

Message

From: Tom Beezer [redacted] **GRO**
Sent: 17/03/2019 10:19:08
To: Jane MacLeod [redacted] **GRO**
CC: Andrew Parsons [redacted] **GRO**; Rodric Williams [redacted] **GRO**; Amy Prime
Subject: RE: URGENT: Litigation Options - CONFIDENTIAL AND SUBJECT TO LEGAL PRIVILEGE. [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]

Jane

My comments in red, below.

t

Tom Beezer
Partner
Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP

d: [redacted]
m: **GRO**
t: [redacted]
e: [redacted]

[Stay informed: sign up to our e-alerts](#)

Join us for Disrupting Disputes 2.0
20 March 2019 at the British Library

Book your place [here](#)



womblebond dickinson.com



From: Jane MacLeod [mailto:redacted] **GRO**
Sent: 17 March 2019 09:26
To: Tom Beezer
Cc: Andrew Parsons; Rodric Williams; Amy Prime
Subject: RE: URGENT: Litigation Options - CONFIDENTIAL AND SUBJECT TO LEGAL PRIVILEGE. [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]

All

Attached is my summary of statements that might demonstrate 'bias' and I have highlighted the most obvious. Reading through these again, it is clear that they need to be understood in the context of a decision that was not supposed to be about the factual evidence. Absent that lens, many of them are strong statements, however one would normally expect a trial judge to form a view as to the reliability of witnesses. Jane, I agree with that statement.

So the bias argument hangs on the argument that the evidence should have been inadmissible or at the very least not relied upon by the Judge when making findings, but that seems not to have occurred here – despite the Judge's strained assertions in the judgement that he didn't take into account the findings of fact that he then goes on to make. If for any reason the contention that this evidence was inadmissible is not upheld, then these findings of fact and credibility must surely stand? Yes – but then there is the second aspect of this matter which is the "legal" bit of the appeal and how far

(if at all) those findings of fact (even if 'validly made') can be relevant to the question of what the contract meant and did *at the time it was formed*.

To that extent the views on appeal and the strength of the argument about procedural unfairness is key. We would not be considering the recusal application if procedural unfairness were not seen as a ground of appeal. Given the comments it may have been considered anyway – but here I do agree the two issues are tied together. To what extent would our appeal chances be lessened if we did not rely on procedural unfairness? Is this something we are ready to discuss yet? This is a detailed piece of work and it is this that LNQC has said 40 to 50 hrs' work on. That is paused for now. My view is that absent a recusal application the procedural unfairness element of an appeal is weakened considerably but the "law" bit of an appeal lives on. The black letter stuff. In answer to your question, we can discuss at a high level, but the forensic detail and real informed view on prospects is some way off. As part of that we need to trigger LNQC when POL is ready.

Ideally, I would like to know today whether Grabiner is supportive of the recusal application, and if so, to what extent OEC have asked LGQC for this today. I don't know if that means we will get it, but the Q has been posed of LGQC. Are we able to get any insight on that? Provided that he is, then we should stand up Neuberger for the Board call, and I will also be able to feedback the outcome of the meeting with Grabiner. (which could be any time from 1.30 onwards that suits him).

Thanks

Jane



Jane MacLeod

Group Director of Legal, Risk & Governance
Ground Floor
20 Finsbury Street
LONDON
EC2Y 9AQ

Mobile number: **GRO**

From: Tom Beezer [mailto:**GRO**]

Sent: 16 March 2019 18:42

To: Jane MacLeod <**GRO**>

Cc: andrew.parsons <**GRO**>; Rodric Williams <**GRO**>; Amy Prime <**GRO**>

Subject: Re: URGENT: Litigation Options - CONFIDENTIAL AND SUBJECT TO LEGAL PRIVILEGE. [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]

Jane

On timings for Monday I have heard from Rob at OEC.

Lord Grabiner can make 1pm or after on Monday for a pre call. But Rob says:

He has another appointment at 5.25 that he cannot cancel. He can speak earlier or from 6.30.

Thanks

Jane, thoughts on which QC in light of the above ? Thoughts on timing of meeting ?

T

On 16 Mar 2019, at 18:17, Jane MacLeod <[redacted] GRO > wrote:

Tom

As discussed, I have made a number of comments and re-sequenced the draft paper – attached.

One key piece of work is to pull out some of the more egregious comments that the Judge has made – most of the Board will not have read the judgment, so it's worth putting these in an Appendix. I'll pull out my 'favourites' tonight and send them through.

Very happy to discuss the changes/comments.

