importance</b> [2] 93/10 136/9 <b>important</b> [4] 22/2	137/9 149/3 183/11 <b>impose</b> [1] 79/4 <b>imposition</b> [1] 78/22 <b>improve</b> [1] 66/18 <b>improved</b> [1] 174/11 <b>inaccurate</b> [1] 8/19 <b>inadequate</b> [2] 156/10 174/5 <b>inadmissible</b> [1] 52/9 <b>inappropriate</b> [3] 48/3 63/24 117/8 <b>incantation</b> [1] 71/15 <b>incidental</b> [1] 147/23 <b>include</b> [8] 26/14 26/15 52/2 79/18 129/22 132/20 162/5 182/17 <b>included</b> [10] 2/6 55/2 57/8 80/16 149/20 173/16 181/10 181/13 182/24 185/17 <b>including</b> [14] 26/8 37/16 76/15 95/15 100/17 107/16 113/14 121/9 128/16 133/10 140/5 162/18 173/17 179/22 <b>inclusion</b> [1] 162/10 <b>incompetence</b> [3] 61/14 89/8 119/3 <b>incompetent</b> [1] 61/1 <b>incomplete</b> [3] 12/9 12/12 155/1 <b>inconsistent</b> [2] 43/15 178/3 <b>incorporated</b> [1] 19/16 <b>incorrect</b> [3] 12/10 63/12 110/1 <b>increasingly</b> [1] 29/3 <b>incredulity</b> [1] 53/4 <b>incumbent</b> [1] 86/4 <b>indeed</b> [11] 7/12 10/3 15/19 54/13 73/7 73/24 76/11 111/1 121/13 129/7 132/19 <b>independence</b> [4] 20/3 25/8 28/3 152/6 <b>independent</b> [13] 20/25 34/7 34/14 42/25 148/4 148/10 148/20 149/3 149/10 149/14 152/16 153/8 162/7 <b>indicate</b> [4] 4/23 96/24 102/19 106/6 <b>indicated</b> [3] 130/9 178/2 185/2 <b>indicating</b> [1] 94/3 <b>indication</b> [1] 184/14 <b>indicative</b> [2] 122/5 122/8 <b>indictment</b> [2] 105/13 129/2
----------	---	--	---	---

<b>I</b>	<b>instruction [6]</b> 18/18 149/1 150/18 153/14 154/16 156/9 <b>instructions [5]</b> 2/18 34/13 135/11 135/12 151/13 <b>insufficient [1]</b> 161/25 <b>integrity [23]</b> 4/24 40/10 95/4 95/19 101/10 104/8 107/22 113/17 116/8 116/19 117/12 121/15 124/8 138/7 139/3 139/5 140/3 141/21 141/22 158/20 159/23 159/24 164/19 <b>intend [2]</b> 138/18 169/9 <b>intended [1]</b> 70/7 <b>intention [2]</b> 19/25 116/4 <b>interest [31]</b> 2/15 29/25 65/24 66/22 68/21 68/24 69/1 69/4 69/8 70/14 71/4 71/7 73/9 73/12 73/17 73/25 74/11 74/20 75/7 75/14 75/21 76/6 76/9 76/21 77/3 77/19 77/23 78/11 87/21 112/11 112/14 <b>interested [2]</b> 34/6 34/15 <b>interesting [4]</b> 72/14 72/18 131/14 184/7 <b>internal [4]</b> 54/19 60/21 148/17 156/19 <b>Internet [1]</b> 138/8 <b>interview [54]</b> 4/21 22/16 22/24 23/5 23/9 24/7 24/19 24/20 29/4 44/8 47/16 48/5 48/10 48/19 48/21 48/23 49/24 50/10 50/14 50/17 50/21 51/4 51/6 51/12 51/17 52/6 53/1 53/10 58/8 72/17 75/22 80/20 82/12 83/12 84/20 88/1 90/22 96/19 101/5 108/23 108/25 110/3 111/6 115/11 118/21 118/25 119/2 122/2 122/4 127/15 181/11 181/23 181/24 185/20 <b>interviewed [6]</b> 20/13 47/18 49/8 49/9 89/20 169/23 <b>interviewee [2]</b> 47/4 48/21 <b>interviewee's [1]</b> 48/20 <b>interviewing [4]</b>	22/14 23/16 48/12 53/9 <b>interviews [8]</b> 46/23 47/24 47/25 53/16 72/16 72/21 102/12 157/15 <b>into [25]</b> 2/1 5/2 11/19 14/10 19/16 32/10 36/5 41/11 41/12 44/1 56/3 57/11 69/10 71/17 76/5 76/18 78/14 83/5 83/8 85/7 88/6 141/14 147/25 151/6 152/9 <b>intuition [1]</b> 70/10 <b>investigate [6]</b> 24/12 86/21 105/20 113/22 130/4 131/12 <b>investigated [7]</b> 15/13 20/22 64/8 82/14 121/13 121/22 145/2 <b>investigates [1]</b> 168/4 <b>investigating [6]</b> 3/23 6/13 28/10 53/18 53/20 62/25 <b>investigation [43]</b> 3/20 10/3 10/5 11/4 11/9 17/3 17/6 17/9 18/11 18/12 18/16 19/23 20/9 20/20 21/1 46/21 62/22 80/16 83/2 83/3 83/8 86/15 86/18 88/9 93/14 97/20 98/4 99/1 102/6 102/10 106/14 108/19 110/12 118/10 119/11 122/12 123/9 123/23 124/1 133/1 143/24 170/4 172/22 <b>investigations [10]</b> 4/14 9/11 13/12 19/8 19/21 28/4 83/5 94/4 113/12 119/4 <b>investigative [10]</b> 19/15 20/4 24/24 27/8 32/11 46/22 48/14 92/17 93/1 122/6 <b>investigator [37]</b> 4/15 17/12 18/13 18/18 19/1 20/1 21/11 21/23 22/20 23/7 24/7 26/6 30/2 56/21 60/23 61/11 81/17 85/22 89/6 94/1 98/19 101/21 102/1 108/14 118/24 119/22 130/15 131/1 132/5 132/12 133/16 172/1 174/3 175/19 176/2 181/8 184/5 <b>Investigator's [2]</b> 56/17 110/17	<b>Investigator/Disclosure [1]</b> 21/11 <b>investigators [14]</b> 9/18 13/3 15/15 40/5 47/23 63/7 72/19 81/7 81/12 86/15 122/16 138/4 150/7 166/25 <b>invitation [1]</b> 157/1 44/18 58/5 59/8 70/21 157/22 175/17 <b>involved [12]</b> 15/11 22/5 22/8 60/8 80/15 86/17 92/12 95/14 131/16 136/14 163/2 175/2 <b>involving [1]</b> 165/9 <b>irrespective [2]</b> 29/23 82/20 <b>is [294]</b> <b>Ishaq [6]</b> 15/22 123/19 127/3 127/4 127/15 168/16 <b>Ishaq's [1]</b> 125/12 <b>isn't [2]</b> 12/18 94/20 <b>issue [34]</b> 4/23 17/24 28/25 32/21 34/24 36/18 51/15 54/22 64/21 65/11 68/1 79/6 90/4 90/17 93/10 99/18 109/3 116/20 121/23 123/21 124/10 125/3 126/10 126/19 130/4 149/1 152/12 154/12 158/21 167/16 167/25 168/3 169/19 170/25 <b>issued [2]</b> 47/3 144/10 <b>issues [58]</b> 4/13 5/20 14/2 15/21 16/18 16/22 21/2 27/18 29/3 29/5 29/21 33/12 38/5 38/13 38/17 39/4 42/23 64/1 83/9 88/18 89/3 92/5 92/13 95/22 97/23 98/2 101/5 102/9 105/4 109/11 116/8 118/23 119/2 123/9 124/8 125/4 125/10 128/7 132/25 133/2 141/8 146/5 146/6 148/15 151/5 151/23 153/12 153/14 153/16 153/20 153/21 155/4 155/8 155/10 155/17 157/24 167/17 186/3 <b>it [376]</b> <b>it'll [1]</b> 30/7 <b>it's [73]</b> 2/7 11/10 11/25 13/22 23/17 24/16 29/12 30/15 32/1 32/4 33/21 37/5	37/24 39/10 39/18 39/21 40/13 40/18 41/6 41/14 41/21 42/8 42/10 42/14 45/19 54/4 59/4 62/12 64/25 68/19 70/11 72/14 72/18 76/11 77/4 81/4 84/5 84/8 84/10 85/14 85/16 85/16 91/9 94/1 94/20 99/8 100/5 103/16 106/3 110/11 112/2 118/20 119/10 119/20 120/7 124/18 130/1 136/6 137/22 137/23 138/3 141/24 142/10 144/11 145/8 145/11 151/10 168/2 168/5 171/1 175/6 176/12 176/19 <b>iteration [3]</b> 73/16 73/19 174/18 <b>iterations [1]</b> 60/13 <b>its [23]</b> 1/25 16/19 36/4 43/15 47/1 51/21 64/7 92/13 97/24 139/4 139/15 143/9 143/15 143/16 144/7 145/11 160/19 168/10 170/16 170/17 172/9 172/12 173/4 <b>itself [7]</b> 26/18 117/18 124/11 126/11 168/9 175/22 185/1
<b>J</b>				
<b>James [2]</b> 168/22 169/4 <b>Janet [2]</b> 3/5 66/18 <b>Janet Skinner [1]</b> 66/18 <b>January [4]</b> 114/18 115/1 162/21 179/4 <b>Jarnail [12]</b> 33/21 35/9 35/24 36/10 37/12 99/4 99/8 107/5 113/8 142/23 143/11 158/17 <b>Jason [1]</b> 1/13 <b>Jenkins [48]</b> 7/21 8/1 121/19 124/8 124/18 126/1 127/1 127/19 127/20 128/5 128/13 128/19 130/8 130/11 130/19 131/3 133/11 133/13 134/3 134/20 135/12 135/17 135/21 137/11 147/22 148/19 149/2 149/4 149/20 151/14 151/22 151/25 155/3 155/13 156/12 157/3 158/8 158/16 159/12 160/8 161/4 162/6 162/19 162/23 164/12 165/9 168/13				

<p><b>J</b></p> <p><b>Jenkins...</b> [1] 169/4</p> <p><b>Jenkins'</b> [2] 152/3 158/4</p> <p><b>Jennings</b> [4] 161/16 162/17 163/3 164/12</p> <p><b>Joan</b> [3] 118/7 118/11 118/15</p> <p><b>Joan Bailey</b> [1] 118/11</p> <p><b>Joan Bailey's</b> [2] 118/7 118/15</p> <p><b>job</b> [1] 129/17</p> <p><b>Josephine</b> [3] 62/20 178/25 184/23</p> <p><b>judge</b> [4] 13/18 29/18 133/20 150/3</p> <p><b>judging</b> [1] 10/15</p> <p><b>judgment</b> [3] 98/6 102/17 106/4</p> <p><b>Julian</b> [2] 3/5 66/19</p> <p><b>Juliet</b> [3] 103/11 112/2 176/21</p> <p><b>July</b> [2] 142/11 145/12</p> <p><b>jumping</b> [1] 31/12</p> <p><b>June</b> [1] 116/5</p> <p><b>jurisdiction</b> [1] 108/5</p> <p><b>jury</b> [5] 32/3 85/10 108/12 135/4 135/8</p> <p><b>just</b> [52] 7/15 14/25 16/17 17/7 17/15 21/22 22/6 27/11 31/24 32/20 33/2 40/21 42/15 57/7 62/12 67/25 70/17 70/24 72/12 72/23 77/11 80/10 90/10 94/10 94/16 95/25 99/7 99/10 100/5 115/2 117/24 122/7 127/13 128/2 129/14 129/25 131/14 138/4 140/12 141/3 142/10 144/20 145/4 147/14 150/17 150/18 154/23 156/17 159/11 161/18 167/10 176/1</p> <p><b>justice</b> [3] 34/16 79/11 143/20</p> <p><b>Justice Act</b> [1] 79/11</p> <p><b>justify</b> [1] 122/12</p>	<p><b>kept</b> [2] 90/24 145/25</p> <p><b>key</b> [1] 51/1</p> <p><b>Keying</b> [1] 146/21</p> <p><b>Khayyam</b> [3] 123/19 125/12 168/16</p> <p><b>Kim</b> [3] 39/14 39/20 137/22</p> <p><b>kind</b> [11] 2/15 12/22 31/13 32/17 71/2 76/4 76/18 87/21 99/19 136/21 158/11</p> <p><b>kindly</b> [1] 158/24</p> <p><b>King</b> [15] 39/18 39/23 40/8 114/19 115/1 124/5 126/7 138/1 142/22 148/18 149/23 156/15 156/20 157/23 161/24</p> <p><b>King's</b> [1] 143/6</p> <p><b>knew</b> [7] 47/4 87/12 89/11 101/20 127/13 153/14 154/25</p> <p><b>know</b> [13] 1/13 11/25 17/21 40/4 44/10 63/11 79/14 85/10 89/16 94/19 135/9 142/25 166/20</p> <p><b>knowing</b> [3] 42/23 61/23 89/14</p> <p><b>knowledge</b> [7] 2/4 3/9 57/10 129/20 132/9 135/4 159/3</p> <p><b>known</b> [3] 30/10 79/12 115/24</p> <p><b>KPMG</b> [1] 105/7</p>	<p>55/10 55/17 56/24 56/25 94/18 103/13 120/8 162/2 178/4 178/9 179/13 180/2</p> <p><b>lawyer</b> [49] 20/24 22/4 33/22 33/22 35/5 50/17 50/20 56/23 56/25 60/22 61/19 62/2 62/9 62/25 64/13 65/13 65/13 65/17 67/16 81/17 85/21 89/4 92/24 92/24 93/20 94/2 94/17 94/22 100/6 101/21 102/1 103/8 103/12 107/1 111/10 112/25 124/4 131/1 131/16 132/12 133/16 143/6 148/18 177/19 183/4 183/22 184/2 184/5 184/14</p> <p><b>lawyer's</b> [1] 120/4</p> <p><b>lawyers</b> [19] 9/18 13/3 15/15 37/5 37/16 54/19 55/9 57/16 60/14 63/7 82/18 128/23 133/18 148/17 157/23 166/24 166/25 167/1 183/16</p> <p><b>lay</b> [1] 5/22</p> <p><b>layman's</b> [1] 152/11</p> <p><b>lead</b> [1] 23/23</p> <p><b>leading</b> [2] 4/2 138/9</p> <p><b>leads</b> [2] 114/7 137/24</p> <p><b>least</b> [27] 24/4 28/5 32/2 38/4 39/5 45/7 45/13 50/19 54/12 58/19 59/14 64/5 77/9 89/12 131/23 136/19 142/6 153/19 154/7 154/22 156/3 166/18 172/18 172/25 173/4 183/12 184/7</p> <p><b>leave</b> [1] 149/25</p> <p><b>led</b> [6] 75/13 102/15 126/20 155/14 155/17 182/15</p> <p><b>Lee</b> [1] 179/16</p> <p><b>left</b> [2] 14/16 70/9</p> <p><b>legal</b> [8] 3/19 4/4 48/20 49/25 78/21 79/5 150/23 164/19</p> <p><b>legally</b> [1] 48/22</p> <p><b>legislation</b> [1] 79/2</p> <p><b>legislative</b> [1] 79/21</p> <p><b>legitimate</b> [1] 78/14</p> <p><b>length</b> [1] 36/24</p> <p><b>Lesley</b> [1] 107/3</p> <p><b>less</b> [3] 72/9 99/24 114/15</p> <p><b>let</b> [4] 43/3 129/19 159/2 177/8</p> <p><b>Let's</b> [1] 111/3</p>	<p><b>letter</b> [7] 39/13 39/21 39/22 39/25 40/17 156/8 184/10</p> <p><b>level</b> [5] 17/15 44/3 78/25 88/23 136/1</p> <p><b>levels</b> [1] 19/21</p> <p><b>lever</b> [1] 135/19</p> <p><b>lever-arch</b> [1] 135/19</p> <p><b>levers</b> [2] 45/20 46/1</p> <p><b>lie</b> [2] 26/17 80/17</p> <p><b>light</b> [5] 105/16 135/10 148/16 150/22 175/5</p> <p><b>like</b> [11] 23/20 24/8 24/13 54/18 94/19 125/8 125/13 141/24 146/20 156/21 180/20</p> <p><b>likely</b> [7] 62/3 62/10 62/16 71/18 113/9 139/7 174/20</p> <p><b>limb</b> [4] 66/5 68/3 68/8 77/20</p> <p><b>limbo</b> [1] 139/13</p> <p><b>limitation</b> [1] 98/3</p> <p><b>limitations</b> [1] 4/11</p> <p><b>limited</b> [12] 12/4 12/5 24/17 29/20 34/23 82/16 89/21 150/6 150/13 150/21 168/18 185/14</p> <p><b>line</b> [33] 15/3 30/18 74/6 81/4 83/16 85/14 86/11 87/24 88/14 89/24 90/7 92/10 92/23 100/7 101/1 108/1 109/2 109/5 109/10 109/15 113/1 114/6 114/7 114/14 121/8 122/25 123/3 123/6 130/20 132/2 144/12 170/21 182/22</p> <p><b>lines</b> [28] 4/16 16/9 16/13 18/19 21/8 23/22 24/4 26/7 32/1 77/13 80/2 80/9 80/23 81/8 81/13 82/4 82/10 82/24 91/24 93/21 94/21 95/14 104/1 107/15 117/5 130/22 174/15 182/14</p> <p><b>link</b> [1] 71/23</p> <p><b>Lisa</b> [7] 22/12 24/13 60/20 85/21 89/5 93/15 96/1</p> <p><b>Lisa Brennan</b> [2] 22/12 60/20</p> <p><b>Lisa Brennan's</b> [1] 96/1</p> <p><b>list</b> [5] 74/13 76/15 149/21 151/7 169/16</p> <p><b>listed</b> [11] 77/23 108/10 113/13 124/24 125/8 125/12 125/15 162/21 182/9 182/12</p>	<p>185/2</p> <p><b>litigation</b> [1] 155/15</p> <p><b>little</b> [8] 21/7 27/23 66/2 94/16 145/8 146/17 167/10 174/7</p> <p><b>live</b> [1] 139/15</p> <p><b>lodged</b> [1] 6/3</p> <p><b>logical</b> [1] 132/14</p> <p><b>logs</b> [4] 110/13 113/17 130/3 132/4</p> <p><b>long</b> [2] 59/6 70/22</p> <p><b>longer</b> [1] 182/6</p> <p><b>look</b> [56] 5/1 5/19 6/8 6/23 7/2 8/25 11/7 17/6 29/9 30/5 30/8 32/14 33/19 39/16 40/16 60/6 67/2 72/3 80/24 85/4 86/6 86/7 94/10 95/6 99/3 103/8 105/3 106/25 107/12 109/19 111/3 111/25 113/4 114/23 115/2 120/4 121/6 122/1 123/24 124/13 128/20 131/11 137/20 142/6 145/4 147/17 156/15 156/21 158/14 159/1 159/9 161/10 162/14 167/8 176/17 178/25</p> <p><b>looked</b> [17] 17/1 46/20 47/21 55/1 66/16 71/1 75/9 79/7 85/11 85/12 87/22 100/25 123/23 147/14 176/6 180/19 184/2</p> <p><b>looking</b> [12] 4/7 9/6 11/13 21/14 21/15 26/8 28/8 30/7 47/25 62/25 143/25 166/10</p> <p><b>loser</b> [1] 58/9</p> <p><b>loss</b> [7] 44/18 44/20 77/25 78/4 87/11 117/15 117/15</p> <p><b>losses</b> [9] 83/14 84/17 92/6 104/17 120/17 122/13 126/22 127/6 139/6</p> <p><b>lost</b> [1] 43/24</p> <p><b>lot</b> [5] 8/10 88/9 111/21 135/21 182/4</p> <p><b>lots</b> [1] 72/21</p> <p><b>low</b> [7] 67/12 68/11 69/24 70/13 70/24 99/15 99/23</p> <p><b>Lynette</b> [1] 113/5</p> <p><b>Lyons</b> [1] 35/6</p>
<p><b>K</b></p> <p><b>KC</b> [3] 1/8 1/10 187/2</p> <p><b>keen</b> [1] 54/16</p> <p><b>keep</b> [6] 124/17 156/17 157/11 159/10 159/25 169/3</p> <p><b>keeping</b> [1] 1/6</p> <p><b>keeps</b> [1] 32/13</p> <p><b>Kelleher</b> [1] 41/9</p> <p><b>Kelleher's</b> [1] 36/2</p>	<p><b>lastly</b> [6] 5/15 6/23 7/2 62/20 107/21 161/15</p> <p><b>later</b> [2] 94/3 95/8</p> <p><b>latter</b> [3] 13/8 15/21 89/23</p> <p><b>law</b> [18] 13/6 13/19 13/20 13/23 16/2 21/5</p>	<p>111/3</p>	<p>182/12</p>	<p>37/16 44/21 49/6</p>

