1		Thursday, 9 May 2024			
2	(9.45 am)				
3	MR BLAKE: Good morning, sir, can you see and hear me?				
4	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can, thank you.				
5	MR BLAKE: Thank you very much. This morning we're going to				
6		hear from Mr Clarke.			
7		SIMON ANDREW CLARKE (affirmed)			
8		Questioned by MR BLAKE			
9	MR	BLAKE: Thank you. Can you give your full name, please?			
10	Α.	Simon Andrew Clarke.			
11	Q.	Mr Clarke, you should have in front of you a witness			
12		statement?			
13	Α.	I have.			
14	Q.	Is it dated 23 March 2024?			
15	Α.	If you give me a moment it is.			
16	Q.	Can I ask you to turn to page 69?			
17	Α.	I have it.			
18	Q.	Is that your signature?			
19	Α.	It is.			
20	Q.	Is that statement true to the best of your knowledge and			
21		belief?			
22	Α.	It is.			
23	Q.	Thank you very much. That statement has the URN			
24		WITN08130100. That statement will be published on the			
25		Inquiry's website shortly.			
		1			
1	Q.	Yes. In terms of Post Office work, while you were at			
2		Cartwright King, is it right to say that you only			
3		undertook work for the Post Office after separation from			
4		Royal Mail Group?			
5	Α.	Some can I just add one other point first? I also			
6		practice at the independent Bar.			
7	Q.	Thank you. In addition to your own			
8	Α.	In addition to my own firm.			
9		In answer to your question, I joined Cartwright King			

- 10 in January 2010 and, effectively, was General Defence
- 11 Counsel for their clients. I was aware, from just
- 12 general background noise, that they prosecuted for Royal
- 13 Mail Group through Post Office. I was aware that Post
- 14 Office separated in April, I think, 2012, from Royal
- 15 Mail Group but I didn't receive any instructions from
- 16 the in-house Head of Advocacy to undertake any Post
- 17 Office work substantively until about April/May 2013,
- 18 although I did one or two brief mention hearings,
- I think, before that. So, really, 2013 was when my
 involvement started.
- 21 Q. Thank you. What did you understand Cartwright King's22 role to be in relation to those Post Office cases; were
- 23 you an agent for the Post Office or something else?
- 24 A. Again, this is all background noise. Pre-separation,
- 25 I understood that Royal Mail Group had a number of agent 3

- Mr Clarke, many people in this room will already
- 2 know but you are a barrister?
- 3 A. Yeah.

- 4 Q. You were called to the Bar in 1997?
- 5 A. Yeah.
- 6 Q. You practised at the self-employed criminal Bar until
- 7 2010?
- 8 **A.** I did.
- 9 Q. Then you joined Cartwright King?
- 10 A. That's correct.
- 11 Q. You were based at Cartwright King until 2016?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. You then set up your own firm with Mr Bowyer and
- 14 Mr Smith --
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. -- both of whom we've heard from. Like Mr Smith,
- 17 I think, did you have access to Cartwright King emails
- 18 and electronic repositories at some point thereafter?
- A. I did. We retained a consultancy with them, largely in
 the area of work that we'd set up the firm for but also
 because they wanted, from time to time, additional help
- 22 with the Post Office work they continued to do.
- 23 Q. Thank you. You're still senior partner of that firm; is24 that correct?
- 25 A. The firm I set up, yes.

- 1 solicitors across the country that they would ask to 2 deal with matters in their own areas, prosecuting in the 3 Magistrates' Court and instructing counsel in the Crown 4 Court. Post-separation, Andy Cash at Cartwright King, 5 one of the senior partners, had some links with Post 6 Office and he used those links to obtain a contract 7 between Post Office and Cartwright King that Cartwright 8 King would conduct all of the Post Office prosecutions 9 across England and Wales from 1 April 2012. 10 That was my understanding of the position. I know 11 that to be the case because, when I did get involved, 12 I looked back to see what the position was. 13 Q. In terms of authority to make certain decisions in how 14 cases are run, where did you see that lie, at Cartwright 15 King or the Post Office or a combination of the two? A. Our function, as I saw it, and certainly my function, 16 17 was to advise and Post Office were responsible for 18 taking the decisions because Post Office were the prosecuting authority. 19 20 Q. That is all fine in theory but was that the reality? There were times when Post Office didn't follow our 21 Α. 22 advice and there were times when they did. There were 23 times when they were resistant to our advice, there were 24 times when they accepted it. But you have to remember
- 25 that, from my point of view, I was only ever instructed

- 1 to prosecute substantively a single case and it was that
- 2 case that, effectively, I think, led us to where we are
- 3 today. In my mind, certainly it is.
- 4 Q. We see reference in your witness statement to being
- 5 instructed by Andy Cash, who was the senior solicitor at6 Cartwright King?
- 7 **A.** Yeah.
- 8 Q. To what extent did you consider that you had to be
 9 specifically instructed to carry out that Post Office
- 10 work in respect of individual pieces of work?
- 11 A. We used the word "instructed" generically. Andy Cash
- was, at the time, Head of Criminal Advocacy, one of hisfunctions was to allocate in-house Cartwright King cases
- and clients to particular barristers to work on, and
- 45 Andre Oracle all sate of the states to work
- 15 Andy Cash allocated that case to me.
- 16 Q. We'll come to quite a few different advices that you
 17 wrote over the years. Sometimes it seems as though they
 18 weren't specifically requested by the Post Office?
- 19 **A.** No, no.
- 20 Q. To what extent did you have autonomy to simply act as21 an effectively standing counsel to the Post Office?
- 22 A. I never saw myself as standing counsel to the Post
- 23 Office. I was an employee of Cartwright King.24 I occasionally saw something that concerned me and
- advised because I was concerned, not because I had been
 - 5
- 1 description, if you like, could best be seen as the
- 2 solicitor to the case and, if you want to formalise
- 3 things and talk about who instructed whom, Martin was
- 4 effectively the instructing solicitor and was referred
- 5 to that from time to time, internally as the instructing
- solicitor on a case, with Andy Cash as the boss, if youlike.
- 8 But Martin would also give advice off of his own bat
- 9 to Post Office, from time to time. I know that because
- 10 I've looked at the hearings and, to my surprise, have
- 11 learnt that, in some respects.
- 12 **Q.** What do you mean, to your surprise?
- 13 A. Well, I knew he was speaking to Jarnail Singh -- Jarnail
 14 Singh would phone him up extremely regularly and he was
- 15 speaking to Jarnail Singh and giving Jarnail Singh
- 16 *ad hoc* advice on a daily basis and, occasionally -- no,
- 17 more than occasionally -- Martin would come to us and
- 18 say, "Jarnail's asked this, what do you think?" But,
- 19 quite often, Martin would give the advice himself.
- 20 My surprise comes because I've seen a number of
- 21 written documents where Martin appears to have been
- 22 dealing directly with Andrew Parsons and Jarnail Singh
- 23 separately or together, without -- I just don't
- 24 recognise the documents.
- 25 Q. You don't recognise the documents?

- specifically instructed to advise, and a good example is
 what happened in the Samra case.
- 3 **Q.** Thank you. We'll get to the Samra case shortly. We've heard from Mr Smith. The impression given by Mr Smith
- heard from Mr Smith. The impression given by Mr Smith
 that he relied on you for guidance and would, in many
- 6 ways, defer to you; is that impression correct?
- 7 **A.** No.
- 8 Q. Why not?
- 9 A. Martin Smith was the communications route, if you like,
- 10 the point of contact between Post Office and Cartwright
- 11 King and so everything I did, occasionally I would deal
- 12 with Rodric Williams directly but, most of the time,
- 13 everything I did and everything Harry Bowyer did went to
- 14 Martin, who would forward it to Jarnail Singh and/or
- 15 Rodric Williams and occasionally, I think, other people
- 16 in Post Office. So he was the main conduit between the17 two.
- 18 Q. He may have been a main conduit, which was effectively
 19 how he described himself. but, in terms of actual
- 20 responsibility, understanding, involvement in the
- 21 underlying cases, do you agree or disagree with the
- 22 evidence that he gave in that respect?
- A. I disagree to an extent. We -- because Harry Bowyer and
 I were barristers, we tried to maintain the
- 25 barrister-solicitor relationship. So Martin's
 - 6
- 1 **A.** Yeah, some that were put to him the other day.
- 2 Q. So they may have been written but without being shared
- 3 with yourself?
- 4 A. Yeah.
- 5 Q. Mr Smith also admitted certain short comings in his own6 knowledge?
- 7 A. I saw that.
- 8 **Q.** Were you aware of that at the time?
- 9 A. No. Again, if I can clarify, I came in in April/May
- 10 2013. By that time, Martin Smith and Andy Cash had been
- 11 prosecuting for Post Office for quite a long time and
- 12 I had no knowledge of what they were and what they
- 13 weren't doing during that period because I wasn't
- 14 involved. So when I came in in 2013 and stopped the
- 15 prosecutions, effectively, from June onwards, I didn't
- 16 look to see what Martin's state of knowledge was; I was
- 17 more interested in repairing the damage which had
- 18 plainly been caused.
- 19 Q. Were you aware of any shortcomings in his legal20 knowledge?
- 21 A. He would ask me questions on law and I would help him
- 22 with them. I don't think there was any particular
- 23 deficit that I can point to. I was surprised when he
- 24 said the other day that he had no knowledge of
- 25 prosecution disclosure duties because he was a defence 8

1		solicitor.
2	Q.	I think post-conviction disclosure duties?
3	Α.	Well, it's not that different. The fundamental
4		principles, as Brian Altman confirmed to us in advice,
5		are the same: is there material that might reasonably be
6		expected to undermine the convictions such as to render
7		it unsafe? I paraphrase but, by and large, it's the
8		same principles.
9		But the other point which concerned me, which did
10		surprise me, is that the defence lawyers are expected to
11		know prosecution duties of disclosure and prosecution
12		duties vis à vis expert witnesses as well because,
13		otherwise, how can you properly defend your client in
14		the face of disclosure issues or expert witness issues?
15	Q.	At paragraph 9 of your witness statement you say that,
16		in late 2012, you were instructed to provide some
17		general advice on prosecution procedures to Mr Smith.
18		Are we to understand that as training, or something
19		else?
20	Α.	lt's you'll forgive me, it's a slightly vague
21		paragraph and I think it's intended to be because
22		I don't I recall giving advice. I do not recall
23		giving training and so it's likely and I make
24		a reference in the paragraph, I think, to written advice
25		about I may have provided written advice about 9
		3
1		experience of the Post Office, you say at paragraph 34
2		of your witness statement that the Post Office appears
3		to work in silos.
4	A.	You don't mind if I turn it up?
5	Q.	That's absolutely fine. I don't think we need to bring
6 7		it onto screen.
7	A.	No, it's here. Yes.
8 9	Q.	Can you assist us with what you meant by the Post Office
9		working in silos?

10 **A.** When I first raised the issues relating to expert

- 11 witnesses with Post Office, they became very defensive
- 12 in a general sense, and when I spoke to people in Post
- 13 Office on the telephone, I think we had a couple of
- 14 meetings, I spoke wit Rodric Williams, with Jarnail
- 15 Singh, with Chris Aujard and his predecessor, who
- 16 I think was Susan Crichton, and I was aware of hearing
- 17 around Cartwright King and around Post Office generally
- 18 that people just weren't talking to each other.
- 19 And, as an example, Rodric Williams wouldn't know
- 20 what Post Office Security was doing; Jarnail Singh
- 21 wouldn't have much communication with Rodric Williams;
- 22 the Investigation -- this is all stuff I picked up --
- 23 Investigation Teams weren't really talking to anybody
- 24 substantively. Everybody was living in their own
- 25 particular work environment and there was no
 - 11

- 1 evidential requirements in a particular case but I don't
- 2 recall. That, I think, is what I'm referring to.
- 3 Martin would have given me a file and said, "Can you do
- 4 me an advice on evidence?", for instance. I think
- 5 that's what I am referring to. It's not training.
- 6 I delivered no training to anybody.
- 7 Q. Within Cartwright King, were you aware of any training
- 8 about the role of a prosecutor, duties of disclosure,
- 9 duties in respect of the instruction of expert witnesses10 or --
- 11 A. Prior to my involvement in May 2013, I just wouldn't
- 12 know, because I wasn't involved. There was none after,
- 13 other than -- I've just said I didn't deliver any
- 14 training, that's not, strictly speaking, true. After
- 15 the Samra case, I gave training for the purposes of the
- 16 sift process that you've heard about. I had to train
- 17 those who were doing the first sift, so they knew what
- 18 they were looking for but that was the extent of it.
- 19 **Q.** (Unclear: simultaneous speaking) ... say, a solicitor
- 20 who had conduct --21 **A.** No.
- 22 **Q.** -- of a criminal prosecution? No?
- A. No. I've just committed the offence of talking over youwith the shorthand-writer, I'm sorry. No.
- 25 **Q.** In terms of how the Post Office worked in your 10
- 1 communication across the business, if you like, and it 2 was quite frustrating because you would send an advice 3 in and, a week or so later, you would say to somebody 4 "You've seen my advice?" and they would say, "Well, no", 5 and you would have to then track down and find out why 6 they hadn't seen it when you know they ought to have 7 seen it, and it was largely because people weren't 8 communicating with each other. We'll come on to talk about the weekly meetings and the 9 Q. central hub --10 Yeah. 11 Δ Q. -- but was that a theme that continued throughout your 12 13 time at the Post Office, or ... 14 Α. It was. It got worse, I think. One of the reasons why 15 I advised that the weekly hub meetings were convened was 16 to cure this problem, was to make people speak to each 17 other, about Horizon in particular, because I rather 18 suspected at the time -- I know better now -- but at the 19 time, I rather suspected that one of the reasons why these two Horizon bugs detected by Second Sight escaped 20 21 people's attention was because nobody was talking to 22 each other, as simple as that. 23 Q. What do you put that down to, fundamentally? 24 Α. Office politics? I don't know. It's speculative. It
- 25 became something more after the event. But, at the time 12

		ine rost	Office Hoff201
1		I was encountering it in June, July, August 2013, I put	
2		it down to office politics. People were working within	
3		their own comfort zones and never the twain shall meet,	:
4		as they say.	
5	Q.	I'm going to take you to another passage from your	:
6		statement it's WITN08130100, and if we can look at	
7		paragraph 47, page 138, please.	
8	Α.	Can I just read it?	
9	Q.	You can. I'm going to bring it onto screen as well.	
10		It's page 47 and it's the second half of paragraph 138	1
11		that I want to take you to?	1
12	Α.	Yeah, I know	1
13	Q.	You say there:	1
14		"Looking back, I now see what appears to have been	1
15		three strands of thought within [the Post Office] on the	1
16		topic of disclosure. The first strand amounted to	1
17		an article of faith: 'Horizon is both robust and	1
18		reliable there is nothing wrong with it and if	1
19		Horizon says money is missing then it is missing'. The	1
20		second strand considered that the cost of providing	2
21		disclosure was prohibitive and should always be	2
22		discouraged. The third strand, I felt, arose out of	2
23		an almost religious panic: 'Horizon must not be seen to	2
24		have been impugned'."	2
25		Now, at least the second strand and the third strand	2
		13	
1		bugs", which is why I asked for the call to be made to	
2		Gareth Jenkins the following day.	
3	Q.	We'll come to that call but, in terms of you've used	:
4		the word "fundamental" just now, in terms of nothing	
5		fundamentally wrong.	:
6	Α.	Yeah.	
7	Q.	Your first strand here is there is nothing wrong with it	
8		and if Horizon says money is missing, then it's missing.	
9	Α.	Yeah.	
10	Q.	By at least the time you'd spoken to Gareth Jenkins, you	1
11	-	knew that that couldn't have been correct?	1
12	Α.	Yeah, I think that's probably right, yeah.	1
13	Q.	Thank you. You've been very clear in your evidence just	1
14	ч.	now and also in your statement about various failings at	1
15		the Post Office. Do you think that you also might have	1
16		, , , ,	1
		taken too tough a stance, particularly in relation to	
17 10		disclosure to subpostmasters?	1
18	A.	I think that's arguable, yes.	1
19	Q.	We'll come and look at it over time. Let's start in	1
20		late June/early July 2013. That can come off the	2
21		screen, please.	2
22		You say that you first became aware of bugs on	2
23		27 June 2013, then you were told about the Second Sight	2

- 24 Interim Report by Martin Smith. Can you just elaborate
- 25 on that slightly?
- 15

there were presumably things you knew from quite

- an early stage, as in you were aware that they were
- concerned about the costs --
- 4 **A.** Yes.