Kind regards,

Jane

<image001.png>

Jane MacLeod

Group Director of Legal, Risk & Governance
Ground Floor
20 Finsbury Street
LONDON
EC2Y 9AQ

Mobile number: [redacted] GRO

Tom Beezer

Partner
Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP

d: [redacted]
m: [redacted]
t: [redacted]
e: [redacted] GRO

[Stay informed: sign up to our e-alerts](#)

***Join us for Disrupting Disputes 2.0
20 March 2019 at the British Library***

Book your place [here](#)



womblebond Dickinson.com



From: Tom Beezer [mailto:[redacted] GRO]

Sent: 16 March 2019 13:31

To: Jane MacLeod <[redacted] GRO >; andrew.parsons <[redacted] GRO >

Cc: Rodric Williams <[redacted] GRO >; Amy Prime <[redacted] GRO >

Subject: RE: URGENT: Litigation Options - CONFIDENTIAL AND SUBJECT TO LEGAL PRIVILEGE. [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]

Jane

I have now had more input & comment from DCQC and Andy.

I attach:

- a clean Word Doc' of the current draft of the note (you'll see one comment from Andy in highlight, so this is still draft), and
- a 'compare' PDF which shows at a glance the additions that have been made from the version of the draft note that I sent you earlier.

All comments welcomed. If you would like a version w/o the highlight question (or section questioned) then let me know.

Kind regards

Tom Beezer
Partner
Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP



Stay informed: sign up to our e-alerts

***Join us for Disrupting Disputes 2.0
20 March 2019 at the British Library***

Book your place here

<image002.png>

womblebond Dickinson.com

<image003.png> <image004.png>

From: Tom Beezer
Sent: 16 March 2019 11:03
To: 'Jane MacLeod'; Andrew Parsons
Cc: Rodric Williams; Amy Prime
Subject: RE: URGENT: Litigation Options - CONFIDENTIAL AND SUBJECT TO LEGAL PRIVILEGE.
[WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]

Jane

As you have an important call shortly I attach the note as it currently stands.

The draft note picks up some of your bullet points, but not all. It will need to be added to over the course of today (all comments gratefully received).

I am tied up for an hour now but will be around this afternoon, just after 12.30.

I hope sending on the draft now is a helpful step.

t

From: Jane MacLeod [mailto: [REDACTED] GRO]
Sent: 16 March 2019 10:55
To: Tom Beezer; Andrew Parsons
Cc: Rodric Williams; Amy Prime
Subject: RE: URGENT: Litigation Options - CONFIDENTIAL AND SUBJECT TO LEGAL PRIVILEGE. [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]

Many thanks – I have a call at 12.15 with our Chairman, Al Cameron and our Minister Kelly Tolhurst (and others), although I don't believe recusal will be part of the discussion. I have been advised by the UKGI GC that 'government' will not express an opinion on recusal as they will not want the 'executive' to be seen to be criticising the 'judiciary'.

This will put more pressure on our Board, and the Chairman is acutely conscious that such an application will not sit well with the perception that PO is arrogant, whereas we are trying to edge towards 'contrition'.

That effect of that is that we need to be very clear what the risks will be of not proceeding with the application, which I imagine include:

- Impact on evidence given by PO witnesses (especially Angela) in the current Horizon trial, and the impact of that on our case;
- Extent to which this detracts from the 'procedural unfairness' grounds for appeal;
- Impact of delay - if we didn't bring the application 'now' and then decided that the Horizon judgement also demonstrated 'prejudice' – would we be able to use that also in an appeal on the Common Issues judgement (which almost certainly will be after the HIT judgment);
- Would result in (I assume?) only appeal grounds as being incorrect interpretation (and application) of the law. Although LNQC opinion seemed to suggest we had reasonably good grounds?

I'll look forward to receiving the draft, and will let you know if I need a call later today to discuss.

Kind regards,

Jane

<image001.png>

Jane MacLeod

Group Director of Legal, Risk & Governance
Ground Floor
20 Finsbury Street
LONDON
EC2Y 9AQ

Mobile number: [REDACTED] GRO

From: Tom Beezer [mailto: [REDACTED] GRO]
Sent: 16 March 2019 09:54
To: Jane MacLeod [mailto: [REDACTED] GRO]; andrew.parsons [mailto: [REDACTED] GRO]
Cc: Rodric Williams [mailto: [REDACTED] GRO]; Amy Prime [mailto: [REDACTED] GRO]
Subject: RE: URGENT: Litigation Options - CONFIDENTIAL AND SUBJECT TO LEGAL PRIVILEGE. [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]

Jane

A short e mail as to timings. We will be sending you a draft "Board friendly" (I hope...) recusal note on or before lunchtime today.

I hope that works for you.