<b>M</b>	16/24 18/10 21/6 32/17 36/19 49/2 75/16 92/18 99/21 128/15 146/24 146/25 <b>mapped [1]</b> 149/15 <b>March [1]</b> 107/2 <b>marked [1]</b> 183/17 <b>marker [1]</b> 31/11 <b>Martin [5]</b> 114/19 114/25 149/23 156/19 160/16 <b>material [85]</b> 3/13 4/9 4/11 5/25 6/3 6/17 7/6 7/11 7/14 8/9 8/16 9/22 10/12 11/3 12/12 12/18 12/21 18/17 20/17 21/24 21/24 24/15 24/17 28/22 30/5 32/4 33/13 39/1 39/2 52/8 52/11 88/5 101/3 101/16 105/24 106/2 110/12 125/23 134/2 134/12 141/12 141/14 141/17 142/5 144/13 145/1 165/25 166/1 170/7 171/16 171/22 171/23 172/2 172/13 172/16 172/23 172/25 173/9 173/17 174/5 174/20 175/2 175/9 175/13 175/20 176/9 176/10 176/11 177/11 177/12 177/18 177/25 178/9 178/22 179/19 180/10 180/14 180/24 181/22 182/10 182/12 182/21 185/11 185/14 185/16 <b>materials [5]</b> 11/10 14/11 14/13 19/18 102/23 <b>matter [10]</b> 19/10 68/19 80/18 86/24 121/18 126/8 135/3 139/18 169/12 170/11 <b>matters [4]</b> 2/20 10/15 11/12 162/9 <b>may [33]</b> 1/8 12/9 12/11 17/14 20/21 32/17 39/9 64/6 64/8 68/7 68/15 68/21 69/18 70/2 70/12 74/14 90/1 103/16 110/15 120/5 124/20 125/15 139/12 143/1 148/2 167/17 169/23 169/24 173/6 176/19 182/8 183/12 183/15 <b>McFarlane [4]</b> 103/12 103/25 112/2 176/21 <b>McKeag [1]</b> 39/19 <b>McLachlan's [1]</b> 160/6 <b>me [21]</b> 5/24 11/18	12/23 16/17 19/25 22/7 61/25 70/17 72/13 85/5 86/4 91/18 120/19 125/22 159/2 159/20 162/25 168/21 177/8 180/4 185/13 <b>mean [8]</b> 18/8 81/16 81/19 122/8 123/5 126/24 134/22 149/11 <b>meaning [1]</b> 130/8 <b>means [5]</b> 44/23 55/24 121/3 151/25 175/18 <b>meant [5]</b> 69/18 70/25 72/6 82/3 152/20 <b>measure [1]</b> 13/2 <b>mechanism [1]</b> 79/12 <b>media [5]</b> 33/17 35/15 36/5 41/6 41/10 <b>medium [4]</b> 67/20 67/22 68/1 112/9 <b>meeting [2]</b> 35/10 142/2 <b>meetings [3]</b> 33/24 153/24 159/14 <b>Member's [1]</b> 34/3 <b>members [2]</b> 33/25 55/18 <b>memo [4]</b> 26/3 95/8 120/8 148/23 <b>memoranda [3]</b> 69/14 69/16 73/11 <b>memorandum [9]</b> 60/22 94/13 99/5 111/24 116/5 116/22 117/7 176/18 184/4 <b>memory [1]</b> 121/16 <b>memos [1]</b> 99/21 <b>mention [3]</b> 111/5 112/13 168/15 <b>mentioned [11]</b> 29/22 53/4 56/15 77/11 111/6 130/1 150/19 153/16 154/4 158/19 169/13 <b>mentioning [1]</b> 49/13 <b>menu [1]</b> 4/13 <b>merits [1]</b> 57/9 <b>message [3]</b> 35/19 36/4 36/6 <b>messages [1]</b> 64/14 <b>met [5]</b> 57/20 69/7 69/8 75/14 112/22 <b>metadata [1]</b> 53/5 <b>methodology [1]</b> 8/24 <b>MG6C [1]</b> 180/25 <b>might [45]</b> 16/20 19/20 23/12 23/23 26/17 57/13 58/12 64/3 64/19 68/23 69/1 69/8 70/14 78/11 80/17 89/3 91/10	96/17 101/7 101/12 101/20 111/19 112/10 112/11 113/23 119/6 121/18 122/14 128/13 132/4 134/12 142/5 144/15 148/12 151/19 162/25 163/2 166/18 170/6 172/23 172/24 175/2 175/21 179/20 186/4 <b>migration [2]</b> 115/14 115/17 <b>millions [1]</b> 36/19 <b>mind [4]</b> 63/10 64/13 148/6 156/4 <b>mindset [1]</b> 53/20 <b>ministers [1]</b> 143/20 <b>misconduct [1]</b> 122/11 <b>misleading [1]</b> 155/1 <b>Misra [9]</b> 25/23 30/15 30/18 39/2 135/1 147/22 156/1 160/4 171/8 <b>missed [1]</b> 183/1 <b>missing [3]</b> 19/20 19/20 120/25 <b>mistake [4]</b> 76/3 90/2 104/12 108/16 <b>mistakes [4]</b> 23/20 24/8 24/13 24/21 <b>moment [11]</b> 4/10 14/25 72/13 76/25 111/17 146/17 148/24 156/20 165/5 169/21 186/5 <b>Monday [1]</b> 1/1 <b>money [33]</b> 31/23 43/10 43/13 43/17 43/19 44/9 44/10 44/12 44/23 45/3 45/21 46/4 46/5 59/25 60/10 79/18 83/13 83/22 83/25 84/9 84/10 84/10 84/13 84/15 85/24 86/4 86/22 88/11 104/21 109/16 115/21 120/24 122/23 <b>monies [2]</b> 43/23 83/18 <b>month [1]</b> 179/7 <b>months [4]</b> 109/12 109/13 139/20 146/25 <b>more [34]</b> 3/21 16/21 17/20 21/13 21/14 22/8 22/9 30/1 36/21 48/13 50/20 50/25 64/11 67/3 72/15 76/2 82/18 84/21 89/18 103/22 111/3 113/11 118/6 121/25 130/20 146/1 146/18 154/25 155/18 161/25 163/24	165/20 170/10 185/1 <b>morning [7]</b> 1/3 1/12 46/7 46/8 99/18 150/4 186/9 <b>most [7]</b> 36/4 124/24 125/1 156/23 157/19 164/13 167/15 <b>motivation [3]</b> 29/17 29/24 30/6 <b>move [11]</b> 33/7 46/20 53/23 71/8 91/8 96/9 97/17 119/8 123/18 147/16 186/2 <b>MPs [2]</b> 34/10 34/15 <b>MR [138]</b> 1/11 1/12 22/18 36/2 37/3 37/12 40/19 41/9 42/20 46/10 46/20 47/11 52/23 67/8 67/15 69/22 91/21 94/1 95/7 96/18 96/21 97/1 97/9 97/15 97/23 98/2 98/12 99/1 99/6 99/12 99/15 100/14 100/15 100/24 101/7 102/13 102/21 103/2 103/6 104/18 105/5 106/7 107/5 107/14 108/19 110/4 110/10 111/25 115/3 116/7 116/18 116/22 117/6 117/22 118/5 118/24 120/8 121/7 121/19 124/8 124/18 126/1 127/1 127/3 127/4 127/15 127/19 127/20 128/5 128/13 128/18 128/19 128/21 130/1 130/8 130/11 130/19 131/3 131/6 131/21 133/11 133/13 134/3 134/20 135/12 137/11 141/4 141/7 142/1 142/14 142/21 142/23 143/4 143/16 143/22 144/4 145/9 147/14 147/15 147/18 148/8 148/19 148/22 149/2 149/4 149/19 149/20 149/20 151/11 151/14 151/22 151/25 152/3 154/19 155/3 155/13 156/12 157/3 158/4 158/8 158/16 158/22 159/12 159/13 160/8 160/17 161/4 162/6 162/19 162/23 164/12 165/9 167/22 168/13 177/21 184/4 186/8 187/4 <b>Mr Allen [1]</b> 128/18 <b>Mr Allen's [2]</b> 130/1 131/6 <b>Mr Atkinson [5]</b> 1/12 46/20 91/21 147/14
----------	--	--	--	--

<b>M</b>	107/14 116/7 116/18 117/6 142/1 143/4 147/18 149/19 149/20 151/11 158/22 159/13 160/17 <b>Mr Smith [4]</b> 115/3 116/22 117/22 118/5 <b>Mr Thomas [2]</b> 47/11 67/15 <b>Mr Utting [1]</b> 177/21 <b>Mr Wilson [1]</b> 121/7 <b>Mr Wilson's [1]</b> 120/8 <b>Mr Yates [1]</b> 96/21 <b>Mr Yates' [4]</b> 96/18 97/1 97/9 97/15 <b>Mrs [7]</b> 22/19 23/2 25/23 67/25 115/6 115/20 118/18 <b>Mrs Bailey [1]</b> 118/18 <b>Mrs Henderson [2]</b> 22/19 23/2 <b>Mrs Hutchings [2]</b> 115/6 115/20 <b>Mrs Misra [1]</b> 25/23 <b>Mrs Skinner [1]</b> 67/25 <b>Ms [34]</b> 22/17 23/15 24/8 37/24 37/24 39/2 94/17 96/6 103/25 106/16 106/19 106/23 107/10 111/13 114/20 116/23 117/9 119/12 119/17 120/2 121/17 122/11 126/6 126/25 128/8 128/14 133/19 135/1 156/1 161/16 163/3 164/12 177/23 179/5 <b>Ms Allison [1]</b> 119/12 <b>Ms Berridge [1]</b> 94/17 <b>Ms Brander [1]</b> 177/23 <b>Ms Brennan [3]</b> 22/17 23/15 24/8 <b>Ms Brennan's [1]</b> 96/6 <b>Ms Hamilton's [1]</b> 179/5 <b>Ms Henderson [1]</b> 122/11 <b>Ms Henderson's [3]</b> 119/17 120/2 121/17 <b>Ms Hutchings [1]</b> 114/20 <b>Ms Hutchings' [2]</b> 116/23 117/9 <b>Ms Jennings [3]</b> 161/16 163/3 164/12 <b>Ms McFarlane [1]</b> 103/25 <b>Ms Misra [3]</b> 39/2	135/1 156/1 <b>Ms Nield [1]</b> 37/24 <b>Ms Palmer [2]</b> 106/23 107/10 <b>Ms Palmer's [2]</b> 106/16 106/19 <b>Ms Panter [5]</b> 126/6 126/25 128/8 128/14 133/19 <b>Ms Rudkin's [1]</b> 111/13 <b>Ms Sefton [1]</b> 37/24 <b>much [16]</b> 3/11 7/13 8/23 45/24 46/6 46/11 59/17 82/18 89/15 91/8 91/13 91/20 101/20 181/19 186/7 186/10 <b>must [9]</b> 31/21 32/24 34/22 79/8 120/25 146/19 157/6 169/1 177/9 <b>my [46]</b> 1/13 11/21 12/13 12/14 19/13 21/5 33/2 47/7 47/8 50/6 52/19 56/18 59/13 62/24 66/7 68/1 77/6 79/9 81/6 85/5 85/7 99/13 99/25 103/18 108/16 111/15 112/6 120/12 136/2 136/16 138/6 139/25 150/2 155/6 157/19 160/3 160/9 160/10 161/8 161/22 162/11 164/1 164/6 169/15 185/6 185/13 <b>myself [2]</b> 13/14 168/19	32/13 33/7 35/20 36/5 39/11 49/14 59/10 59/14 64/5 73/2 76/5 105/23 108/2 112/19 114/11 114/12 114/13 116/13 118/3 121/19 133/24 137/5 138/7 141/7 144/17 146/4 148/1 150/3 151/2 151/4 151/23 158/7 158/10 160/23 163/13 163/24 164/2 164/3 164/6 165/20 172/2 172/24 179/19 <b>needed [23]</b> 21/9 28/11 28/24 62/18 64/7 64/17 64/18 70/8 70/23 77/8 84/14 100/11 101/22 107/24 108/15 132/15 138/25 145/2 154/11 156/4 156/5 158/3 173/6 <b>needing [1]</b> 179/18 <b>needn't [1]</b> 2/6 <b>needs [2]</b> 31/24 158/25 <b>neither [1]</b> 65/7 <b>neutralised [1]</b> 140/19 <b>never [5]</b> 88/6 121/21 128/16 145/17 152/19 <b>nevertheless [2]</b> 11/21 49/7 <b>new [2]</b> 66/12 157/7 <b>next [4]</b> 81/22 124/25 132/14 173/1 <b>Nield [2]</b> 15/22 37/24 <b>nine [2]</b> 73/18 109/12 <b>no [116]</b> 3/15 5/25 7/14 9/4 10/16 17/10 17/14 18/8 18/16 20/10 20/18 22/1 23/19 24/8 25/21 27/15 27/21 30/4 33/7 36/17 39/17 49/14 53/17 57/3 59/18 61/16 64/14 64/16 65/9 66/20 66/20 69/15 71/3 73/24 75/8 78/5 79/23 81/18 85/4 86/13 87/25 89/21 92/19 94/5 94/24 95/2 95/5 95/16 96/1 96/4 96/8 96/15 96/20 97/2 97/11 97/16 97/25 98/13 98/20 98/23 99/2 99/2 102/3 102/9 102/11 103/3 103/7 104/4 104/24 105/23 106/20 106/24 108/1 108/10 112/15 112/18 112/19 113/3 116/13 118/16 118/20 119/4 120/3 121/4 121/11	123/8 123/12 129/6 132/12 135/15 137/19 138/24 142/17 142/19 143/21 144/11 146/15 152/9 158/10 162/13 166/12 166/21 168/15 168/20 171/3 171/12 172/11 172/15 172/20 173/7 176/16 179/25 180/7 180/14 181/14 186/1 <b>nod [1]</b> 112/11 <b>non [2]</b> 177/11 180/24 <b>non-sensitive [2]</b> 177/11 180/24 <b>none [9]</b> 73/22 94/20 95/14 106/25 108/7 135/15 146/14 150/12 184/16 <b>nonetheless [7]</b> 48/3 62/7 68/10 75/12 77/1 133/25 153/17 <b>nor [6]</b> 65/7 95/3 95/18 112/16 143/21 151/18 <b>normal [3]</b> 43/20 50/16 164/8 <b>normally [1]</b> 19/3 <b>not [225]</b> <b>note [10]</b> 8/12 38/16 47/21 96/14 100/5 102/8 105/5 113/20 119/20 164/4 <b>noted [3]</b> 78/2 78/16 125/1 <b>notes [2]</b> 8/6 115/9 <b>nothing [17]</b> 56/19 61/9 63/17 71/16 87/14 96/24 102/18 106/5 107/24 110/23 119/16 139/10 154/24 155/15 184/12 184/17 184/23 <b>notice [3]</b> 40/1 40/14 173/4 <b>notices [3]</b> 92/7 95/21 104/11 <b>notification [1]</b> 173/2 <b>notify [1]</b> 172/22 <b>noting [1]</b> 131/17 <b>November [7]</b> 40/7 40/12 40/20 124/18 167/11 177/22 177/24 <b>now [22]</b> 2/7 4/2 8/10 19/18 37/7 41/6 46/8 61/4 63/11 77/11 123/24 136/5 136/6 136/10 138/12 138/22 139/25 141/9 157/20 158/7 161/12 185/18 <b>nuances [1]</b> 74/12 <b>number [22]</b> 2/1 15/18 15/20 25/2
----------	---	---	---	--



