

From: "Parsons, Andrew" <[REDACTED]>
To: Belinda Crowe <[REDACTED]>, Angela Van-Den-Bogerd <[REDACTED]>, Andy Holt <[REDACTED]>, Rodric Williams <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Chris Aujard <[REDACTED]>, David Oliver <[REDACTED]>, "claire.parmenter@[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: Post Office Mediation Claims. [BD-4A.FID20472253]
Date: Tue, 8 Apr 2014 20:42:12 +0000
Importance: Normal
Inline-Images: image001.jpg; image002.jpg; image003.jpg

Belinda

I've spoken to both Rodric and Simon Clarke at CK about the email from Priti Singh at Howe and all three of us have similar thoughts on the way to proceed.

The only redactions made to the copies of the reports sent to SPMRs was to remove:

1. the personal information of some of the individuals named in the report (eg. names, telephone numbers, etc.)
2. a header in the document that said that the document was subject to legal privilege when it clearly was not. This was done to avoid any confusion over the privilege status of the document.

In light of this, I do not understand Howe & Co's complaint that there is substantial missing material. It is not suggested that POL provides an un-redacted version of the report as (i) this is not necessary and (ii) we do owe some duty of privacy to the individuals involved. Instead, it is recommended that POL maintains its current position and simply explains the redactions to the report.

In this vein, I've set out below a possible response to Howe to go from Chris. This response is purposefully short in order to avoid any dialogue with Howe on this matter. I do not believe that this matter need go through the WG as this is about POL's prosecution duties and not Scheme business. This response could, and in my view should, be sent regardless of Steve Darlington's email below as it is important that POL's position is clearly stated before Ron's begins to escalate Steve's views to the Working Group.

Just for background information, the material part of the Helen Rose report has nothing to do with her comments about reversal data. SS and Howe are taking this point as evidence of a problem with the integrity of Horizon. In fact, Helen's issue was that the credence data, although accurate, did not on its face clearly distinguish between automated reversals and user generated reversals. This information is available but in a different report. The concern was not with the data's accuracy but that the presentation of the data could be misleading if its limitation were not fully understood. Putting this issue aside, the real (and confidential) reason that the report was disclosed was because Helen's comment at the bottom of page 3 suggests that it was widely known that there were problems with Horizon. This statement (regardless of whether it is correct) could have been used to attack Gareth Jenkin's credibility as POL's Horizon expert as he had previously stated that there were no problems with Horizon.

As a side point – in Steve's email he refers to an "Andy Winn / Andy Lusher email". I don't know anything about this document – does this mean anything to anyone else?

Kind regards
Andy

=====

Dear Ms Maru-Singh

I refer to your email of 7 April 2014.

The version of the report sent to Ms Robinson was redacted to protect the privacy and personal information of the individuals named in the report. This was done to ensure compliance with the Data Protection Act 1998. All material information in the report has been provided to your client in full compliance with Post Office's legal duties. We will therefore not be providing an unredacted copy of the report..

For the sake of good order, I note that Post Office disagrees with the statements in your email about the integrity of data on Horizon and the safety of convictions.

I do not believe that this matter should delay the submission of your clients' CQRs. However, should you require further time on any particular case you may of course apply in the usual way to the Working Group for an extension – please make this request in writing to [schemeenquiries](#) [GRO]

Yours sincerely

Chris Aujard

=====

Andrew Parsons

Senior Associate

for and on behalf of Bond Dickinson LLP

Bond Dickinson

Direct:
Mobile:
Fax:

GRO

Follow Bond Dickinson:



www.bonddickinson.com

From: Belinda Crowe [GRO]
Sent: 08 April 2014 19:42
To: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; Parsons, Andrew; Andy Holt; Rodric Williams
Cc: Chris Aujard; David Oliver [GRO]
Subject: Fwd: Post Office Mediation Claims.

Please see below. Not yet decided about whether to postpone this week's WG call but does anyone know anything about the email being quoted below about remote alteration of figures in branch? I think that this is a new one on me.

Andy P, can we please chase CK for a response on the Rose report point.

Best wishes
Belinda

Belinda Crowe
[148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ](#)

GRO

Postline:

GRO

GRO

belinda.crowe [GRO]

Begin forwarded message:

From: Ron Warmington <[GRO]>
Date: 8 April 2014 17:30:57 BST
To: 'Belinda Crowe' <[GRO]>
Cc: <[GRO]>
Subject: FW: Post Office Mediation Claims.

Agenda item for this week's WG call perhaps?

Regards, Ron.

From: Steve Darlington [GRO]
Sent: Tuesday, April 08, 2014 1:50 PM
To: 'Ron Warmington'
Cc: Post Office Group
Subject: FW: Post Office Mediation Claims.
Importance: High

Dear Ron,

As Priti has stated in her last sentence we are seeking a stay on the time limits on all cases under review due to the implications of POL's non-disclosure of system-generated transactions and Horizon's integrity issues.

The 'Helen Rose Report' is of critical significance to all cases. The information contained within it is a compelling case for such a stay in its own right. When combined with the Andy Winn/Alan Lusher email in the case of Ward which explicitly states that Fujitsu can remotely change the figures in the branches without the SPMs' knowledge or authority, the case for a general stay is overwhelming.

We ask that the Working Party considers this request as a matter of urgency In order that we do not prejudice our clients' cases by omitting what is clearly information of the utmost general significance,.

We also request that the Working Party demands that POL acts quickly to provide the information requested in Priti's email immediately so that the mediation process is not hindered further.

Regards

Steve Darlington BA (Hons) ACA

Finance Director

Tel: [GRO] **Fax:** [GRO]
1010 Great West Road, Brentford, TW8 9BA
www.howe.co.uk

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: 148 OLD STREET, LONDON EC1V 9HQ.