1

2

3

- 5 $\,$ Q. $\,$ -- and you were also aware that they were very resistant
 - to allegations about the reliability of Horizon?
- 7 A. lagree.
- 8 Q. In terms of (1), we know that you certainly found out
- 9 that it wasn't accurate at the latest by the phone
- 10 conversation that you had with Gareth Jenkins and the
- 11 Second Sight Report -- you look reluctant.
- 12 A. Just slightly. You say I "certainly found out". That
- 13 was when I learned that there were bugs in the system.
- 14 That, at the time, didn't necessarily speak to the
- 15 general unreliability of Horizon because we were still
- 16 hearing that the systems that were in place to deal with
- 17 bugs -- this is what we were told on the day we were
- 18 told, on 27 June, I think, that there were potential
- 19 bugs -- that there was nothing fundamentally wrong with
- 20 Horizon. So I would suggest that a better take on that
- 21 phone call would be I had concerns because I had been
- 22 told, I think by Martin Smith, that there were -- that
- 23 Second Sight had identified two bugs, and were to
- 24 publish this report, and my in instinctive reaction was,
- 25 "We need to find out who told Second Sight about those 14

Α.	We had heard and I don't know whether it's that day
	or not but we had heard very close in time to me
	being told, that Post Office had commissioned
	an organisation called Second Sight to look into Horizon
	and that they had done so as a result, I think and
	this is anecdotal of pressure from Justice for
	Subpostmasters organisation, or the like. And the
	messages we were getting back from Post Office around
	about 25/26 June, were "We've got nothing to worry
	about, Second Sight are going to give it a clean bill of
	health".
	27 June, I think Martin must have had some contact
	with either Jarnail Singh or Rodric Williams because he
	then came to me and I think I can't say where we were
	or what we were doing it might have been by telephone or
	it might have been in person but he said to me "Second
	Sight are going to say there are two bugs", and that
	really was the extent of it and my immediate reaction
	was "Who told them?" And the reason who told them was
	so important was because if it were the expert that they
	were relying on to give evidence, then his evidence had
	not been entirely complete, in the early cases.
Q.	Was that an immediate thought, as early as 27 June?
Α.	Oh, yes. Oh, yes. To be told that there were that
	the report was going to tell us that there were bugs in 16
	Q.

1	the system is a process-stopping mechanism.	You can't

- 2 go anywhere from that other than to say "Well, how?
- Why? Who told them?", because your duties as
 a prosecutor are so absolute in those circumstances the
- 4 a prosecutor are so absolute in those circumstances that 5 any competent barrister is going to say "Well, stop. We
- 6 have to see what's going on here".
- 7 Q. You say in your statement that you saw the Helen Rose8 Report soon after.
- 9 **A.** Yeah.
- 10 **Q.** That report was written on 12 June 2013.
- 11 **A.** Yeah.
- 12 Q. It identified issues at the Lepton Branch --
- 13 A. Yeah.
- 14 Q. -- it included certain correspondence with Gareth
 15 Jenkins and there was a mention in it of Horizon
 16 integrity issues.
- 17 A. Yeah.
- 18 Q. Can you assist us at all with when you were likely to
 19 have seen that? Was it before the conversation with
 20 Gareth Jenkins?
- 20 Garetri Jerikins?
- 21 A. No, it was after.
- 22 Q. It was after.
- 23 A. I know it was after because up until that point, Horizon
- 24 was -- I don't mock but Horizon was "robust", it's
- 25 integrity was sound, it worked perfectly. What put me 17
- 1 contacted Jarnail Singh for the contact details but
- 2 I don't know what he said to them.
- 3 Q. There was no conversation on your part --
- 4 **A.** No.
- 5 Q. -- with the Post Office?
- 6 **A.** No.
- 7 Q. Did you have a long conversation with Mr Smith before8 this call?
- 9 A. I don't believe so. My reaction was "We need to speak
- to the expert. Can you set it up please?" I'm prettysure is the way it would have gone.
- 12 Q. You said it was very clear that there was a problem with13 Gareth Jenkins on the 27th.
- 14 A. Yeah.
- 15 Q. Can you recall Mr Smith's position?
- 16 **A.** No, forgive me. There wasn't a problem with Gareth
- 17 Jenkins on the 27th; there was a problem that indicated
- 18 there were bugs with Horizon. My concern, and the
- 19 reason for the Gareth Jenkins call, was to find out who
- 20 told Second Sight because I think the language in the
- 21 Second Sight Report was "We have been informed", and
- 22 I --
- 23 Q. I think --
- 24 A. -- wanted to know who the informant was and my first
- 25 port of call was to ask the expert, and it was only when 19

- 1 on notice that it might not have done was the
- 2 conversation with Martin Smith that there were bugs in
- 3 the system, as per Second Sight. Had I had the Lepton
- 4 report prior to that then my reaction that occurred on
- 5 27 June would have occurred when I first saw that Helen
- 6 Rose Report. It's that report that reinforced my view
- 7 that there was something seriously wrong.
- 8 So I would have seen it after I was told by Martin
 9 Smith about --
- 10 **Q.** Within a week, within two weeks?
- 11 A. Well, did I refer to it in my 15 July Advice?
- 12 Q. We'll come to look at that.
- 13 A. Well, if I refer it -- I'm not -- I'm not going to get
- 14 into "I don't remember", but if I refer to it in my
- 15 15 July Advice, then I had it before 15 July. If
- 16 I don't, then I had it after.
- 17 **Q.** Thank you. Let's look at the phone call with Gareth
- 18 Jenkins, that's at POL00142322. That's 28 June.
- 19 A. Yeah.
- 20 **Q.** So Mr Smith has told you on the 27th about the potential
- 21 bugs? 22 **A.** Yeah.
- 23 Q. Was there a conversation with anyone at the Post Office
- 24 before this conversation took place?
- 25 A. Well, I asked Martin to set this call up. I imagine he 18
- 1 I spoke to the expert during this call that I realised
- 2 the problem was with -- lay with Gareth Jenkins.
- Q. I had understood your earlier evidence to be that, when
 you were aware of the bugs on the 27th, that immediately
 caused you to be concerned --
- 6 A. Yes.

- Q. -- about the reliability of Mr Jenkins?
- 8 A. Yes, yes.
- 9 Q. What about Mr Smith? Was he as concerned about you as10 Mr Jenkins, or not?
- 11 A. I don't think we had -- vague recollection -- I don't
- 12 think we had much of a conversation about it. I'm not
- 13 convinced that Martin Smith appreciated the full import
- 14 of the problem at that point.
- 15 **Q.** I'm going to read to you some passages from this
- 16 transcript.
- 17 **A.** Please. 18 **Q.** You say
 - 8 **Q.** You say:
- 19 "Hi, is that Gareth Jenkins?"
- 20 He says: "It is indeed."
- 21 You say: "Oh hi Gareth, it's Simon Clarke, I'm
- 22 a barrister prosecuting a case for Jarnail on Monday at
- 23 Birmingham Crown Court", and that's the Samra case?
- 24 **A.** Yes.
- 25 Q. He says: "Right."

1		You say: "Jarnail suggested that we give you a call	1		
2		because we've heard that the Insight Committee Report is	2		
3		due to go before MPs next week I think I don't know if			
4		you have heard the same thing, have you?"			
5		He says: "8 July is the date I have been told."			
6		Just pausing there, "Jarnail suggested that we give			
7		you a call" was it Jarnail's suggestion or	7		
8	Α.	It was mine	8		
9	Q.	Was that a way of you	9		
10	Α.	Sorry, I'm speaking over you.	10		
11	Q.	Can you assist a with why you said that Jarnail had	11		
12		suggested it?			
13	Α.	It's likely a rhetorical device to open the conversation	13		
14		with Gareth Jenkins.	14		
15	Q.	If we scroll down, please, you say:	15		
16		"Okay, well can I give you a brief sort of thumbnail	16		
17		sketch? Basically this is a postmistress who is alleged	17		
18		to have made double transaction withdrawals from Horizon	18		
19		when people have come in and taken money out of the Post	19		
20		Office Card Accounts. Do you follow?"	20		
21		He says: "Yes, I think I've heard about that sort of	21		
22		scam going on, yes."	22		
23		You say: "Yes, and essentially what she is doing she	23		
24		is asking them to put their PIN number in a second time	24		
25		claiming it hasn't worked the first time, and	25		
		21			
1		wouldn't have any impact whatsoever on that part of er	1		
2		what's going on erm and I think we've, we are confident	2		
3		that the audit trail that you are using for prosecution	3		
4		has not been compromised by those bugs."	4		
5		Just pausing there, "2 bugs that we have declared to	5		
6		Second Sight"; did that cause you any concern,	6		
7		suspicion?	7		
8	Α.	That confirmed to me that it was Gareth Jenkins that had	8		
9		told Second Sight about the bugs and, more importantly,	9		
10		that he knew about them.	10		
11	Q.	If we scroll over the page, please:	11		
12		You say: "What I'm looking for is confirmation	12		
13		effectively that you have given so can I ask you	13		
		a couple of questions which may prompt yes or no	14		
14		answers?	15		
15		He says, "Sure."	16		
15 16		He says, "Sure." Did you have a script ready or			
15 16 17	Α.	-	16		
15 16 17 18	A. Q.	Did you have a script ready or	16 17		
15 16 17 18 19		Did you have a script ready or No.	16 17 18		
15 16 17 18 19 20	Q.	Did you have a script ready or No. was this off the top of your head?	16 17 18 19		
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A.	Did you have a script ready or No. was this off the top of your head? Sorry, I'm indicating off the top.	16 17 18 19 20		
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q.	Did you have a script ready or No. was this off the top of your head? Sorry, I'm indicating off the top. The stenographer will have	16 17 18 19 20 21		
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A.	Did you have a script ready or No. was this off the top of your head? Sorry, I'm indicating off the top. The stenographer will have I'm thinking. About the poor	16 17 18 19 20 21 22		

accordingly then taking the money out herself. "Yep."	
Then you say: "All of and I mean all of the evidence	
we have got against her is Horizon data evidence."	
He says: "Yep."	
Then you say: "And when I say that what I mean is	
that all the transactions are conducted over the counter	
through Horizon."	
0	
He says: "Yep."	
I'll skip the next bit. You then go on to say:	
"Okay. The problem I have got is that we are not	
allowed to see the report but we are told that there are	
up to 30 offices where bugs have been identified, yeah,	
and we know that Hurst Lane is not one of the branches	
where there has been an identified bug. Still with us?"	
He says: "Erm right as I say certainly I am aware of	
2 bugs. Is it. Firstly is they something that has been	
done on Horizon on the new Horizon system or the old	
system."	
You say "It's the."	
He says: "What's the date?"	
You say: "It's Horizon Online."	
He then says: "Okay right. So there is 2 bugs that	
we have declared to Second Sight in that sort of erm and	
erm we know exactly which branches are affected and the	y
22	
22 from Post Office card accounts is there any reason to	
from Post Office card accounts is there any reason to	
from Post Office card accounts is there any reason to believe that Horizon can be can slip into error?"	
from Post Office card accounts is there any reason to believe that Horizon can be can slip into error?" He says: "Not that I'm aware of."	
from Post Office card accounts is there any reason to believe that Horizon can be can slip into error?" He says: "Not that I'm aware of." Then, if we scroll down, you then say: "Okay. Where are we going from here. What's the questions I posed	
from Post Office card accounts is there any reason to believe that Horizon can be can slip into error?" He says: "Not that I'm aware of." Then, if we scroll down, you then say: "Okay. Where are we going from here. What's the questions I posed earlier. Sorry I've got Martin Smith", and you	
from Post Office card accounts is there any reason to believe that Horizon can be can slip into error?" He says: "Not that I'm aware of." Then, if we scroll down, you then say: "Okay. Where are we going from here. What's the questions I posed earlier. Sorry I've got Martin Smith", and you introduce Martin Smith at that point who he	
from Post Office card accounts is there any reason to believe that Horizon can be can slip into error?" He says: "Not that I'm aware of." Then, if we scroll down, you then say: "Okay. Where are we going from here. What's the questions I posed earlier. Sorry I've got Martin Smith", and you introduce Martin Smith at that point who he acknowledges.	
from Post Office card accounts is there any reason to believe that Horizon can be can slip into error?" He says: "Not that I'm aware of." Then, if we scroll down, you then say: "Okay. Where are we going from here. What's the questions I posed earlier. Sorry I've got Martin Smith", and you introduce Martin Smith at that point who he acknowledges. Then he says: "Hi. It's the Horizon function is	
from Post Office card accounts is there any reason to believe that Horizon can be can slip into error?" He says: "Not that I'm aware of." Then, if we scroll down, you then say: "Okay. Where are we going from here. What's the questions I posed earlier. Sorry I've got Martin Smith", and you introduce Martin Smith at that point who he acknowledges. Then he says: "Hi. It's the Horizon function is functioning perfectly"	
from Post Office card accounts is there any reason to believe that Horizon can be can slip into error?" He says: "Not that I'm aware of." Then, if we scroll down, you then say: "Okay. Where are we going from here. What's the questions I posed earlier. Sorry I've got Martin Smith", and you introduce Martin Smith at that point who he acknowledges. Then he says: "Hi. It's the Horizon function is functioning perfectly" Then you say: "This is the other point. Bugs have	
from Post Office card accounts is there any reason to believe that Horizon can be can slip into error?" He says: "Not that I'm aware of." Then, if we scroll down, you then say: "Okay. Where are we going from here. What's the questions I posed earlier. Sorry I've got Martin Smith", and you introduce Martin Smith at that point who he acknowledges. Then he says: "Hi. It's the Horizon function is functioning perfectly" Then you say: "This is the other point. Bugs have been identified in Horizon which call into question some	
from Post Office card accounts is there any reason to believe that Horizon can be can slip into error?" He says: "Not that I'm aware of." Then, if we scroll down, you then say: "Okay. Where are we going from here. What's the questions I posed earlier. Sorry I've got Martin Smith", and you introduce Martin Smith at that point who he acknowledges. Then he says: "Hi. It's the Horizon function is functioning perfectly" Then you say: "This is the other point. Bugs have been identified in Horizon which call into question some of the aspects of the way in which it operates. That's	
from Post Office card accounts is there any reason to believe that Horizon can be can slip into error?" He says: "Not that I'm aware of." Then, if we scroll down, you then say: "Okay. Where are we going from here. What's the questions I posed earlier. Sorry I've got Martin Smith", and you introduce Martin Smith at that point who he acknowledges. Then he says: "Hi. It's the Horizon function is functioning perfectly" Then you say: "This is the other point. Bugs have been identified in Horizon which call into question some of the aspects of the way in which it operates. That's a fair assessment, isn't it?"	
from Post Office card accounts is there any reason to believe that Horizon can be can slip into error?" He says: "Not that I'm aware of." Then, if we scroll down, you then say: "Okay. Where are we going from here. What's the questions I posed earlier. Sorry I've got Martin Smith", and you introduce Martin Smith at that point who he acknowledges. Then he says: "Hi. It's the Horizon function is functioning perfectly" Then you say: "This is the other point. Bugs have been identified in Horizon which call into question some of the aspects of the way in which it operates. That's a fair assessment, isn't it?" Mr Jenkins says: "Erm yes."	
from Post Office card accounts is there any reason to believe that Horizon can be can slip into error?" He says: "Not that I'm aware of." Then, if we scroll down, you then say: "Okay. Where are we going from here. What's the questions I posed earlier. Sorry I've got Martin Smith", and you introduce Martin Smith at that point who he acknowledges. Then he says: "Hi. It's the Horizon function is functioning perfectly" Then you say: "This is the other point. Bugs have been identified in Horizon which call into question some of the aspects of the way in which it operates. That's a fair assessment, isn't it?" Mr Jenkins says: "Erm yes."	t
from Post Office card accounts is there any reason to believe that Horizon can be can slip into error?" He says: "Not that I'm aware of." Then, if we scroll down, you then say: "Okay. Where are we going from here. What's the questions I posed earlier. Sorry I've got Martin Smith", and you introduce Martin Smith at that point who he acknowledges. Then he says: "Hi. It's the Horizon function is functioning perfectly" Then you say: "This is the other point. Bugs have been identified in Horizon which call into question some of the aspects of the way in which it operates. That's a fair assessment, isn't it?" Mr Jenkins says: "Erm yes." Then you say: "Yeah, okay. How can we be sure that (a) we have identified all of the bugs that there are	
from Post Office card accounts is there any reason to believe that Horizon can be can slip into error?" He says: "Not that I'm aware of." Then, if we scroll down, you then say: "Okay. Where are we going from here. What's the questions I posed earlier. Sorry I've got Martin Smith", and you introduce Martin Smith at that point who he acknowledges. Then he says: "Hi. It's the Horizon function is functioning perfectly" Then you say: "This is the other point. Bugs have been identified in Horizon which call into question some of the aspects of the way in which it operates. That's a fair assessment, isn't it?" Mr Jenkins says: "Erm yes."	
from Post Office card accounts is there any reason to believe that Horizon can be can slip into error?" He says: "Not that I'm aware of." Then, if we scroll down, you then say: "Okay. Where are we going from here. What's the questions I posed earlier. Sorry I've got Martin Smith", and you introduce Martin Smith at that point who he acknowledges. Then he says: "Hi. It's the Horizon function is functioning perfectly" Then you say: "This is the other point. Bugs have been identified in Horizon which call into question some of the aspects of the way in which it operates. That's a fair assessment, isn't it?" Mr Jenkins says: "Erm yes." Then you say: "Yeah, okay. How can we be sure that (a) we have identified all of the bugs that there are	
from Post Office card accounts is there any reason to believe that Horizon can be can slip into error?" He says: "Not that I'm aware of." Then, if we scroll down, you then say: "Okay. Where are we going from here. What's the questions I posed earlier. Sorry I've got Martin Smith", and you introduce Martin Smith at that point who he acknowledges. Then he says: "Hi. It's the Horizon function is functioning perfectly" Then you say: "This is the other point. Bugs have been identified in Horizon which call into question some of the aspects of the way in which it operates. That's a fair assessment, isn't it?" Mr Jenkins says: "Erm yes." Then you say: "Yeah, okay. How can we be sure that (a) we have identified all of the bugs that there are and (b) that although Horizon has been demonstrated tha	
from Post Office card accounts is there any reason to believe that Horizon can be can slip into error?" He says: "Not that I'm aware of." Then, if we scroll down, you then say: "Okay. Where are we going from here. What's the questions I posed earlier. Sorry I've got Martin Smith", and you introduce Martin Smith at that point who he acknowledges. Then he says: "Hi. It's the Horizon function is functioning perfectly" Then you say: "This is the other point. Bugs have been identified in Horizon which call into question some of the aspects of the way in which it operates. That's a fair assessment, isn't it?" Mr Jenkins says: "Erm yes." Then you say: "Yeah, okay. How can we be sure that (a) we have identified all of the bugs that there are and (b) that although Horizon has been demonstrated that to be fallible that insofar as the case we are	
from Post Office card accounts is there any reason to believe that Horizon can be can slip into error?" He says: "Not that I'm aware of." Then, if we scroll down, you then say: "Okay. Where are we going from here. What's the questions I posed earlier. Sorry I've got Martin Smith", and you introduce Martin Smith at that point who he acknowledges. Then he says: "Hi. It's the Horizon function is functioning perfectly" Then you say: "This is the other point. Bugs have been identified in Horizon which call into question some of the aspects of the way in which it operates. That's a fair assessment, isn't it?" Mr Jenkins says: "Erm yes." Then you say: "Yeah, okay. How can we be sure that (a) we have identified all of the bugs that there are and (b) that although Horizon has been demonstrated that to be fallible that insofar as the case we are conducting is concerned we can eliminate the possibility	
from Post Office card accounts is there any reason to believe that Horizon can be can slip into error?" He says: "Not that I'm aware of." Then, if we scroll down, you then say: "Okay. Where are we going from here. What's the questions I posed earlier. Sorry I've got Martin Smith", and you introduce Martin Smith at that point who he acknowledges. Then he says: "Hi. It's the Horizon function is functioning perfectly" Then you say: "This is the other point. Bugs have been identified in Horizon which call into question some of the aspects of the way in which it operates. That's a fair assessment, isn't it?" Mr Jenkins says: "Erm yes." Then you say: "Yeah, okay. How can we be sure that (a) we have identified all of the bugs that there are and (b) that although Horizon has been demonstrated that to be fallible that insofar as the case we are conducting is concerned we can eliminate the possibility of error."	
from Post Office card accounts is there any reason to believe that Horizon can be can slip into error?" He says: "Not that I'm aware of." Then, if we scroll down, you then say: "Okay. Where are we going from here. What's the questions I posed earlier. Sorry I've got Martin Smith", and you introduce Martin Smith at that point who he acknowledges. Then he says: "Hi. It's the Horizon function is functioning perfectly" Then you say: "This is the other point. Bugs have been identified in Horizon which call into question some of the aspects of the way in which it operates. That's a fair assessment, isn't it?" Mr Jenkins says: "Erm yes." Then you say: "Yeah, okay. How can we be sure that (a) we have identified all of the bugs that there are and (b) that although Horizon has been demonstrated that to be fallible that insofar as the case we are conducting is concerned we can eliminate the possibility of error."	