<b>N</b> <b>number...</b> [18] 27/11 27/13 27/19 30/12 30/25 33/24 42/20 44/6 54/11 67/4 73/4 73/14 81/8 81/13 90/18 108/12 124/22 184/25 <b>number 4</b> [1] 108/12 <b>numbered</b> [2] 95/11 177/1 <b>numbers</b> [1] 160/24 <b>numerous</b> [2] 116/12 146/1	149/19 156/15 159/12 165/24 166/15 <b>October 2012</b> [1] 134/4 <b>off</b> [9] 44/14 47/8 52/19 76/16 79/9 99/8 124/16 144/22 145/11 <b>offence</b> [11] 54/7 56/10 58/10 62/13 62/14 63/2 70/20 78/9 87/20 99/15 99/23 <b>offences</b> [8] 3/21 54/8 57/25 59/8 59/11 62/5 71/18 107/10 <b>offer</b> [1] 126/12 <b>offering</b> [2] 130/11 130/20 <b>office</b> [92] 3/20 7/3 7/23 9/18 9/18 10/13 10/17 13/2 13/3 13/10 16/22 19/2 19/17 21/5 25/2 25/12 26/4 26/11 26/21 28/3 33/25 34/2 34/6 34/23 36/18 39/14 40/5 41/6 43/3 43/10 43/14 45/2 47/1 49/1 49/15 50/12 52/17 54/12 55/10 58/21 59/2 64/1 64/2 64/7 64/10 65/22 66/2 66/5 71/19 71/24 72/8 78/22 78/23 79/22 80/4 80/22 82/1 86/21 87/2 97/14 105/20 106/5 117/10 124/23 126/4 128/6 130/6 131/1 131/19 133/9 133/21 135/20 137/10 138/11 140/8 143/17 148/17 149/22 150/6 150/13 150/21 155/19 161/23 164/8 164/14 166/24 166/25 168/18 169/2 170/16 171/14 172/8 <b>Office's</b> [9] 16/3 24/24 28/4 30/2 33/16 130/21 171/17 172/9 172/12 <b>officer</b> [19] 6/12 6/13 17/13 18/7 19/1 20/2 21/12 22/14 22/17 23/16 53/9 53/19 53/21 53/22 113/11 143/10 150/8 174/3 181/7 <b>Officer's</b> [3] 19/24 177/13 179/3 <b>officers</b> [4] 48/4 48/4 108/13 151/3 <b>offices</b> [1] 36/24 <b>often</b> [9] 19/7 38/17 48/3 74/20 88/24 89/19 174/5 185/1	185/6 <b>Oh</b> [1] 135/25 <b>old</b> [2] 74/25 157/7 <b>older</b> [1] 12/11 <b>omission</b> [2] 85/18 183/13 <b>omitted</b> [2] 151/13 151/16 <b>on</b> [280] <b>once</b> [1] 59/2 <b>one</b> [61] 12/14 14/2 16/20 17/14 17/16 20/4 20/19 21/13 21/14 22/1 22/9 23/19 24/8 24/16 31/19 36/13 39/15 40/4 42/18 45/6 45/7 47/7 47/18 51/4 51/14 51/22 52/22 61/7 69/3 69/21 69/24 75/15 76/16 76/19 79/22 85/16 85/17 86/7 86/17 97/4 100/25 107/4 116/7 117/13 119/20 121/17 126/9 128/16 133/9 135/22 137/22 144/12 148/17 150/7 152/9 152/13 155/8 163/4 169/22 175/15 184/18 <b>ones</b> [2] 12/20 90/22 <b>oneself</b> [1] 59/21 <b>Online</b> [3] 115/14 158/19 159/23 <b>only</b> [17] 12/5 41/10 47/7 67/6 82/15 82/16 85/16 86/7 90/19 102/11 115/13 147/23 154/18 158/2 177/25 178/1 178/9 <b>onto</b> [1] 164/20 <b>onus</b> [2] 72/5 168/5 <b>onwards</b> [3] 93/13 97/19 106/12 <b>open</b> [4] 9/21 85/3 134/19 148/12 <b>operated</b> [1] 172/6 <b>operating</b> [3] 64/4 94/8 118/2 <b>operation</b> [18] 16/19 38/13 41/25 42/18 43/20 64/7 88/19 97/24 97/24 98/1 101/6 101/9 110/5 113/2 135/5 135/8 144/25 155/24 <b>operations</b> [1] 83/5 <b>operative</b> [1] 131/23 <b>operator</b> [1] 119/4 <b>opinion</b> [14] 99/13 103/18 107/8 112/6 120/12 134/10 134/11 135/3 135/5 149/14 149/16 153/7 153/9	162/9 <b>opinions</b> [1] 2/21 <b>opportunity</b> [4] 47/5 51/11 150/24 183/1 <b>opposed</b> [5] 60/24 61/12 63/20 122/5 122/21 <b>opposite</b> [1] 39/8 <b>or</b> [231] <b>oral</b> [3] 9/1 165/23 166/14 <b>order</b> [11] 6/6 8/18 17/4 20/18 34/5 79/4 130/3 139/17 151/19 164/21 165/3 <b>ordered</b> [1] 150/4 <b>orders</b> [1] 140/7 <b>Ordinarily</b> [1] 175/11 <b>ordinary</b> [1] 57/17 <b>organisation</b> [3] 21/4 21/14 143/13 <b>origin</b> [1] 142/12 <b>original</b> [1] 125/21 <b>other</b> [38] 14/3 16/16 24/2 24/20 31/11 38/20 41/12 49/2 52/22 58/24 69/1 69/25 75/15 86/15 89/5 92/18 96/17 104/3 104/14 108/12 125/23 129/12 131/19 132/20 133/10 133/18 141/19 144/16 148/18 160/10 164/13 175/15 177/10 179/1 184/1 184/3 184/18 184/25 <b>others</b> [11] 7/11 19/9 29/18 42/3 85/15 100/8 122/21 136/14 142/1 156/14 168/9 <b>otherwise</b> [7] 4/22 6/17 45/21 75/1 96/19 117/22 178/22 <b>ought</b> [12] 51/3 59/13 87/5 100/19 100/23 101/2 107/14 136/17 141/17 153/16 153/22 153/25 <b>our</b> [11] 31/23 35/9 35/19 37/7 38/7 139/5 139/8 139/17 140/12 148/12 151/1 <b>out</b> [63] 2/10 2/14 2/17 2/20 15/10 17/16 17/16 18/1 19/17 26/11 34/21 36/16 36/20 40/11 40/13 56/6 56/17 57/20 58/2 63/23 66/24 69/25 70/9 70/11 70/24 72/7 73/5 80/7 83/19 84/21 84/25 86/14 87/20 90/22 98/5 100/8 103/20 104/15 104/19	104/20 111/2 111/4 112/8 115/12 117/18 117/20 119/4 120/14 122/7 127/4 139/16 141/5 149/15 151/24 152/3 152/21 153/17 157/6 160/9 162/17 164/9 175/19 176/1 <b>outcome</b> [1] 92/25 <b>outset</b> [1] 32/5 <b>outside</b> [1] 153/15 <b>outstanding</b> [1] 163/1 <b>outweigh</b> [1] 70/14 <b>outwith</b> [1] 135/3 <b>over</b> [34] 4/24 16/20 16/22 18/21 36/19 38/14 38/19 39/11 40/8 40/25 42/21 49/5 51/21 52/10 55/7 64/24 67/1 73/20 90/8 93/24 107/13 112/1 112/24 115/15 119/10 120/6 121/6 136/5 139/18 142/23 146/25 164/25 174/16 184/21 <b>overall</b> [2] 14/7 182/1 <b>overly</b> [1] 174/10 <b>oversee</b> [1] 34/18 <b>oversight</b> [2] 20/25 21/7 <b>oversimplistic</b> [1] 74/15 <b>overturned</b> [1] 140/7 <b>overview</b> [1] 155/4 <b>owed</b> [1] 152/6 <b>own</b> [6] 11/21 16/3 22/21 43/2 122/17 129/9 <b>Oyeteju</b> [1] 62/1
				<b>P</b> <b>PACE</b> [3] 47/19 50/15 72/20 <b>page</b> [99] 1/24 2/7 3/3 14/21 15/1 18/21 30/9 33/21 36/12 40/18 40/25 47/21 54/2 55/7 60/4 60/5 64/24 65/16 67/1 67/1 71/9 73/10 73/20 80/25 81/3 86/14 90/9 92/2 93/12 93/18 93/24 93/25 96/10 96/14 97/19 97/21 97/22 99/7 99/10 102/4 102/8 103/10 103/11 103/15 105/1 105/2 105/5 106/13 107/4 107/7 107/13 107/13 107/25 108/16 108/17 108/22 111/18 112/1 112/2 112/24 113/6 113/7 114/18



<b>P</b>	124/17 126/6 126/25 128/8 128/14 133/19 167/12	<b>paragraph 567 [1]</b> 33/8	105/3	41/12 151/6 152/9 159/18
<b>page...</b> [36] 114/24 115/15 116/15 118/8 119/8 119/10 120/6 120/10 121/6 121/7 122/1 123/19 124/14 125/25 125/25 130/2 137/21 142/9 142/21 143/4 148/8 152/23 155/21 159/10 163/3 163/16 164/11 167/9 171/2 173/11 176/20 176/21 177/22 180/21 183/5 184/21	<b>papers [9]</b> 12/5 74/3 86/10 87/23 97/5 106/5 106/10 119/19 129/11	<b>paragraph 6 [1]</b> 7/5 <b>paragraph 605 [1]</b> 126/1	<b>paragraphs 217 [1]</b> 27/4	<b>pasting [1]</b> 161/19
<b>page 1 [3]</b> 99/10 107/7 120/10	<b>paperwork [1]</b> 52/21	<b>paragraph 606 [2]</b> 126/12 128/3	<b>paragraphs 278 [1]</b> 43/7	<b>Patel [2]</b> 126/2 162/18
<b>page 114 [2]</b> 108/16 108/17	<b>paragraph [69]</b> 7/5 9/16 15/2 17/6 18/21 18/23 22/10 25/22 33/8 40/7 40/8 47/20 53/13 54/4 55/7 56/15 60/7 64/25 65/15 67/2 71/8 73/10 77/12 81/1 83/10 88/15 90/11 92/2 93/5 95/11 95/20 96/14 97/18 97/21 98/7 102/8 102/17 106/3 106/12 106/15 108/22 112/10 112/20 113/6 114/17 115/4 115/10 116/15 119/15 122/2 126/1 126/12 128/3 129/25 131/15 132/19 138/5 152/22 155/21 160/18 169/7 171/1 173/10 176/22 177/5 177/7 180/21 183/6 184/21	<b>paragraph 620 [1]</b> 15/2	<b>paragraphs 312 [1]</b> 108/18	<b>pattern [1]</b> 27/6 <b>pausing [1]</b> 72/12
<b>page 116 [1]</b> 108/22	<b>paragraph 1 [3]</b> 95/11 138/5 176/22	<b>paragraph 621 [1]</b> 17/6	<b>paragraphs 330 [1]</b> 97/3	<b>pay [1]</b> 87/16
<b>page 117 [1]</b> 111/18	<b>paragraph 108 [1]</b> 18/23	<b>paragraph 622 [1]</b> 18/21	<b>paragraphs 34 [1]</b> 43/8	<b>payment [1]</b> 79/19
<b>page 12 [1]</b> 173/11	<b>paragraph 158 [1]</b> 119/15	<b>paragraph 623 [3]</b> 22/10 47/20 53/13	<b>paragraphs 366 [1]</b> 80/7	<b>payments [1]</b> 83/19
<b>page 152 [2]</b> 113/6 113/7	<b>paragraph 17 [1]</b> 173/10	<b>paragraph 624 [1]</b> 81/1	<b>paragraphs 37 [1]</b> 93/11	<b>pays [1]</b> 164/9
<b>page 159 [1]</b> 118/8	<b>paragraph 2 [1]</b> 40/7	<b>paragraph 625 [1]</b> 83/10	<b>paragraphs 43 [1]</b> 93/18	<b>Penny [1]</b> 149/21
<b>page 170 [1]</b> 119/8	<b>paragraph 223 [2]</b> 106/12 106/15	<b>paragraph 626 [2]</b> 88/15 90/11	<b>paragraphs 444 [1]</b> 118/9	<b>people [10]</b> 10/4 22/8 24/21 31/1 32/9 33/6 38/8 38/20 42/25 164/13
<b>page 172 [1]</b> 122/1	<b>paragraph 230 [1]</b> 93/5	<b>paragraph 628 [1]</b> 92/2	<b>paragraphs 45 [1]</b> 93/25	<b>per [6]</b> 68/9 68/12 68/14 68/16 68/19 68/19
<b>page 188 [1]</b> 130/2	<b>paragraph 284 [1]</b> 106/3	<b>Paragraph 632 [1]</b> 54/4	<b>paragraphs 602 [1]</b> 124/3	<b>perceived [1]</b> 132/8
<b>page 2 [1]</b> 121/7	<b>paragraph 3 [1]</b> 40/8	<b>paragraph 633 [3]</b> 55/7 56/15 60/7	<b>paragraphs 63 [1]</b> 96/11	<b>percentage [1]</b> 139/7
<b>page 21 [1]</b> 93/12	<b>paragraph 316 [1]</b> 108/22	<b>paragraph 634 [1]</b> 64/25	<b>paragraphs 637 [1]</b> 97/20	<b>performed [1]</b> 129/5
<b>page 211 [1]</b> 123/19	<b>paragraph 32 [1]</b> 9/16	<b>paragraph 635 [1]</b> 65/15	<b>Pardoe [1]</b> 143/10	<b>performing [1]</b> 165/15
<b>page 213 [1]</b> 125/25	<b>paragraph 351 [1]</b> 98/7	<b>paragraph 637 [1]</b> 67/2	<b>Parliament [1]</b> 33/25	<b>perfunctory [1]</b> 65/10
<b>page 218 [2]</b> 14/21 15/1	<b>paragraph 4.10 [1]</b> 177/5	<b>paragraph 638 [1]</b> 71/8	<b>part [10]</b> 27/20 32/3 51/2 80/22 99/1 99/23 124/25 144/23 160/2 172/20	<b>perhaps [12]</b> 16/16 45/19 58/16 59/15 88/7 95/21 114/15 136/22 148/1 155/1 159/1 164/9
<b>page 219 [3]</b> 47/21 80/25 81/3	<b>paragraph 414 [1]</b> 25/22	<b>paragraph 639 [2]</b> 73/10 77/12	<b>partiality [1]</b> 148/13	<b>period [15]</b> 13/14 16/20 16/23 26/8 38/19 42/21 48/1 57/16 57/23 105/13 121/1 129/2 136/6 170/2 185/23
<b>page 221 [1]</b> 92/2	<b>paragraph 423 [1]</b> 113/6	<b>paragraph 654 [1]</b> 180/21	<b>partially [1]</b> 33/15	<b>person [25]</b> 18/4 18/25 19/10 20/5 20/6 20/12 20/16 21/13 23/10 23/21 23/24 24/11 35/15 42/15 48/14 54/23 56/20 60/2 74/23 89/11 89/20 90/13 90/16 153/13 156/6
<b>page 223 [1]</b> 54/2	<b>paragraph 425 [1]</b> 114/17	<b>paragraph 656 [1]</b> 183/6	<b>particular [29]</b> 3/24 5/4 5/16 6/11 6/24 8/14 10/18 13/16 25/16 47/12 50/4 59/8 59/9 60/8 63/16 67/9 80/2 80/14 89/21 92/1 120/20 127/2 128/6 132/25 137/12 149/9 169/19 171/7 173/14	<b>persons [2]</b> 18/14 20/11
<b>page 224 [2]</b> 60/4 60/5	<b>paragraph 484 [1]</b> 122/2	<b>paragraph 657 [1]</b> 184/21	<b>particularise [3]</b> 38/16 125/4 167/17	<b>perspective [1]</b> 179/9
<b>page 23 [1]</b> 93/18	<b>paragraph 532 [1]</b> 129/25	<b>paragraph 666 [1]</b> 171/1	<b>particularly [10]</b> 5/25 8/8 12/11 50/23 53/21 56/9 59/2 66/21 136/19 170/10	<b>Peter [3]</b> 67/21 108/19 109/20
<b>page 233 [1]</b> 180/21		<b>paragraph 69 [1]</b> 96/14	<b>parties [5]</b> 34/6 34/15 51/16 52/1 172/13	<b>Peterborough [1]</b> 162/20
<b>page 238 [1]</b> 171/2		<b>paragraph 87 [1]</b> 97/18	<b>parts [3]</b> 51/1 52/5 165/5	<b>Phase [1]</b> 9/3
<b>page 24 [1]</b> 93/25		<b>paragraph 94 [1]</b> 97/21	<b>party [7]</b> 136/13 166/2 170/25 171/22 171/23 172/3 172/23	<b>Phase 4 [1]</b> 9/3
<b>page 243 [1]</b> 2/7		<b>paragraph's [1]</b> 50/20	<b>pass [1]</b> 68/7	<b>phrase [1]</b> 141/4
<b>page 3 [2]</b> 33/21 112/2		<b>paragraphs [22]</b> 27/4 36/12 43/7 43/8 80/7 93/11 93/18 93/25 95/13 96/11 97/3 97/20 102/5 105/3 108/18 118/9 119/9 124/3 132/20 171/7 177/1 177/1	<b>passed [2]</b> 37/5 68/14	<b>phraseology [1]</b> 114/3
<b>page 30 [1]</b> 96/10		<b>paragraphs 109 [1]</b> 102/5	<b>past [7]</b> 36/19 146/14 147/21 150/1 150/10 154/5 157/3	<b>physical [1]</b> 49/10
<b>page 32 [1]</b> 96/14		<b>paragraphs 149 [1]</b>	<b>pasted [5]</b> 41/11	<b>pick [1]</b> 179/1
<b>page 38 [1]</b> 97/19				<b>picked [2]</b> 65/15 92/23
<b>page 40 [1]</b> 97/21				
<b>page 46 [1]</b> 102/4				
<b>page 48 [1]</b> 102/8				
<b>page 5 [1]</b> 40/18				
<b>page 59 [1]</b> 105/2				
<b>page 85 [1]</b> 106/13				
<b>Page's [1]</b> 106/7				
<b>pages [1]</b> 177/24				
<b>pages 25 [1]</b> 177/24				
<b>Palmer [4]</b> 106/15 106/23 107/3 107/10				
<b>Palmer's [2]</b> 106/16 106/19				
<b>Panter [8]</b> 124/5				

