

Thomas Penny



From: Thomas Penny
Sent: 05 March 2010 14:41
To: john.longman@GRO
Cc: jane.m.owen@GRO
Subject: FW: REGINA v SEEMA MISRA GUILDFORD CROWN COURT TRIAL - 15TH MARCH 2010

Attachments: 0303.5th interim technical expert's report to the Court 2010-02-25 v0 1 (2).doc

Hi Jon

I hope you had a good break.

I've decided to take Monday off. I'm pretty sure you'll need to catch up on everything that's been going on in your absence so I assume you wouldn't be able to make Monday. If you can make Tuesday, that's great. Either email or ring; if there's no answer just let me know what time you can be with us.

Failing that, we can talk on Tuesday and arrange some time.

Kind regards
Penny

Penny Thomas
Security Analyst, Customer Services
Fujitsu Services Retail & Royal Mail Group Account
Lovelace Road, Bracknell, Berks RG12 8SN

Tel:
Mob:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Web:



<http://uk.fujitsu.com>

Fujitsu Services Limited, Registered in England no 96056, Registered Office 22, Baker Street, London W1U 3BW

This E-mail is only for the use of its intended recipient. Its contents are subject to a duty of confidence and may be privileged. Fujitsu Services does not guarantee that this E-mail has not been intercepted and amended or that it is virus-free.

From: Thomas Penny
Sent: 05 March 2010 07:36
To: jarnail.a.singh@GRO; john.longman@GRO
Subject: FW: REGINA v SEEMA MISRA GUILDFORD CROWN COURT TRIAL - 15TH MARCH 2010

Jarnail

When I left yesterday Gareth was waiting for a return call from Charles Mclachlan; it appears they have agreed a telephone call, as below.

Jon

We need some help with analysis and witness statement generation for Gareth, would you be available Monday or Tuesday to visit us and help?

Kind regards
Penny

Penny Thomas
Security Analyst, Customer Services
Fujitsu Services Retail & Royal Mail Group Account
Lovelace Road, Bracknell, Berks RG12 8SN

Tel:
Mob:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Web:



<http://uk.fujitsu.com>

Fujitsu Services Limited, Registered in England no 96056, Registered Office 22, Baker Street, London W1U 3BW

This E-mail is only for the use of its intended recipient. Its contents are subject to a duty of confidence and may be privileged. Fujitsu Services does not guarantee that this E-mail has not been intercepted and amended or that it is virus-free.

From: Jenkins Gareth GI
Sent: 04 March 2010 16:48
To: [charles.mclachlan](#) GRO
Cc: Thomas Penny
Subject: REGINA v SEEMA MISRA GUILDFORD CROWN COURT TRIAL - 15TH MARCH 2010

Charles,

I've added my comments to your 5th Report (attached – comments are as Word revisions – mainly in the far right hand column).



0303.5th interim
technical exp...

As discussed briefly I've also now got hold of the transaction logs for December 2006 to December 2007. These amount to a total of nearly half a million transactions (431,490 to be precise).

What I have done is searched through them looking for all examples of Debit Card transactions which have not been successful, since this seems to be one of the defence's main attacks on the system.

There are 92 such failed transactions for a total value of £117,149.98. I've analysed all those with an individual value of more than £1,000 (leaving £6,113.55 worth that I've not analysed).

In all the cases I've analysed one of 3 things happened:

1. The Customer session was then settled by a Cheque (and so the failure must have been noticed by the clerk)
2. The Customer session was abandoned (ie any good were returned and the transactions cancelled and the only item from the session is the failed Debit Card payment).
3. The Customer session was settled to Cash (which could have been accidental). However in all such cases the transaction was subsequently reversed resulting in the cash also being reversed.

There are business rules that control whether transactions can be cancelled or if they have to be committed and then reversed (which is the main difference between cases 2 and 3 above). I suspect (but can't necessarily prove) that in case 2 the sessions were for purchase of Foreign Currency. I case 3 the sessions were all for purchase of Premium Bonds.

I think this refutes the assertion that failed Debit Card Payments are the cause of the losses.

I'm not sure what further analysis to carry out. However I've identified some possible areas to pursue:

1. I've looked at Pouch Reversals (where cash or currency is packed for despatch to POL's Cash Centre) and the Pouch is subsequently Cancelled. This is a method by which cash losses can be partially hidden and was mentioned in the defendant's interviews. For Dec 2006 there were no such examples.
2. Each night there should be a Cash Declaration made for each Stock Unit in the Branch indicating the current cash in the till. It is also possible to look at all the cash movements for each Stock Unit by looking at the Cash transactions. I've tried to compare the Cash movements in terms of the Transactions and also in terms of differences in Declarations and there seems to be very little correlation indicating that the cash declarations are probably inaccurate
3. As part of the monthly Balancing process, special transactions are recorded to reflect Stock Adjustments and Discrepancies detected by the system as part of this process. These all result in the system assuming that Cash it put into (or removed) from the Till to reflect these Adjustments / Discrepancies. It may be worth examining these.

As arranged, I'll give you a ring at 12 noon tomorrow.

Regards

Gareth

Gareth Jenkins
Distinguished Engineer
Applications Architect
Royal Mail Group Account

FUJITSU
Lovelace Road, Bracknell, Berkshire, RG12 8SN
Tel:

GRO

Mobile:
email:
Web:

<http://uk.fujitsu.com>



Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

Fujitsu Services Limited, Registered in England no 96056, Registered Office 22 Baker Street, London, W1U 3BW

This e-mail is only for the use of its intended recipient. Its contents are subject to a duty of confidence and may be privileged. Fujitsu Services does not guarantee that this e-mail has not been intercepted and amended or that it is virus-free.