

Message

From: Matthews, Gavin [GRO]
Sent: 02/08/2016 13:48:17
To: Rodric Williams [GRO]; Parsons, Andrew [GRO]
Pheasant, Andrew [GRO]
Subject: RE: Post Office Limited - Strictly Private & Confidential [BD-4A.FID26859284]

Hi Rod

I hope you have had a great holiday.

I'm just responding to your email below because I've discussed the matter with Andy Parsons and given my involvement with the CCRC from the start I will lead on this issue supported by Andy Pheasant. I'm not in on Friday but perhaps we can meet up early next week – I'm in London for a meeting on Wednesday 10 August at 2.30 but could meet with you in the morning. Alternatively I am pretty free on Monday/ Tuesday next week also if that is more suitable for you.

Andy and I have given the matter some initial thought and our preliminary views (which we can discuss further when we meet) are that the following are possible areas to develop;

1. Push them on their jurisdiction to take this action ("exceptional circumstances") which was slightly tenuous at the start. If they have not already found any link between the cases then there are no exceptional circumstances and they have no jurisdiction.
2. Apply some political pressure BiS/MoJ
3. Tell the CCRC that you are coming under increasing pressure internally to know when the CCRC is likely to have completed its findings – Can Amanda help?
4. Tell the CCRC that there are now group litigation civil proceedings on foot and that several of the claimants in those proceedings are applicants in the CCRC process and there is a real danger that any delay in the CCRC investigation will cause those claimants cases to be stayed pending the result ie the CCRC investigation may hold up some of the civil case.

Let me know how you are fixed for next week.

Kind regards

Gavin

Gavin Matthews

Partner

for and on behalf of Bond Dickinson LLP

Bond Dickinson

Direct: [GRO]
Mobile:
Office:

Follow Bond Dickinson:



www.bonddickinson.com

From: Rodric Williams [mailto:[GRO]]
Sent: 01 August 2016 12:48

To: Parsons, Andrew; Pheasant, Andrew; Matthews, Gavin
Subject: FW: Post Office Limited - Strictly Private & Confidential

Hi - please see below and attached. Could we discuss on Friday when I'm back in the office? I'd like to start thinking about whether and how we can start forcing the issue with the CCRC - they've been looking at these for a long time and seem to be jumping down every rabbit hole they're directed to (for example, the "ComputerWeekly" issue won't have any bearing on any case under review).

I'm also conscious about the noise about the receipt payment mismatch issue and its effect on Misra, to which the document requests may be linked.

Sent from my Windows Phone

From: PearceA
Sent: 01/08/2016 13:02
To: Rodric Williams
Subject: RE: Post Office Limited - Strictly Private & Confidential

Hi Rodric,

This was a very timely email – I'd planned to take stock of where we are with these cases before I go on leave (on 3rd August!)

Thank you for the updated Case Tracker and the state of play re Trousdale, Hedges, Holmes, Owen, Joshi and Shaheen. Thanks also for the ATM information.

Concerning the MacDonald case, we haven't heard anything from Mr Patel so if there's anything else that you can do to encourage him to contact us that would be very helpful. In addition, please could you send us copies of the documents linked to the entries from 23/7/09-1/9/09 on the Broughton 'electronic filing cabinet' document which was attached to your email of 14/3/2016? (I haven't sent a further section 17 notice for these on the basis that they're covered by our original request re Mrs MacDonald's case. Please let me know if you think otherwise.)

I'm afraid I've also got some further requests for information and documents.

Documents:

1. We met with Ron Warmington of Second Sight on 17/6/16. He mentioned a couple of documents that we think it would be helpful to see (i) the thematic spreadsheet which Second Sight created identifying the alleged faults/problems; and (ii) a June 2014 report which Mr Warmington prepared on POL's investigations department and prosecution process. I attach a section 17 notice to cover this request. Please let me know if you need more information to help identify or locate the documents.
2. We are trying to locate the transaction logs for the Misra case. We haven't been able to find them in the data room. We have found a 255-page 'event log' and a 29-page log of 'Transactions associated with rejected card payments' but no sign of the full transaction logs. If the logs weren't printed out for trial, are you still able to access them from the audit store? (Again, I haven't sent a further section 17 notice for these on the basis that they're covered by our original request re Ms Misra's case.)