<b>P</b>	141/19 153/3 155/22 158/3 175/9 176/4 176/5 176/8 178/24 180/9 180/12 <b>pointed [2]</b> 26/9 77/2 <b>pointing [1]</b> 111/4 <b>points [7]</b> 12/2 14/12 25/11 54/1 108/8 152/8 154/24 <b>POL [1]</b> 111/21 <b>POL00020489 [1]</b> 147/17 <b>POL00026567 [1]</b> 137/20 <b>POL00044820 [1]</b> 99/4 <b>POL00046488 [1]</b> 111/11 <b>POL00047159 [1]</b> 120/5 <b>POL00047320 [1]</b> 53/5 <b>POL00047322 [1]</b> 53/3 <b>POL00047331 [2]</b> 93/24 94/12 <b>POL00047335 [1]</b> 95/7 <b>POL00050912 [2]</b> 111/19 111/23 <b>POL00052178 [1]</b> 109/19 <b>POL00052884 [1]</b> 176/17 <b>POL00052990 [1]</b> 107/2 <b>POL00055590 [1]</b> 30/8 <b>POL00057341 [1]</b> 114/23 <b>POL00058155 [1]</b> 33/20 <b>POL00059402 [1]</b> 124/14 <b>POL00059404 [1]</b> 167/8 <b>POL00064235 [1]</b> 179/2 <b>POL00096978 [1]</b> 149/18 <b>POL00096997 [1]</b> 156/16 <b>POL00096999 [1]</b> 158/14 <b>POL00097008 [1]</b> 159/9 <b>POL00097061 [1]</b> 162/14 <b>POL00120723 [1]</b> 39/12 <b>POL00141396 [1]</b> 142/20 <b>POL00141416 [1]</b> 145/5	<b>POL0052884 [1]</b> 103/9 <b>police [15]</b> 13/16 19/9 19/21 20/22 47/2 47/14 48/4 49/3 49/21 50/13 51/3 86/16 86/18 86/23 181/4 <b>policies [3]</b> 16/4 25/2 173/5 <b>policy [15]</b> 3/19 4/5 19/5 26/12 54/11 71/14 71/24 72/8 72/11 72/15 72/21 78/23 82/1 82/6 185/23 <b>position [15]</b> 12/20 19/2 40/10 45/22 49/7 54/18 56/16 75/15 81/24 84/14 112/16 131/8 138/11 174/10 185/22 <b>positively [2]</b> 93/1 110/23 <b>possession [2]</b> 144/15 182/10 <b>possibility [4]</b> 12/17 80/19 120/24 132/1 <b>possible [9]</b> 4/8 52/5 89/13 111/5 125/22 128/5 128/20 139/14 151/10 <b>post [102]</b> 3/20 7/3 7/22 9/17 9/18 10/13 10/17 13/2 13/3 13/10 16/3 16/22 19/2 19/16 21/5 24/24 25/2 25/12 26/3 26/11 26/21 28/3 28/4 30/2 30/15 33/16 33/24 34/2 34/6 34/23 36/17 36/24 39/14 40/5 41/6 43/3 43/10 43/13 45/2 47/1 52/17 54/12 55/10 58/21 59/2 64/1 64/2 64/7 64/9 65/22 66/2 66/4 71/19 71/23 72/8 78/22 78/23 79/22 80/4 80/22 82/1 86/20 87/2 97/14 105/20 106/5 117/10 124/23 126/4 128/6 130/6 130/21 130/25 131/19 133/9 133/21 135/20 137/10 138/11 140/8 143/16 148/16 149/22 150/6 150/13 150/21 155/19 161/23 164/8 164/14 166/24 166/25 168/18 169/2 170/16 171/14 171/17 172/8 172/9 172/12 178/11 179/7 <b>post-committal [1]</b> 178/11	<b>post-dates [1]</b> 179/7 <b>post-trial [1]</b> 30/15 <b>postmaster [3]</b> 11/2 127/23 169/22 <b>postmasters [1]</b> 29/4 <b>potential [7]</b> 94/25 100/21 104/5 107/18 121/12 139/11 148/24 <b>potentially [10]</b> 39/5 76/7 77/2 87/5 93/10 134/9 154/9 171/17 172/4 172/17 <b>pounds [1]</b> 146/25 <b>practice [17]</b> 6/23 6/24 13/6 13/13 19/10 32/18 48/25 57/12 71/25 105/9 105/17 144/10 177/6 178/16 178/20 179/9 185/24 <b>pre [9]</b> 48/19 48/23 49/24 113/15 179/21 179/22 180/2 180/5 180/18 <b>pre-committal [2]</b> 180/2 180/5 <b>pre-interview [3]</b> 48/19 48/23 49/24 <b>pre-prepared [1]</b> 113/15 <b>pre-the [1]</b> 180/18 <b>precisely [1]</b> 17/4 <b>prefer [1]</b> 161/1 <b>preferred [1]</b> 148/9 <b>premeditated [1]</b> 76/3 <b>preparation [1]</b> 137/8 <b>prepare [3]</b> 140/21 145/21 174/4 <b>prepared [15]</b> 7/21 18/12 33/16 50/17 97/14 98/25 113/15 115/11 117/14 141/1 142/14 147/15 150/9 161/6 178/1 <b>preparing [1]</b> 72/15 <b>preponderance [1]</b> 181/22 <b>present [7]</b> 80/13 116/14 137/7 150/3 150/11 161/1 185/18 <b>presentation [1]</b> 108/11 <b>presented [2]</b> 132/23 160/1 <b>presently [1]</b> 168/1 <b>press [3]</b> 38/15 42/2 141/24 <b>presumably [2]</b> 160/1 160/4 <b>presume [1]</b> 160/11 <b>previous [7]</b> 70/22 155/15 158/24 159/1 163/10 171/7 181/15 <b>previously [3]</b> 4/5	109/13 161/5 <b>primary [1]</b> 79/1 <b>principal [1]</b> 103/12 <b>principally [1]</b> 4/14 <b>prior [4]</b> 48/20 97/14 121/2 179/14 <b>private [2]</b> 69/5 143/18 <b>proactively [1]</b> 29/9 <b>probably [2]</b> 29/17 36/4 <b>problem [13]</b> 4/20 17/15 35/22 64/6 90/24 91/3 117/19 117/20 127/5 127/13 127/13 127/24 167/2 <b>problematic [1]</b> 141/5 <b>problems [13]</b> 24/22 27/21 38/24 90/20 102/14 114/10 115/18 118/22 139/11 169/24 170/1 170/3 173/22 <b>procedural [2]</b> 173/12 174/2 <b>Procedure [1]</b> 162/2 <b>procedures [1]</b> 34/11 <b>proceed [3]</b> 8/20 118/5 158/2 <b>proceedings [7]</b> 5/21 6/2 10/7 10/12 96/25 102/20 106/7 <b>process [20]</b> 6/6 18/16 20/9 21/22 23/4 23/25 43/22 44/5 45/1 45/9 45/20 46/1 46/2 52/2 55/15 124/24 169/2 180/13 181/11 181/23 <b>processes [1]</b> 34/11 <b>produce [5]</b> 113/12 146/24 154/17 157/5 164/21 <b>produced [6]</b> 55/9 114/19 114/25 135/6 147/4 156/12 <b>producing [1]</b> 173/6 <b>profession [1]</b> 156/7 <b>Professor [1]</b> 160/6 <b>profoundly [1]</b> 41/14 <b>progress [1]</b> 143/8 <b>promulgation [2]</b> 143/16 144/8 <b>proof [3]</b> 31/2 139/1 139/4 <b>proper [6]</b> 42/7 42/9 47/5 144/8 145/22 167/25 <b>properly [11]</b> 12/3 15/8 34/25 36/23 63/21 64/4 127/21 134/12 145/3 158/8 163/9 <b>proportionate [1]</b>
----------	--	--	--	---

<b>P</b>	69/24 70/3 70/18 70/24 74/8 75/18 99/14 99/16 99/17 99/23 100/2 103/19 105/8 107/9 112/7 112/9 120/13 <b>prospects [6]</b> 67/5 67/9 67/22 67/23 68/1 70/12 <b>protect [4]</b> 25/13 27/9 28/2 144/1 <b>protective [1]</b> 33/4 <b>prove [7]</b> 45/3 59/15 59/20 59/21 62/4 122/10 138/7 <b>proved [4]</b> 46/4 62/13 62/15 63/3 <b>provide [10]</b> 34/5 50/3 137/15 140/1 149/15 155/4 155/5 158/11 162/7 171/23 <b>provided [29]</b> 1/20 2/2 4/12 7/20 9/8 38/5 48/23 51/23 61/11 66/2 97/14 98/25 129/2 147/24 155/19 160/23 169/10 169/15 175/13 175/22 176/13 177/18 178/10 178/17 178/21 180/4 180/6 180/15 180/17 <b>provider [1]</b> 171/22 <b>provides [1]</b> 21/21 <b>providing [3]</b> 18/15 63/23 165/11 <b>proving [1]</b> 74/8 <b>provision [5]</b> 49/24 96/3 97/8 165/7 178/8 <b>provisions [1]</b> 177/4 <b>prudent [1]</b> 113/11 <b>public [33]</b> 33/16 41/5 41/10 65/24 66/22 68/21 68/23 69/1 69/4 69/7 70/13 71/4 71/7 73/9 73/12 73/17 73/25 74/11 74/20 75/6 75/14 75/21 76/5 76/9 76/20 77/3 77/19 77/23 78/11 79/11 87/21 112/11 112/13 <b>publicity [1]</b> 150/22 <b>purpose [2]</b> 21/17 49/23 <b>purposes [3]</b> 68/18 83/22 131/18 <b>pursue [13]</b> 4/15 16/8 26/6 80/9 80/23 81/8 81/12 82/3 82/23 85/15 92/22 114/13 114/14 <b>pursued [16]</b> 23/23 32/2 44/20 82/15 82/15 82/17 86/12	87/24 88/15 93/2 104/2 104/14 116/9 117/6 132/2 174/15 <b>pursuit [3]</b> 16/13 93/20 111/5 <b>pushed [1]</b> 148/11 <b>put [21]</b> 27/18 35/9 45/7 49/7 56/22 58/21 70/1 72/5 77/24 89/8 114/15 115/21 139/4 139/18 154/8 157/2 158/25 159/6 162/20 170/18 173/4 <b>putting [5]</b> 63/11 141/3 154/21 165/5 168/5 <b>puzzled [1]</b> 69/19	<b>raises [1]</b> 21/2 <b>raising [8]</b> 29/5 63/25 82/21 101/5 110/5 125/2 126/3 167/15 <b>rang [1]</b> 119/23 <b>range [4]</b> 57/25 63/6 149/6 166/23 <b>ranging [2]</b> 155/23 156/2 <b>rarely [2]</b> 73/12 77/15 <b>rather [51]</b> 14/3 16/23 17/17 26/23 29/9 32/5 32/8 32/12 38/15 42/10 42/12 45/16 45/24 57/9 58/22 61/1 61/13 70/9 70/24 76/3 77/4 88/12 90/2 100/13 110/16 118/4 122/12 126/4 127/16 131/11 133/22 141/11 141/21 142/2 142/8 143/23 144/1 144/5 144/11 144/18 144/25 145/22 149/14 152/21 153/8 157/13 168/7 168/18 176/3 178/24 183/13 <b>rationale [2]</b> 21/18 120/19 <b>raw [1]</b> 181/12 <b>reach [2]</b> 125/19 151/20 <b>reached [4]</b> 37/25 56/1 57/10 119/24 <b>reaches [1]</b> 12/14 <b>reaching [2]</b> 13/1 56/12 <b>read [11]</b> 16/17 40/21 56/16 69/14 69/16 69/18 108/12 115/12 122/10 125/20 129/22 <b>reading [7]</b> 22/23 25/6 69/25 103/24 155/7 173/23 185/14 <b>ready [1]</b> 150/5 <b>real [7]</b> 23/7 55/11 55/20 55/21 57/25 171/3 171/12 <b>realist [1]</b> 67/9 <b>realistic [18]</b> 56/13 57/2 61/6 67/5 67/17 67/23 68/5 69/23 70/3 70/18 74/8 75/18 99/14 100/1 103/19 107/9 112/7 120/13 <b>reality [1]</b> 58/23 <b>really [6]</b> 42/17 43/2 69/15 70/23 168/17 182/16 <b>reason [4]</b> 122/19 126/20 131/7 131/20 <b>reasonable [38]</b> 4/15 16/9 16/13 18/19 21/8 23/22 24/4 26/7 80/1	80/9 80/23 81/8 81/13 82/4 82/24 83/16 85/14 88/14 88/22 89/24 90/7 91/23 92/10 92/23 93/21 100/7 101/1 104/1 107/15 113/1 114/6 114/14 130/22 144/12 170/21 174/14 182/14 182/22 <b>reasonableness [1]</b> 63/13 <b>reasonably [1]</b> 9/21 <b>reasoning [2]</b> 55/2 55/13 <b>reasons [4]</b> 14/9 44/12 85/16 131/5 <b>reassured [1]</b> 118/25 <b>rebut [2]</b> 113/21 170/6 <b>rebuttal [1]</b> 160/6 <b>rebutting [3]</b> 26/22 26/22 113/14 <b>recall [2]</b> 79/10 122/19 <b>recap [1]</b> 3/16 <b>receipt [2]</b> 153/13 159/4 <b>received [3]</b> 8/10 135/19 143/22 <b>receiving [1]</b> 69/19 <b>recently [1]</b> 1/25 <b>recognise [5]</b> 12/2 19/7 41/1 74/5 136/8 <b>recognised [4]</b> 18/25 19/2 179/24 185/18 <b>recognising [2]</b> 168/8 172/2 <b>recognition [1]</b> 149/2 <b>recommended [2]</b> 116/18 117/6 <b>recommending [1]</b> 114/20 <b>reconciliations [2]</b> 34/11 36/20 <b>reconsider [1]</b> 148/1 <b>record [8]</b> 8/21 53/1 55/3 70/22 76/8 76/15 92/9 145/24 <b>recorded [1]</b> 36/21 <b>recording [3]</b> 17/15 51/5 51/5 <b>records [8]</b> 11/1 44/14 83/9 87/10 87/17 96/18 101/4 104/17 <b>recounts [1]</b> 88/20 <b>recover [1]</b> 43/19 <b>recovery [4]</b> 43/10 43/13 45/14 45/25 <b>recurrent [2]</b> 32/21 92/6 <b>refer [7]</b> 10/1 11/1 25/12 33/9 93/23
----------	--	---	--	---