One of us will send over the draft in a short while.

t

Tom Beezer

Partner

Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP

d:
m:
t:
e:



[Stay informed: sign up to our e-alerts](#)


***Join us for Disrupting Disputes 2.0
20 March 2019 at the British Library***

Book your place [here](#)

womblebond Dickinson.com

<image002.png>

<image003.png> <image004.png>

From: Jane MacLeod [mailto:
Sent: 15 March 2019 15:34
To: Tom Beezer; Andrew Parsons
Cc: Rodric Williams
Subject: FW: URGENT: Litigation Options - CONFIDENTIAL AND SUBJECT TO LEGAL PRIVILEGE.
Importance: High

Tom, Andy

As discussed, set out below is the email I sent this morning to the Chairman and Tom Cooper setting out the proposal for the recusal application. We are setting up a board call for 5pm Monday, and I will need to issue a 'plain English' paper to the Board over the weekend to get them familiarised with the issue. In particular that will need to address:

- Why we are considering a recusal application
- What the application (if successful) will achieve
- Risks of not proceeding
- Prospects of success: what advice have we received, who from (LNQC but given speed with which it was produced - is it fully considered?; Will LGQC have read in sufficiently by then to also be able to offer an opinion? 'why we should believe them?')
- risks
- Process & timing

In addition, the following Monday (25th) we have a scheduled Board meeting and I will need to be able to brief in more detail on an appeal, recognising that it will still be a work in progress. However as we

don't have another scheduled Board until end May, it is likely that we will need the Board to endorse the appeal strategy at end March, with a further approval meeting/call once the appeal grounds are finalised and we can assess 'risk'.

As mentioned I think that as part of the initial Appeal discussion, the board will want to understand the scale of the financial risk of:

- (a) not appealing (and therefore how many existing & historic contracts will be affected by the judgement?)
- (b) appealing and losing (same as above?)
- (c) appealing and winning – restores contracts to pre-judgement position

Recognising in each case that the consequences apply not just to the claimant group but to all postmasters on those contracts types, and potentially, all those on other contract types but who have substantially the same provisions.

I will task one of my team to start looking at the modelling to support the legal analysis.

Kind regards,

Jane

<image001.png>

Jane MacLeod

Group Director of Legal, Risk & Governance
Ground Floor
20 Finsbury Street
LONDON
EC2Y 9AQ

Mobile number: **GRO**

From: Jane MacLeod

Sent: 15 March 2019 08:19

To: Tim Parker <GRO>; Thomas Cooper <GRO>

Cc: Alisdair Cameron <GRO>

Subject: URGENT: Litigation Options - CONFIDENTIAL AND SUBJECT TO LEGAL PRIVILEGE.

Importance: High

Dear Tim and Tom

As flagged on the board call on Tuesday, we have sought further advice on appeals and as to whether we have grounds to request the judge to recuse himself on the grounds of bias.

Advice

We sought advice from Lord Neuberger who stepped down last year as the President of the Supreme Court (and as such was the highest judge in the U.K.). We sought his views as to whether the draft judgement demonstrated the following grounds for appeal:

- Whether the Judge has correctly interpreted and applied the law as to construction of a document or application of a principle of law;

- Whether there are grounds to argue that findings have been made as a result of serious procedural irregularity (which goes to the admission of, and reliance on, among other issues, inadmissible evidence), and
- (most urgently) Whether Mr Justice Fraser demonstrated grounds on which we could apply for him to recuse himself.

The test for recusal is 'whether the fair-minded and informed observer, having considered the facts, would conclude there is a real possibility that the [Judge] was biased'.

Attached is Lord Neuberger's preliminary advice (Please note, in paragraph 11 he refers to 'the Note' – this is a note put together by David Cavendar QC summarising the key extracts of the judgement and trial transcript). As you will see, in paragraph 5 Lord Neuberger states that although he has only looked at the issues very cursorily, "at least some of them raise quite significant points on which the PO has a reasonable case, and at least on the face of it, some points on which the PO has a pretty strong case."

Further however, he suggests (para 19) that if we wish to rely on the ground of procedural unfairness at an appeal, then 'PO has little option but to seek to get the Judge to recuse himself at this stage' and in para 20 that if we fail to act promptly during the Horizon trial we "risk being held to have waived [our] rights, or at least weakened our position on the recusal issue."

Timing

I have set out below the proposed process and timetable. This suggests that we should make the decision urgently - preferably not later than Monday with a view to making the application early to mid next week.

Risks

The risks with seeking for the Judge to recuse himself are:

- a) The application is successful and the Horizon Trial is adjourned (and probably has to be re-heard by another judge); we proceed with an appeal on the Common Issues Trial (timing to be determined) and a new judge is put in place for remaining aspects of trials.
- b) The application is unsuccessful (at first request and in the Court of Appeal) then it is likely that the judge is further antagonised, however he will be aware that the Common Issues appeal is progressing which includes the "procedural unfairness" assertion. Possible impact in that scenario is the Judge is more cautious as to behaviours to (possibly) POL's benefit.
- c) The theoretical downside to a recusal application is that it fails and that Fraser remains the judge at Trial 3 which will require multiple findings of fact which are more tricky to appeal.

