



Telephone attendance

Client: Royal Mail Group PLC Sub Postmaster Litigation

Matter: Mr Lee Castleton

Matter no: 348035.134

Attending:

Name: Stephen Dilley

Location: N/A

Date: 21 December 2006

Start time:

Units:

I received an email in from Brian Pinder this morning stating that the spreadsheet he had received was the archived version of the data Anne checked in 2004, but it is not the same electronic document. I emailed him back to ask him how Mr Castleton would be able to see the same that Anne Chambers saw and whether he would need to visit Fujitsu. We then had a telephone conversation about that and he said that Castleton would need to visit Fujitsu to see it in the same format that Anne did but that Brian would need considerable notice of any visit because it takes ages to get the right documents extracted from archive.

Thereafter Brian emailing me back a bit later and saying that in fact Castleton couldn't see the data in precisely the same format that Anne saw it for no particular reason. I had a telephone conversation with him in the afternoon in which he also said that he had noticed that the earlier events log he had emailed to me had some incorrect text added to it during the extraction from archive process. He was therefore going to email me a corrected events log.

Time engaged just on the telephone conversations with Brian (including attendance note) but excluding the time of any correspondence – 24 minutes