

**From:** "Parsons, Andrew" <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** Rodric Williams <[REDACTED]>, Jane MacLeod  
<[REDACTED]>, Patrick Bourke  
<[REDACTED]>, Mark Underwood <[REDACTED]>  
**Cc:** "Prime, Amy" <[REDACTED]>, "Porter, Tom"  
<[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** Report of Brian Altman QC - subject to litigation privilege [BD-4A.FID26859284]

**Date:** Tue, 26 Jul 2016 12:55:36 +0000

**Importance:** Normal

**Attachments:** Review\_of\_Post\_Office\_Ltd\_Criminal\_Prosecutions\_-\_Brian\_Altman\_QC\_-\_July....pdf

**Inline-Images:** image001.jpg; image002.jpg; image003.jpg

---

All

Please find attached Brian Altman's Report on the question of whether Post Office has brought charges without sufficient evidence.

As a quick reminder of the background: Brian was instructed off the back of Jonathan Swift's recommendations. His work was subsequently adopted as a work-stream within the Group Litigation. Brian was asked to review the sufficiency of the evidence on which charges were brought in a sample set of 8 cases – those cases having been selected as being high profile cases within the Group Litigation and / or CCRC cases.

In summary, Brian's conclusions are that:

n the seven cases reviewed, there was sufficient evidence to justify the charges in each case.

n the eighth case, there was insufficient documentation available in the files for a review to be undertaken.

The primary allegation (that Post Office operated a deliberate policy of charging theft when there was an insufficient evidential basis to support that charge) is fundamentally misplaced; not only is there no evidence of such a policy, there is positive evidence that each case was approached both by internal and external lawyers professionally and with propriety, and, unquestionably, case-specifically.

The secondary allegation (that offences were indicted with an eye to the making of applications for confiscation and/or compensation orders on conviction) is similarly misplaced as in the seven cases reviewed there was a proper legal and evidential basis for bringing the charges, which included due consideration of the orders that might follow conviction.

There is a minor criticism about the use of inconsistent language in the recording of charging decisions, and about offering no evidence on a theft count, resulting in a judge formally entering a not guilty verdict, when the count ought technically to have been left on the file.

Brian has also reviewed the relevant parts of our Letter of Response and confirmed that his Report is consistent with the points made in that letter.

As this Report supports the approach being adopted in the Group Litigation, I do not believe that there are any immediate follow-up actions required. However, if you have something in mind or have any questions, please do let me know.

Kind regards  
Andy

**Andrew Parsons**

Partner

Bond Dickinson

Direct:

GRO

Mobile:

Follow Bond Dickinson:



[www.bonddickinson.com](http://www.bonddickinson.com)

**Please consider the environment! Do you need to print this email?**

The information in this e-mail and any attachments is confidential and may be legally privileged and protected by law. mark underwood (GRO) only is authorised to access this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not mark underwood (GRO) please notify [andrew.parsons@bond-dickinson.com](#) (GRO) as soon as possible and delete any copies. Unauthorised use, dissemination, distribution, publication or copying of this communication or attachments is prohibited and may be unlawful.

Any files attached to this e-mail will have been checked by us with virus detection software before transmission. Bond Dickinson LLP accepts no liability for any loss or damage which may be caused by software viruses and you should carry out your own virus checks before opening any attachment.

Content of this email which does not relate to the official business of Bond Dickinson LLP, is neither given nor endorsed by it.

This email is sent by Bond Dickinson LLP which is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales under number OC317661. Our registered office is 4 More London Riverside, London, SE1 2AU, where a list of members' names is open to inspection. We use the term partner to refer to a member of the LLP, or an employee or consultant who is of equivalent standing. Our VAT registration number is GB123393627.

Bond Dickinson LLP is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority.