Henrietta Paget		
From: Sent: To: Subject	ot:	Henrietta Paget [ GRO ] 14 August 2009 18:14 'jarnail.a.singht GRO ]'; 'marilyn.benjamint GRO ] Rudkin
Dear Ja	arnail,	
	you for sending me rect, and Mr. Ward	Mr. Dove's response, which I agree needs to be regarded as a concession that the defence I's helpful e-mail.
	stay), but I suppose indication given and I am not sure that prejudice by their statement. Otherwise, that in order to make. Applying Neuberg full turnover, minus But nor would the business out of acceptance with the seems to me that monies alone or general I seems to give indicate the seem	there is even ground for an abuse of process argument (there being no indictment to see that we know what the defence mean: they will invite the court to hold us to the ind/or make no confiscation order.  If an abuse of process style argument would succeed, unless the defence can show real reliance on Mr. Dove's indication between 1 <sup>st</sup> May and receipt of the Section 16(3) adication would probably only serve to gain the sympathy of the court in deciding what is as modified by Seager, I do not think it likely the benefit figure would be found to be the us deductions (as helpfully set out by Mr. Harbinson). It court necessarily fix the benefit at the level of direct loss and leave the running of the account. The precise finding might perhaps depend on the proportions of stolen monies monies used to shore up the business.  If it is a matter for Royal Mail whether to agree to fix the benefit on the basis of the stolen to on to seek part of the turnover as well. If the latter, I obviously the hearing will not be easons helpfully explained by the defence.
I hope	this helps.	
Yours, Henrie	tta	
HENRI	ETTA PAGET	
Londo: Teleph	ell Yard n WC2A 2JR one: GRO GRO E 390	

This e-mail may contain sensitive information or material subject to legal privilege. If received in error please call GRO to alert the sender immediately.