

---

**From:** Patrick Bourke[/O=MMS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=PATRICK BOURKBE7DB8D6-53EC-4534-922B-495877001727E11]  
**Sent:** Fri 12/06/2015 4:53:14 PM (UTC)  
**To:** Mark R Davies; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd  
**Cc:** Melanie Corfield  
**Subject:** RE: BBC Panorama interview

Mark

Many thanks. What an absurd way to deal with a 'story'. I am currently very much in the same place as you on this. A TV kangaroo court is not appealing to say the least.

And there is nothing new in this.

We'll get all the papers. Happy to talk at any point over weekend.

Best wishes

Patrick

---

**From:** [Mark R Davies](#)  
**Sent:** 12/06/2015 17:44  
**To:** [Angela Van-Den-Bogerd](#)  
**Cc:** [Melanie Corfield](#); [Patrick Bourke](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: BBC Panorama interview

Hi Angela

I send you this just for info. You will see what we are dealing with here and I increasingly feel that we should not put you up to face what would clearly be an attempt to put unsupported allegations to you in a way intended to embarrass you and us, regardless of facts.

I will reflect at weekend but my sense is we should now refocus our efforts on the network and the good people in it whose businesses will be tarnished by this. So we may get you to an interview but with Brunswick so we can blitz the network through all channels before the programme to reassure and give people opportunity to ask questions.

I'm copying Patrick and Mel. This is my initial thinking and clearly we need to consider further.

Patrick/Mel: please can I have details of all the cases they refer to?

Thanks and sorry to land this email now.

Forget it now and have great weekends all.

Mark

Mark Davies  
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director  
Mobile: [GRO](#)

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Conor Spackman <GRO>  
**Date:** 12 June 2015 16:56:44 BST  
**To:** "mark.r.davies" <GRO> <GRO>  
**Cc:** Matthew Bardo <GRO>, "melanie.corfield" <GRO>  
<GRO>  
**Subject:** BBC Panorama interview

Dear Mark,

Firstly, I would like to thank you for the time you and your colleagues spent with Matthew Bardo and Tim Robinson on Tuesday. It was very helpful to be able to discuss this subject in detail with the relevant people.

Since we last wrote to the Post Office, our research has continued and I am now able to give you more information about the points that are likely to be raised in the programme.

Our evidence suggests that the Post Office may have unfairly used theft charges to put pressure on sub-postmasters to plead guilty to false accounting and/or repay apparent losses identified by the Horizon computer system. The evidence also suggests that the Post Office failed to consider or investigate the possibility that Horizon could be the cause of some of the losses. As you know, it has been suggested that these failings may have led to miscarriages of justice in some cases.

Having read reports written by Second Sight and Post Office responses to them, we wish to address the following question areas in an interview. They are broken down below under the subject matter to which they relate:

#### **Jo Hamilton**

- the decision to charge Jo Hamilton with theft
- why Ms Hamilton's office was £2000 down on the Horizon system and why this doubled to £4000 when she followed the instructions from the help desk
- her claim that she sought help and the Post Office failed to provide it
- her explanation that she subsequently felt trapped and did not know what to do other than sign off inaccurate accounts

#### **Noel Thomas**

- Mr Thomas's claim that that he told the helpline about his problems with the system and about the missing money
- the suggestion that it is no longer possible to know the results of important tests carried out on Mr Thomas' system because those records have now been lost or destroyed
- the suggestion that Mr Thomas was poorly treated after 42 years of loyal service
- that the Post Office now believes that the cause of the shortfall in Mr Thomas' branch is likely to have been mistakes by him or his staff

#### **Seema Misra**

- Ms Misra's claim that she and her staff were not provided with adequate help despite making more than 900 calls to the helpline
- the suggestion that the Post Office failed to disclose crucial information during Ms Misra's trial including technical information about Horizon to the defence's expert witness
- that the Post Office and Fujitsu had identified bugs in Horizon prior to Ms Misra's trial that were not disclosed to the defence

- the suggestion that this information could have helped Seema and other sub-postmasters stay out of prison

#### **Post Office investigations and prosecutions**

- the suggestion that the Post Office has a financial interest in prosecuting sub-postmasters because it helps with the recovery of missing money
- particularly in that context, the suggestion that miscarriages of justice are more likely because the Post Office exercises both the power of investigation and prosecution
- the suggestion that the Post Office has unfairly pursued theft charges to pressure people into paying up
- the claim by numerous sub-postmasters that they were told by Post Office investigators they were the only ones having problems with the Horizon system

#### **Horizon system**

- the suggestion that the complexity of the Horizon system adds to the likelihood of errors
- the suggestion that the lack of an automatic paper record from the Horizon system adds to the likelihood of errors
- the suggestion that Post Office prosecutions relied on the belief that the computer system was robust, when in fact computer errors may call this into question
- the suggestion that bugs in Horizon were more widespread than Second Sight have found
- the suggestion that there were around 30 people working in “third line support” at Fujitsu and that they fixed dozens of system errors
- the suggestion that errors were fixed by a team who could access transaction data, add transactions or make changes to transactions that would affect the balance in branch, without the sub-postmasters knowledge

#### **Second Sight investigation and select committee in parliament**

- Second Sight’s claim that their work has been hampered by an increasing lack of co-operation
- Second Sight’s understanding that this is the result of legal advice
- Second Sight’s claim that the Post Office has failed to provide full access to legal and prosecution files
- The apparent failure of the Post Office to provide Second Sight with emails relating to the eyewitness account of an incident in Bracknell in 2008
- Second Sight’s evidence that remote access to branch data is possible in spite of Post Office denials

Please could you let us know the time that you have scheduled on Wednesday 17 June for the interview? I would be grateful if we could arrive about an hour before the interview begins in order to set up. It usually takes about half an hour to pack the kit away again after we have finished filming.

Thanks for your help.

Conor

-----

<http://www.bbc.co.uk>

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not

the views of the BBC unless specifically stated.

If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system.

Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it and notify the sender immediately.

Please note that the BBC monitors e-mails sent or received.

Further communication will signify your consent to this.

-----