Questions:

1. In November 2015, Computer Weekly reported an issue whereby payments had been duplicated on Horizon. It was reported that this was caused by the user forcing log off. We have also seen this referred to as the "Dalmellington Error". Would it be possible for POL to provide us with an explanation of this issue, similar to the way that you responded to the issues identified in the Second Sight part two report?
2. We've seen a number of references to the "Receipts and Payments Mismatch Problem" which, we think, has also been referred to as the Callendar Square/Falkirk problem. Are we right in thinking that they're the same thing and are we right in thinking that the issue concerns only transfers to remote stock units (ie those run from a laptop in remote areas)? Could the issue affect transfers between stock units within a branch?
3. We've seen references to some sort of 'fault log' produced by Fujitsu. I understand from the CRMs working on the cases that this has been variously referred to as the 'peak incident reports', 'pinnacle', and the 'known error log'. Do these refer to the same thing? Is it one document or is a series of documents? It may be that we need to see this/these, but I'm trying to get a better sense of what they are before issuing a formal request.

I suspect that we'll need to discuss these questions in more detail but I thought I'd attempt to set them out here and then give you a call when I'm back from leave (week commencing 22 August).

I hope you had a good break and I'll speak to you soon.

Kind regards,
Amanda

Amanda Pearce
Group Leader
Criminal Cases Review Commission
Tel: **GRO**
www.ccrcc.gov.uk

From: Rodric Williams [mailto:**GRO**]
Sent: 25 July 2016 13:09
To: PearceA
Cc: StuartF
Subject: Post Office Limited - Strictly Private & Confidential

Amanda,

I hope this finds you well. I thought it might be helpful to drop you a line summarising where we are in responding to your various Section 17 Notices before I go on annual leave (returning 3 August 2016).

I attach an updated Case Tracker. With respect to the first batch of 20 cases, the content of the electronic Cartwright King file has now been reviewed, which identified documents relating to the Robinson, Barang, Prince, Ishaq, Williams and Misra prosecutions. Millnet is creating sub-folders called "Electronic CK Documents" for each of these individuals into which the documents will be transferred. We will let you know once this has been completed and the documents are available for your review.

With respect to the later notifications for Trousdale, Hedges and Holmes, we should be in a position to release documents to you shortly after my return from annual leave (we are just waiting for some confirmations around the categories where we have not located any responsive documents). We are still in the document gathering phase for the most recent notifications for Owen, Joshi and Shaheen.

In looking back over my communications with you, I noted two other open items, one concerning ATMs, the other the specific case of Jaqueline MacDonald.

On ATM's, I attach instructions that set out what Post Office agents have to do on a daily/weekly basis to balance/account for their ATM, which were issued in this format around June/July 2013, and which I believe you asked for when you attended our office for the Horizon demonstration. Please accept my apologies for not providing this to you sooner.

On the MacDonald case, can you please let me know whether or not you still require our assistance to enable your case handler to speak to Mr Zubeir Patel, who provided temporary postmaster services at Mrs MacDonald's branch, as part of the review of that case.

More generally, please let me know if you have any questions or wish to discuss anything in more detail.

Kind regards, Rodric



Rodric Williams
Solicitor, Corporate Services
Post Office Ltd
20 Finsbury Street, London EC2Y 9AQ

GRO

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 by reply email and then delete this email from your system. Any views or opinions expressed within this email are solely those of the sender, unless otherwise specifically stated.

POST OFFICE LIMITED is registered in England and Wales no 2154540. Registered Office: Finsbury Dials, 20 Finsbury Street, London EC2Y 9AQ.

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

The Criminal Cases Review Commission
5 St Philip's Place
Birmingham
B3 2PW

Telephone: **GRO**

Fax: **GRO**

The information contained in this e-mail and any files transmitted with it is confidential and is intended for the use of the person(s) or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, any disclosure, copying, distribution, or any action taken in reliance on it is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please return it immediately to the sender by replying to it and then delete the message from your computer.

We may monitor the content of e-mails sent and received via our network for the purposes of ensuring compliance with policies and procedures.

Viruses: Although we have taken steps to ensure that this e-mail and attachments are free from any virus we advise that in keeping with good computing practice the recipient should ensure they are actually virus free.