
From: Jenkins Gareth GI [/o=Exchange/ou=AdminGroup1/cn=Recipients/cn=Gareth.Jenkins]
Sent: Wed 14/03/2012 11:33:00 AM (UTC)
To: Thomas Penny [GRO]
Subject: RE: RM v Bramwell

Penny,

Thanks for this.

I think we need to do the following:

1. Get POL to sort out commercials so that I can spend time on this
2. Get a proper electronic version of the report. By this I mean a Word Document with any associated Excel spreadsheets (what you sent me was just a scanned image of the hard copy)
3. Once I get those I can go through the report in detail making any suitable comments. An initial detailed comment on the document will probably take around a day (but potentially longer if we don't get it electronically!) It may also be useful if I carry out a similar analysis on the logs you have extracted which may take another couple of days. If we're then talking about meetings with Counsel and court appearances, I suggest you get cover for at least 10 days to start with (but of course we only charge what we spend!)

I suspect that points 1 & 2 could take a while, so it really depends on when POL can do that before I start spending any time on this and also whether it can be done by 5/4/12. My time is fairly tight at present, but I expect this will take priority once we get all the info required.

Regards

Gareth

Gareth Jenkins
Distinguished Engineer
Business Applications Architect
Post Office Account

FUJITSU
Lovelace Road, Bracknell, Berkshire, RG12 8SN

GRO



Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

From: Thomas Penny
Sent: 14 March 2012 10:55
To: Jenkins Gareth GI
Subject: FW: RM v Bramwell

Gareth

Please see mailstring.

Kind regards
Penny

From: Graham Brander
Sent: 14 March 2012 10:33

GRO

To: Thomas Penny
Cc: Jane M Owen; Post Office Security; Andrew Bolc
Subject: FW: RM v Bramwell

Hi Penny

Please would you look at the e-mail below from our solicitors in the Bishops Hull case and pass onto Gareth. Counsel would like Gareth to advise on what from the defence expert report faxed to you last week that he is able to rebut if anything.

I have asked for an electronic copy of the expert report but it is down to the defence as to whether they are prepared to supply this, as they are only required to serve a hard copy.

The court has stipulated that any response from us to the Defence expert report needs to be served by 5th April. Would you please ask Gareth if he would be able to meet this timescale?

Thanks.

Regards

Graham Brander
Security Manager
Security Operations
Post Office Ltd

GRO

Confidential Information: *This e-mail message is for the sole use of the intended recipient (s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorised review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact me by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.*

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

From: Andrew Bolc
Sent: 13 March 2012 17:00
To: Graham Brander
Subject: FW: RM v Bramwell

GRO

Graham,

Please see Emma's email for your information.
Could you see if Fujitsu can work with these rather vague instructions, otherwise i think the only way forward is for you to meet with Sue as soon as possible

to help her understand the system and iron out the specifics that need to be addressed.

It would seem easiest if you could contact Sue's clerk directly to arrange a convenient date.

Thanks Andrew

From: Emma Haley [GRO]
Sent: 13 March 2012 16:24
To: Andrew Bolc
Subject: RM v Bramwell

Dear Andrew


RM v Bramwell

Counsel would, bluntly, like Fujitsu to pour as much cold water as possible on the defence report. If the expert is saying we cannot disagree with anything at all, then we are potentially in some difficulty. I have asked Counsel to provide a specific list of questions, but really the essence is: how much, if anything, can we rebut? And can we explain the accounting system to a jury in a way they will find easy to understand?

A conference is, of course, going to be essential. I mentioned to counsel Mr Brander's suggestion of "barrister training" in Cardiff. That might be ideal. Probably easiest for investigator to liaise directly with counsel's clerk, Grant Bidwell, email: [GRO]

Regards

Emma Haley
Solicitor



BATH * CAMBRIDGE * LONDON * MELKSHAM

GRO

Web: www.stoneking.co.uk



Please consider the environment - is it necessary to print this email?

This message contains confidential information and is intended only for Andrew Bolc [GRO]. If you are not Andrew Bolc [GRO], you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify Emma Haley [GRO] immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. E-mail transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error-free as information could be intercepted, corrupted, lost, destroyed, arrive late or incomplete, or contain viruses. Stone King LLP does not accept liability for any errors or omissions in the content of this message, which arise as a result of e-mail transmission. If verification is required please request a hard-copy version. We do not accept service by email.

Stone King LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC315280. Its registered office is at 13 Queen Square Bath BA1 2HJ. It is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority. The partners are the members of the limited liability partnership. A full list of

all partners is available at all offices.

***** Royal Mail Group Limited registered in England and
Wales registered number 4138203 registered office 3rd Floor, 100 Victoria Embankment, London, EC4Y 0HQ This
email and any attachments are confidential and intended for the addressee only. If you are not the named recipient,
you must not use, disclose, reproduce, copy or distribute the contents of this communication. If you have received this
in error, please contact the sender and then delete this email from your system.