(6) Pages 21 - 24

1		Just pausing there, any reaction from you?	
2	Α.	Now? Well, the problem is that's what he's been saying	
3		in all of his previous reports. You'll recall that,	
4		after this telephone conversation, I asked Martin to	
5		provide me with half a dozen of his previous statements	
6		and what he was saying in his previous statements was	
7		absolutely contrary to what he's just said here.	
8	Q.	Then he says: " but what we can show is that nothing	
9		has been found to show that there is a problem in the	
10		integrity of the audit trail which is what has been used	
11		for the erm your evidence."	
12		You say: "So your view is that erm that if the	
13		defence were to suggest erm there is a problem with	
14		Horizon and therefore we can't rule out that there might	
15		be other problems with Horizon what you say is as far as	
16		you're concerned the integrity of the system is intact?"	
17		He says: "Yes."	
18		So just summarising that conversation, it seems as	
19		though there are two bugs that you hadn't previously	
20		been aware of	:
21	Α.	Yes.	:
22	Q.	that he has confirmed exist and also that he can't	
23		say that there aren't more bugs in the system?	
24	Α.	There's a third strand, which to me was the most	
25		important, and that was that he knew, at the time of	
		25	
1	Q.	We're going to come in due course to formal advice that	
2		was written on this issue	
3	Α.	Yeah.	
4	Q.	but did you, at that point, have another conversation	
5		with somebody at the Post Office?	
6	•		
	Α.	Ooh, possibly with Jarnail Singh. I certainly told	
7	А.	somebody at Post Office orally. I don't think it would	
8	Α.	somebody at Post Office orally. I don't think it would have been Rodric Williams because, at that point, I had	
8 9	Α.	somebody at Post Office orally. I don't think it would have been Rodric Williams because, at that point, I had no contact with him, I hardly knew who he was. So, if	
8 9 10	д.	somebody at Post Office orally. I don't think it would have been Rodric Williams because, at that point, I had no contact with him, I hardly knew who he was. So, if anybody, it would have been Jarnail Singh. It's highly	
8 9 10 11	Α.	somebody at Post Office orally. I don't think it would have been Rodric Williams because, at that point, I had no contact with him, I hardly knew who he was. So, if anybody, it would have been Jarnail Singh. It's highly likely that I would have said to him on the telephone	
8 9 10 11 12	Α.	somebody at Post Office orally. I don't think it would have been Rodric Williams because, at that point, I had no contact with him, I hardly knew who he was. So, if anybody, it would have been Jarnail Singh. It's highly likely that I would have said to him on the telephone "You've got problems", and I would have explained the	
8 9 10 11 12 13		somebody at Post Office orally. I don't think it would have been Rodric Williams because, at that point, I had no contact with him, I hardly knew who he was. So, if anybody, it would have been Jarnail Singh. It's highly likely that I would have said to him on the telephone "You've got problems", and I would have explained the nature of the problem to him.	
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q.	somebody at Post Office orally. I don't think it would have been Rodric Williams because, at that point, I had no contact with him, I hardly knew who he was. So, if anybody, it would have been Jarnail Singh. It's highly likely that I would have said to him on the telephone "You've got problems", and I would have explained the nature of the problem to him. Do you think it's likely that you spoke to anybody else	
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q.	somebody at Post Office orally. I don't think it would have been Rodric Williams because, at that point, I had no contact with him, I hardly knew who he was. So, if anybody, it would have been Jarnail Singh. It's highly likely that I would have said to him on the telephone "You've got problems", and I would have explained the nature of the problem to him. Do you think it's likely that you spoke to anybody else at that point	
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A.	somebody at Post Office orally. I don't think it would have been Rodric Williams because, at that point, I had no contact with him, I hardly knew who he was. So, if anybody, it would have been Jarnail Singh. It's highly likely that I would have said to him on the telephone "You've got problems", and I would have explained the nature of the problem to him. Do you think it's likely that you spoke to anybody else at that point No.	
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q.	somebody at Post Office orally. I don't think it would have been Rodric Williams because, at that point, I had no contact with him, I hardly knew who he was. So, if anybody, it would have been Jarnail Singh. It's highly likely that I would have said to him on the telephone "You've got problems", and I would have explained the nature of the problem to him. Do you think it's likely that you spoke to anybody else at that point No. or just Jarnail Singh?	
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A.	somebody at Post Office orally. I don't think it would have been Rodric Williams because, at that point, I had no contact with him, I hardly knew who he was. So, if anybody, it would have been Jarnail Singh. It's highly likely that I would have said to him on the telephone "You've got problems", and I would have explained the nature of the problem to him. Do you think it's likely that you spoke to anybody else at that point No. or just Jarnail Singh? No, the only person I knew at Post Office at that time	
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q.	somebody at Post Office orally. I don't think it would have been Rodric Williams because, at that point, I had no contact with him, I hardly knew who he was. So, if anybody, it would have been Jarnail Singh. It's highly likely that I would have said to him on the telephone "You've got problems", and I would have explained the nature of the problem to him. Do you think it's likely that you spoke to anybody else at that point No. or just Jarnail Singh? No, the only person I knew at Post Office at that time was Jarnail Singh and I didn't actually know him; I just	
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A.	somebody at Post Office orally. I don't think it would have been Rodric Williams because, at that point, I had no contact with him, I hardly knew who he was. So, if anybody, it would have been Jarnail Singh. It's highly likely that I would have said to him on the telephone "You've got problems", and I would have explained the nature of the problem to him. Do you think it's likely that you spoke to anybody else at that point No. or just Jarnail Singh? No, the only person I knew at Post Office at that time was Jarnail Singh and I didn't actually know him; I just knew he was the contact for Martin Smith.	
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q.	somebody at Post Office orally. I don't think it would have been Rodric Williams because, at that point, I had no contact with him, I hardly knew who he was. So, if anybody, it would have been Jarnail Singh. It's highly likely that I would have said to him on the telephone "You've got problems", and I would have explained the nature of the problem to him. Do you think it's likely that you spoke to anybody else at that point No. or just Jarnail Singh? No, the only person I knew at Post Office at that time was Jarnail Singh and I didn't actually know him; I just knew he was the contact for Martin Smith. We're now going to come to the case of Samra and there	
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A.	somebody at Post Office orally. I don't think it would have been Rodric Williams because, at that point, I had no contact with him, I hardly knew who he was. So, if anybody, it would have been Jarnail Singh. It's highly likely that I would have said to him on the telephone "You've got problems", and I would have explained the nature of the problem to him. Do you think it's likely that you spoke to anybody else at that point No. or just Jarnail Singh? No, the only person I knew at Post Office at that time was Jarnail Singh and I didn't actually know him; I just knew he was the contact for Martin Smith. We're now going to come to the case of Samra and there is a hearing a few days after that conversation on the	
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. A. A.	somebody at Post Office orally. I don't think it would have been Rodric Williams because, at that point, I had no contact with him, I hardly knew who he was. So, if anybody, it would have been Jarnail Singh. It's highly likely that I would have said to him on the telephone "You've got problems", and I would have explained the nature of the problem to him. Do you think it's likely that you spoke to anybody else at that point No. or just Jarnail Singh? No, the only person I knew at Post Office at that time was Jarnail Singh and I didn't actually know him; I just knew he was the contact for Martin Smith. We're now going to come to the case of Samra and there is a hearing a few days after that conversation on the 1 July?	
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. Q. Q.	somebody at Post Office orally. I don't think it would have been Rodric Williams because, at that point, I had no contact with him, I hardly knew who he was. So, if anybody, it would have been Jarnail Singh. It's highly likely that I would have said to him on the telephone "You've got problems", and I would have explained the nature of the problem to him. Do you think it's likely that you spoke to anybody else at that point No. or just Jarnail Singh? No, the only person I knew at Post Office at that time was Jarnail Singh and I didn't actually know him; I just knew he was the contact for Martin Smith. We're now going to come to the case of Samra and there is a hearing a few days after that conversation on the 1 July? Day listed for trial.	
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. A. A.	somebody at Post Office orally. I don't think it would have been Rodric Williams because, at that point, I had no contact with him, I hardly knew who he was. So, if anybody, it would have been Jarnail Singh. It's highly likely that I would have said to him on the telephone "You've got problems", and I would have explained the nature of the problem to him. Do you think it's likely that you spoke to anybody else at that point No. or just Jarnail Singh? No, the only person I knew at Post Office at that time was Jarnail Singh and I didn't actually know him; I just knew he was the contact for Martin Smith. We're now going to come to the case of Samra and there is a hearing a few days after that conversation on the 1 July?	

	mq	
4		
1		this conversation and beforehand, that those bugs were
2		extant because it was he who had informed Second Sight
3		of them, and that, to me, was the most important element
4	_	of that conversation.
5	Q.	Putting those all together, was that quite a bombshell
6		moment for you?
7	Α.	Yes, it was.
8	Q.	Is this the first time in your career where
9		a conversation with a witness has been recorded in this
10		way or is it at least unusual for you to have recorded
11		it?
12	Α.	It's unusual but it's not the first time.
13	Q.	Why did you feel it was necessary to record it?
14	Α.	I thought it was hugely important that we knew who told
15		Second Sight of the bugs because, if it had been Fujitsu
16		or Gareth Jenkins, then, frankly, Gareth Jenkins was in
17		trouble and I needed a record of what was said. And
18		just so that you understand the position because when
19 20		you sent this document to me you didn't know who the
20 21		author was or what the conversation was about and
21 22		I explained it in my witness statement I had said to Martin Smith "We ought to record this". He recorded it
22		on his mobile telephone and then I said to him "Can you
23 24		transcribe it please?", and clearly you've located it in
25		the records and, frankly, thank goodness I said that.
20		26
1		We're going to spend a bit of time on your attendance
2		note from that hearing.
3	Α.	That's cool.
4	Q.	If we scroll down, it's a hearing note written by you?
5	Α.	Yes, if I signed it it's mine.
6	Q.	Yes, it has your name at the bottom, 1 July 2013.
7		There's some background to the case at the top,
8		paragraph 2 I'll read. That says:
9		"All of the duplicate transactions were conducted
10		over the counter through Horizon, this being the only
11		portal through which Post Office Card Accounts may be
12		conducted. Accordingly transactions are evidenced
13		through entries appearing in Post Office Card Account
14		statements. Those entries represent Horizon data."
15		That's, effectively, what you told Mr Jenkins in
16		that conversation, that the evidence was fundamentally
17		relying on Horizon data?
18	Α.	Yeah, I cringed if you saw because I hate using the word
19		"evidenced" as a verb but yes.
20	Q.	If we scroll down, please, to the bottom of paragraph 3,
21		you say there:
22		"Further, whilst she has not directly suggested that
23		Horizon data is wrong, there is an implicit suggestion
24		that if the complainant's accounts of not having made
25		duplicate transactions is correct, then the fault must

1		lie with Horizon."
2		So an acknowledgement from yourself that, although
3		it hadn't been pleaded, it was
4	Α.	It follows.
5	Q.	something that was highly relevant to that trial?
6	Α.	Yeah.
7	Q.	"Recent information", paragraph 4:
8		"The limited information available to me comes from
9		a number of sources within Post Office Limited: Head of
10		Litigation Hugh Flemington; Head of Criminal Law Jarnail
11		Singh; and Gareth Jenkins of Fujitsu Services Limited."
12		We've heard you talk about Jarnail Singh, we've
13		heard you talk about Gareth Jenkins. Can you assist us
14		with any conversation you had with Hugh Flemington at
15		this time?
16	Α.	I don't believe I have ever spoken with Hugh Flemington.
17		I saw him the other day and didn't recognise him.
18		Information from Hugh Flemington, if I had had any
19		and it's likely I had because of this would have come
20		through Jarnail Singh.
21	Q.	Thank you. You say:
22		"I first became aware of the issue of bugs within
23		the Horizon system on 27 June", exactly as we've just
24		been discussing.
25	Α.	Yeah.
		29

1	Α.	No, it's more basic than that. Fujitsu gave the bugs
2		names. I think they gave a bug a name called Bug 64 and
3		then another bug was called the Callendar Square bug and
4		then there was something else called the Falkirk bug,
5		and then somebody told me that the Falkirk bug was the
6		Callendar Square bug. So it was a confusion in their
7		naming of the bugs, which caused this paragraph, which
8		made me not sure whether there were two or more.
9	Q.	Where did that confusion come from; can you recall who
10		the conversation was with?
11	Α.	Again, most of this would have come through oh, in
12		fact, I mention is there, Bug 68 most of it would
13		have come through Jarnail Singh and through him via
14		Martin Smith, or directly.
15	Q.	You then say:
16		"The two bugs I'm instructed of by [the Post Office]
17		are: Bug 14, so called because it affected 14 post
18		offices, and Bug 68 (named for similar reasons?)."
19		So you weren't clear whether that was the number of
20		branches affected or some other reason. It could, in
21		theory, have been the 68th bug that they had found?
22	Α.	Yes, this exemplifies the confusion.
23	Q.	"vi. The effect of Bug 14 has been the appearance of
24		incorrect financial balance information in the system,
25		known to include the false indication of financial data. 31

1	Q.	The Second Sight Report indicated that:
2		" Horizon may not be 'bug' free. I am instructed
3		that the report is to be provided to Parliament prior to
4		publication, perhaps as early as Monday (1 July).
5		I have not seen the report.
6		"Prior to 27 June I had seen no reference in any of
7		the expert reports tendered for the prosecution in other
8		cases to the existence or possible existence of bugs.
9		On 27 June and through the following day I was
10		instructed that, in a number of post offices, the
11		Horizon system may have produced false balances."
12		Then you say that you are informed of the following,
13		and (i), if we scroll down please, over the page:
14		"All of the information used by Hewlett Packard is
15		derived directly from Horizon.
16		"Horizon is not 'bug' free.
17		"Fujitsu Services Ltd had reported the existence of
18		two bugs to the Second Sight committee.
19		"A number of bugs have been identified which have
20		affected number of post offices although it is not clear
21		to me that those are the same as disclosed to the Second
22		Sight committee by Fujitsu."
23		Now is that a reference to the Helen Rose Report or
24		to some other conversation or to that Gareth Jenkins
25		conversation?