<b>R</b>	95/19 95/20 97/9 98/11 103/2 104/7 105/4 106/14 106/16 106/19 110/10 118/15 120/2 121/14 128/21 133/15 134/7 135/15 137/12 141/23 142/3 142/5 144/25 154/22 155/17 155/24 158/12 162/9 168/6 171/15 173/15 176/18 178/13 179/9 <b>Relations [3]</b> 33/17 41/5 41/10 <b>relationship [1]</b> 171/14 <b>relative [1]</b> 69/8 <b>relatively [2]</b> 68/10 180/11 <b>release [4]</b> 35/11 38/15 42/2 141/25 <b>released [1]</b> 38/7 <b>relevance [3]</b> 82/11 83/21 87/4 <b>relevant [22]</b> 26/8 77/14 77/17 84/1 84/5 84/8 84/10 84/23 88/25 89/25 90/15 90/18 91/5 108/13 117/21 134/2 134/9 165/25 171/17 172/4 172/17 185/22 <b>relevantly [1]</b> 97/18 <b>reliability [23]</b> 27/1 28/18 28/21 31/17 32/4 39/4 60/15 64/21 101/13 101/16 102/1 104/7 118/3 124/21 125/10 127/16 130/13 132/22 134/3 142/4 144/2 168/10 172/5 <b>reliable [13]</b> 29/12 29/13 32/15 60/11 63/10 64/10 87/13 101/4 118/6 131/12 142/7 144/19 168/7 <b>reliance [3]</b> 7/2 104/8 116/25 <b>relied [7]</b> 63/19 75/23 101/3 118/4 123/11 173/17 182/11 <b>relieved [1]</b> 37/7 <b>rely [2]</b> 59/15 104/16 <b>relying [4]</b> 29/11 101/18 120/19 135/16 <b>remainder [1]</b> 107/12 <b>remained [2]</b> 81/20 81/24 <b>remaining [1]</b> 125/14 <b>remains [1]</b> 42/6 <b>remember [5]</b> 47/9 86/13 145/13 147/1 179/16 <b>remembering [1]</b>	86/17 <b>remind [4]</b> 1/14 80/10 137/11 152/5 <b>removed [1]</b> 160/3 <b>repaid [2]</b> 78/3 78/13 <b>reparation [2]</b> 77/14 77/17 <b>repay [1]</b> 84/17 <b>repayment [5]</b> 45/21 76/17 77/11 78/18 79/18 <b>repayments [1]</b> 43/23 <b>repeated [1]</b> 127/11 <b>repeatedly [2]</b> 82/11 127/11 <b>replied [1]</b> 126/1 <b>replies [3]</b> 162/23 163/3 164/12 <b>reply [7]</b> 36/2 39/21 95/7 141/1 153/18 164/14 169/3 <b>report [112]</b> 1/24 2/3 2/6 2/11 2/24 3/3 3/6 3/8 7/5 8/14 9/16 10/1 12/2 12/15 14/22 14/25 17/14 18/22 25/1 25/11 26/20 27/5 33/9 33/9 43/6 43/9 47/20 54/2 60/4 62/22 63/1 65/19 66/1 71/10 80/6 80/21 80/25 92/2 92/21 93/5 93/11 96/9 96/10 97/19 102/4 102/5 105/2 105/3 105/6 105/16 106/13 108/17 110/17 110/21 111/17 111/20 113/4 114/17 118/8 119/9 119/11 119/21 122/1 123/20 124/21 125/7 125/13 125/22 125/24 126/2 126/9 127/25 129/25 132/20 134/14 139/16 140/19 146/4 148/11 149/24 150/5 150/14 151/1 151/4 151/22 154/5 154/8 154/17 156/12 156/25 157/5 157/13 157/17 158/5 158/23 158/25 160/19 162/1 163/5 164/18 166/5 168/14 168/16 169/9 169/13 169/18 171/2 173/10 177/13 179/3 179/12 180/21 <b>reports [11]</b> 1/20 3/17 4/3 7/18 18/12 26/5 139/19 146/13 156/22 158/18 161/6 <b>representative [2]</b> 48/20 49/25 <b>represented [3]</b> 47/6	48/22 49/4 <b>reputation [1]</b> 25/24 <b>request [6]</b> 35/17 53/10 53/11 101/15 114/1 159/6 <b>requested [1]</b> 34/17 <b>requests [5]</b> 38/1 82/17 144/24 157/2 168/18 <b>require [2]</b> 148/12 178/20 <b>required [25]</b> 13/6 13/20 13/21 23/22 72/6 104/1 117/24 127/8 128/10 133/17 134/7 134/8 162/25 163/12 163/23 164/4 164/23 165/3 174/8 174/13 174/19 174/25 178/4 178/9 183/24 <b>requirement [7]</b> 16/8 80/8 80/14 149/9 172/21 173/2 174/17 <b>requirements [3]</b> 162/1 175/6 175/25 <b>requires [1]</b> 155/13 <b>requiring [1]</b> 176/2 <b>resources [1]</b> 69/11 <b>respect [4]</b> 3/13 168/6 174/16 183/2 <b>respects [3]</b> 15/20 16/24 27/11 <b>respond [2]</b> 157/12 169/18 <b>responded [1]</b> 94/2 <b>responding [1]</b> 156/13 <b>response [3]</b> 37/22 95/6 169/8 <b>responses [2]</b> 95/10 95/13 <b>responsibilities [3]</b> 3/22 18/1 152/3 <b>responsibility [6]</b> 21/19 22/4 24/12 100/13 136/3 170/3 <b>responsible [5]</b> 98/16 98/17 100/9 110/6 117/15 <b>rest [2]</b> 121/6 163/15 <b>restored [1]</b> 140/9 <b>restricted [1]</b> 34/9 <b>restricting [2]</b> 128/12 170/16 <b>restrictive [1]</b> 174/10 <b>restrictively [1]</b> 166/17 <b>result [14]</b> 33/3 43/24 65/2 79/10 82/17 89/7 89/13 90/1 104/12 105/10 105/18 111/6 118/1 147/4 <b>resulted [2]</b> 16/10 48/9	<b>resulting [1]</b> 80/24 <b>results [1]</b> 111/1 <b>retain [1]</b> 172/24 <b>retained [1]</b> 140/20 <b>retention [1]</b> 173/5 <b>retiral [2]</b> 105/6 106/9 <b>retrieval [1]</b> 131/17 <b>return [1]</b> 161/13 <b>revealed [1]</b> 161/6 <b>review [19]</b> 23/11 33/23 34/2 34/8 34/21 35/20 35/21 36/16 50/18 57/15 66/7 81/6 97/5 105/25 121/9 146/1 183/4 183/9 183/14 <b>reviewed [13]</b> 6/15 6/19 15/13 34/19 46/25 67/4 81/11 128/16 174/7 183/16 183/23 184/14 184/19 <b>reviewing [20]</b> 20/24 34/10 50/19 65/13 82/17 93/19 94/2 94/22 94/22 95/15 100/17 103/8 104/2 107/1 107/16 111/10 112/25 120/4 177/19 183/16 <b>reviews [1]</b> 10/25 <b>revised [1]</b> 1/25 <b>RICHARD [3]</b> 1/10 1/16 187/2 <b>ridiculous [1]</b> 98/20 <b>right [55]</b> 2/25 3/1 3/18 4/4 4/12 7/7 7/9 7/16 7/25 8/3 8/5 8/15 9/4 9/10 9/24 23/6 26/14 29/23 31/21 35/25 51/2 51/14 54/4 60/16 61/20 62/17 64/20 68/7 73/14 77/25 81/18 91/12 93/3 94/20 94/24 96/7 96/20 97/2 107/13 118/20 119/20 121/11 128/1 128/18 130/7 130/17 131/22 157/8 166/3 174/13 178/9 179/10 179/11 181/22 186/7 <b>rightly [3]</b> 85/21 86/14 111/4 <b>rights [1]</b> 47/4 <b>rigorous [1]</b> 175/17 <b>rise [5]</b> 55/11 55/20 55/21 63/18 118/23 <b>risk [5]</b> 10/14 24/4 32/2 32/6 72/9 <b>robust [5]</b> 34/25 138/12 150/16 150/22 155/20 <b>robustness [1]</b> 36/7
----------	--	--	--	--

<b>R</b> <b>rock [1]</b> 157/13 <b>role [7]</b> 17/11 17/13 17/22 19/24 161/22 162/11 165/14 <b>roles [2]</b> 17/17 17/24 <b>room [1]</b> 146/21 <b>root [1]</b> 92/11 <b>Rose [1]</b> 150/8 <b>ROTI [1]</b> 52/25 <b>round [1]</b> 61/25 <b>routine [1]</b> 48/7 <b>routinely [2]</b> 19/16 92/16 <b>Rudkin's [1]</b> 111/13 <b>rule [1]</b> 100/7 <b>rules [9]</b> 13/7 13/10 16/2 134/7 136/10 136/12 136/16 158/12 162/3 <b>rumour [1]</b> 64/13 <b>run [2]</b> 57/17 176/6 <b>Ruth [1]</b> 177/23	18/6 18/22 22/11 23/2 24/15 29/6 29/7 29/15 29/16 39/12 39/21 39/24 40/9 42/18 48/7 55/7 55/20 58/5 59/17 60/7 60/18 61/17 62/1 62/21 65/1 65/16 66/6 67/2 70/24 71/21 73/16 74/5 75/15 77/5 77/13 79/7 81/5 85/3 85/9 85/9 88/22 92/4 92/14 92/21 93/18 95/7 97/22 110/23 110/25 113/19 114/12 118/20 122/3 122/25 126/15 132/12 135/15 145/25 152/15 153/2 153/4 153/13 153/21 154/11 154/15 154/20 155/12 171/2 173/11 180/8 180/22 183/6 184/21 185/5 <b>saying [28]</b> 23/6 31/23 32/20 32/22 32/23 38/10 38/20 44/11 48/15 69/22 75/24 90/23 98/19 98/21 114/9 114/12 120/17 131/21 132/6 132/10 133/19 133/22 142/24 146/19 160/9 161/4 183/15 185/24 <b>says [15]</b> 37/3 99/12 115/3 116/11 116/24 124/19 137/1 147/18 148/8 151/22 165/17 167/14 168/13 168/23 176/22 <b>scale [2]</b> 19/8 20/22 <b>scenario [1]</b> 169/16 <b>schedule [23]</b> 6/16 103/21 112/8 120/15 175/8 175/14 176/10 177/11 177/12 178/23 182/18 182/24 182/25 183/22 184/3 184/6 184/8 184/11 184/12 184/17 184/25 185/3 185/9 <b>schedules [14]</b> 174/4 174/9 177/9 177/18 177/25 178/8 178/21 180/19 180/23 181/9 181/20 182/1 183/7 183/17 <b>scheme [1]</b> 79/21 <b>scope [1]</b> 172/9 <b>screen [3]</b> 15/1 30/7 80/1 <b>script [1]</b> 153/3 <b>scroll [48]</b> 17/7 35/4 37/3 39/20 40/25 92/4 93/12 94/16 96/15 99/7 99/11 103/10	108/1 109/22 112/1 112/21 115/2 115/10 118/9 120/7 121/5 123/20 124/16 124/17 138/4 138/21 142/10 145/6 145/7 147/17 156/16 156/18 158/15 159/10 159/11 160/16 160/25 162/14 162/23 163/16 167/9 167/10 167/14 168/12 176/20 176/22 176/25 179/3 <b>scrolling [1]</b> 156/17 <b>scrutiny [1]</b> 21/21 <b>search [1]</b> 175/18 <b>second [32]</b> 1/18 10/5 10/12 10/24 11/6 15/3 17/24 27/5 35/20 53/4 53/6 65/11 80/25 88/13 90/10 95/20 99/7 103/10 105/25 107/3 109/2 109/23 112/10 119/1 138/3 138/16 139/12 147/18 169/7 171/1 171/24 176/20 <b>secondary [1]</b> 79/1 <b>secondly [4]</b> 3/2 4/18 5/1 84/13 <b>secret [1]</b> 157/11 <b>Secretary [2]</b> 35/7 35/12 <b>section [7]</b> 157/4 159/22 160/19 161/2 161/17 164/20 179/15 <b>section 3 [3]</b> 160/19 161/2 179/15 <b>Section 9 [2]</b> 157/4 161/17 <b>Security [3]</b> 164/8 164/15 177/6 <b>see [84]</b> 1/3 6/18 8/18 11/4 14/11 30/20 31/13 35/4 36/2 36/11 39/13 39/18 40/19 40/22 46/17 52/16 54/16 54/18 56/23 59/5 61/23 71/2 71/4 83/17 86/5 86/8 86/10 87/23 91/18 94/17 95/11 98/1 99/5 99/8 99/11 99/19 101/1 101/20 101/25 103/9 103/15 103/16 106/17 107/4 107/25 109/19 110/25 111/8 114/24 116/1 119/23 120/7 120/10 121/23 122/22 123/16 124/15 128/21 131/7 133/12 133/21 137/20 137/25 142/10 142/20 145/7 145/8 145/18 146/7 147/3 147/11 149/18 151/3	155/7 164/11 170/5 171/20 171/25 173/3 175/6 176/25 179/2 186/1 186/8 <b>seeing [1]</b> 52/20 <b>seek [6]</b> 15/4 43/19 45/1 93/6 166/1 172/24 <b>seeking [5]</b> 48/11 70/11 90/14 126/21 144/16 <b>seem [2]</b> 12/23 120/21 <b>Seema [3]</b> 30/15 30/18 171/8 <b>seemed [2]</b> 11/18 185/13 <b>seeming [1]</b> 43/9 <b>seemingly [4]</b> 5/5 5/8 25/13 148/19 <b>seems [9]</b> 19/25 22/7 38/3 61/24 86/4 142/11 146/17 157/22 162/16 <b>seen [29]</b> 8/8 8/10 12/20 12/25 19/18 24/16 32/18 37/6 39/1 39/10 42/6 42/21 42/22 48/4 48/7 55/9 56/11 57/4 99/2 116/5 116/12 145/12 166/10 166/11 166/23 171/4 171/13 175/8 183/8 <b>Sefton [2]</b> 15/22 37/24 <b>send [1]</b> 125/21 <b>sending [1]</b> 142/22 <b>sends [2]</b> 35/5 35/13 <b>senior [2]</b> 64/14 94/17 <b>sense [6]</b> 37/11 68/12 87/14 134/24 135/16 165/10 <b>sensitive [3]</b> 177/11 177/12 180/24 <b>sent [8]</b> 56/23 56/25 60/22 159/20 159/24 161/21 168/15 184/10 <b>sentence [6]</b> 44/4 65/1 81/23 99/19 109/23 134/16 <b>sentences [2]</b> 60/6 128/3 <b>sentiments [1]</b> 31/13 <b>separate [6]</b> 20/2 32/22 58/17 158/21 159/25 180/7 <b>September [1]</b> 147/16 <b>series [5]</b> 95/9 153/6 153/9 162/17 181/2 <b>serious [2]</b> 85/18 92/17 <b>seriousness [1]</b>	57/18 <b>serve [3]</b> 125/8 125/13 131/2 <b>served [15]</b> 40/21 41/21 105/7 106/23 118/18 124/22 134/24 146/14 150/5 154/5 160/19 162/5 180/12 180/20 181/14 <b>service [6]</b> 57/11 164/8 179/8 180/18 181/4 181/5 <b>serving [1]</b> 40/14 <b>set [29]</b> 2/10 2/14 2/17 2/20 15/10 18/1 31/10 40/11 40/13 56/6 56/16 57/19 58/2 66/24 70/23 73/5 80/7 98/5 103/20 111/2 112/8 120/14 141/5 151/24 152/3 152/21 153/17 157/6 176/1 <b>setting [1]</b> 79/5 <b>settled [3]</b> 22/15 23/3 23/9 <b>seven [2]</b> 150/5 162/21 <b>Seventh [1]</b> 109/10 <b>shape [1]</b> 127/19 <b>shapes [2]</b> 125/5 167/18 <b>share [2]</b> 45/19 143/1 <b>Sharron [1]</b> 162/17 <b>she [44]</b> 22/17 22/18 24/1 35/6 60/20 61/1 62/7 62/21 83/13 85/23 89/6 95/10 103/16 104/10 104/13 112/4 115/12 115/13 115/16 115/18 115/19 115/19 115/21 115/24 116/2 116/3 116/14 117/13 117/14 117/16 118/18 118/20 119/5 120/24 122/15 122/15 122/16 124/7 124/19 145/20 145/20 145/24 150/9 167/14 <b>sheet [1]</b> 150/10 <b>short [8]</b> 46/14 55/23 59/6 91/15 147/9 181/9 181/20 182/6 <b>shortage [1]</b> 90/12 <b>shortages [4]</b> 60/25 61/12 76/13 109/3 <b>shortfall [6]</b> 15/12 82/14 92/9 92/11 109/6 110/1 <b>shortfalls [4]</b> 26/16 80/17 83/20 110/6 <b>shorthand [2]</b> 30/10 55/15 <b>shortly [3]</b> 53/7 58/21 129/3
--	--	--	---	---

