

From: Marianne Tutin Tutin [GRO]
Subject: Re: The note of my meeting
Date: 16 March 2024 at 02:58
To: Henry Staunton [REDACTED]
Cc: Michael Burd Michael.Burd [GRO]

Dear Henry,

I've noted your comments regarding [REDACTED] which I will consider.

I want to ensure there is no misunderstanding as to my email below, however. I did not suggest nor have I accepted your clarifications and amendments. The amendments you have made are not an accurate reflection of what we discussed on 22 January. Rather, I said that I am willing to take your amendments into consideration as post-meeting additional representations. I will then make a decision in respect of the allegations based upon all the evidence before me.

Best wishes,

Marianne

From: Henry Staunton [REDACTED]
Date: Friday, 15 March 2024 at 15:14
To: Marianne Tutin [GRO]
Cc: Michael Burd [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: The note of my meeting

Dear Marianne ,

Thank you for your letter .

Michael did note that I had crossed out the specific reference to [REDACTED] . That is because I could see that increasingly such documentation was being forwarded to the Select Committee and I did not think we should make [REDACTED] name public for no good reason . That remains my view . At the time I spoke to you I thought everything would remain confidential but I do not believe that Post Office can be relied on to keep it confidential . Hence we should not refer to [REDACTED] . It adds nothing to the story .

Michael has noted that you are accepting the vast bulk of my clarifications and amendments (reflecting my subsequent finding of relevant file notes) . However , it would be helpful to know which clarifications , if any , you may not consider so that we can make specific representations to you before you finalise your report .

Many thanks ,
Henry

Sent from [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Marianne Tutin [GRO]
Sent: Friday, March 15, 2024 1:43 pm
To: Henry Staunton [REDACTED]
Cc: Michael Burd [GRO]
Subject: Re: The note of my meeting

Dear Henry,

Thank you for your amendments to the note and I've had regard to your comments below. I've grateful to you for clarifying the "sham" comment.

I'm afraid I'm not able to agree the extensive amendments that you've made. You have deleted certain matters that I recall you saying and now included different answers. For the most part, however, your amendments appear to be clarifications or additions you wish to make following our meeting. Therefore, I am happy to consider them in that spirit, i.e. as further written representations, rather than an as accurate record of the content of our discussion on 22 January.

Best wishes,

Marianne

Marianne Tutin
Barrister



DDI [GRO]
Email [GRO]

Tel [GRO]
DX 349 London Chancery Lane

Client Reception
Devereux Chambers
Devereux Court
London WC2R 3JH

Postal Address
Devereux Chambers
Queen Elizabeth Building
Temple London EC4Y 9BS



<http://devereuxchambers.co.uk/barristers/profile/marianne-tutin>

Regulated by the Bar Standards Board

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email is confidential and maybe subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender. You must not copy, distribute or use it without authority.

DATA PROTECTION: Our Privacy Notice is available [here](#).

From: Henry Staunton [REDACTED]

Date: Wednesday, 13 March 2024 at 17:33

To: Marianne Tutin [GRO]

Cc: Michael Burd - Lewis Silkin-PA [GRO]

[GRO]

Subject: Fwd: The note of my meeting

Dear Marianne,

As promised, I attach a corrected version of your note (which you may treat as approved and signed by me), in connection with which I would add the following comments:

- At the time that we met I was right in the middle of dealing with the fallout of the Mr Bates TV programme, and had had scant time to look back at documents or try to refresh my memory. (Unlike Nick Read, I was not given an extension of time to prepare.) In the period since I have (for all too obvious reasons) had the chance to look back at contemporaneous documents and my notes, so some of my amendments reflect what I have been able to verify truly transpired.
- I do think it important to be clear that it is not correct to characterise Jane's note to me of 24 May 2023 as a 'Speak Up' complaint. Jane, who of all people knew exactly what a Speak Up complaint is, did not characterise it as such; and, as previously stated, she was asking for an 'off the record' conversation and a 'steer' on how to deal with Nick, which is not how the Speak Up procedure works. In fact, as the record shows, Jane *did* send out a draft Speak Up complaint in July 2023, and submitted a final Speak Up complaint in September. But both occurred significantly after her May email to me.
- All that said, I did take Jane's May note seriously and, indeed, went through it with Nick at the time;

- It is notable that, in her Speak Up document, Jane complained only about Nick. I was not mentioned at all, and though others were mentioned, only Nick was the subject of complaint.
- I have been able since we met to get to the bottom of the conversation in which I am alleged to have used the terms “pains in the arses”, “girls” etc.. I was in fact referring to comments which had been made to me years earlier by a CEO of a previous company I chaired, which I made clear I fundamentally disagreed with and which had been an impediment to achieving diversity on that Board. I attach a copy of a letter I have sent to the Select Committee which explains this further.
- Finally, I want to clarify my “sham” comment, which I believe has been misunderstood. I am not suggesting that your efforts are a sham. Rather, I believe that the scope of your investigation was cynically widened by the Post Office to add in allegations against me (“pains in the arses”, taking things to the Board etc) in an attempt to ‘spread the load’ and provide some ‘cover’ for Nick. In that sense, I genuinely believe that the scope you were given was artificially inflated so far as allegations against me are concerned. I am sorry if you took this as a slight against you. The proof, of course, is in the pudding, as they say; it is surely ironic that I was fired for allegedly having been a bully, when anyone reading Jane’s complaint can see that no such allegation is made against me but Nick, who is complained about at length (including for engaging in bullying behaviour), remains in post.

