POL00168551

From: Jane MacLeod[GRO]
Sent: Fri 10/06/2016 11:30:43 AM (UTC)
To: Rodric Williams[GRO] Patrick Bourke[GRO] Mark Underwood[GRO]
Subject: FW: Chairman's review - CONFIDENTIAL AND SUBJECT TO LEGAL PRIVILEGE

fyi

Jane MacLeod
General Counsel
Ground Floor

20 Finsbury Street
LONDON
EC2Y 9AQ

Mobile number: GRO

From: Jane MacLeod
Sent: 10 June 2016 12:30
To: Tim Parker
Subject: Chairman's review - CONFIDENTIAL AND SUBJECT TO LEGAL PRIVILEGE

Tim

Further to my email below, we met with Tony Robinson QC last night to discuss the Postmaster Litigation. In the course of that discussion we asked him for his advice as to whether the work being undertaken for the purposes of your review should be continued.

His strong advice was that the work being undertaken under the aegis of your review should not continue in light of the litigation. However, he also recommended that the subject matter of that work should continue provided it is re-scoped and re-instructed for the purposes of the litigation.

Clearly you will need to inform the Minister and we will prepare a form of words for you to use. I understand you are in the office next Thursday (16 June), so please let me know if you would like to discuss this then. I am of course available by phone in the meantime.

Kind regards,

Jane

Jane MacLeod
General Counsel
Ground Floor

20 Finsbury Street
LONDON
EC2Y 9AQ

Mobile number: GRO

POL00168551

-----Original Message-----
From: Jane MacLeod
Sent: 27 May 2016 18:07
To: Tim Parker
Subject: Chairman's review

Tim

As flagged at the Board earlier this week, I hosted a call with Jonathan Swift QC today to ask what, in his view, would be a reasonable course of action for you to take in relation to his recommendations as to the further lines of enquiry which could be undertaken, now that POL faces litigation covering essentially the same ground.

In summary, Jonathan felt that Tony Robertson QC (the barrister retained to advise POL on its defence to the proceedings) should first be requested to advise POL whether in light of the litigation, the various works teams should be continued, paused or re-defined.

We will send instructions to Tony early next week and expect to have this advice relatively quickly. Once this advice has been received, Jonathan has said that he would be happy to discuss with you how best to take this forward in the context of your review, as well as considering how to position this with BNR, and others with knowledge of and interest in the Review.

I will let you know as soon as we have Tony Robinson's advice. As ever, please give me a call if you would like to discuss.

Kind regards,

Jane

Jane MacLeod
General Counsel
The Post Office
GRO

Sent from my iPad