<b>S</b>	100/15 100/24 101/7 107/14 113/8 116/7 116/18 117/6 142/1 142/23 143/4 143/11 147/18 149/19 149/20 151/11 158/22 159/13 160/17 <b>Singh's [1]</b> 107/5 <b>single [2]</b> 31/2 135/22 <b>sir [12]</b> 1/3 1/7 46/7 46/11 46/16 91/10 91/13 91/17 147/5 147/11 186/2 186/10 <b>sit [1]</b> 46/9 <b>situation [3]</b> 74/19 89/22 140/11 <b>sixth [1]</b> 112/20 <b>Skinner [3]</b> 3/5 66/18 67/25 <b>skip [2]</b> 40/8 111/16 <b>slapping [1]</b> 32/18 <b>slew [1]</b> 123/23 <b>slightly [4]</b> 17/5 89/8 123/21 132/7 <b>small [1]</b> 2/1 <b>smaller [3]</b> 19/8 20/22 50/23 <b>Smith [9]</b> 114/19 114/25 115/3 116/22 117/22 118/5 149/23 156/19 160/16 <b>smoke [1]</b> 138/24 <b>snuck [1]</b> 39/10 <b>so [122]</b> 4/8 7/13 7/17 7/19 8/5 11/4 11/10 13/13 13/16 14/7 14/17 16/4 17/18 19/12 19/23 19/23 20/2 20/4 20/12 21/13 22/22 23/6 23/15 24/7 24/17 29/15 32/4 33/22 36/8 37/14 37/25 38/3 38/7 38/9 38/25 39/11 39/12 40/20 44/17 47/15 47/18 49/9 50/17 52/16 54/15 54/22 55/12 56/7 56/21 59/10 59/16 61/10 62/13 62/24 68/20 69/17 70/17 72/1 74/2 76/2 76/17 76/24 77/16 79/6 81/3 81/15 82/20 83/25 85/14 90/3 90/23 91/7 96/9 98/9 99/11 99/25 100/9 100/15 101/7 110/23 112/13 115/13 117/24 122/15 125/15 126/25 127/16 128/22 130/11 132/21 133/20 140/23 141/24 142/9 143/12 144/18 145/24	150/25 153/5 153/23 156/3 156/19 159/6 161/2 161/4 165/2 166/12 176/4 177/16 179/6 179/7 179/8 180/7 180/14 181/20 182/11 182/15 182/17 182/20 183/18 183/20 185/8 <b>so-called [1]</b> 132/21 <b>software [2]</b> 155/4 155/8 <b>solely [1]</b> 78/3 <b>solicitor [7]</b> 47/12 47/13 47/17 49/11 139/2 142/22 144/5 <b>solicitors [6]</b> 7/22 39/19 39/20 109/21 126/5 143/18 <b>some [53]</b> 7/9 7/14 10/25 14/10 14/12 14/15 22/6 26/20 27/7 30/5 32/12 35/24 39/22 39/23 47/23 54/1 65/9 68/7 68/14 79/4 80/7 80/22 87/25 88/4 88/5 88/7 92/22 93/6 93/9 93/19 101/14 111/4 120/23 123/22 123/25 125/23 136/13 148/15 159/16 159/17 163/24 164/5 164/16 165/2 165/14 171/7 171/20 171/20 174/10 175/17 179/1 183/12 183/20 <b>somebody [2]</b> 148/4 148/9 <b>someone [15]</b> 26/3 31/22 42/19 43/17 45/15 61/22 70/10 72/2 76/7 86/3 127/18 129/20 135/2 136/3 136/17 <b>something [16]</b> 10/21 23/1 29/25 32/13 32/24 39/10 78/25 99/24 109/7 111/6 128/24 133/14 166/19 169/25 170/5 170/11 <b>soon [2]</b> 125/22 139/14 <b>sorry [11]</b> 32/8 90/10 103/10 108/16 145/5 149/19 159/14 162/24 173/13 173/23 178/17 <b>sort [7]</b> 4/13 8/22 18/14 53/8 117/20 164/9 164/16 <b>sorts [1]</b> 124/1 <b>sought [10]</b> 10/20 11/3 11/9 34/14 38/12 76/2 83/14 84/16	105/20 140/2 <b>sounded [1]</b> 98/19 <b>sounds [1]</b> 152/14 <b>source [2]</b> 8/4 33/5 <b>sparse [1]</b> 7/11 <b>speak [1]</b> 157/8 <b>speaking [2]</b> 72/19 182/3 <b>speaks [1]</b> 31/20 <b>specialist [1]</b> 148/10 <b>specific [26]</b> 93/7 124/10 125/4 126/8 126/10 130/4 133/8 151/17 151/17 151/18 154/18 155/3 157/16 163/18 163/25 164/22 165/19 165/20 168/6 169/13 169/14 169/17 170/8 170/9 170/9 170/10 <b>specifically [4]</b> 4/19 34/9 109/11 164/14 <b>specify [1]</b> 132/25 <b>speed [2]</b> 85/5 146/2 <b>spelt [4]</b> 26/11 70/9 72/7 127/4 <b>spend [1]</b> 168/21 <b>split [2]</b> 5/2 53/25 <b>spoken [2]</b> 122/17 164/24 <b>spread [1]</b> 150/9 <b>spreadsheet [1]</b> 151/3 <b>squarely [1]</b> 110/4 <b>staff [1]</b> 98/17 <b>stage [17]</b> 11/6 15/4 51/18 68/22 68/22 68/24 73/3 88/10 108/2 112/20 117/11 121/17 163/11 171/24 171/25 174/24 179/14 <b>stages [3]</b> 88/21 124/23 171/24 <b>stamp [1]</b> 32/5 <b>stamped [1]</b> 31/25 <b>stance [3]</b> 33/4 184/22 184/22 <b>stand [2]</b> 22/2 159/25 <b>standard [6]</b> 31/2 51/14 58/22 123/3 123/5 185/20 <b>standards [2]</b> 13/4 58/23 <b>stands [1]</b> 157/1 <b>start [12]</b> 1/23 14/1 14/21 15/2 17/2 17/5 30/6 33/20 36/6 54/1 94/11 111/9 <b>started [4]</b> 46/7 86/14 120/18 121/20 <b>starting [2]</b> 43/16 81/1 <b>starts [2]</b> 40/22 93/12 <b>state [6]</b> 8/15 11/11	63/10 146/15 146/23 165/13 <b>stated [3]</b> 131/9 165/24 166/15 <b>statement [64]</b> 4/22 38/4 40/3 40/12 40/13 40/17 40/20 41/7 41/11 42/11 42/13 58/9 58/10 99/20 99/25 101/15 109/20 109/23 110/4 111/8 115/11 117/14 121/19 130/12 130/16 131/2 133/19 134/2 134/5 137/9 137/15 137/24 140/22 141/20 142/8 142/12 144/16 144/19 144/22 154/23 155/6 157/15 157/17 158/25 159/2 159/5 159/6 160/2 160/4 160/10 161/8 161/11 161/18 161/20 162/5 162/6 163/5 163/8 163/21 163/22 164/2 164/20 165/12 165/18 <b>statement' [1]</b> 113/16 <b>statement/interviews</b> <b>[1]</b> 157/15 <b>statements [27]</b> 9/1 29/5 41/13 42/14 97/13 98/24 100/9 100/11 103/5 106/22 108/2 108/7 108/10 108/13 112/19 112/22 116/12 116/13 116/17 117/11 118/17 121/20 122/18 122/20 132/22 134/24 157/4 <b>stave [1]</b> 44/14 <b>stealing [4]</b> 60/24 61/12 109/16 115/21 <b>step [1]</b> 156/6 <b>Stephen [1]</b> 40/3 <b>steps [4]</b> 19/15 29/21 93/1 121/23 <b>Steve's [1]</b> 40/11 <b>still [5]</b> 16/12 66/23 150/25 158/3 158/15 <b>stolen [5]</b> 31/23 45/3 74/18 75/4 85/24 <b>stop [3]</b> 72/25 100/4 147/1 <b>stopped [1]</b> 99/22 <b>stopping [2]</b> 141/3 150/17 <b>story [3]</b> 33/13 35/8 37/14 <b>story' [1]</b> 37/7 <b>strands [1]</b> 15/4 <b>strategy [1]</b> 139/17 <b>strength [1]</b> 69/9 <b>stress [1]</b> 125/18 <b>stressed [1]</b> 34/22
----------	--	--	--	---

<b>S</b>	64/15 78/8 78/12 99/13 100/1 103/18 107/8 112/6 120/12 124/7 127/25 131/2 176/23 <b>suggest [8]</b> 36/9 49/23 53/6 61/9 119/16 131/22 134/13 158/7 <b>suggested [4]</b> 8/18 54/12 70/17 115/13 <b>suggesting [3]</b> 87/5 105/17 132/1 <b>suggestion [7]</b> 31/2 57/3 85/2 121/17 123/16 154/15 155/12 <b>suggests [1]</b> 112/25 <b>summaries [3]</b> 18/11 52/5 125/20 <b>summarise [3]</b> 29/15 64/12 108/24 <b>summarised [1]</b> 133/4 <b>summary [10]</b> 17/8 50/21 50/25 56/17 56/21 124/6 125/14 145/21 146/12 152/24 <b>summons [3]</b> 5/23 55/15 180/17 <b>summonses [1]</b> 5/22 <b>supervising [2]</b> 17/22 18/7 <b>supervision [4]</b> 18/9 18/15 28/14 82/16 <b>supplied [1]</b> 163/4 <b>supply [2]</b> 101/10 164/18 <b>support [4]</b> 113/18 115/5 155/19 169/1 <b>supporting [1]</b> 170/8 <b>suppose [1]</b> 112/10 <b>sure [6]</b> 69/15 75/20 79/3 79/8 131/7 136/14 <b>surprising [1]</b> 42/12 <b>Susan [1]</b> 35/6 <b>suspect [30]</b> 4/20 4/23 20/8 20/13 20/15 23/10 26/9 27/12 44/9 44/19 44/19 49/5 49/7 50/4 50/7 54/7 63/17 63/25 75/22 77/16 77/24 78/2 78/13 80/20 83/12 87/7 88/1 88/18 90/23 92/5 <b>suspect's [1]</b> 88/9 <b>suspects [3]</b> 32/22 82/13 127/12 <b>suspending [1]</b> 76/24 <b>Suzanne [2]</b> 106/15 107/3 <b>sworn [2]</b> 1/10 187/2 <b>system [130]</b> 4/18	19/14 24/22 25/24 26/1 26/18 27/10 27/16 28/2 28/9 28/14 30/24 31/20 31/21 32/23 34/25 35/1 36/8 36/23 36/25 40/11 42/2 43/21 63/21 64/2 64/4 64/9 64/10 76/1 80/18 84/18 87/11 88/19 89/10 90/25 92/6 94/7 95/1 95/18 95/23 96/16 98/1 98/14 100/22 101/6 101/10 104/6 107/19 109/12 109/24 110/5 113/2 114/10 115/20 116/24 117/16 117/19 118/1 118/23 118/25 119/7 124/11 124/22 125/2 125/5 125/11 126/10 126/19 127/6 127/21 128/1 129/19 129/21 129/24 131/12 132/10 134/11 135/6 138/9 138/13 138/14 138/23 139/1 139/4 139/6 139/22 140/3 140/13 140/23 140/25 141/21 141/22 141/25 144/1 144/18 144/25 145/3 145/17 145/22 145/23 146/9 146/13 146/17 146/18 147/25 148/3 150/15 150/15 150/21 150/24 152/11 152/25 153/11 153/20 153/21 153/24 154/4 154/13 155/6 155/20 155/25 157/7 157/20 159/4 167/16 167/18 168/7 168/10 172/5 181/18 <b>systems [2]</b> 33/1 146/20	<b>taking [5]</b> 69/21 100/5 105/23 122/7 156/6 <b>talking [4]</b> 20/12 20/19 26/4 139/19 <b>tape [2]</b> 51/5 52/3 <b>Taped [1]</b> 53/1 <b>tapes [2]</b> 51/23 185/21 <b>target [1]</b> 53/14 <b>task [2]</b> 4/2 183/11 <b>Taylor [1]</b> 105/7 <b>team [4]</b> 19/23 55/17 146/16 164/19 <b>technical [2]</b> 129/23 170/13 <b>tell [21]</b> 7/5 7/17 25/21 29/6 41/9 43/6 76/4 81/22 82/9 83/10 88/16 93/24 113/7 114/18 122/18 124/3 125/25 130/2 136/4 137/10 180/20 <b>telling [7]</b> 72/2 132/13 133/24 152/14 153/1 153/8 153/10 <b>ten [1]</b> 36/19 <b>ten years [1]</b> 36/19 <b>tend [3]</b> 69/2 71/21 131/21 <b>tends [1]</b> 49/23 <b>Tenth [1]</b> 109/15 <b>Teresa [1]</b> 95/8 <b>terminals [2]</b> 26/17 80/17 <b>terms [25]</b> 3/12 4/12 5/22 7/6 8/24 12/8 13/25 34/21 36/16 70/9 72/7 110/24 114/6 130/22 152/8 152/11 166/3 173/12 174/2 174/5 178/8 180/5 180/11 180/19 183/4 <b>test [33]</b> 5/4 31/17 56/2 57/21 59/6 65/12 65/17 66/5 66/24 66/25 67/5 67/6 67/6 67/22 68/4 68/8 68/18 68/20 69/8 71/8 73/3 73/5 74/12 75/10 112/11 118/3 119/5 127/20 150/24 170/4 174/12 174/21 175/7 <b>testing [4]</b> 26/23 117/24 127/16 127/19 <b>tests [1]</b> 71/12 <b>text [4]</b> 41/3 99/11 140/22 159/17 <b>than [62]</b> 12/20 14/3 16/23 17/17 21/13 21/14 22/8 22/9 26/23 29/9 32/5 32/8 32/12 36/22 38/15 45/16	45/24 50/20 50/25 57/9 58/22 61/1 61/13 68/9 68/13 70/9 70/24 72/17 76/3 79/1 88/12 90/2 100/13 110/16 114/16 118/4 122/12 126/5 127/16 131/11 132/7 133/22 141/11 141/21 142/2 142/8 143/23 144/1 144/5 144/11 144/18 145/1 145/23 146/18 149/15 153/8 157/13 168/7 168/18 176/3 178/24 183/13 <b>thank [62]</b> 1/5 1/7 1/17 3/11 8/14 8/23 13/1 14/21 17/2 22/10 24/23 30/9 33/7 39/7 39/25 40/19 43/5 46/6 46/11 46/18 46/19 48/18 50/13 53/23 54/3 60/5 65/16 73/8 79/24 80/11 81/3 88/13 91/8 91/13 91/19 91/20 92/4 97/17 99/12 104/25 111/23 111/23 118/7 119/8 119/10 123/18 147/7 147/12 147/13 148/7 158/23 163/17 166/13 168/12 170/20 170/24 173/8 183/3 186/2 186/7 186/10 186/12 <b>Thanks [1]</b> 37/4 <b>that [1130]</b> <b>that I [2]</b> 4/9 57/22 <b>that's [56]</b> 1/23 3/1 3/2 7/16 8/3 9/4 17/24 32/23 29/13 29/17 33/4 35/9 38/8 39/15 40/20 40/21 43/21 46/10 54/22 59/17 65/21 71/6 76/3 77/9 81/18 88/15 90/8 93/17 94/24 95/24 96/20 97/2 97/3 97/18 97/24 105/2 106/13 111/12 111/12 111/19 114/7 114/11 116/7 121/11 128/18 147/19 155/20 163/7 163/20 166/3 167/21 168/16 173/1 179/11 181/1 184/22 <b>theft [35]</b> 5/16 43/18 45/16 56/10 56/13 59/19 60/21 61/22 62/21 62/23 67/10 67/13 67/18 69/23 69/24 70/4 70/6 70/21 74/9 75/11 75/19 76/23 77/1 77/6 83/23
----------	--	--	---	--