1		"Hurst Lane Post Office"
2		So that's the one in this particular case.
3	Α.	Yeah.
4	Q.	" is not one of those post offices identified as
5		having been affected.
6		"The report's authors were instructed to investigate
7		a number of cases of apparent Horizon error, including
8		at least one where prosecution was contemplated. That
9		prosecution would have been relied heavily upon data
10		obtained from Horizon"
11		Now, I don't think that is information that we saw
12		in that Gareth Jenkins recording. Do you know where
13		that information came from?
14	Α.	Again, it would have come through Jarnail Singh,
15		possibly from people behind him.
16	Q.	Paragraph 7:
17		"Once we became aware of the timetable for
18		publication of the Second Sight Report and its preview
19		to Parliament, Martin Smith and I and with Head of
20		Criminal Law Jarnail Singh's agreement, contacted Gareth
21		Jenkins in order to establish what was known about the
22		status of Horizon integrity."
23		So it seems as though there was a conversation with
24		Jarnail Singh, where he agreed to you phoning up
25	Α.	l accept that, yeah. 32

1	Q.	There's then a summary of the phone call. I'm not going	1		a judge for a certificate not to disclose material to
2		to go through those points. We have already read the	2		the defence where that material was subject to a public
3		transcript. Can we scroll down to paragraph 8, please.	3		interest immunity. Such applications most often occur
4		You say:	4		in cases involving national security or where police
5		"The information may be distilled thus: Fujitsu	5		have used informants and undercover officers. The list
6		Services Limited and Post Office Limited after aware	6		of such cases however is not closed: in a case where the
7		that Horizon had suffered bugs Bug 68 and Bug 14 (it	7		public interest may be the prevention of a widespread
8		is highly likely that the two bugs reported to Second	8		loss of confidence in a public institution, or the loss
9		Sight by Fujitsu are Bugs 14 and 68). One bug has been	9		of trust in a system operated by such an institution, or
10		neutralised, the other remains extant. The extant bug	10		the prevention of journalistic speculation as to the
11		affects Horizon to a limited degree and at specific post	11		efficacy of systems almost universally relied upon by
12		office locations; it manifests itself by producing false	12		the public, there may be an argument that the protection
13		balances; whilst Fujitsu Services Ltd continue to have	13		of a [public interest immunity] certificate is
14		faith in the integrity of Horizon, and whilst there is	14		appropriate.
15		no other indication of any more bugs, further possible	15		"PII Hearings are always held in chambers, that is,
16		bugs within Horizon cannot be ruled out."	16		in the absence of any defendant or defence
17		Similar words to those used by Gareth Jenkins in	17		representative, and usually in the judge's chambers
18		that conversation?	18		(retiring room). No other person may be present other
19	Α.	And forgive me, it's stating the obvious.	19		than a court clerk, any relevant police officer and the
20	Q.	I please go over to page 6, paragraph 14. This is	20		prosecuting solicitor."
21		you address the law of disclosure and then you go on to	21		Over the page, please, you say:
22		address public interest immunity.	22		"In this case I took the view that such an approach
23	Α.	Yeah.	23		to the problem might be appropriate. Accordingly Martin
24	Q.	You say at paragraph 14:	24		Smith and I, in conjunction with Jarnail Singh, decided
25		"In some circumstances it is possible to apply to 33	25		that the best way forward was to seek a ruling (the 34
1		grant of a PII certificate) from the trial judge that we	1		that we could not commence this trial as scheduled. To
2		need not disclose to the defence the fact that the	2		do so would be to mislead the court into believing that
3		Second Sight Report was to be presented to Parliament	3		we had complied with our duties as prosecutor and that,
4		today; and that the report contained references to the	4		we cannot contemplate."
5		existence of bugs in Horizon both past and present; and	5	Α.	Yes.
6		2) to adjourn the trial until such time as we were able	6	Q.	There isn't detail here about what the judge was
7		to fully comply with our disclosure duties."	7		actually told?
8		First of all, can I just ask, that hearing took	8	Α.	-
9		place in the absence of notice to the defendant; is that	9	Q.	Can you assist us with I mean, we see paragraph 14,
10		correct?	10		for example, about the possible heads of public interest
11	Α.	No, it's not correct.	11		immunity that could be argued. What was it that you
12	Q.	That's not correct?	12		were saying to the judge in chambers that persuaded him
13	Α.	No. It is common practice amongst counsel that, if	13		to grant a PII certificate?
14		a PII application is to be made, that defending counsel	14	Α.	-
15		will be informed informally at court by prosecuting	15		issue with the expert, that bugs had been identified,
16		counsel and that's what I did.	16		that we could no longer rely on our expert. I told the
17	Q.	So you informed defence counsel and then had the PII	17		judge that there was a report due to be published to MPs
18		hearing.	18		and something that had been impressed on me by Post
19	Α.	Yeah. Can I just add to that that the proposition that	19		Office through Jarnail Singh was the issue of
20		I could just go and see the judge without telling	20		Parliamentary privilege. It is possible that it would
21		defence counsel would, at the very least, have prompted	21		have been a breach of Parliamentary privilege to have
22		defence counsel to say, "What's going on?" So defence	22		effectively produced the report before Parliament had
23		counsel would have had to have been informed and he was.	23		released it for production. I told the judge that and
24	Q.	If we scroll down, paragraph 17:	24		that really was the basis of the application.
25		"The effect of the late development in this case is	25		I wanted to comply with my disclosure duties but

35

judge that there was a report due to be published to MPs
and something that had been impressed on me by Post
Office through Jarnail Singh was the issue of
Parliamentary privilege. It is possible that it would
have been a breach of Parliamentary privilege to have
effectively produced the report before Parliament had
released it for production. I told the judge that and
that really was the basis of the application.
I wanted to comply with my disclosure duties but

36

(9) Pages 33 - 36

4			4		
1		I couldn't, on that day, largely because I believed	1	•	the page
2		Parliamentary privilege prevent me from doing so and so	2	Α.	Before you do that, can I just say, that is everything
3	~	that's what I said to the judge.	3		I asked for from the judge. I did not want a PII
4	Q.	You've said in paragraph 14 that a potential argument	4		certificate that prevented disclosure completely. I was
5		could be made about journalistic speculation about the	5		looking to buy time so that Parliament could deal with
6		system. Was that something that was raised before the	6		the report and I could then comply with my disclosure
7		judge?	7		duties, and that's why the judge timed me. I think he
8	Α.		8		limited it to eight weeks. I asked for less but I think
9		just to settle on just one point in paragraph 14 as	9		he gave me eight weeks.
10		a single compelling point. The overall issue was all of	10	Q.	Yes, well, the case was adjourned for eight weeks.
11		them taken together suggested to me that publishing the	11	Α.	Yeah, but I only wanted a short period in order to allow
12		report to the defence at that time would be	12		for the publication of the report so that I could then
13		inappropriate.	13		comply without worrying about what Parliament was
14	Q.	Paragraph 18 then says:	14		doing comply with my disclosure duties.
15		"The judge, His Honour Judge Chambers, was	15	Q.	Paragraph 19:
16		ultimately persuaded of the arguments advanced in	16		"The judge also commented that this situation should
17		support of the grant of a certificate."	17		never have arisen and that the Post Office were to
18		Then certain orders were made.	18		provide a written explanation as to why this information
19	Α.	Yeah.	19		had been withheld from solicitors and counsel until as
20	Q.	"Defence to be told that a report had been commissioned.	20		late as last Thursday."
21		"The prosecution to be permitted to withhold	21		So it seems as though you explained to the judge
22		information	22		that this was all news to you?
23		"Non-disclosure Order to be temporary and reviewed	23	Α.	Yes. I'd only learnt a few days before. I smile
24		at a 'mention' hearing."	24		because he was a bit more scathing about the situation
25		Then adjourned for eight weeks. If we scroll over	25		than that paragraph suggests. He was quite upset.
		37			38
1	Q.	That's because a trial was due to take place that had to	1	Q.	Thank you. Paragraph 21, you say:
2		be vacated or some other reason?	2		"Of greater concern is the absence of any reference
3	Α.	Not just because, offectively, we were westing the			to Bug 68 or Bug 14 any of Fujitsu Services Limited's
4		Not just because, effectively, we were wasting the	3		to buy to of buy 14 any of Fujitsu Services Liffliteu's
5		court's time by aborting a trial that was due to start	3 4		statements served in support of other criminal
5					
6		court's time by aborting a trial that was due to start	4		statements served in support of other criminal
		court's time by aborting a trial that was due to start that day but because the prosecution had plainly not	4 5		statements served in support of other criminal prosecutions. This is a matter to be returned to at the
6	Q.	court's time by aborting a trial that was due to start that day but because the prosecution had plainly not done that which they ought to have done in time for the	4 5 6		statements served in support of other criminal prosecutions. This is a matter to be returned to at the appropriate time."
6 7	Q.	court's time by aborting a trial that was due to start that day but because the prosecution had plainly not done that which they ought to have done in time for the trial.	4 5 6 7		statements served in support of other criminal prosecutions. This is a matter to be returned to at the appropriate time." So this is your concern about the potential impact
6 7 8	Q.	court's time by aborting a trial that was due to start that day but because the prosecution had plainly not done that which they ought to have done in time for the trial. Paragraph 20, you provide a comment and conclusion. You	4 5 6 7 8	А.	statements served in support of other criminal prosecutions. This is a matter to be returned to at the appropriate time." So this is your concern about the potential impact on historic cases that relied on Gareth Jenkins'
6 7 8 9	Q.	court's time by aborting a trial that was due to start that day but because the prosecution had plainly not done that which they ought to have done in time for the trial. Paragraph 20, you provide a comment and conclusion. You say:	4 5 7 8 9	А.	statements served in support of other criminal prosecutions. This is a matter to be returned to at the appropriate time." So this is your concern about the potential impact on historic cases that relied on Gareth Jenkins' evidence?
6 7 8 9 10	Q.	court's time by aborting a trial that was due to start that day but because the prosecution had plainly not done that which they ought to have done in time for the trial. Paragraph 20, you provide a comment and conclusion. You say: "I am not particularly concerned at the judge's	4 5 7 8 9 10	А.	statements served in support of other criminal prosecutions. This is a matter to be returned to at the appropriate time." So this is your concern about the potential impact on historic cases that relied on Gareth Jenkins' evidence? Yes, it is and I think what I'm doing here is flagging
6 7 8 9 10 11	Q.	court's time by aborting a trial that was due to start that day but because the prosecution had plainly not done that which they ought to have done in time for the trial. Paragraph 20, you provide a comment and conclusion. You say: "I am not particularly concerned at the judge's requirement for a written explanation from [the Post	4 5 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q.	statements served in support of other criminal prosecutions. This is a matter to be returned to at the appropriate time." So this is your concern about the potential impact on historic cases that relied on Gareth Jenkins' evidence? Yes, it is and I think what I'm doing here is flagging up that I'm going to advise to, as I did on 8 July and
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q.	court's time by aborting a trial that was due to start that day but because the prosecution had plainly not done that which they ought to have done in time for the trial. Paragraph 20, you provide a comment and conclusion. You say: "I am not particularly concerned at the judge's requirement for a written explanation from [the Post Office] to a large degree the Heads of Litigation and	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12		statements served in support of other criminal prosecutions. This is a matter to be returned to at the appropriate time." So this is your concern about the potential impact on historic cases that relied on Gareth Jenkins' evidence? Yes, it is and I think what I'm doing here is flagging up that I'm going to advise to, as I did on 8 July and 15 July, I think I'm sort of pointing in that direction.
6 7 9 10 11 12 13	Q.	court's time by aborting a trial that was due to start that day but because the prosecution had plainly not done that which they ought to have done in time for the trial. Paragraph 20, you provide a comment and conclusion. You say: "I am not particularly concerned at the judge's requirement for a written explanation from [the Post Office] to a large degree the Heads of Litigation and Criminal Law were in much the same position as were	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		statements served in support of other criminal prosecutions. This is a matter to be returned to at the appropriate time." So this is your concern about the potential impact on historic cases that relied on Gareth Jenkins' evidence? Yes, it is and I think what I'm doing here is flagging up that I'm going to advise to, as I did on 8 July and 15 July, I think I'm sort of pointing in that direction. Was that something you mentioned to the judge at the PII
6 7 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q.	court's time by aborting a trial that was due to start that day but because the prosecution had plainly not done that which they ought to have done in time for the trial. Paragraph 20, you provide a comment and conclusion. You say: "I am not particularly concerned at the judge's requirement for a written explanation from [the Post Office] to a large degree the Heads of Litigation and Criminal Law were in much the same position as were Martin Smith and I and accordingly I have no difficulty	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		statements served in support of other criminal prosecutions. This is a matter to be returned to at the appropriate time." So this is your concern about the potential impact on historic cases that relied on Gareth Jenkins' evidence? Yes, it is and I think what I'm doing here is flagging up that I'm going to advise to, as I did on 8 July and 15 July, I think I'm sort of pointing in that direction. Was that something you mentioned to the judge at the PII hearing, that there were concerns about a witness who had been used in both
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q.	court's time by aborting a trial that was due to start that day but because the prosecution had plainly not done that which they ought to have done in time for the trial. Paragraph 20, you provide a comment and conclusion. You say: "I am not particularly concerned at the judge's requirement for a written explanation from [the Post Office] to a large degree the Heads of Litigation and Criminal Law were in much the same position as were Martin Smith and I and accordingly I have no difficulty insisting with the preparation of an explanation." You say there the Heads of Litigation and Criminal	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q.	statements served in support of other criminal prosecutions. This is a matter to be returned to at the appropriate time." So this is your concern about the potential impact on historic cases that relied on Gareth Jenkins' evidence? Yes, it is and I think what I'm doing here is flagging up that I'm going to advise to, as I did on 8 July and 15 July, I think I'm sort of pointing in that direction. Was that something you mentioned to the judge at the PII hearing, that there were concerns about a witness who
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q.	court's time by aborting a trial that was due to start that day but because the prosecution had plainly not done that which they ought to have done in time for the trial. Paragraph 20, you provide a comment and conclusion. You say: "I am not particularly concerned at the judge's requirement for a written explanation from [the Post Office] to a large degree the Heads of Litigation and Criminal Law were in much the same position as were Martin Smith and I and accordingly I have no difficulty insisting with the preparation of an explanation."	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q.	statements served in support of other criminal prosecutions. This is a matter to be returned to at the appropriate time." So this is your concern about the potential impact on historic cases that relied on Gareth Jenkins' evidence? Yes, it is and I think what I'm doing here is flagging up that I'm going to advise to, as I did on 8 July and 15 July, I think I'm sort of pointing in that direction. Was that something you mentioned to the judge at the PII hearing, that there were concerns about a witness who had been used in both Oh yes, oh yes. It would have been wrong to with hold that.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17		court's time by aborting a trial that was due to start that day but because the prosecution had plainly not done that which they ought to have done in time for the trial. Paragraph 20, you provide a comment and conclusion. You say: "I am not particularly concerned at the judge's requirement for a written explanation from [the Post Office] to a large degree the Heads of Litigation and Criminal Law were in much the same position as were Martin Smith and I and accordingly I have no difficulty insisting with the preparation of an explanation." You say there the Heads of Litigation and Criminal Law were in the same position. What do you mean by that?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A.	statements served in support of other criminal prosecutions. This is a matter to be returned to at the appropriate time." So this is your concern about the potential impact on historic cases that relied on Gareth Jenkins' evidence? Yes, it is and I think what I'm doing here is flagging up that I'm going to advise to, as I did on 8 July and 15 July, I think I'm sort of pointing in that direction. Was that something you mentioned to the judge at the PII hearing, that there were concerns about a witness who had been used in both Oh yes, oh yes. It would have been wrong to with hold that. If we scroll down and over the page, please,
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19		court's time by aborting a trial that was due to start that day but because the prosecution had plainly not done that which they ought to have done in time for the trial. Paragraph 20, you provide a comment and conclusion. You say: "I am not particularly concerned at the judge's requirement for a written explanation from [the Post Office] to a large degree the Heads of Litigation and Criminal Law were in much the same position as were Martin Smith and I and accordingly I have no difficulty insisting with the preparation of an explanation." You say there the Heads of Litigation and Criminal Law were in the same position. What do you mean by that? That's what I'd been told, that they'd only just	4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A.	statements served in support of other criminal prosecutions. This is a matter to be returned to at the appropriate time." So this is your concern about the potential impact on historic cases that relied on Gareth Jenkins' evidence? Yes, it is and I think what I'm doing here is flagging up that I'm going to advise to, as I did on 8 July and 15 July, I think I'm sort of pointing in that direction. Was that something you mentioned to the judge at the PII hearing, that there were concerns about a witness who had been used in both Oh yes, oh yes. It would have been wrong to with hold that.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18		court's time by aborting a trial that was due to start that day but because the prosecution had plainly not done that which they ought to have done in time for the trial. Paragraph 20, you provide a comment and conclusion. You say: "I am not particularly concerned at the judge's requirement for a written explanation from [the Post Office] to a large degree the Heads of Litigation and Criminal Law were in much the same position as were Martin Smith and I and accordingly I have no difficulty insisting with the preparation of an explanation." You say there the Heads of Litigation and Criminal Law were in the same position. What do you mean by that? That's what I'd been told, that they'd only just discovered the existence of the bugs at roughly the same	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A.	 statements served in support of other criminal prosecutions. This is a matter to be returned to at the appropriate time." So this is your concern about the potential impact on historic cases that relied on Gareth Jenkins' evidence? Yes, it is and I think what I'm doing here is flagging up that I'm going to advise to, as I did on 8 July and 15 July, I think I'm sort of pointing in that direction. Was that something you mentioned to the judge at the PII hearing, that there were concerns about a witness who had been used in both Oh yes, oh yes. It would have been wrong to with hold that. If we scroll down and over the page, please, paragraph 23 says: "It is also the case that we shall have to review
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21		court's time by aborting a trial that was due to start that day but because the prosecution had plainly not done that which they ought to have done in time for the trial. Paragraph 20, you provide a comment and conclusion. You say: "I am not particularly concerned at the judge's requirement for a written explanation from [the Post Office] to a large degree the Heads of Litigation and Criminal Law were in much the same position as were Martin Smith and I and accordingly I have no difficulty insisting with the preparation of an explanation." You say there the Heads of Litigation and Criminal Law were in the same position. What do you mean by that? That's what I'd been told, that they'd only just discovered the existence of the bugs at roughly the same time that I did and, if that was right, then they were	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A.	statements served in support of other criminal prosecutions. This is a matter to be returned to at the appropriate time." So this is your concern about the potential impact on historic cases that relied on Gareth Jenkins' evidence? Yes, it is and I think what I'm doing here is flagging up that I'm going to advise to, as I did on 8 July and 15 July, I think I'm sort of pointing in that direction. Was that something you mentioned to the judge at the PII hearing, that there were concerns about a witness who had been used in both Oh yes, oh yes. It would have been wrong to with hold that. If we scroll down and over the page, please, paragraph 23 says:
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22		court's time by aborting a trial that was due to start that day but because the prosecution had plainly not done that which they ought to have done in time for the trial. Paragraph 20, you provide a comment and conclusion. You say: "I am not particularly concerned at the judge's requirement for a written explanation from [the Post Office] to a large degree the Heads of Litigation and Criminal Law were in much the same position as were Martin Smith and I and accordingly I have no difficulty insisting with the preparation of an explanation." You say there the Heads of Litigation and Criminal Law were in the same position. What do you mean by that? That's what I'd been told, that they'd only just discovered the existence of the bugs at roughly the same time that I did and, if that was right, then they were in the same position we were.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A.	statements served in support of other criminal prosecutions. This is a matter to be returned to at the appropriate time." So this is your concern about the potential impact on historic cases that relied on Gareth Jenkins' evidence? Yes, it is and I think what I'm doing here is flagging up that I'm going to advise to, as I did on 8 July and 15 July, I think I'm sort of pointing in that direction. Was that something you mentioned to the judge at the PII hearing, that there were concerns about a witness who had been used in both Oh yes, oh yes. It would have been wrong to with hold that. If we scroll down and over the page, please, paragraph 23 says: "It is also the case that we shall have to review any other prosecution which relies upon Horizon data, for the same reasons."
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A.	court's time by aborting a trial that was due to start that day but because the prosecution had plainly not done that which they ought to have done in time for the trial. Paragraph 20, you provide a comment and conclusion. You say: "I am not particularly concerned at the judge's requirement for a written explanation from [the Post Office] to a large degree the Heads of Litigation and Criminal Law were in much the same position as were Martin Smith and I and accordingly I have no difficulty insisting with the preparation of an explanation." You say there the Heads of Litigation and Criminal Law were in the same position. What do you mean by that? That's what I'd been told, that they'd only just discovered the existence of the bugs at roughly the same time that I did and, if that was right, then they were in the same position we were. Was that a specific conversation with the Head of	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A.	statements served in support of other criminal prosecutions. This is a matter to be returned to at the appropriate time." So this is your concern about the potential impact on historic cases that relied on Gareth Jenkins' evidence? Yes, it is and I think what I'm doing here is flagging up that I'm going to advise to, as I did on 8 July and 15 July, I think I'm sort of pointing in that direction. Was that something you mentioned to the judge at the PII hearing, that there were concerns about a witness who had been used in both Oh yes, oh yes. It would have been wrong to with hold that. If we scroll down and over the page, please, paragraph 23 says: "It is also the case that we shall have to review any other prosecution which relies upon Horizon data,
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A.	court's time by aborting a trial that was due to start that day but because the prosecution had plainly not done that which they ought to have done in time for the trial. Paragraph 20, you provide a comment and conclusion. You say: "I am not particularly concerned at the judge's requirement for a written explanation from [the Post Office] to a large degree the Heads of Litigation and Criminal Law were in much the same position as were Martin Smith and I and accordingly I have no difficulty insisting with the preparation of an explanation." You say there the Heads of Litigation and Criminal Law were in the same position. What do you mean by that? That's what I'd been told, that they'd only just discovered the existence of the bugs at roughly the same time that I did and, if that was right, then they were in the same position we were.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A.	statements served in support of other criminal prosecutions. This is a matter to be returned to at the appropriate time." So this is your concern about the potential impact on historic cases that relied on Gareth Jenkins' evidence? Yes, it is and I think what I'm doing here is flagging up that I'm going to advise to, as I did on 8 July and 15 July, I think I'm sort of pointing in that direction. Was that something you mentioned to the judge at the PII hearing, that there were concerns about a witness who had been used in both Oh yes, oh yes. It would have been wrong to with hold that. If we scroll down and over the page, please, paragraph 23 says: "It is also the case that we shall have to review any other prosecution which relies upon Horizon data, for the same reasons." So you're flagging there what became ultimately your