Sincerely,
Henry

This email is sent on behalf of Lewis Silkin LLP. Lewis Silkin LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC317120. We are authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority and a list of members is available for inspection at our registered office, Arbor, 255 Blackfriars Road, London, SE1 9AX. Any reference to a partner in relation to Lewis Silkin LLP is to a member of Lewis Silkin LLP, or to an employee or consultant with equivalent qualifications and standing. This email is confidential and may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, do not copy or disclose its content, but please contact the sender immediately.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail and any attachment is confidential and may be subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient or believe you may have received it in error please delete it and notify the sender as soon as possible. You must not copy, distribute or use the information in this e-mail without the sender's authority.

This email message has been delivered safely and archived online by Mimecast.

From: Marianne Tutin Tutin [GRO]
Subject: Re: Investigation
Date: 8 March 2024 at 04:41
To: Michael Burd Michael.Burd [GRO] Henry Staunton [REDACTED]

Dear Michael,

Thank you for letting me know. I appreciate Henry's efforts in doing so, but the difficulty is that I will be receiving his comments 7 weeks after I spoke to him. If Henry suggests substantial amendments, I will require some convincing that such changes reflect our discussion accurately, given the passage of time and in circumstances where recordings were not made.

I should also add that I was surprised and somewhat disappointed to see Henry say in his open letter to the Chair of the BTC of 4 March 2024, the contents of which I have noted, that my investigation is a "sham". From my perspective, that is not the case. I will be making objective findings of fact on the basis of the evidence before me. I have not been placed under any pressure to make certain findings of fact or recommendations.

Best wishes,

Marianne

From: Michael Burd [GRO]
Date: Wednesday, 6 March 2024 at 19:32
To: Marianne Tutin [GRO], Henry Staunton [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Investigation

Dear Marianne,

Henry has asked that I write to you to let you know that he still intends to get a corrected version to you of the note you made of your meeting with him. He has been completely taken up until now by preparations for the Parliamentary Sub-Committee hearing, the hearing itself and a welter of follow-up requests/requirements that have arisen since. I am away until the weekend, but the intention is to get this to you early next week.

Kind regards,
Michael

Michael Burd

Partner | T [GRO] | M [GRO]

Lewis Silkin LLP

Arbor, 255 Blackfriars Road, London SE1 9AX - UK

PA [GRO] | T [GRO] | [GRO]

www.lewissilkin.com | www.iuslaboris.com

From: Marianne Tutin [GRO]
Sent: Friday, February 23, 2024 9:13 AM
To: Henry Staunton [REDACTED] Michael Burd [GRO]
Subject: Re: Investigation

Dear Henry,

Thank you for your emails on Wednesday, which I have received, including your response document.

In case there is any confusion, for the purposes of my investigation, the allegations that have been made about you directly are as set out at points (5) and (6) of my invitation letter dated 10 January 2024, namely that:

- During a meeting on around 25 January 2023, you referred to women as “pains in the arses” and at the same meeting, said of one candidate for the RemCo Chair position words to the effect of “she doesn’t look coloured, where does she come from?” and in view of her age referred to the same candidate as a “girl” (when other women were referred to as “ladies”); and
- The Board failed to intervene or address the allegations raised by Ms Davies with you via a letter dated 24 May 2023.

As I also stated in the invitation letter, this investigation is and remains confidential. Neither the fact or the content of the investigation should be discussed with anyone other than any legal advisers.

Best wishes,

Marianne

From: Henry Staunton [REDACTED]
Date: Friday, 23 February 2024 at 09:01
To: Michael Burd - Lewis Silkin-PA [REDACTED] **GRO**
[REDACTED] **GRO**
Cc: Marianne Tutin [REDACTED] **GRO**
Subject: Investigation

Dear Michael ,

I wrote to Marianne earlier this week as you know with a full summary of my response to the charges levelled against me . I said I would deal with her 27 page document (mainly relating to the charges against Nick) after the Select Committee .

I asked for confirmation that she received my email but do not believe I have heard back (I have been dealing with scores of emails wrt the Select Committee so apologies if I have missed it) . My emails often struggle to make it through her system for some reason . I copied you with my response . Could you please resend my email to her and obtain a confirmation of receipt .

I am sorry to ask but your emails do seem to get through .

Many thanks ,
Henry

Sent from [Outlook for iOS](#)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail and any attachment is confidential and may be subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient or believe you may have received it in error please delete it and notify the sender as soon as possible. You must not copy, distribute or use the information in this e-mail without the sender's authority.

This email message has been delivered safely and archived online by Mimecast.
