

From: Owain Draper <[redacted] GRO>
To: Andrew Parsons <[redacted] GRO>, Gideon Cohen <[redacted] GRO>, Dave Panaech <[redacted] GRO>, Mandy Robertson <[redacted] GRO>, Amy Prime <[redacted] GRO>, Victoria Brooks <[redacted] GRO>
Cc: David Cavender <[redacted] GRO>

Subject: Re: Examination in chief

Date: Tue, 13 Nov 2018 22:13:05 +0000

Importance: Normal

Inline-Images: image001.png; image002.png; image003.png

Sure – we will knock up some submissions tomorrow on this point.

The key points are (1) the manuals in all relevant periods make clear that amounts settled centrally can be disputed and (2) the Lead Claimants did in fact settle centrally and dispute. Ultimately, therefore, the rules were clear and the Lead Claimants acted consistently with having known the rules. Any suggestion now that they did not know that they could dispute is self-serving and can be rejected. It is also worth noting that many (perhaps even all) the LCs in fact admit to having known that they could dispute amounts that they settled centrally (which is unsurprising given that they in fact did it).

There is also the even more basic point, which David has put to the witnesses: irrespective of the reason for the shortfall or any dispute over it, it can never be honest to make a false statement subject to a declaration of truth. We will say that even a sudden and unexplained shortfall of £20k could not justify false accounting – the honest SPM in that circumstance simply accounts properly and throws up his hands, asking for help; he does not lie to Post Office about the cash in the branch and hope that it never finds out.

I would be amazed if even this Judge were to say that false accounting was in some way justified. That would be perverse, in the strict sense of that term. It is also completely irrelevant to the construction of the contracts, although I agree that Green will try to rely on it! I imagine he may clash with the Judge on these points in closing.

Kind Regards,

Owain

Owain Draper

One Essex Court, Temple

EC4Y 9AR

Switchboard: [redacted] GRO

www.oeclaw.co.uk<<http://www.oeclaw.co.uk>>

The content of this email is confidential and may subject to legal professional privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete it permanently and inform the sender.

From: Andrew Parsons <[redacted] GRO>
Date: Tuesday, 13 November 2018 at 21:50
To: Gideon Cohen <[redacted] GRO>, Dave Panaech <[redacted] GRO>, Mandy Robertson <[redacted] GRO>, Amy Prime <[redacted] GRO>, Victoria Brooks <[redacted] GRO>

Cc: David Cavender [GRO], Owain Draper [GRO]
Subject: RE: Examination in chief

Please can you send me the draft submissions (or an outline) on point 2. We really need to nail this point otherwise we risk our house of cards coming down as Green will say if SPMs can't dispute losses, then PO forces them to put inaccurate things in their accounts, that justifies false accounting, it also means that they cannot be held liable for what their accounts say (because those accounts are plainly inaccurate because they can't dispute mistakes), thus the normal rules of agency cannot apply to SPMs and clauses 12.12 / 4.1 should be construed as requiring PO to prove every loss in every account.

A

Andrew Parsons
Partner
Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP

d:
m:
t:
e:

GRO

andrew.parsons [GRO]

Stay informed: sign up to our e-alerts <<https://www.womblebonddickinson.com/uk/preferences>>

[Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP Logo]

womblebonddickinson.com <<http://www.womblebonddickinson.com>>

[Twitter Logo] <http://www.twitter.com/wbd_uk>

[LinkedIn Logo] <<https://www.linkedin.com/company/womble-bond-dickinson-uk-llp/>>

From: Gideon Cohen [mailto:[GRO]]
Sent: 13 November 2018 21:44
To: Andrew Parsons; Dave Panaech; Mandy Robertson; Amy Prime; Victoria Brooks
Cc: David Cavender; Owain Draper
Subject: RE: Examination in chief

Thanks Andy.

On your first point, is that a question for evidence or for a possible amendment to the Defence? Owain, given that it is Stubbs, you are probably better placed to take a view?

On the second point, we could pick that up with Angela, but might get a bit lengthy for XIC. My view is that we have the material available to deal with this in submissions.

All best

Gideon

Gideon Cohen
Barrister

One Essex Court
Temple
London EC4Y 9AR

Switchboard:

GRO

Fax number:

GRO

www.oeclaw.co.uk<<http://www.oeclaw.co.uk>>

The contents of this email are CONFIDENTIAL and may be PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, please telephone (GRO) and delete this email.