(10) Pages 37 - 40

1		involves a thought process which helps you to marshal
2		where you want to go and that's, I suspect that's the
3		beginning of me thinking we need to go wider than this
4	~	case.
5	Q.	Finally, paragraph 24 says:
6		"Finally, it is worth commenting on the reasoning
7		behind my advice that we seek a PII certificate in this
8 9		case. [The Post Office] were rightly, in my opinion,
9 10		very concerned at the potential adverse publicity which would inevitable have been generated by the revelation
10		of the existence of a (draft) Second Sight Report into
12		Horizon. To permit this information to enter the public
13		domain at such an early stage would have been to
14		encourage extremely unhealthy and likely virulent
15		speculation as to the content of any report, most
16		probably in the national press. Such speculation would
17		have seriously damaged the reputation of [the Post
18		Office] and would have great any undermined public
19		confidence in both [the Post Office] and [the Post
20		Office] systems. Our objective was to avoid such
21		consequences: that objective we achieved."
22		Now, that isn't anything about Parliamentary
23		privilege.
24	Α.	No.
25	Q.	That is about publicity and avoiding publicity. So do
		41
1		confidence in both the Post Office and Post Office
1 2		confidence in both the Post Office and Post Office systems. It doesn't say anything about privilege.
	А.	
2	A.	systems. It doesn't say anything about privilege.
2 3	A.	systems. It doesn't say anything about privilege. I agree but, to an extent, I disagree with you about the
2 3 4	A.	systems. It doesn't say anything about privilege. I agree but, to an extent, I disagree with you about the import of paragraph 24. One of the things we were
2 3 4 5	А.	systems. It doesn't say anything about privilege. I agree but, to an extent, I disagree with you about the import of paragraph 24. One of the things we were concerned with it wasn't just forgive me, it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Α.	systems. It doesn't say anything about privilege. I agree but, to an extent, I disagree with you about the import of paragraph 24. One of the things we were concerned with it wasn't just forgive me, it wasn't just Parliamentary privilege we were concerned
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Α.	systems. It doesn't say anything about privilege. I agree but, to an extent, I disagree with you about the import of paragraph 24. One of the things we were concerned with it wasn't just forgive me, it wasn't just Parliamentary privilege we were concerned with, we were also concerned with I, because I made the application and I advised the application be made I was concerned with the proposition that if the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A.	systems. It doesn't say anything about privilege. I agree but, to an extent, I disagree with you about the import of paragraph 24. One of the things we were concerned with it wasn't just forgive me, it wasn't just Parliamentary privilege we were concerned with, we were also concerned with I, because I made the application and I advised the application be made I was concerned with the proposition that if the existence of the report and the existence of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Α.	systems. It doesn't say anything about privilege. I agree but, to an extent, I disagree with you about the import of paragraph 24. One of the things we were concerned with it wasn't just forgive me, it wasn't just Parliamentary privilege we were concerned with, we were also concerned with I, because I made the application and I advised the application be made I was concerned with the proposition that if the existence of the report and the existence of the suggestion that there were bugs in Horizon had come out
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A.	systems. It doesn't say anything about privilege. I agree but, to an extent, I disagree with you about the import of paragraph 24. One of the things we were concerned with it wasn't just forgive me, it wasn't just Parliamentary privilege we were concerned with, we were also concerned with I, because I made the application and I advised the application be made I was concerned with the proposition that if the existence of the report and the existence of the suggestion that there were bugs in Horizon had come out before the report had been presented to Parliament, then
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Α.	systems. It doesn't say anything about privilege. I agree but, to an extent, I disagree with you about the import of paragraph 24. One of the things we were concerned with it wasn't just forgive me, it wasn't just Parliamentary privilege we were concerned with, we were also concerned with I, because I made the application and I advised the application be made I was concerned with the proposition that if the existence of the report and the existence of the suggestion that there were bugs in Horizon had come out before the report had been presented to Parliament, then the speculation would be damaging, not just to Post
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A.	systems. It doesn't say anything about privilege. I agree but, to an extent, I disagree with you about the import of paragraph 24. One of the things we were concerned with it wasn't just forgive me, it wasn't just Parliamentary privilege we were concerned with, we were also concerned with I, because I made the application and I advised the application be made I was concerned with the proposition that if the existence of the report and the existence of the suggestion that there were bugs in Horizon had come out before the report had been presented to Parliament, then the speculation would be damaging, not just to Post Office, but to the entire financial system upon which
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Α.	systems. It doesn't say anything about privilege. I agree but, to an extent, I disagree with you about the import of paragraph 24. One of the things we were concerned with it wasn't just forgive me, it wasn't just Parliamentary privilege we were concerned with, we were also concerned with I, because I made the application and I advised the application be made I was concerned with the proposition that if the existence of the report and the existence of the suggestion that there were bugs in Horizon had come out before the report had been presented to Parliament, then the speculation would be damaging, not just to Post Office, but to the entire financial system upon which Post Office was based and, because the speculation could
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A.	systems. It doesn't say anything about privilege. I agree but, to an extent, I disagree with you about the import of paragraph 24. One of the things we were concerned with it wasn't just forgive me, it wasn't just Parliamentary privilege we were concerned with, we were also concerned with I, because I made the application and I advised the application be made I was concerned with the proposition that if the existence of the report and the existence of the suggestion that there were bugs in Horizon had come out before the report had been presented to Parliament, then the speculation would be damaging, not just to Post Office, but to the entire financial system upon which Post Office was based and, because the speculation could be inaccurate, it could be wild, for all the reasons
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17		systems. It doesn't say anything about privilege. I agree but, to an extent, I disagree with you about the import of paragraph 24. One of the things we were concerned with it wasn't just forgive me, it wasn't just Parliamentary privilege we were concerned with, we were also concerned with I, because I made the application and I advised the application be made I was concerned with the proposition that if the existence of the report and the existence of the suggestion that there were bugs in Horizon had come out before the report had been presented to Parliament, then the speculation would be damaging, not just to Post Office, but to the entire financial system upon which Post Office was based and, because the speculation could be inaccurate, it could be wild, for all the reasons I suggest here.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q.	systems. It doesn't say anything about privilege. I agree but, to an extent, I disagree with you about the import of paragraph 24. One of the things we were concerned with it wasn't just forgive me, it wasn't just Parliamentary privilege we were concerned with, we were also concerned with I, because I made the application and I advised the application be made I was concerned with the proposition that if the existence of the report and the existence of the suggestion that there were bugs in Horizon had come out before the report had been presented to Parliament, then the speculation would be damaging, not just to Post Office, but to the entire financial system upon which Post Office was based and, because the speculation could be inaccurate, it could be wild, for all the reasons I suggest here. Insofar as your application was, in fact, based on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19		systems. It doesn't say anything about privilege. I agree but, to an extent, I disagree with you about the import of paragraph 24. One of the things we were concerned with it wasn't just forgive me, it wasn't just Parliamentary privilege we were concerned with, we were also concerned with I, because I made the application and I advised the application be made I was concerned with the proposition that if the existence of the report and the existence of the suggestion that there were bugs in Horizon had come out before the report had been presented to Parliament, then the speculation would be damaging, not just to Post Office, but to the entire financial system upon which Post Office was based and, because the speculation could be inaccurate, it could be wild, for all the reasons I suggest here. Insofar as your application was, in fact, based on Parliamentary privilege, is this paragraph here
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20		systems. It doesn't say anything about privilege. I agree but, to an extent, I disagree with you about the import of paragraph 24. One of the things we were concerned with it wasn't just forgive me, it wasn't just Parliamentary privilege we were concerned with, we were also concerned with I, because I made the application and I advised the application be made I was concerned with the proposition that if the existence of the report and the existence of the suggestion that there were bugs in Horizon had come out before the report had been presented to Parliament, then the speculation would be damaging, not just to Post Office, but to the entire financial system upon which Post Office was based and, because the speculation could be inaccurate, it could be wild, for all the reasons I suggest here. Insofar as your application was, in fact, based on Parliamentary privilege, is this paragraph here something that we are all guilty of, which is perhaps
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21		systems. It doesn't say anything about privilege. I agree but, to an extent, I disagree with you about the import of paragraph 24. One of the things we were concerned with it wasn't just forgive me, it wasn't just Parliamentary privilege we were concerned with, we were also concerned with I, because I made the application and I advised the application be made I was concerned with the proposition that if the existence of the report and the existence of the suggestion that there were bugs in Horizon had come out before the report had been presented to Parliament, then the speculation would be damaging, not just to Post Office, but to the entire financial system upon which Post Office was based and, because the speculation could be inaccurate, it could be wild, for all the reasons I suggest here. Insofar as your application was, in fact, based on Parliamentary privilege, is this paragraph here something that we are all guilty of, which is perhaps gloating in an attendance note about something that you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q.	systems. It doesn't say anything about privilege. I agree but, to an extent, I disagree with you about the import of paragraph 24. One of the things we were concerned with it wasn't just forgive me, it wasn't just Parliamentary privilege we were concerned with, we were also concerned with I, because I made the application and I advised the application be made I was concerned with the proposition that if the existence of the report and the existence of the suggestion that there were bugs in Horizon had come out before the report had been presented to Parliament, then the speculation would be damaging, not just to Post Office, but to the entire financial system upon which Post Office was based and, because the speculation could be inaccurate, it could be wild, for all the reasons I suggest here. Insofar as your application was, in fact, based on Parliamentary privilege, is this paragraph here something that we are all guilty of, which is perhaps gloating in an attendance note about something that you know the client would be happy about?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		systems. It doesn't say anything about privilege. I agree but, to an extent, I disagree with you about the import of paragraph 24. One of the things we were concerned with it wasn't just forgive me, it wasn't just Parliamentary privilege we were concerned with, we were also concerned with I, because I made the application and I advised the application be made I was concerned with the proposition that if the existence of the report and the existence of the suggestion that there were bugs in Horizon had come out before the report had been presented to Parliament, then the speculation would be damaging, not just to Post Office, but to the entire financial system upon which Post Office was based and, because the speculation could be inaccurate, it could be wild, for all the reasons I suggest here. Insofar as your application was, in fact, based on Parliamentary privilege, is this paragraph here something that we are all guilty of, which is perhaps gloating in an attendance note about something that you know the client would be happy about? I hate the word "gloating" but I think you're probably
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q.	systems. It doesn't say anything about privilege. I agree but, to an extent, I disagree with you about the import of paragraph 24. One of the things we were concerned with it wasn't just forgive me, it wasn't just Parliamentary privilege we were concerned with, we were also concerned with I, because I made the application and I advised the application be made I was concerned with the proposition that if the existence of the report and the existence of the suggestion that there were bugs in Horizon had come out before the report had been presented to Parliament, then the speculation would be damaging, not just to Post Office, but to the entire financial system upon which Post Office was based and, because the speculation could be inaccurate, it could be wild, for all the reasons I suggest here. Insofar as your application was, in fact, based on Parliamentary privilege, is this paragraph here something that we are all guilty of, which is perhaps gloating in an attendance note about something that you know the client would be happy about? I hate the word "gloating" but I think you're probably right. Yeah.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A.	systems. It doesn't say anything about privilege. I agree but, to an extent, I disagree with you about the import of paragraph 24. One of the things we were concerned with it wasn't just forgive me, it wasn't just Parliamentary privilege we were concerned with, we were also concerned with I, because I made the application and I advised the application be made I was concerned with the proposition that if the existence of the report and the existence of the suggestion that there were bugs in Horizon had come out before the report had been presented to Parliament, then the speculation would be damaging, not just to Post Office, but to the entire financial system upon which Post Office was based and, because the speculation could be inaccurate, it could be wild, for all the reasons I suggest here. Insofar as your application was, in fact, based on Parliamentary privilege, is this paragraph here something that we are all guilty of, which is perhaps gloating in an attendance note about something that you know the client would be happy about? I hate the word "gloating" but I think you're probably

