

GRO

Horizon - FJ POSITIONING.



02-09-13

3 PAGES

Draft BPs

↳ Reports "didn't contain all they should have"


"Reluctance to deal of known issues"

"As a conseq., necess to review cases to determine whether a not a partic Dept was prejudiced by absence of info"

Copies of Advice. → Share with common interest privilege.

6 Statements as examples. → MIGHT BE "TECH. CORRECT", but NO IN SUBSTANCE) ^{34 of Advice}
↳ goes to factment/obj's to do justice..

→ Tel to MS → but report revealed existence of bugs. } → NO THIS, WRO'VE CONTINUED
→ Clashed of Gault. } of PREMISE ALL IS OK (as per G.J.).



→ We do have an issue of how we share the info

MAIN SUMMARY.

INFERENCE.

(i) Syst designed to look for bugs, but doesn't mention any

↳ BY IMPLICATION, THERE ARE NONE. → Signed Stmt after Telling SS of the Bugs. ^{B/C NONE ARE MENTIONED.}

MS work.

→ Don't think he's ever been advised of his duties.

→ Started w/ Micra. [2010]

→ Has turned up since (but not given).

→ His duty is to the Court.

→ Seen to rely on this. → OK haven't done anything since.

SD - WE KNOW OF SOME OF THESE...

- WHAT WERE WE DOING TO INSTRUCT G.J.

↳ FJ will say, it's up to Df. Counsel to raise the issue.

↳ likely affected - it's auto...
[ARE FJ reviewing this?]
↳ "and correctly account for it."
↳ misleading -

FJ: "this is how we did it", a confirm

: ~~error~~

: PWS: we don't do 'bug-free' -> it's up to you what you do w/ the system

aka: PWS [per CK] Def. council should raise this

① Tells how system

-> CK to confirm ^{in writing} [G] is only reason why we're reversing.

-> LS to come to BAQC

-> Post a Go Reversing Process Procedure.

(Durham -> transaction acknowledgment)

Manchester
Leicester.

-> how do they balance? -> Crosses only.

Damages

- "Restitution" of money rec'd
- loss of compensation