From: Andrew Parsons (GRO)

Sent: 13 November 2018 21:22

To: Gideon Cohen; Dave Panaech; Mandy Robertson; Amy Prime; Victoria Brooks

Cc: David Cavender; Owain Draper

Subject: RE: Examination in chief

Gideon - These are fine.

Dave / Victoria – between you, please can you let the witnesses know the general nature of the questions they will get.

Gideon - two other points.

1. What are we doing about the Stubbs defence that refers to docs from Paul Williams that Paul did not send? This is not a problem with Paul's evidence but a mistake by the legal team in preparing the Defence so I think we need to own up to this.

2. I'm really not comfortable that the Judge has a clear understanding of how SPMRs can dispute either transactions corrections or end of trading period shortfalls. We could pick this up with Angela?

Thoughts?

A

Andrew Parsons
Partner
Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP

d:

m:

t:

e:

GRO

GRO

andrew.parsons@ (GRO)

Stay informed: sign up to our e-alerts<<https://www.womblebonddickinson.com/uk/preferences>>
[Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP Logo]
womblebonddickinson.com<<http://www.womblebonddickinson.com>>
[Twitter Logo]<http://www.twitter.com/wbd_uk> [LinkedIn Logo]
<<https://www.linkedin.com/company/womble-bond-dickinson-uk-llp/>>

From: Gideon Cohen [mailto:GRO]
Sent: 13 November 2018 18:35
To: Dave Panaech; Mandy Robertson; Amy Prime
Cc: Andrew Parsons; David Cavender; Owain Draper
Subject: Examination in chief

All,

Please see attached the 2 documents we are currently intending to present as typo-corrections for our witnesses.

There are a number of other points which will be canvassed in examination in chief rather than by written correction, because they are (a) new evidence and/or (b) more involved than a typo correction. Currently, we have questions for Beal (clarifying which hotline was 24 hr); Haworth (clarifying which checklist he used, and mentioning the CoA for the Crossflatts branch); Trotter (explaining why he didn't go through the contract in his first interview with Dar); and Van Den Bogerd (giving figures on how many branches, both generally and of the Cs in this case, are run by (a) companies and/or (b) multiples).

The additional points for examination in chief which arose today were for Longbottom (explaining the nature of the 2 page balancing guide, and that it was not a replacement for the manuals) and Ridge (explaining that there were 2 different Christines with different jobs).

Please let me know if there are any queries, internally or from the witnesses, on what will be covered.

Thanks

Gideon

Gideon Cohen
Barrister

One Essex Court
Temple
London EC4Y 9AR

Switchboard:

GRO

Fax number:

GRO

www.oeclaw.co.uk<<http://www.oeclaw.co.uk>><<http://www.oeclaw.co.uk>>

The contents of this email are CONFIDENTIAL and may be PRIVILEGED. If you are not the intended recipient, please telephone (020) 7583 2000 and delete this email.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

Please consider the environment! Do you need to print this email?

The information in this e-mail and any attachments is confidential and may be legally privileged and protected by law. gcohen@GRO only is authorised to access this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not gcohen@GRO please notify andrew.parsons@GRO as soon as possible and delete any copies. Unauthorised use, dissemination, distribution, publication or copying of this communication or attachments is prohibited and may be unlawful. Information about how we use personal data is in our Privacy Policy<<https://www.womblebonddickinson.com/uk/privacy-policy>> on our website.

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

Content of this email which does not relate to the official business of Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP, is neither given nor endorsed by it.

This email is sent by Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP which is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales under number OC317661. Our registered office is 4 More London Riverside, London, SE1 2AU, where a list of members' names is open to inspection. We use the term partner to refer to a member of the LLP, or an employee or consultant who is of equivalent standing. Our VAT registration number is GB123393627.

Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP is a member of Womble Bond Dickinson (International) Limited, which consists of independent and autonomous law firms providing services in the US, the UK, and elsewhere around the world. Each Womble Bond Dickinson entity is a separate legal entity and is not responsible for the acts or omissions of, nor can bind or obligate, another Womble Bond Dickinson entity. Womble Bond Dickinson (International) Limited does not practice law. Please see www.womblebonddickinson.com/legal<<http://www.womblebonddickinson.com/legal>> notices for further details.

Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