		you accept that a significant part of the reasoning
2		behind seeking that certificate was to avoid speculation
3		and publicity?
4	Α.	l do.
5	Q.	Looking back at it, do you think it was a proper
6		application to have been made?
7	Α.	Yes. I would go so far as to say, if I were in the same
8		situation now, with the same information I had, I would
9		make that application again. That is, if there was
10		a report which was subject to Parliamentary privilege,
11		and it was important that Parliament saw the report
12		first and we've all seen in the press the number of
13		times Parliament has complained about people saying
14		things before going to Parliament I would make the
15		application again.
16		I consider that the issues that I had raised fell
17		squarely within the main authority on the subject, which
18		was Re H and Re C, where it's suggested that the
19		categories to which public interest immunity applied
20		were not closed, and I thought this was a proper
21		category to make the application.
22	Q.	Mr Clarke, that all sounds very reasonable, but
23		paragraph 24 does not mention at all Parliamentary
24		privilege. Paragraph 24 is very much about the
25		reputation of the Post Office and undermining public 42
	Α.	Can I just make the point, which I think is quite
1		
		important, is that the judge did grant the application
1 2 3		important, is that the judge did grant the application so the suggestion that it was an improper application,
2		
2 3		so the suggestion that it was an improper application,
2 3 4		so the suggestion that it was an improper application, I would go so far to suggest, can't stand because the
2 3 4 5		so the suggestion that it was an improper application, I would go so far to suggest, can't stand because the judge granted it and the judge, therefore, felt that it
2 3 4 5 6		so the suggestion that it was an improper application, I would go so far to suggest, can't stand because the judge granted it and the judge, therefore, felt that it was a proper application to make. That sounds slightly
2 3 4 5 6 7		so the suggestion that it was an improper application, I would go so far to suggest, can't stand because the judge granted it and the judge, therefore, felt that it was a proper application to make. That sounds slightly defensive but it's a point I make because, had it been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	so the suggestion that it was an improper application, I would go so far to suggest, can't stand because the judge granted it and the judge, therefore, felt that it was a proper application to make. That sounds slightly defensive but it's a point I make because, had it been an improper application, the judge would have said, "I'm not granting this". What we don't have is the information the judge was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q.	so the suggestion that it was an improper application, I would go so far to suggest, can't stand because the judge granted it and the judge, therefore, felt that it was a proper application to make. That sounds slightly defensive but it's a point I make because, had it been an improper application, the judge would have said, "I'm not granting this". What we don't have is the information the judge was presented with. I haven't made a suggestion that it was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q.	so the suggestion that it was an improper application, I would go so far to suggest, can't stand because the judge granted it and the judge, therefore, felt that it was a proper application to make. That sounds slightly defensive but it's a point I make because, had it been an improper application, the judge would have said, "I'm not granting this". What we don't have is the information the judge was presented with. I haven't made a suggestion that it was an improper application but what I would suggest is that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q.	so the suggestion that it was an improper application, I would go so far to suggest, can't stand because the judge granted it and the judge, therefore, felt that it was a proper application to make. That sounds slightly defensive but it's a point I make because, had it been an improper application, the judge would have said, "I'm not granting this". What we don't have is the information the judge was presented with. I haven't made a suggestion that it was an improper application but what I would suggest is that paragraph 24, looking at that, it seems as though the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q.	so the suggestion that it was an improper application, I would go so far to suggest, can't stand because the judge granted it and the judge, therefore, felt that it was a proper application to make. That sounds slightly defensive but it's a point I make because, had it been an improper application, the judge would have said, "I'm not granting this". What we don't have is the information the judge was presented with. I haven't made a suggestion that it was an improper application but what I would suggest is that paragraph 24, looking at that, it seems as though the objective that is set out in paragraph 24 is not itself
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15		so the suggestion that it was an improper application, I would go so far to suggest, can't stand because the judge granted it and the judge, therefore, felt that it was a proper application to make. That sounds slightly defensive but it's a point I make because, had it been an improper application, the judge would have said, "I'm not granting this". What we don't have is the information the judge was presented with. I haven't made a suggestion that it was an improper application but what I would suggest is that paragraph 24, looking at that, it seems as though the objective that is set out in paragraph 24 is not itself a proper objective to make a PII application.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q.	so the suggestion that it was an improper application, I would go so far to suggest, can't stand because the judge granted it and the judge, therefore, felt that it was a proper application to make. That sounds slightly defensive but it's a point I make because, had it been an improper application, the judge would have said, "I'm not granting this". What we don't have is the information the judge was presented with. I haven't made a suggestion that it was an improper application but what I would suggest is that paragraph 24, looking at that, it seems as though the objective that is set out in paragraph 24 is not itself a proper objective to make a PII application. I think I agree with that. The reason I speak about the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17		so the suggestion that it was an improper application, I would go so far to suggest, can't stand because the judge granted it and the judge, therefore, felt that it was a proper application to make. That sounds slightly defensive but it's a point I make because, had it been an improper application, the judge would have said, "I'm not granting this". What we don't have is the information the judge was presented with. I haven't made a suggestion that it was an improper application but what I would suggest is that paragraph 24, looking at that, it seems as though the objective that is set out in paragraph 24 is not itself a proper objective to make a PII application. I think I agree with that. The reason I speak about the propriety of the application is I have heard it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18		so the suggestion that it was an improper application, I would go so far to suggest, can't stand because the judge granted it and the judge, therefore, felt that it was a proper application to make. That sounds slightly defensive but it's a point I make because, had it been an improper application, the judge would have said, "I'm not granting this". What we don't have is the information the judge was presented with. I haven't made a suggestion that it was an improper application but what I would suggest is that paragraph 24, looking at that, it seems as though the objective that is set out in paragraph 24 is not itself a proper objective to make a PII application. I think I agree with that. The reason I speak about the propriety of the application is I have heard it suggested elsewhere and perhaps I'm getting ahead of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Α.	so the suggestion that it was an improper application, I would go so far to suggest, can't stand because the judge granted it and the judge, therefore, felt that it was a proper application to make. That sounds slightly defensive but it's a point I make because, had it been an improper application, the judge would have said, "I'm not granting this". What we don't have is the information the judge was presented with. I haven't made a suggestion that it was an improper application but what I would suggest is that paragraph 24, looking at that, it seems as though the objective that is set out in paragraph 24 is not itself a proper objective to make a PII application. I think I agree with that. The reason I speak about the propriety of the application is I have heard it suggested elsewhere and perhaps I'm getting ahead of myself and shouldn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q.	so the suggestion that it was an improper application, I would go so far to suggest, can't stand because the judge granted it and the judge, therefore, felt that it was a proper application to make. That sounds slightly defensive but it's a point I make because, had it been an improper application, the judge would have said, "I'm not granting this". What we don't have is the information the judge was presented with. I haven't made a suggestion that it was an improper application but what I would suggest is that paragraph 24, looking at that, it seems as though the objective that is set out in paragraph 24 is not itself a proper objective to make a PII application. I think I agree with that. The reason I speak about the propriety of the application is I have heard it suggested elsewhere and perhaps I'm getting ahead of myself and shouldn't You're protecting yourself from Mr Moloney, which is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Α.	so the suggestion that it was an improper application, I would go so far to suggest, can't stand because the judge granted it and the judge, therefore, felt that it was a proper application to make. That sounds slightly defensive but it's a point I make because, had it been an improper application, the judge would have said, "I'm not granting this". What we don't have is the information the judge was presented with. I haven't made a suggestion that it was an improper application but what I would suggest is that paragraph 24, looking at that, it seems as though the objective that is set out in paragraph 24 is not itself a proper objective to make a PII application. I think I agree with that. The reason I speak about the propriety of the application is I have heard it suggested elsewhere and perhaps I'm getting ahead of myself and shouldn't You're protecting yourself from Mr Moloney, which is Well, I suppose if you want to put it that way, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 4 15 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 4 15 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 15 10 11 12 12 11 12 11 12 11 12 11 12 11 12 11 12 11 12 11 12 11 12 11 12 11 11	A. Q.	so the suggestion that it was an improper application, I would go so far to suggest, can't stand because the judge granted it and the judge, therefore, felt that it was a proper application to make. That sounds slightly defensive but it's a point I make because, had it been an improper application, the judge would have said, "I'm not granting this". What we don't have is the information the judge was presented with. I haven't made a suggestion that it was an improper application but what I would suggest is that paragraph 24, looking at that, it seems as though the objective that is set out in paragraph 24 is not itself a proper objective to make a PII application. I think I agree with that. The reason I speak about the propriety of the application is I have heard it suggested elsewhere and perhaps I'm getting ahead of myself and shouldn't You're protecting yourself from Mr Moloney, which is Well, I suppose if you want to put it that way, yes. I saw what Mr Moloney asked of Martin Smith and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5 16 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 10 17 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	A. Q.	so the suggestion that it was an improper application, I would go so far to suggest, can't stand because the judge granted it and the judge, therefore, felt that it was a proper application to make. That sounds slightly defensive but it's a point I make because, had it been an improper application, the judge would have said, "I'm not granting this". What we don't have is the information the judge was presented with. I haven't made a suggestion that it was an improper application but what I would suggest is that paragraph 24, looking at that, it seems as though the objective that is set out in paragraph 24 is not itself a proper objective to make a PII application. I think I agree with that. The reason I speak about the propriety of the application is I have heard it suggested elsewhere and perhaps I'm getting ahead of myself and shouldn't You're protecting yourself from Mr Moloney, which is Well, I suppose if you want to put it that way, yes. I saw what Mr Moloney asked of Martin Smith and I disagreed quite seriously with the propositions that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7 8 9 21 22	A. Q.	so the suggestion that it was an improper application, I would go so far to suggest, can't stand because the judge granted it and the judge, therefore, felt that it was a proper application to make. That sounds slightly defensive but it's a point I make because, had it been an improper application, the judge would have said, "I'm not granting this". What we don't have is the information the judge was presented with. I haven't made a suggestion that it was an improper application but what I would suggest is that paragraph 24, looking at that, it seems as though the objective that is set out in paragraph 24 is not itself a proper objective to make a PII application. I think I agree with that. The reason I speak about the propriety of the application is I have heard it suggested elsewhere and perhaps I'm getting ahead of myself and shouldn't You're protecting yourself from Mr Moloney, which is Well, I suppose if you want to put it that way, yes. I saw what Mr Moloney asked of Martin Smith and I disagreed quite seriously with the propositions that were being put.

(11) Pages 41 - 44

3

4 5

6

Flemington?

