From: Carol King[CN=Carol King/OU=e/O=POSTOFFICE]

Sent: Mon 26/07/2004 5:09:31 PM (UTC)

To: Rod ismay

Subject: Re: Cleveleys PO 153 405 Mrs J Wolstenholme

Rod as before Cheers Carol

---- Forwarded by Carol King/e/POSTOFFICE on 26/07/2004 17:09 -----

Jim Cruise

To: Carol 26/03/2004 15:40

King/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE

Subject: Re: Cleveleys PO 153 40

Wolstenholme

If the payment-in was increased by £20,000 and accepted, the case would settle and because there would have been no trial there would be no determination by the court on any of the disputed facts in the case and it could not be held up as a precedent for any future claims. Each case has to be assessed on its own merits and a settlement in this particularly difficult case for POL would not mean that future claims where the Horizon system was involved would need to be or should be settled. There would be no admissin that the Horizon system was at fault if the case settled at this stage on the basis of an improved payment-in.

A large part of the problem in this case is the age of the claim and the fact that not all the call logs/records are available as they have been destroyed by Fujitsu which is one reason why we do not particularly wish there to be a trial of this case.

Carol King

To: Jim 26/03/2004 14:57

Cruise/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE

cc: Jennifer

Robson/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE. Clive

Burton/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE

Subject: Re: Cleveleys PO 153 40

Wolstenholme

Jim

I have read the notes and spoken to Jennifer Robson about this case and wondered if you could clarify something for us please? If we were to settle (and we are not stating at this point that we will) could we ask for this to be without prejudice and settle without admitting that Horizon was at fault. There have been a number postmasters who have not been able to use the equipment though trained fully at the time of installation and it has frequently been used as an excuse for errors. We would not want this case to set a precedent for similar cases in th future.

Regards

Carol

Jim Cruise To: Carol King/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE#POSTOFFICE#POSTOFFICE#POSTOFFICE#POSTOFFICE#POSTOFFICE#POSTOFFICE#POSTOFFICE#POSTOFFICE#POSTOFFICE#POSTOFFICE#POSTOFFICE#POSTOFFICE#POSTOFFICE#POSTOFFICE#POSTOFFICE#POSTO

cc. Andy R 26/03/2004 14:11

Pearson/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE

Cleveleys PO 153 405 Mr: Subject:

Wolstenholme

I refer to my email to you dated 17/3/04. Can you please let me know if you are willing to increase the payment-in by £20,000 as my agents in Manchester have written to say that they feel the payment-in should be increased as soon as possible.