We should also not proceed with this course of action unless we are prepared to appeal a decision by him not to recuse himself.

In the meantime I propose today to brief a further senior silk today (probably Lord Grabiner) to act on the recusal application. Should the Board decide not to proceed, then we can withdraw the instructions; however as he will need reading in time, this parallel track will minimise delay.

Next steps

Tim, this is clearly a board decision and we would need to give the Board time to consider the options, however we would like to convene a call over the weekend or on Monday at the latest to discuss this proposal. Lord Neuberger is available for a conference call to discuss his views, although he is in Argentina, so there are some time considerations. Once he has read in, and assuming he agrees with Lord Neuberger, I expect Lord Grabiner would also be available for a call.

Tom, you have previously counselled us that any appeal should be discussed with the shareholder - please advise how we progress this as a matter of urgency?

Would we be able to talk today to consider the way forward?

Kind regards,

Jane

<image001.png>

Jane MacLeod

Group Director of Legal, Risk & Governance
Ground Floor
20 Finsbury Street
LONDON
EC2Y 9AQ

Mobile number: GRO

LITIGATION PROCESS & TIMETABLE FOR RECUSAL APPLICATION

- 1) POL engage with the QC who is likely to be instructed to make recusal application ASAP (if one is made) to get QC "*warmed up*" to application, arguments to be deployed and (potentially) to speak to POL Board if needed, as the person who would in fact be the mouthpiece of POL. **Timing:** Friday for choice of QC and delivery of papers.
- 2) Assuming a QC is to be "*warmed up*" David Cavender QC to brief on background as fully as possible. **Timing:** Friday.
- 3) POL to decide if it is to make a recusal application. **Timing:** By (say) Monday.
- 4) POL Board may wish to speak to Lord Neuberger as part of their decision making process. The Clerks at OEC have confirmed that is possible and have contact numbers for Lord Neuberger as needed. **Please NOTE** Lord Neuberger is in South America (Argentina).
- 5) As soon as decision to make application has been made (if that transpires) Freeths & Judge to be put on notice. Suggested "appropriate" notice period is one day (or more if decision made earlier than early next week). Freeths put on notice by letter from WBD (or possibly Counsel to Counsel) and the Judge by a note between the Clerks ? **Timing:** early next week once decision to proceed made.
- 6) Gideon Cohen (at One Essex Court and already part of the Counsel team) to be instructed to be Junior to chosen QC. **Timing:** Friday, if "warm up" route followed.
- 7) QC & Gideon prepare Application Notice and Skeleton for recusal application. This work could **start now** if we follow the "warm up" route.
- 8) Application is made first half of next week at 10am during the Horizon trial. Thereafter there are variables:
 - a. Judge may agree. Unlikely but possible. HIT trial is adjourned there and then and POL appeals the CIT findings and (if successful) we re-list CIT & HIT.
 - b. Judge may pass matter to another judge to hear. Unlikely.
 - c. Judge refuses (likely) and POL takes that refusal to Court of Appeal asap. That could be same day (possible but unlikely) or at that same week at some point if CofA recognise urgency.
 - d. CofA may agree with recusal application. If so, POL appeals the CIT findings and (if successful) we re-list HIT.

- e. CofA may refuse recusal application in which case HIT rolls on.

Please note in any scenario where HIT is adjourned then there will be possible increased costs consequences for Claimants that POL could bear if it is ultimately unsuccessful.

<image001.png>

Jane MacLeod

Group Director of Legal, Risk & Governance
Ground Floor
20 Finsbury Street
LONDON
EC2Y 9AQ

Mobile number: **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.

“Post Office Limited is committed to protecting your privacy. Information about how we do this can be found on our website at www.postoffice.co.uk/privacy”

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. jane.macleod@postoffice.co.uk only is authorised to access this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not jane.macleod@postoffice.co.uk, please notify tom.beezer@postoffice.co.uk 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. Information about how we use personal data is in our [Privacy Policy](#) on our website.

Any files attached to this e-mail will have been checked by us with virus detection software before transmission. Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) 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 Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP, is neither given nor endorsed by it.

This email is sent by Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) 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.

Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP is a member of Womble Bond Dickinson (International) Limited, which consists of independent and autonomous law firms providing services in the US, the UK, and elsewhere around the world. Each Womble Bond Dickinson entity is a separate legal entity and is not responsible for the acts or omissions of, nor can bind or obligate, another Womble Bond Dickinson entity. Womble Bond Dickinson (International) Limited does not practice law. Please see www.womblebond Dickinson.com/legal notices for further details.

Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority.

<_DOC_154825881(1)_Post Office - Recusal Note (002)jm comments.docx>