1	Α.	Oh, fine then. Thank you, I'm happy.
2	Q.	In your witness statement, paragraphs 43 and 44, you say
3		that you went to the Post Office's offices on 3 July, so
4		a couple of days after this hearing.
5	Α.	Yeah, if that's what it says, yeah.
6	Q.	I think, you say in your statement, most likely with
7		Rodric Williams and Jarnail Singh. Are you able to
8		assist us at all with how likely that is?
9	Α.	Very likely. I would have that to have met him very
10		early on and so it's I suspect it was almost
11		inevitable that I would have met him at that meeting.
12		I can't think of a reason why I wouldn't have met him at
13		that meeting. It makes absolute sense.
14	Q.	When you say "him", we know you had conversations with
15		Jarnail Singh
16	Α.	Yeah.
17	Q.	what about Rodric Williams?
18	Α.	No, that's what I'm saying. I think it's inevitable
19		that that's when I first met Rodric Williams.
20	Q.	Thank you.
21	Α.	I think that's absolutely right.
22	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: Mr Blake, what number paragraph was that,
23		did you just refer
24		BLAKE: 43 and 44.
25	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: 43 and 44, thank you. 45
		45
1	MD	DIALE, the break the state of a sector main sector and the
	IVIT	BLAKE: I'm just thinking about a mid-morning break. I'm
2	IVIT	coming to a point but I think let's go on
2 3	WIR	coming to a point but I think let's go on Actually, no, sir, I think if we're going to take
	WIR	coming to a point but I think let's go on Actually, no, sir, I think if we're going to take two morning breaks, I think now is actually
3 4 5		coming to a point but I think let's go on Actually, no, sir, I think if we're going to take two morning breaks, I think now is actually an appropriate time.
3 4 5 6		coming to a point but I think let's go on Actually, no, sir, I think if we're going to take two morning breaks, I think now is actually an appropriate time. WYN WILLIAMS: All right. That's fine. Rather than,
3 4 5	SIR	coming to a point but I think let's go on Actually, no, sir, I think if we're going to take two morning breaks, I think now is actually an appropriate time. WYN WILLIAMS: All right. That's fine. Rather than, say, 10.58, let's say 11.00.
3 4 5 6 7 8	SIR	coming to a point but I think let's go on Actually, no, sir, I think if we're going to take two morning breaks, I think now is actually an appropriate time. WYN WILLIAMS: All right. That's fine. Rather than, say, 10.58, let's say 11.00. BLAKE: I think it's only a ten-minute oh, yes.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	SIR MR SIR	coming to a point but I think let's go on Actually, no, sir, I think if we're going to take two morning breaks, I think now is actually an appropriate time. WYN WILLIAMS: All right. That's fine. Rather than, say, 10.58, let's say 11.00. BLAKE: I think it's only a ten-minute oh, yes. WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I'm giving you 12 minutes, Mr Blake.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	SIR MR SIR MR	coming to a point but I think let's go on Actually, no, sir, I think if we're going to take two morning breaks, I think now is actually an appropriate time. WYN WILLIAMS: All right. That's fine. Rather than, say, 10.58, let's say 11.00. BLAKE: I think it's only a ten-minute oh, yes. WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I'm giving you 12 minutes, Mr Blake. BLAKE: Thank you very much, sir.
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	SIR MR SIR MR	coming to a point but I think let's go on Actually, no, sir, I think if we're going to take two morning breaks, I think now is actually an appropriate time. WYN WILLIAMS: All right. That's fine. Rather than, say, 10.58, let's say 11.00. BLAKE: I think it's only a ten-minute oh, yes. WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I'm giving you 12 minutes, Mr Blake. BLAKE: Thank you very much, sir. 48 am)
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	SIR MR SIR MR (10	coming to a point but I think let's go on Actually, no, sir, I think if we're going to take two morning breaks, I think now is actually an appropriate time. WYN WILLIAMS: All right. That's fine. Rather than, say, 10.58, let's say 11.00. BLAKE: I think it's only a ten-minute oh, yes. WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I'm giving you 12 minutes, Mr Blake. BLAKE: Thank you very much, sir. 48 am) (A short break)
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	SIR MR SIR (10	coming to a point but I think let's go on Actually, no, sir, I think if we're going to take two morning breaks, I think now is actually an appropriate time. WYN WILLIAMS: All right. That's fine. Rather than, say, 10.58, let's say 11.00. BLAKE: I think it's only a ten-minute oh, yes. WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I'm giving you 12 minutes, Mr Blake. BLAKE: Thank you very much, sir. 48 am) (A short break).
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	SIR MR SIR (10 (11 MR	coming to a point but I think let's go on Actually, no, sir, I think if we're going to take two morning breaks, I think now is actually an appropriate time. WYN WILLIAMS: All right. That's fine. Rather than, say, 10.58, let's say 11.00. BLAKE: I think it's only a ten-minute oh, yes. WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I'm giving you 12 minutes, Mr Blake. BLAKE: Thank you very much, sir. 48 am) (A short break). 00 am) BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can you see and hear me?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	SIR MR SIR (10 (11 MR SIR	coming to a point but I think let's go on Actually, no, sir, I think if we're going to take two morning breaks, I think now is actually an appropriate time. WYN WILLIAMS: All right. That's fine. Rather than, say, 10.58, let's say 11.00. BLAKE: I think it's only a ten-minute oh, yes. WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I'm giving you 12 minutes, Mr Blake. BLAKE: Thank you very much, sir. 48 am) (A short break) .00 am) BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can you see and hear me? WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, yes.
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	SIR MR SIR (10 (11 MR SIR	coming to a point but I think let's go on Actually, no, sir, I think if we're going to take two morning breaks, I think now is actually an appropriate time. WYN WILLIAMS: All right. That's fine. Rather than, say, 10.58, let's say 11.00. BLAKE: I think it's only a ten-minute oh, yes. WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I'm giving you 12 minutes, Mr Blake. BLAKE: Thank you very much, sir. 48 am) (A short break) .00 am) BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can you see and hear me? WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, yes. BLAKE: Thank you.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	SIR MR SIR (10 (11 MR SIR	coming to a point but I think let's go on Actually, no, sir, I think if we're going to take two morning breaks, I think now is actually an appropriate time. WYN WILLIAMS: All right. That's fine. Rather than, say, 10.58, let's say 11.00. BLAKE: I think it's only a ten-minute oh, yes. WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I'm giving you 12 minutes, Mr Blake. BLAKE: Thank you very much, sir. 48 am) (A short break) .00 am) BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can you see and hear me? WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, yes. BLAKE: Thank you. Mr Clarke, we left off on the case of Samra. It's
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	SIR MR SIR (10 (11 MR SIR	coming to a point but I think let's go on Actually, no, sir, I think if we're going to take two morning breaks, I think now is actually an appropriate time. WYN WILLIAMS: All right. That's fine. Rather than, say, 10.58, let's say 11.00. BLAKE: I think it's only a ten-minute oh, yes. WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I'm giving you 12 minutes, Mr Blake. BLAKE: Thank you very much, sir. 48 am) (A short break) .00 am) BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can you see and hear me? WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, yes. BLAKE: Thank you. Mr Clarke, we left off on the case of Samra. It's right to say that, in that case, you had disclosable
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	SIR MR SIR (10 (11 MR SIR	coming to a point but I think let's go on Actually, no, sir, I think if we're going to take two morning breaks, I think now is actually an appropriate time. WYN WILLIAMS: All right. That's fine. Rather than, say, 10.58, let's say 11.00. BLAKE: I think it's only a ten-minute oh, yes. WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I'm giving you 12 minutes, Mr Blake. BLAKE: Thank you very much, sir. 48 am) (A short break) 00 am) BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can you see and hear me? WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, yes. BLAKE: Thank you. Mr Clarke, we left off on the case of Samra. It's right to say that, in that case, you had disclosable information about bugs, errors and defects in Horizon,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	SIR MR (10 (11 MR SIR MR	coming to a point but I think let's go on Actually, no, sir, I think if we're going to take two morning breaks, I think now is actually an appropriate time. WYN WILLIAMS: All right. That's fine. Rather than, say, 10.58, let's say 11.00. BLAKE: I think it's only a ten-minute oh, yes. WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I'm giving you 12 minutes, Mr Blake. BLAKE: Thank you very much, sir. 48 am) (A short break) .00 am) BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can you see and hear me? WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, yes. BLAKE: Thank you. Mr Clarke, we left off on the case of Samra. It's right to say that, in that case, you had disclosable information about bugs, errors and defects in Horizon, correct?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	SIR MR SIR (10 (11 MR SIR MR	coming to a point but I think let's go on Actually, no, sir, I think if we're going to take two morning breaks, I think now is actually an appropriate time. WYN WILLIAMS: All right. That's fine. Rather than, say, 10.58, let's say 11.00. BLAKE: I think it's only a ten-minute oh, yes. WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I'm giving you 12 minutes, Mr Blake. BLAKE: Thank you very much, sir. 48 am) (A short break) .00 am) BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can you see and hear me? WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, yes. BLAKE: Thank you. Mr Clarke, we left off on the case of Samra. It's right to say that, in that case, you had disclosable information about bugs, errors and defects in Horizon, correct? Correct.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	SIR MR (10 (11 MR SIR MR A. Q.	coming to a point but I think let's go on Actually, no, sir, I think if we're going to take two morning breaks, I think now is actually an appropriate time. WYN WILLIAMS: All right. That's fine. Rather than, say, 10.58, let's say 11.00. BLAKE: I think it's only a ten-minute oh, yes. WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I'm giving you 12 minutes, Mr Blake. BLAKE: Thank you very much, sir. 48 am) (A short break) 00 am) BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can you see and hear me? WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, yes. BLAKE: Thank you. Mr Clarke, we left off on the case of Samra. It's right to say that, in that case, you had disclosable information about bugs, errors and defects in Horizon, correct? Correct. It was a case that involved Horizon?
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	SIR MR (10 (11 MR SIR MR A. Q. A.	coming to a point but I think let's go on Actually, no, sir, I think if we're going to take two morning breaks, I think now is actually an appropriate time. WYN WILLIAMS: All right. That's fine. Rather than, say, 10.58, let's say 11.00. BLAKE: I think it's only a ten-minute oh, yes. WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I'm giving you 12 minutes, Mr Blake. BLAKE: Thank you very much, sir. 48 am) (A short break) 00 am) BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can you see and hear me? WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, yes. BLAKE: Thank you. Mr Clarke, we left off on the case of Samra. It's right to say that, in that case, you had disclosable information about bugs, errors and defects in Horizon, correct? Correct. It was a case that involved Horizon? Yes.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	SIR MR SIR (10 (11 MR SIR MR A. Q.	coming to a point but I think let's go on Actually, no, sir, I think if we're going to take two morning breaks, I think now is actually an appropriate time. WYN WILLIAMS: All right. That's fine. Rather than, say, 10.58, let's say 11.00. BLAKE: I think it's only a ten-minute oh, yes. WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I'm giving you 12 minutes, Mr Blake. BLAKE: Thank you very much, sir. 48 am) (A short break) .00 am) BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can you see and hear me? WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, yes. BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can you see and hear me? WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, yes. BLAKE: Thank you. Mr Clarke, we left off on the case of Samra. It's right to say that, in that case, you had disclosable information about bugs, errors and defects in Horizon, correct? Correct. It was a case that involved Horizon? Yes. It's a case that the effectiveness or inadequacy of
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	SIR MR (10 (11 MR SIR MR A. Q. A.	coming to a point but I think let's go on Actually, no, sir, I think if we're going to take two morning breaks, I think now is actually an appropriate time. WYN WILLIAMS: All right. That's fine. Rather than, say, 10.58, let's say 11.00. BLAKE: I think it's only a ten-minute oh, yes. WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I'm giving you 12 minutes, Mr Blake. BLAKE: Thank you very much, sir. 48 am) (A short break) 00 am) BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can you see and hear me? WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, yes. BLAKE: Thank you. Mr Clarke, we left off on the case of Samra. It's right to say that, in that case, you had disclosable information about bugs, errors and defects in Horizon, correct? Correct. It was a case that involved Horizon? Yes.

0		day. Teant put it any higher than that.
7	Q.	Thank you. It's at that meeting that you advised there
8		should be this central hub, I think, later followed up
9		in writing?
10	Α.	Likely, yes. I think that's right.
11	Q.	Did you, at that meeting with Rodric Williams, explain
12		the real concerns that you have explained to us about
13		Gareth Jenkins?
14	Α.	Yes. It was the point of the meeting.
15	Q.	What was the reaction to that; what do you recall of the
16		reaction to that?
17	Α.	I expected surprise, shock, horror; I did not see any of
18		those things. He appeared to me to be taking it into
19		his is it right and his concern was with where we went
20		from here.
21	Q.	Did it seem as though you weren't providing him with new
22		information?
23	Α.	I think it would be unfair to say that, I can't look
24		into his mind. All I can say is I did not see the
25		surprise and astonishment I expected.
		46
1	Α.	Yes.
2	Q.	Public interest immunity enabled that information to be
3		hidden from the public for the time being?
4	Α.	Yes, for a limited period.
5	Q.	The result was that you didn't need to say in open court
6		something that you would have had to have said, had that
7		not taken place via the PII mechanism?
8	A.	l don't think I would have had to have said it in open
9		court; I simply would have had to have disclosed the
10		material to the defence and then they would have made
11		what they would of it.
12	Q.	Exactly, so it would have been used in open court
13	Α.	Yes.
14	Q.	had it not been covered by the envelope of public
15		interest immunity?
16	Α.	Yeah, that's correct.
17	Q.	I'm going to move on to what happened to cases where
18		there had been convictions or ongoing prosecutions or
19		some ongoing actions and disclosure that was or wasn't
20		made in those cases. Can we please look at POL00145145,
21		please. Thank you. If we please could look at page 5,
22		this the very same day as that public interest immunity
23		hearing. We have an email from Andrew Parsons. if we

MR BLAKE: Am I right in saying you never met Hugh

day. I can't put it any higher than that.

A. I have no recollection of ever having met him. He may

have been in a room with me, I don't know. I did not

recognise him when I saw him on the screen the other

- hearing. We have an email from Andrew Parsons, if wescroll down to -- it's an internal email, but you'll see
- 25 it's forwarded to you. He attaches ten letters to

52

1	subpostmasters, for review. Are you aware I'll take	1		Office, so it's not surprising he was copied into
2	you to those letters but I think you've seen them quite	2		everything.
3	recently they are letters about a bug called B14; do	3	Q.	
4	you recall that issue?	4		"I attach the letters we propose sending to branches
	Vaguely, yes. I've seen the documents recently, yes.	5		affected by B14."
6 Q .	·	6		Then he refers to the Merthyr Dyfan letter, which
7	branches letters disclosing that issue. Could we please	7		concerns a Costcutter branch:
8	turn to page 1. It's what we know as the local suspense	8		" which might have involved a Police prosecution
9	account issue.	9		of a branch assistant."
10 A .		10		They're no clearer on the status of that
11 Q .		11		investigation/prosecution.
12	an email from Rodric Williams to you and to Martin	12		If we look at the final paragraph on that page, it
13	Smith, and he says:	13		says:
14	"Simon, Martin,	14		"During our conference, you explained prosecuting
15	"Two issues from the conference today"	15		counsel's duty of disclosure. Please also net us know
16	So it seems as though you had a conference on	16		whether we could satisfy our duty of disclosure,
17	3 July, in fact that's the one we just talked about, is	17		(ie that we know of an issue which might be relevant to
18	it?	18		criminal proceedings) by notifying the police/Costcutter
	Yes.	19		prosecuting counsel of B14 so that <u>they</u> can take a view
	So we know, as we see I mean, it's copied to Hugh	20		on whether <u>they</u> should disclose it to the defence
21 22	Flemington, does that indicate in any way that Hugh	21		[according to] <u>their</u> duty."
	Flemington might have been at that meeting?	22		Your response is at the top of the page and you
23 A . 24	•	23		respond as follows:
24 25	for information purposes. As I understood it, he was I may be wrong I think he was Head of Legal at Post	24 25		"All letters. Is it necessary to inform each of the offices of the fact that other branches are affected?
20	49	25		50
1	It seems to me that these letters will somehow get in	1		the Court of Appeal and involvement in potential appeals
2	the public domain (Justice for Subpostmasters	2		because, as far as I'm concerned, the Court of Appeal is
3	Alliance??). If that were to happen then again we run	3		the final arbiter in whether or not convictions are safe
4	the risk of adverse speculation at least until Second	4		or otherwise, and so I'm always very careful when it
5	Sight is published (if it is to be)."	5		and, to this day, I'm very careful about what I do and
6	Very much echoing what was said at the end of that	6		say in the knowledge that the Court of Appeal may end up
7	attendance note about adverse publicity, adverse	7		reviewing what's been done. So I always approach issues
8	speculation. It does seem as though you were, as at	8		of appeal with caution and that's what I'm doing here.
9	4 July, particularly concerned with limiting adverse	9	Q.	You've described these as competing interests. On the
10	speculation.	10		one hand, you have being open and transparent
11 A .	l agree.	11	Α.	Yeah.
12 Q .	"Merthyr Dyfan. In this case there are competing	12	Q.	on the other hand, you have the potential impact on
13	interests: open and transparent dealing by the Post	13		an appeal. It certainly sounds as though you are
14	Office as against the proposition that this is likely to	14		concerned that, if you are open and transparent, it may
15	be an appeal case. Could you hold off on this letter	15		assist the appeal.
16	for a short while I will come back to you this	16	Α.	I think that's reasonable, a reasonable assertion.
17	afternoon once I've more fully considered the position	17	Q.	Yes, and you think that is not the best approach or best
8	and seen what [the Post Office] have forwarded to Martin	18		advice that you could have been giving at that time?
19	Smith."	19	Α.	Again, I think that's right. I would ask you to
20	Now, you've explained in your statement that this	20		remember that we're on the 4 July so, literally, only
21	was some sort of concern about the sub justice (sic)	21		a few days into my involvement in the entire Post Office
22	rule, can you assist us with	22		process, substantively, with quite limited information
23 A .	Sub judice rule?	23		and, effectively, trying to preserve the position until
24 Q .	Yes.	24		I knew what I was doing. I think that's what it comes
25 A .	Probably not that. I've always been very cautious about	25		down to. But I accept that the commentary you pass on

51

(13) Pages 49 - 52

		all to the united all the second and
1	~	this is perfectly valid.
2	Q.	Could we please look at POL00297182, same day, a bit
3 4		later on. You respond, Simon Clarke, yourself, to Rodric Williams, although
4 5	Α.	It's not up.
6	Q.	it's forwarded. Yes, it's POL00297182.
7	ω.	I think maybe you wrongly or inadvertently sent it
, 8		to Martin Smith first but it's certainly forwarded to
9		Rodric Williams and it's to Rodric Williams. Perhaps
10		you thought Martin Smith was going to forward it. Are
11		you able to assist us at all?
12	Α.	Looking at this, it's likely that I forwarded it to
13		Martin Smith for him to pass on. Again, this was very,
14		very early on in my dealings with Rodric Williams and so
15		it's likely I would have thought it had better gone
16		through Martin to Rodric than through me direct but
17		that's just a silly protocol thing.
18	Q.	If we scroll down it says, as follows:
19		"Rodric, what we had initially believed to be
20		perhaps one of the more difference cases in fact turns
21		at to be one of the easiest. This defendant is awaiting
22		his trial and accordingly has not been convicted and
23		sentenced. Because we are"
24		Just pausing there, so it seems as though it was not
25		an appeal case that you were concerned about because
		53
1		suggested be disclosed. Are you still confident that
2		that was the right advice to have been giving?
3	Α.	It's right as far as it goes, that is the duty is to
4		disclose to the CPS so that the CPS then take over
5		responsibility for the general disclosure function but
6	_	I agree with you that there should have been more.
7	Q.	You say:
8		"They will know the defence being run and if the
9		defence is based on the proposition that Horizon may be
10		responsible or that it is implicit in the defence (per
11 12		Samra) then they will disclose. If not then they will not!
12		"I think contact with the CPS should be made by us
14		at this end so as to maintain a firewall between [the
15		Post Office] and this overall problem; so that you are
16		seen to be acting independently and transparently
17		through lawyers; and because we are in any event dealing
18		with the other reviews."
18 19		
		with the other reviews." Can we please move on to POL00145201. If we could start on page 2, this is going to assist us with the
19		Can we please move on to POL00145201. If we could
19 20		Can we please move on to POL00145201. If we could start on page 2, this is going to assist us with the
19 20 21		Can we please move on to POL00145201. If we could start on page 2, this is going to assist us with the timing of various things. We see there 4 July, Hugh
19 20 21 22		Can we please move on to POL00145201. If we could start on page 2, this is going to assist us with the timing of various things. We see there 4 July, Hugh Flemington is sending you a first rough draft from
19 20 21 22 23		Can we please move on to POL00145201. If we could start on page 2, this is going to assist us with the timing of various things. We see there 4 July, Hugh Flemington is sending you a first rough draft from Second Sight of one half of the Interim Report. That is a significant part of that report that details the two bugs.
19 20 21 22 23 24		Can we please move on to POL00145201. If we could start on page 2, this is going to assist us with the timing of various things. We see there 4 July, Hugh Flemington is sending you a first rough draft from Second Sight of one half of the Interim Report. That is a significant part of that report that details the two

1		they haven't yet been convicted?
2	Α.	I think that must be right. Can I add this: this also
3		looks like it's a case being prosecuted not by Post
4		Office but by the Crown Prosecution Service.
5	Q.	Yes, and, in light of that, your advice is as follows:
6		"Because we are not the prosecutor our duty extends
7		to the following:
8		"1. Identify the name of the defendant;
9		"2. Identify the prosecuting CPS area
10		"3. Inform the CPS area of the existence of B14;
11		that it has affected [that] branch; and that a report is
12		due soon;
13		"4. Disclose the Second Sight Report to the CPS
14		once we have it.
15		"If we follow this route the disclosure 'ball' will
16		then be in the CPS court and our duty is satisfied."
17		Just pausing there, is that right? I mean, you had
18		more information than just the existence of B14 and the
19		fact that the Second Sight Report was going to be
20		published. You had that transcript of the conversation
21		with Gareth Jenkins; you had your knowledge about Gareth
22		Jenkins having been involved and about his reliability;
23		you had the various other discussions; I don't know if
24		by this time you had the Helen Rose Report or not but
25		you certainly that more information than is being 54
1	A.	Yeah.
2 3	Q.	If we go on to page 1, Martin Smith sends an email at the bottom of this page, saying:
3 4		"Our advice overall with regard to disclosure has
4 5		not changed. The disclosure of a partial report would
6		not meet with our duties or help the current situation.
7		I think the disclosure of a partial report would provide
, 8		partial information and give rise to adverse publicity
9		and speculation. It would be far better to advise once
10		we have seen the entire report. Having said that, the
11		Second Sight Report would not need to be disclosed in
12		every case that decision would be taken on
13		a case-by-case basis. In many cases, it will not be
14		disclosable."
15		He says "our overall advice"; is it fair to suggest
16		that you inputted into this?
17	Α.	Yeah.
18	Q.	To what extent was it his advice, to what extent was it
19	-	your advice? Whose typing was this, for example? Do
20		you think you sent it to
21	Α.	It's got my style about it. I can't say I wrote it but
22		it looks as though I've given some real input into it.
23	Q.	We know the Second Sight Report is almost complete.
		5 July you are expressing concerns again about adverse

