

Message

From: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd [GRO]
on behalf of Angela Van-Den-Bogerd [GRO]
Sent: 18/12/2014 09:09:46
To: Alwen Lyons [GRO]
Subject: RE: One Show


Alwen,

Yep that's the one! From the clip on him last night I feel he's appeared on the show to try to put pressure on us not to recover the £18k losses he's incurred which he knows he is liable for.

Angela

Angela Van Den Bogerd | Head of Partnerships

-  Ty Brwydran House, Atlantic Close, SWANSEA SA7 9FJ
-  Mobile: [GRO] Mobex: [GRO]
-  angela.van-den-bogerd [GRO]



Confidential Information:

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorised review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient please contact me by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

-----Original Message-----

From: Alwen Lyons
Sent: 18 December 2014 09:02
To: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd
Subject: Re: One Show

I thought I remembered him!!

The frustrating thing is that he wouldn't take advice

Thanks
Alwen

Alwen Lyons
Company Secretary
[GRO]

> On 18 Dec 2014, at 08:55, Angela Van-Den-Bogerd [GRO] wrote:
>
> Thanks Alwen,
>

> I have and here's my response.

>

> Angela

> GRO

>

> ----- Original Message -----

> From: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd

> Sent: Thursday, December 18, 2014 12:05 AM

> To: Belinda Crowe; Paula Vennells

> Subject: RE: One Show

>

> Paula,

>

> Steve Phillips at Nelson is in the Scheme. We have extensively investigated his claims - first as BAU and then as a Scheme application. He claims that interference on his telephone line was causing him losses in branch as well as intermittent power cuts. We have invested a large amount of time sharing our investigation findings with him. I have personally visited him to share our findings and have demonstrated to him that the cause of his losses is highly likely to be errors at the counter (we have evidence of a large number of errors being attributed to Steve himself) although we can not rule out theft as his security procedures were lacking. We advised him early on through BAU when his losses had not reached £18k to introduce individual stock units. He refused and the losses continued. When I became involved I insisted he introduce individual stock units which my team set up for him. Since this point the losses have stopped (other than the usual tolerance level ie £20ish per week)

>

> The reason we haven't been in touch with Steve about the loss is that I agreed with him we would block his debt until his application had concluded in the Scheme. Steve is aware of this. He is also aware that our investigation has found no system or equipment fault and therefore he realises he is responsible for the loss. Second Sight has yet to produce their view on this case - this is I believe a few weeks off.

>

> Angela

>

>

> From: Belinda Crowe

> Sent: 17 December 2014 22:42

> To: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd

> Subject: Fw: One Show

>

> See below from Paula.

> GRO

>

> ----- Original Message -----

> From: Paula Vennells

> Sent: Wednesday, December 17, 2014 09:45 PM

> To: Mark R Davies; Belinda Crowe; Gavin Lambert; Patrick Bourke

> Cc: Alice Perkins GRO

> Subject: One Show

>

> Hi all, I managed to catch the one show on iPlayer.

>

> Not denying the fact it is unhelpful and inaccurate, (especially the focus on Horizon - but see below re thoughts on that), Mark has achieved a balance of reporting beyond anything I could have hoped for. The statements stamped across the screen with the PO sign as a back drop were really powerful. They emphasised everything we have done, and came across as ... fact! Very good.

>

> The rest was hype and human interest. Not easy for me to be objective but I was more bored than outraged. The MP quoted (who?) was full of bluster, and inaccurate. Jo Hamilton lacked passion and admitted false accounting on TV. JA was nowhere to be seen. And the bulletin was too long.

>

> What I thought was helpful was that it presented Horizon as the problem, which is exactly what SS say they haven't found. And so easier for us to refute. There was nothing about intimidation, poor coaching and the message about not knowing how to use the system, in my eyes made the SPMRs look inadequate.

>

> Lastly, (belt and braces I know - forgive me), can we find out how the SPMR in Nelson (Wales) thinks we're about to go after him for £18k and why he thinks we haven't been in touch. That sounds like a live issue, not one in the scheme? (I'm sure we have been in touch!)

>

> My sincere thanks to all of you. I had an email tonight from Richard C saying how much you had helped, that we could have done nothing more and he was sorry the debate had not gone better.

>

> Paula

>

>

>

> Sent from my iPhone