<b>T</b>	52/13 53/19 59/4 62/20 63/3 63/22 64/2 66/6 69/2 70/8 70/14 70/23 72/8 73/8 73/9 73/20 75/22 79/7 84/22 85/24 86/4 86/19 92/9 93/24 94/10 94/19 95/6 95/9 96/9 101/20 104/13 107/7 107/12 107/13 108/4 108/6 109/5 109/22 111/3 112/21 112/24 113/19 115/1 115/23 119/4 121/20 125/12 125/23 126/12 131/11 134/13 138/21 139/18 139/20 140/4 140/14 143/4 145/11 146/3 146/6 146/14 147/2 148/8 148/15 151/6 155/8 157/17 158/21 159/9 160/16 161/15 162/23 163/15 163/16 164/11 168/9 168/22 169/3 169/3 169/11 170/3 174/1 176/1 176/25 178/1	68/12 136/15 155/5 158/21 166/11 175/9 <b>they've [4]</b> 21/24 21/24 86/9 124/11 <b>thing [6]</b> 48/8 72/3 76/4 95/24 132/14 136/21 <b>things [20]</b> 21/9 32/23 49/2 58/2 58/14 61/21 69/25 73/2 75/5 75/25 76/18 85/8 87/18 117/13 131/20 133/22 149/14 177/10 182/9 185/17 <b>think [71]</b> 2/24 5/23 7/17 7/20 18/3 21/25 22/22 23/17 23/18 27/17 30/13 30/20 31/4 32/20 35/8 37/11 39/12 40/4 41/1 42/17 47/16 47/22 48/6 48/8 49/13 50/22 52/19 54/4 54/13 55/12 57/12 57/18 59/1 59/1 59/4 60/12 61/3 71/14 73/22 75/16 77/22 79/8 79/9 81/22 86/13 86/16 92/21 93/12 94/13 94/20 95/11 96/5 98/23 103/24 109/19 122/22 133/25 136/23 137/25 145/8 151/16 154/20 159/24 163/7 163/20 163/24 166/10 166/23 167/21 174/24 179/4 <b>thinking [2]</b> 78/25 147/20 <b>third [19]</b> 23/1 71/6 73/8 74/5 90/7 91/9 91/22 91/24 103/11 115/10 122/25 166/1 170/25 171/22 171/23 172/3 172/13 172/23 176/21 <b>third-party [2]</b> 170/25 171/22 <b>thirdly [2]</b> 18/6 84/15 <b>this [212]</b> <b>this/these [1]</b> 156/21 <b>Thomas [4]</b> 47/10 47/11 67/15 149/21 <b>thorough [3]</b> 5/12 65/5 65/7 <b>those [64]</b> 4/22 9/10 10/2 12/13 13/9 14/9 16/10 16/14 16/22 20/24 22/2 25/8 26/9 27/14 28/10 32/25 38/20 40/3 45/17 48/10 54/21 57/22 58/14 58/18 58/20 60/14 61/16 62/11 69/4 69/25 71/21	73/23 76/17 83/7 83/19 84/22 85/8 87/18 88/4 93/6 94/11 94/21 95/14 108/7 110/14 112/21 113/22 133/2 138/22 141/10 145/21 145/24 147/1 152/7 154/24 160/11 161/24 166/8 170/1 170/2 175/5 177/13 178/10 186/8 <b>though [4]</b> 60/21 82/6 101/7 112/12 <b>thought [8]</b> 43/2 48/16 75/5 77/9 156/5 163/22 165/18 167/7 <b>thoughts [1]</b> 148/5 <b>thousands [1]</b> 146/25 <b>threads [1]</b> 64/24 <b>three [7]</b> 22/11 36/11 60/6 83/1 108/8 109/12 177/13 <b>threshold [2]</b> 68/14 69/7 <b>through [16]</b> 13/14 14/17 27/7 30/25 32/22 32/25 44/22 58/3 58/4 115/2 138/4 142/8 168/18 169/1 182/14 184/3 <b>throughout [1]</b> 105/12 <b>thrown [2]</b> 90/21 157/14 <b>thus [1]</b> 150/12 <b>tidy [1]</b> 159/16 <b>tidying [1]</b> 108/11 <b>time [48]</b> 10/22 10/23 11/4 11/8 12/4 12/14 13/5 13/11 14/16 14/19 16/20 16/23 19/22 22/16 32/12 38/19 39/11 42/21 45/23 46/7 47/17 51/21 60/12 63/8 69/11 69/20 72/1 74/24 88/1 90/23 93/9 96/25 102/20 106/7 115/16 116/14 121/22 127/22 134/4 136/5 136/13 164/7 165/4 165/8 168/21 174/16 178/24 181/24 <b>times [3]</b> 15/14 30/12 174/25 <b>timescale [1]</b> 148/12 <b>timing [2]</b> 41/14 148/15 <b>Timothy [1]</b> 105/7 <b>title [2]</b> 30/17 33/23 <b>today [1]</b> 14/15 <b>together [7]</b> 15/5 27/18 35/9 56/22	64/24 73/25 154/8 <b>told [16]</b> 22/17 22/18 26/5 39/6 60/12 63/2 63/8 72/23 77/10 88/3 98/18 119/2 136/17 136/20 149/16 184/11 <b>tomorrow [5]</b> 14/16 14/16 14/17 136/22 186/9 <b>tone [1]</b> 35/25 <b>tones [1]</b> 148/22 <b>too [3]</b> 59/17 148/2 152/21 <b>took [8]</b> 8/6 8/12 10/19 10/22 38/3 56/16 104/10 184/13 <b>top [7]</b> 30/8 47/8 52/19 79/9 145/6 145/11 155/21 <b>topic [23]</b> 5/24 14/2 14/2 14/8 15/6 17/2 24/23 38/1 42/18 46/21 46/21 46/23 53/23 53/24 71/6 72/13 79/25 91/23 91/23 170/24 171/9 173/8 186/3 <b>topic 4 [1]</b> 53/23 <b>topic 7 [1]</b> 173/8 <b>topic 8 [1]</b> 186/3 <b>topics [3]</b> 7/15 42/8 42/10 <b>total [1]</b> 150/11 <b>touched [3]</b> 45/23 136/2 152/5 <b>track [2]</b> 36/13 61/3 <b>trail [2]</b> 137/24 164/17 <b>training [10]</b> 83/3 88/16 88/20 88/23 89/16 89/21 89/21 89/25 89/25 156/7 <b>trains [1]</b> 36/21 <b>transaction [3]</b> 29/8 110/13 128/17 <b>transcript [7]</b> 50/16 50/25 51/4 51/12 51/25 52/3 177/23 <b>transcripts [1]</b> 22/23 <b>transparency [1]</b> 25/8 <b>treated [2]</b> 8/2 134/23 <b>trend [2]</b> 82/19 83/1 <b>trial [18]</b> 26/4 30/15 30/19 51/17 53/7 85/3 96/6 106/8 106/25 108/5 121/18 124/25 125/19 129/4 157/21 162/19 162/22 174/11 <b>tried [2]</b> 13/18 42/3 <b>troubling [1]</b> 56/14 <b>true [5]</b> 2/3 3/8 41/16 42/5 113/23
----------	---	---	---	---



<p><b>T</b></p> <p><b>trump</b> [1] 75/3</p> <p><b>trust</b> [4] 70/22 74/9 74/19 75/12</p> <p><b>truth</b> [1] 154/21</p> <p><b>try</b> [3] 17/16 84/17 157/13</p> <p><b>Tuesday</b> [1] 159/24</p> <p><b>turn</b> [23] 24/23 25/21 33/8 46/23 49/14 60/4 65/11 71/7 73/8 79/25 83/7 84/21 88/13 90/7 91/22 102/4 105/1 106/12 118/7 122/8 149/18 170/24 173/8</p> <p><b>turned</b> [1] 52/24</p> <p><b>turning</b> [1] 123/21</p> <p><b>turns</b> [1] 141/4</p> <p><b>tweaked</b> [1] 157/17</p> <p><b>tweaking</b> [1] 36/9</p> <p><b>two</b> [17] 1/20 3/4 22/8 22/23 36/12 52/25 69/25 94/3 94/10 110/17 128/3 135/19 158/18 161/6 171/24 177/1 182/15</p> <p><b>two paragraphs</b> [1] 177/1</p> <p><b>tying</b> [1] 45/14</p> <p><b>type</b> [4] 58/9 74/19 90/20 150/18</p> <p><b>types</b> [1] 146/24</p> <p><b>typing</b> [1] 154/13</p>	<p>181/12</p> <p><b>undermine</b> [6] 23/12 58/12 142/6 144/15 175/3 175/21</p> <p><b>undermined</b> [5] 20/17 24/1 70/2 137/13 185/16</p> <p><b>undermines</b> [1] 21/25</p> <p><b>undermining</b> [4] 41/24 134/9 141/15 144/13</p> <p><b>underpinned</b> [1] 168/10</p> <p><b>understand</b> [36] 14/19 21/17 32/25 37/11 37/14 37/19 45/22 45/23 49/8 49/25 53/12 72/5 89/9 90/20 91/4 96/22 98/20 100/24 101/2 121/3 126/22 127/9 127/12 127/20 129/18 129/18 129/23 139/24 140/10 149/5 150/2 151/11 160/8 161/21 162/11 164/3</p> <p><b>understanding</b> [10] 2/10 2/17 29/25 49/12 62/24 101/14 117/25 126/18 129/16 140/1</p> <p><b>understood</b> [8] 15/8 27/25 37/21 48/25 85/1 149/13 163/18 165/11</p> <p><b>undertake</b> [5] 23/25 34/2 92/15 128/13 130/20</p> <p><b>undertaken</b> [8] 4/2 18/3 29/22 34/8 34/12 118/11 119/11 183/11</p> <p><b>undertaking</b> [3] 17/11 17/13 78/18</p> <p><b>unexplained</b> [5] 83/14 83/18 85/7 92/6 126/21</p> <p><b>unfortunate</b> [1] 130/5</p> <p><b>unfounded</b> [3] 110/21 140/24 141/11</p> <p><b>unidentified</b> [3] 105/10 105/18 105/21</p> <p><b>unless</b> [3] 42/17 129/15 157/14</p> <p><b>unlikely</b> [3] 135/8 146/23 148/14</p> <p><b>unpalatable</b> [1] 142/25</p> <p><b>unprecedented</b> [1] 30/23</p> <p><b>unreasonable</b> [3] 12/24 13/22 59/5</p> <p><b>unrepresented</b> [1] 50/8</p> <p><b>unrung</b> [1] 138/19</p>	<p><b>unsettling</b> [2] 15/20 15/25</p> <p><b>until</b> [14] 26/12 46/8 46/9 65/21 65/22 66/3 84/19 138/12 139/12 139/19 139/25 147/5 162/21 186/14</p> <p><b>untrue</b> [1] 115/18</p> <p><b>unused</b> [19] 6/16 173/9 174/4 175/8 175/13 176/10 176/11 177/11 177/12 177/18 177/25 178/8 180/24 182/11 182/18 182/20 182/24 182/25 183/7</p> <p><b>unusual</b> [1] 57/14</p> <p><b>up</b> [63] 2/7 15/1 25/21 27/19 29/3 30/7 32/13 33/8 35/1 35/4 35/12 36/1 36/1 36/3 37/3 42/16 42/20 42/22 42/23 49/14 52/24 53/25 60/4 60/24 61/12 65/15 76/1 76/2 77/4 79/5 87/11 90/21 92/23 95/23 104/17 108/11 124/16 124/17 138/11 139/25 143/4 146/2 147/3 148/8 148/13 154/1 156/18 158/21 159/11 159/16 160/16 160/25 162/19 162/23 163/3 163/16 164/11 167/10 168/12 168/22 169/3 176/22 181/7</p> <p><b>updated</b> [1] 110/18</p> <p><b>upon</b> [7] 26/22 86/5 104/8 106/8 154/3 156/22 179/8</p> <p><b>urgent</b> [2] 149/24 150/3</p> <p><b>us</b> [38] 1/4 1/14 4/2 7/5 7/17 25/21 26/5 29/6 29/13 29/13 29/14 32/17 35/19 43/6 46/17 49/14 52/25 60/12 81/22 82/9 83/10 88/16 93/23 93/24 101/9 101/10 113/7 114/18 122/18 124/3 125/25 130/2 139/4 140/5 147/11 157/14 179/12 180/20</p> <p><b>use</b> [10] 15/25 34/7 42/11 42/13 43/1 44/23 45/19 132/21 168/14 169/9</p> <p><b>used</b> [7] 26/2 33/6 35/1 43/22 114/3 126/3 181/4</p> <p><b>uses</b> [1] 120/11</p> <p><b>using</b> [4] 45/24 45/25</p>	<p>55/14 90/24</p> <p><b>Usual</b> [1] 165/1</p> <p><b>usually</b> [10] 43/22 44/8 56/20 58/4 58/5 99/22 115/7 174/3 174/4 181/14</p> <p><b>Utting</b> [1] 177/21</p>	<p><b>Volume 1</b> [3] 25/1 26/5 72/15</p> <p><b>Volume 1A</b> [1] 136/2</p> <p><b>Volume 2</b> [8] 1/23 14/24 25/11 26/20 33/9 43/6 80/21 166/5</p> <p><b>Volume 2A</b> [3] 3/2 43/8 68/1</p> <p><b>Volumes</b> [3] 1/21 3/16 4/3</p> <p><b>Volumes 1</b> [1] 3/16</p> <p><b>Volumes 2</b> [1] 4/3</p> <p><b>voluntary</b> [3] 43/23 76/17 77/11</p> <p><b>volunteering</b> [1] 133/14</p>
<p><b>U</b></p> <p><b>UK</b> [2] 36/25 150/14</p> <p><b>ultimately</b> [3] 47/17 87/13 109/25</p> <p><b>unable</b> [3] 62/23 125/3 167/16</p> <p><b>unable/not</b> [2] 125/3 167/16</p> <p><b>unbiased</b> [1] 162/8</p> <p><b>unclear</b> [4] 18/6 129/4 155/8 163/11</p> <p><b>unconventional</b> [1] 169/6</p> <p><b>under</b> [24] 5/19 13/6 13/8 13/20 16/9 17/17 26/6 45/25 50/15 62/9 66/21 71/6 72/20 74/24 145/25 162/2 165/13 172/20 173/2 174/12 176/25 179/15 183/24 183/25</p> <p><b>underline</b> [2] 74/14 86/1</p> <p><b>underlined</b> [1] 91/2</p> <p><b>underlines</b> [1] 152/19</p> <p><b>underlying</b> [8] 8/16 56/5 92/12 124/13 131/3 132/3 173/16</p>			<p><b>V</b></p> <p><b>vague</b> [1] 121/16</p> <p><b>vanish</b> [1] 157/20</p> <p><b>varied</b> [3] 7/6 57/22 65/18</p> <p><b>varies</b> [1] 183/20</p> <p><b>various</b> [10] 12/2 16/19 25/11 32/25 44/12 124/23 131/5 131/5 134/25 166/4</p> <p><b>vehicle</b> [1] 79/12</p> <p><b>verse</b> [2] 127/23 170/13</p> <p><b>version</b> [4] 53/6 82/5 110/18 185/19</p> <p><b>versions</b> [2] 52/25 110/17</p> <p><b>versus</b> [1] 52/3</p> <p><b>very</b> [41] 3/11 7/11 7/13 8/23 21/7 22/2 22/15 27/23 33/4 38/4 45/13 45/24 46/6 46/11 50/19 54/16 55/23 61/5 68/15 69/15 71/3 76/11 88/6 91/8 91/13 91/20 115/5 129/17 136/6 138/12 149/24 153/19 154/7 154/22 156/3 172/25 180/4 180/10 182/6 186/7 186/10</p> <p><b>view</b> [35] 11/16 12/1 13/17 21/10 28/1 31/16 31/19 32/16 32/21 33/2 39/3 41/13 43/12 44/25 59/13 63/1 63/13 82/23 88/11 117/2 126/12 131/25 133/7 136/16 141/9 143/1 143/8 143/15 151/13 155/19 157/19 167/1 167/5 183/23 185/6</p> <p><b>viewed</b> [1] 148/2</p> <p><b>viewpoint</b> [2] 150/23 152/20</p> <p><b>viewpoints</b> [1] 19/14</p> <p><b>views</b> [1] 137/14</p> <p><b>viral</b> [1] 139/1</p> <p><b>vital</b> [1] 17/17</p> <p><b>vitiated</b> [1] 70/2</p> <p><b>Volume</b> [15] 1/23 3/2 14/24 25/1 25/11 26/5 26/20 33/9 43/6 43/8 68/1 72/15 80/21 136/2 166/5</p>	<p><b>W</b></p> <p><b>wait</b> [3] 14/25 47/13 92/25</p> <p><b>waiting</b> [1] 1/6</p> <p><b>want</b> [7] 70/12 83/7 87/7 89/9 123/24 145/15 161/5</p> <p><b>wanted</b> [1] 47/6</p> <p><b>was</b> [588]</p> <p><b>wasn't</b> [24] 17/20 21/13 24/18 53/16 61/10 62/12 69/15 79/6 104/24 110/14 110/21 122/24 127/1 129/19 130/9 131/22 131/23 133/17 154/2 166/12 167/7 170/12 180/4 182/5</p> <p><b>way</b> [33] 3/16 10/24 16/12 18/19 27/24 36/5 36/17 37/20 49/11 52/22 56/8 60/19 61/24 66/9 72/16 75/15 89/9 89/14 114/15 118/2 132/11 152/2 153/23 162/8 166/22 169/6 170/18 173/9 175/16 178/6 182/6 183/17 184/18</p> <p><b>ways</b> [3] 16/25 66/24 77/8</p> <p><b>we</b> [209]</p> <p><b>we'd</b> [1] 145/12</p> <p><b>we'll</b> [7] 27/12 29/9 61/4 99/8 107/4 137/25 142/10</p> <p><b>we're</b> [8] 4/7 26/8 32/9 40/14 61/3 122/7 131/14 136/22</p> <p><b>we've</b> [6] 32/19 46/20 99/18 123/23 152/4 177/21</p> <p><b>weak</b> [1] 69/3</p> <p><b>wealth</b> [1] 8/9</p> <p><b>wear</b> [1] 139/20</p> <p><b>week</b> [4] 8/10 35/10</p>

<b>W</b>	148/18 149/12 152/4	156/4 159/21 162/25	60/23 60/25 62/14	<b>whilst [3]</b> 67/8
<b>week... [2]</b> 49/2 163/5	152/7 153/7 153/23	163/25 164/3 165/11	62/15 64/6 65/4 68/4	115/20 122/7
<b>weekend [1]</b> 39/11	154/12 154/20 157/24	165/21 167/2 167/17	68/19 75/6 76/15	<b>who [52]</b> 9/2 15/11
<b>weeks [2]</b> 94/3	159/20 159/22 161/25	170/13 173/21 175/24	76/16 77/13 78/10	17/16 17/22 18/6
139/18	169/21 169/24 170/1	178/4 180/4 180/5	78/11 79/21 80/15	18/15 20/6 20/13
<b>weigh [1]</b> 87/19	170/2 172/17 173/22	180/8 180/11 180/15	80/16 82/21 82/21	20/13 20/16 20/25
<b>weighing [3]</b> 76/6	174/5 174/7 174/9	180/17 180/19 182/7	83/21 83/23 84/23	21/23 22/4 23/21
76/9 76/20	175/24 177/25 178/20	183/24 184/5	85/23 86/5 86/21	24/11 31/22 32/9
<b>weight [1]</b> 69/3	180/20 181/7 181/9	<b>whatever [1]</b> 70/25	87/18 87/19 88/2	35/14 38/8 39/19
<b>Welcome [1]</b> 149/25	181/20 182/1 182/9	<b>when [40]</b> 5/5 5/9	88/24 89/7 89/10	42/15 45/15 48/14
<b>well [27]</b> 6/18 21/21	182/11 183/20 183/21	8/15 13/9 27/17 29/7	89/12 90/1 90/13	48/15 54/6 54/16
28/5 34/10 38/15 42/3	184/1 184/9 185/10	35/1 36/25 37/9 37/16	90/20 91/5 91/6 91/10	54/17 54/20 54/23
42/14 45/6 50/6 56/15	<b>weren't [4]</b> 24/3	37/25 38/12 44/14	94/6 95/22 100/11	60/14 63/7 63/25
61/17 68/2 71/3 71/22	28/25 75/14 86/24	46/4 48/6 49/4 54/10	100/12 101/11 104/18	68/14 69/19 72/23
85/3 98/4 114/6 132/7	<b>what [184]</b> 5/22 6/2	61/16 65/22 70/5	106/8 111/9 113/22	90/17 104/15 121/19
136/2 138/17 141/6	8/18 10/7 10/22 11/17	72/14 72/21 78/18	115/24 117/25 119/5	127/18 128/23 133/7
142/1 149/12 154/7	11/22 11/24 12/3	90/24 92/8 107/14	122/22 123/1 123/13	133/17 133/19 135/2
155/16 173/1 182/9	12/24 13/6 13/19	120/17 126/20 134/24	126/3 127/21 131/12	136/17 143/18 143/22
<b>went [4]</b> 61/22 90/4	13/19 13/20 14/16	134/25 135/18 137/14	138/17 141/12 142/6	152/7 153/20 163/12
104/13 121/18	15/25 16/17 17/8	138/12 139/16 145/20	144/18 145/2 148/1	174/3 181/8
<b>were [174]</b> 6/2 8/11	17/21 19/19 20/23	154/25 166/15 180/16	148/5 153/13 154/23	<b>who'd [2]</b> 32/10
8/15 9/20 10/25 11/6	21/1 21/1 21/17 23/22	180/20 185/9	166/1 168/1 174/14	56/20
13/15 14/1 15/21	24/1 29/7 29/8 29/16	<b>whenever [1]</b> 88/3	174/19 174/22 178/14	<b>whole [4]</b> 57/24
16/12 16/19 17/11	30/1 32/7 32/16 32/20	<b>where [88]</b> 4/19 4/22	184/18 184/25 186/4	76/14 147/25 152/1
17/12 17/25 18/3	37/11 38/10 38/10	7/17 8/6 10/16 12/17	<b>which [118]</b> 2/20 4/4	<b>whom [1]</b> 110/22
18/11 19/20 20/19	38/11 38/14 38/16	12/20 12/23 17/18	5/11 6/15 6/18 8/12	<b>whose [2]</b> 15/12
24/20 26/22 26/22	38/18 38/19 38/20	17/20 23/7 24/2 26/21	9/8 9/13 11/3 17/10	42/20
27/21 27/24 28/6 28/8	38/21 41/13 42/23	27/24 29/2 38/5 42/3	17/10 17/12 18/13	<b>why [21]</b> 23/18 42/12
28/15 28/17 28/19	42/24 42/25 43/21	43/16 44/10 45/2	18/24 19/2 21/15 27/1	44/11 48/16 49/8
29/3 29/15 29/22 31/1	49/9 49/12 51/3 54/17	45/21 47/9 47/11 48/8	27/12 28/19 28/22	55/21 68/23 74/16
31/4 38/20 39/19 44/6	54/25 55/2 55/25 56/2	50/7 50/24 55/24 56/8	30/11 31/4 31/17	84/5 85/14 86/11 87/7
44/15 45/25 47/5 49/8	56/2 56/3 56/10 56/11	56/10 59/7 60/10	31/24 33/12 33/15	87/24 126/22 127/5
49/9 50/8 50/9 53/12	57/7 59/19 59/24	63/16 64/20 64/22	34/3 35/8 41/15 41/23	127/9 130/25 134/19
54/10 54/17 55/17	59/25 61/23 62/3	66/23 69/5 72/25 73/5	46/23 47/9 47/20 49/1	140/23 141/10 185/8
55/23 56/9 57/15	62/10 62/10 70/5 72/6	74/7 74/17 74/20	49/3 51/18 52/21	<b>wide [3]</b> 149/5
58/15 58/23 60/14	72/6 75/17 77/6 77/9	75/21 77/4 78/6 80/19	53/24 57/19 57/20	155/23 156/2
61/20 61/24 62/15	83/1 84/25 85/2 85/12	83/12 84/14 84/15	62/22 65/11 65/15	<b>wide-ranging [2]</b>
63/2 63/16 65/5 65/7	85/12 86/19 87/3 87/8	84/16 84/19 85/11	75/13 77/16 77/24	155/23 156/2
65/9 67/10 67/11	88/24 89/3 89/11	87/8 87/10 88/8 88/18	80/1 82/4 82/11 82/14	<b>wider [2]</b> 118/3
69/17 70/1 70/7 70/8	89/14 89/16 89/24	89/19 90/17 90/23	86/14 89/10 94/7	170/25
70/11 70/19 72/15	90/14 90/16 90/25	92/5 96/20 102/13	96/14 97/21 98/23	<b>will [52]</b> 13/17 14/15
72/23 73/13 74/22	91/2 92/8 92/10 94/2	104/21 106/13 110/14	99/4 102/8 104/8	14/19 19/7 31/10 32/2
74/25 74/25 75/12	94/17 95/24 96/21	119/21 123/22 123/24	105/8 106/1 108/22	34/8 34/14 36/4 43/25
76/14 76/22 77/14	98/19 98/21 100/25	123/25 127/18 128/19	115/17 115/18 116/7	44/1 69/3 93/8 103/15
77/15 77/23 81/6	101/22 102/15 104/22	129/12 136/19 136/24	116/17 116/24 117/2	115/24 125/19 133/20
81/11 82/10 82/14	107/1 108/24 109/22	140/25 141/8 141/13	117/22 123/19 123/22	138/20 138/24 139/3
82/15 82/16 84/13	110/24 114/5 115/3	145/21 160/5 166/5	124/24 128/12 131/8	139/9 139/10 139/13
86/16 87/10 87/13	117/7 117/16 119/5	171/8 173/1 181/8	132/12 132/14 133/8	139/15 139/16 139/20
87/18 87/20 88/3	119/22 121/3 122/8	181/17 181/19 183/16	134/8 135/8 135/12	139/22 140/1 140/3
89/12 89/14 89/16	122/19 125/4 126/18	183/21 184/1 184/9	135/21 135/22 137/8	140/4 140/9 140/12
90/22 91/3 91/6 94/6	126/19 126/24 127/4	<b>whereas [2]</b> 72/7	137/24 139/9 139/23	142/25 144/20 145/16
94/13 96/2 96/5 96/16	127/12 127/14 127/24	129/20	140/17 140/22 147/22	146/1 146/4 148/14
97/13 97/25 98/14	128/21 129/4 129/22	<b>whether [112]</b> 2/14	148/22 152/15 152/21	151/2 151/23 156/23
98/17 98/25 103/5	131/10 131/14 131/21	2/20 6/11 6/12 6/16	153/6 154/2 154/9	157/12 159/4 160/4
104/14 106/22 110/17	131/25 133/12 133/21	8/18 9/20 14/11 20/7	156/22 160/1 163/2	160/20 160/23 163/12
116/18 117/25 118/17	134/7 134/22 136/1	20/8 20/16 21/23	163/12 167/1 168/6	163/13 164/6 177/2
118/22 118/23 119/3	136/4 136/9 136/18	23/17 24/12 24/20	169/25 170/2 170/18	177/4 186/8
122/18 123/1 126/23	137/3 137/5 142/25	24/21 26/16 28/1 28/8	170/25 171/2 172/8	<b>willing [2]</b> 125/3
128/7 128/16 128/23	143/15 143/24 143/25	28/9 28/11 28/20	172/17 173/10 175/9	167/17
129/12 131/5 132/5	145/15 147/3 147/3	29/24 33/19 38/23	175/21 179/13 179/20	<b>Wilson [3]</b> 3/5 66/19
133/9 133/19 134/24	149/11 151/11 152/3	40/22 43/12 44/1	179/20 182/3 183/24	121/7
135/8 135/22 136/17	152/14 153/1 153/4	44/25 45/17 50/4	184/6 184/13	<b>Wilson's [1]</b> 120/8
136/18 136/19 140/13	153/5 153/9 154/11	51/23 52/2 54/23 57/1	<b>while [3]</b> 93/8 131/14	<b>wish [1]</b> 150/25
	154/15 155/10 155/12	58/14 58/15 60/11	169/22	<b>within [11]</b> 2/21 20/9

<b>W</b>	57/19 58/2 58/7 58/11	136/6
<b>within... [9]</b> 20/19	58/14 58/15 58/17	<b>yes [307]</b>
20/25 35/15 50/6	58/19 63/12 63/15	<b>yet [7]</b> 23/10 44/19
134/1 150/5 162/9	63/22 63/23 64/4	128/9 145/18 146/10
185/11 185/18	64/14 64/16 65/24	146/15 152/12
<b>without [15]</b> 57/3	68/3 69/10 70/15	<b>you [460]</b>
81/24 103/24 104/19	70/20 71/21 72/4	<b>you'd [1]</b> 76/24
117/10 118/6 138/24	74/10 74/20 74/21	<b>you'll [9]</b> 30/20 30/21
140/2 144/21 146/19	75/5 75/5 75/13 76/4	39/13 39/18 41/1
161/24 163/13 176/3	76/18 77/1 77/4 77/5	59/10 72/13 137/20
176/14 176/16	77/7 77/17 78/12	145/8
<b>witness [32]</b> 3/6 9/1	83/15 84/22 84/24	<b>you're [17]</b> 11/13
40/13 40/16 40/19	86/8 87/7 87/16 87/17	22/22 23/6 44/2 49/13
41/7 41/11 41/12	87/19 88/22 89/9	87/4 93/13 96/11
42/11 42/13 42/14	89/15 89/18 89/23	106/13 108/18 108/23
97/12 98/24 103/4	91/4 94/18 100/7	111/4 133/25 136/23
106/21 118/17 132/1	100/15 100/25 101/13	154/7 160/9 168/1
135/14 149/8 154/17	101/19 101/23 103/24	<b>you've [15]</b> 1/20 2/21
156/8 157/5 160/2	110/3 113/9 113/10	4/2 7/20 8/25 23/18
160/4 160/10 161/8	116/17 117/18 117/19	23/18 23/19 29/21
161/17 161/20 163/5	120/22 123/3 125/8	29/22 33/3 59/20
163/8 163/20 164/3	125/13 128/11 130/7	95/25 128/2 176/1
<b>witness's [1]</b> 2/8	130/19 131/10 131/18	<b>your [118]</b> 1/15 1/21
<b>witnesses [5]</b> 9/2	132/10 132/13 133/2	2/4 2/10 2/10 2/17
96/5 162/18 163/11	138/6 138/25 144/17	2/17 2/21 3/9 3/12
163/12	144/19 144/22 144/22	3/16 3/17 4/3 7/5 7/18
<b>woefully [1]</b> 156/9	145/1 148/9 148/11	8/14 8/24 9/16 10/1
<b>won [1]</b> 32/19	148/19 152/16 153/5	12/2 12/3 12/8 13/1
<b>won't [1]</b> 29/16	153/5 153/19 154/8	14/7 14/22 16/1 18/22
<b>wonder [3]</b> 33/19	154/9 154/10 154/15	20/1 20/2 22/23 25/1
91/10 186/4	154/20 154/22 155/2	25/6 25/11 26/5 26/20
<b>word [2]</b> 15/25 26/2	155/12 155/22 156/3	27/5 29/20 31/16 33/8
<b>wording [3]</b> 36/10	156/5 156/8 161/1	33/9 39/25 41/13 43/6
65/2 161/2	161/24 164/23 165/13	43/8 47/20 47/24
<b>words [10]</b> 27/17	169/16 169/18 170/15	50/13 54/2 57/10
33/10 35/24 73/24	171/19 171/25 175/5	57/12 60/4 63/13
112/13 134/16 157/9	175/11 175/11 175/12	65/19 66/1 71/10
161/21 161/24 162/11	175/16 175/17 175/24	77/12 80/6 80/21
<b>work [3]</b> 17/16 30/25	178/5 178/20 178/22	80/25 82/23 83/10
36/23	182/2 182/15 182/17	92/2 92/21 93/5 93/11
<b>worked [6]</b> 129/17	<b>wouldn't [8]</b> 48/7	95/8 96/9 97/5 97/19
129/19 133/23 134/11	48/22 49/5 59/17 70/8	102/4 102/5 102/22
135/7 141/25	75/3 129/22 155/7	105/2 105/3 106/9
<b>working [11]</b> 34/25	<b>wrinkle [1]</b> 47/18	106/13 108/17 111/17
43/4 55/9 63/21 100/8	<b>writing [2]</b> 2/11 82/7	113/4 114/17 118/8
105/12 113/10 127/21	<b>written [5]</b> 56/21	119/8 119/10 119/18
129/20 142/1 145/3	87/23 148/23 153/17	120/19 122/1 123/19
<b>workings [1]</b> 56/8	171/20	124/20 125/7 125/13
<b>works [2]</b> 37/4 42/3	<b>wrong [8]</b> 61/24 72/9	125/21 125/24 126/12
<b>world [1]</b> 23/7	90/15 111/12 114/12	129/9 129/25 132/20
<b>worth [3]</b> 48/16 50/20	126/19 131/10 146/22	148/4 149/25 149/25
143/1	<b>wrongdoing [1]</b>	150/3 151/4 154/21
<b>would [158]</b> 13/4	115/25	158/23 158/24 159/1
19/3 19/9 20/11 24/5	<b>Wylie [4]</b> 39/15 39/20	159/2 159/5 165/23
24/6 26/14 26/15	137/22 143/7	166/4 166/14 169/8
29/15 29/23 34/2	<b>Y</b>	169/13 169/18 171/1
38/10 38/10 38/11	<b>Yates [2]</b> 15/24 96/21	173/10 179/12 180/21
38/11 39/5 41/13	<b>Yates' [5]</b> 96/12	183/5
41/23 48/1 48/3 49/11	96/18 97/1 97/9 97/15	<b>yourself [5]</b> 9/6 9/6
50/11 50/16 50/20	<b>Yeah [1]</b> 54/9	9/19 40/22 125/16
50/24 50/24 51/1	<b>year [4]</b> 1/19 49/19	
51/10 51/15 51/16	124/25 177/22	
52/2 52/13 53/8 54/14	<b>years [3]</b> 16/25 36/19	