5 July, you are expressing concerns again about adversepublicity and speculation.

56

(14) Pages 53 - 56

1 A .	Yeah, I agree.	1		was a result of central data reviews in the Post Office
2 Q .	-	2		Finance Service Centre?
3	the draft letter to the Merthyr Dyfan post office and	3	Α.	No, as I understood it, the bug was informed by Gareth
4	the one that was ultimately sent. So there are, in	4		Jenkins/Fujitsu to Second Sight.
5	fact, two documents that I'd like to bring up on screen,	5	Q.	It then says:
6	side by side. This one is the draft letter that was	6		"Your branch is one of that small number affected."
7	sent to you, and we saw the covering email. Then I want	7		We can see on the left-hand side that sentence:
8	to look at the final letter, and that is POL00002213, at	8		"Your branch is within of that small number affected"
9	page 16. Thank you very much. If we could go back one	9		has been removed in the final draft; do you see that?
10	page on the left-hand side, thank you.	10	Α.	I see that.
11	So, on the right-hand side, we have that earlier	11	Q.	
12	draft that you commented on; on the left-hand side, we	12		"We apologise for any confusion this matter may have
13	have the final version which was sent on 5 July, so the	13		caused and we want to assure that we have subsequently
14	day after that first draft Second Sight Report.	14		worked with our suppliers to understand the root cause
15	If we could look at the whole of the document on the	15		of the issue and take action to resolve it. You may
16	left-hand side, please. Thank you very much. Let's	16		however not have been aware of this matter at the time
17	keep them side by side and focusing on the right-hand	17		but we nevertheless felt it important to make you aware
18	side, first paragraph, it says:	18		of this incident and its resolution.
19	"As a result of central data reviews in the Post	19		"The purpose of this letter is to summarise the
20	Office Finance Service Centre, we have identified	20		outcomes of this review and to confirm the remaining
21	a small number of branches whereby a system error in	21		steps which we'll be taking to conclude this incident."
22	data archiving processes has led to an error in the	22		Those 2 paragraphs are the same in both.
23	calculation of losses and gains at branch level."	23	Α.	Mm-hm.
24	Just pausing there, is that right? Are you aware	24		But then it's the next paragraph on the right-hand side:
25	that the basis for that finding, that particular bug,	25		"The occurrence of this amount as a discrepancy has
	57			58
1	been confirmed as relating to a specific and unusual set	1		the Post Office, who then removed any mention to the
2	of circumstances which are not due to any mistake by	2		individual subpostmaster that there were other branches
3	yourself."	3		that were affected.
4	So the suggestion, the clear statement there, from	4		It does.
5	the Post Office that it wasn't the subpostmaster's	5	Q.	Yes. What part of a criminal prosecutor's duty do you
6	fault, that doesn't seem to have made it into the final	6		see it as to be concerned with adverse publicity?
7	version.	7	Α.	
8	Then if we scroll over, both pages, please. In	8	Q.	, ,
9	fact, on the left-hand side, if we ask could stay with	9		respect of this letter, do you think that was
10	the first it may assist. That top paragraph on the	10		appropriate or inappropriate advice?
				It was ill judged and inappropriate.
11	right-hand side:	11		
12	"This has impacted only 14 branches and we are	12	Q.	I'd like to now move on to the
12 13	"This has impacted only 14 branches and we are issuing similar correspondence to all parties concerned	12 13	Q.	I'd like to now move on to the R WYN WILLIAMS: Before you do, Mr Blake, in defence of
12 13 14	"This has impacted only 14 branches and we are issuing similar correspondence to all parties concerned to confirm that the issue is understood and the proper	12 13 14	Q.	I'd like to now move on to the R WYN WILLIAMS: Before you do, Mr Blake, in defence of the author of the final letter, if you look at the first
12 13 14 15	"This has impacted only 14 branches and we are issuing similar correspondence to all parties concerned to confirm that the issue is understood and the proper remedial action has been taken."	12 13 14 15	Q.	I'd like to now move on to the R WYN WILLIAMS: Before you do, Mr Blake, in defence of the author of the final letter, if you look at the first paragraph, it does indicate in that that more than one
12 13 14 15 16	"This has impacted only 14 branches and we are issuing similar correspondence to all parties concerned to confirm that the issue is understood and the proper remedial action has been taken." That doesn't appear in the final letter either, can	12 13 14 15 16	Q. Sif	I'd like to now move on to the R WYN WILLIAMS: Before you do, Mr Blake, in defence of the author of the final letter, if you look at the first paragraph, it does indicate in that that more than one branch was affected, does it not?
12 13 14 15 16 17	"This has impacted only 14 branches and we are issuing similar correspondence to all parties concerned to confirm that the issue is understood and the proper remedial action has been taken." That doesn't appear in the final letter either, can you see that?	12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. SIF	I'd like to now move on to the R WYN WILLIAMS: Before you do, Mr Blake, in defence of the author of the final letter, if you look at the first paragraph, it does indicate in that that more than one branch was affected, does it not? R BLAKE: It does. Although it does remove
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 A .	"This has impacted only 14 branches and we are issuing similar correspondence to all parties concerned to confirm that the issue is understood and the proper remedial action has been taken." That doesn't appear in the final letter either, can you see that? I've not oh, I see, yes. I see that.	12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. SIF	I'd like to now move on to the R WYN WILLIAMS: Before you do, Mr Blake, in defence of the author of the final letter, if you look at the first paragraph, it does indicate in that that more than one branch was affected, does it not? R BLAKE: It does. Although it does remove R WYN WILLIAMS: It waters it down, let's put it like
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 A. 19 Q.	"This has impacted only 14 branches and we are issuing similar correspondence to all parties concerned to confirm that the issue is understood and the proper remedial action has been taken." That doesn't appear in the final letter either, can you see that? I've not oh, I see, yes. I see that. Now, we saw your advice earlier was a concern about	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. SIF MF SIF	I'd like to now move on to the R WYN WILLIAMS: Before you do, Mr Blake, in defence of the author of the final letter, if you look at the first paragraph, it does indicate in that that more than one branch was affected, does it not? R BLAKE: It does. Although it does remove R WYN WILLIAMS: It waters it down, let's put it like that, yes?
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 A. 19 Q. 20	"This has impacted only 14 branches and we are issuing similar correspondence to all parties concerned to confirm that the issue is understood and the proper remedial action has been taken." That doesn't appear in the final letter either, can you see that? I've not oh, I see, yes. I see that. Now, we saw your advice earlier was a concern about notifying the branches that there were other branches	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. SIF MF SIF	 I'd like to now move on to the R WYN WILLIAMS: Before you do, Mr Blake, in defence of the author of the final letter, if you look at the first paragraph, it does indicate in that that more than one branch was affected, does it not? R BLAKE: It does. Although it does remove R WYN WILLIAMS: It waters it down, let's put it like that, yes? R BLAKE: Yes, absolutely.
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 A. 19 Q. 20 21	"This has impacted only 14 branches and we are issuing similar correspondence to all parties concerned to confirm that the issue is understood and the proper remedial action has been taken." That doesn't appear in the final letter either, can you see that? I've not oh, I see, yes. I see that. Now, we saw your advice earlier was a concern about notifying the branches that there were other branches and the publicity that that might generate.	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. SIF SIF SIF	I'd like to now move on to the R WYN WILLIAMS: Before you do, Mr Blake, in defence of the author of the final letter, if you look at the first paragraph, it does indicate in that that more than one branch was affected, does it not? R BLAKE: It does. Although it does remove R WYN WILLIAMS: It waters it down, let's put it like that, yes? R BLAKE: Yes, absolutely. R WYN WILLIAMS: Fine. Thanks.
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 A. 19 Q. 20 21 22 A.	"This has impacted only 14 branches and we are issuing similar correspondence to all parties concerned to confirm that the issue is understood and the proper remedial action has been taken." That doesn't appear in the final letter either, can you see that? I've not oh, I see, yes. I see that. Now, we saw your advice earlier was a concern about notifying the branches that there were other branches and the publicity that that might generate. Yes.	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. SIF SIF SIF	 I'd like to now move on to the R WYN WILLIAMS: Before you do, Mr Blake, in defence of the author of the final letter, if you look at the first paragraph, it does indicate in that that more than one branch was affected, does it not? R BLAKE: It does. Although it does remove R WYN WILLIAMS: It waters it down, let's put it like that, yes? R BLAKE: Yes, absolutely. R WYN WILLIAMS: Fine. Thanks. R BLAKE: Thank you. If we could take that down, please.
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 A. 19 Q. 20 21 22 A. 23 Q.	"This has impacted only 14 branches and we are issuing similar correspondence to all parties concerned to confirm that the issue is understood and the proper remedial action has been taken." That doesn't appear in the final letter either, can you see that? I've not oh, I see, yes. I see that. Now, we saw your advice earlier was a concern about notifying the branches that there were other branches and the publicity that that might generate. Yes. Do you recall seeing that advice?	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. SIF SIF SIF	 I'd like to now move on to the R WYN WILLIAMS: Before you do, Mr Blake, in defence of the author of the final letter, if you look at the first paragraph, it does indicate in that that more than one branch was affected, does it not? R BLAKE: It does. Although it does remove R WYN WILLIAMS: It waters it down, let's put it like that, yes? R BLAKE: Yes, absolutely. R WYN WILLIAMS: Fine. Thanks. R BLAKE: Thank you. If we could take that down, please. Moving on to the general advice and sift, can we please
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 A. 19 Q. 20 21 22 A.	"This has impacted only 14 branches and we are issuing similar correspondence to all parties concerned to confirm that the issue is understood and the proper remedial action has been taken." That doesn't appear in the final letter either, can you see that? I've not oh, I see, yes. I see that. Now, we saw your advice earlier was a concern about notifying the branches that there were other branches and the publicity that that might generate. Yes.	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. SIF SIF SIF	 I'd like to now move on to the R WYN WILLIAMS: Before you do, Mr Blake, in defence of the author of the final letter, if you look at the first paragraph, it does indicate in that that more than one branch was affected, does it not? R BLAKE: It does. Although it does remove R WYN WILLIAMS: It waters it down, let's put it like that, yes? R BLAKE: Yes, absolutely. R WYN WILLIAMS: Fine. Thanks. R BLAKE: Thank you. If we could take that down, please.

(15) Pages 57 - 60

1		"I arrive at this view not least because any
2		[subpostmaster] prosecuted prior to that date would have
3		been prosecuted using original Horizon data; any
4		sentence of imprisonment, Unpaid Work or fine would by
5		now have been completed; and the publicity which is
6		bound to arise once [Second Sight] has published will
7		place 'older' defendants on notice."
8		Just pausing there, you said that you had only very
9		recently got involved. Do you think you were
10		sufficiently informed by that stage to have been giving
11		this advice?
12	Α.	Can I ask you, please, to take me to my statement,
13		paragraph where I deal with this because I have thought
14		very carefully about this and I want to confirm what
15		I said to you.
16	Q.	Yes, please do let us know which paragraph
17	Α.	I'm struggling to find it, to be honest, but I did deal
18		with it.
19	Q.	Can you try your best without referring because we have
20		what's in your statement, it would be best
21	Α.	I stand by what I wrote in my statement. Somebody has
22		put my statement up now.
23	Q.	Yes, but I don't intent to take you to any particular
24		paragraphs
25	Α.	No, can we go back to the document you were asking me
		62
1		a difference in terms of that date. Can you elaborate
2		on that?
3	Α.	Oh, yes, because on the date the audit was done you knew
4		that there were no discrepancies in the accounts, you
5		knew there were no questions about whether or not the
6		relevant subpostmaster had fallen into error or made
7		mistakes or even had committed offences. It was a very
8		clean start point.
9	Q.	But what if you had been prosecuted before the change to
10		Horizon Online, had stopped becoming a subpostmaster,
11		were in prison, may have had your life ruined, your
12		children's lives ruined; how would the audit at the end
13		there have assisted at all with knowing whether they
14		were fairly prosecuted?
15	Α.	It wouldn't have done but our understanding, at the time
16		this decision was made, was that the two bugs we had
17		been told about affected the Horizon Online system,
18		which only started after 1 January.
19	Q.	But you also knew, at that time, that Gareth Jenkins was
20		an unreliable witness
21		We did.
22		who had given unreliable evidence
		We did.
24		and you knew that a system, such as Horizon, could be
25		capable of having additional bugs?
20		64

1 public interest immunity hearing and you have written 2 your general advice about -- if we scroll down, it 3

- begins addressing alternative Fujitsu experts and how 4 Gareth Jenkins should be replaced, and we can see there
- 5 at paragraph 221 that the Second Sight Report is about
- 6 to come out, it's due to be published at 6.00 that
- 7 evenina.
- 8 Α. Yeah, just in terms of chronology, I would ask you to 9 recall that I'm still only eight or nine days into this
- 10 process so it's still very much a learning curve for me.
- If we turn to page 3, please, it is the subject of the 11 Q.
- 12 "Start Date for the Review Process"?
- 13 Α. Yes.
- 14 Q. I'm going to read those three paragraphs. It says:
- "A number of start dates are suggested: 12 months 15 16 back from today; the date of separation of [the Post
- 17 Office] from [Royal Mail Group]; the initial [Horizon
- 18 Online] migration date; others.
- 19 "Considerations as to the selection of the start
- 20 date include proportionality; resourcing; transparency;
- 21 and [the Post Office] reputation. I have come to the
- 22 view that all of those considerations militate in favour
- 23 of a date close to the initial [Horizon Online]
- 24 migration date of 2010, perhaps using 1 January of that 25 year.

61

- 1 about, please?
- 2 Q. What I'd really like is just your reflections as to
- 3 whether, at the point you are writing this, you thought
- 4 that you had sufficient knowledge about to be these 5
- cases to make such a significant judgement.
- 6 A. This is in relation to the start date?
- 7 Q. Yes.
- A. Yeah. I think I had sufficient knowledge to make the 8
- 9 decision about the start date because the most important
- 10 factor in that respect was that we had been told that,
- 11 on 1 January 2010, the new online system had been rolled
- 12 out, so to speak, and that every branch had been audited
- 13 prior to that rollout to ensure that everything balanced
- 14 properly and so it was a good benchmark to say, from
- 15 this date, there were no problems with Horizon and Post
- 16 Office Accounts, and so anything moving forward from 17 that date could be inspected to see whether or not there
- 18 was an issue with the bugs, et cetera. Prior to that,
- we were dealing, I think, with an old system. 19
- 20 Q. That's paragraph 132 of your witness statement --
- 21 Α. Oh, thank you.
- 22 Q. -- and that's exactly what you've said.
- 23 Α. Thank you.
- 24 Q. It's difficult to understand why an audit at the end of
- 25 Legacy Horizon/beginning of Horizon Online would make 63

(16) Pages 61 - 64

- е
- ew
- to

- e

1

2

3

1	Α.	Old Horizon, as well, yes, we did.
2	Q.	So, with that in mind, it may seem to some although
3		we know Mr Altman agreed with you that that date was
4		chosen, given that people had been prosecuted for
5		a number of years before, some, including Ms Misra's
6		case, although that was ultimately looked at, involving
7		Gareth Jenkins?
8	Α.	Well, there are two parts to my answer to that question,
9		I think. The first is that we had to choose a date. It
10		seemed, at the time, that, for the reasons I've given,
11		it was the most logical date to choose. But we then
12		learnt very quickly after that that Brian Altman had
13		been instructed to supervise us the word "supervise"
14		was used: to supervise us and one of the things he
15		did was he looked at the start date, considered the
16		rationale behind it and agreed with it. And had he
17		said, "I don't agree with that start date, we should go
18		back further", I don't want to push responsibility on to
19		somebody else because I stand by the decision I made.
20	Q.	I mean, he was
21	Α.	But
22	Q.	reviewing the advice you'd already given.

- 23 A. Forgive me. We had given the advice that the start date
- 24 should be 1 January. Brian Altman reviewed it and said,
- 25 "I agree with the" -- whatever language he used --65
- 1 A. Yes, over the sift process, it became clear to us --
- 2 perhaps we were rather dim about it but it became clear
- 3 to us that the issues with Horizon extended back before
- 4 1 January 2010 and we started receiving cases for review
- 5 that went back before that. I'm not convinced we
- 6 received every case that had been prosecuted but we did
- 7 expand the ambit of the Horizon -- the pre-1 January
- 8 review but I can't say when that took place. And
- 9 I think, in the end, we reviewed something like -- I've
- 10 got a figure of either 400 or 700 cases but we reviewed
- 11 a lot of cases, and some of those would have been pre-
- 12 January 2010. So we did go back after a time.
- 13 Q. Not a comprehensive look?
- 14 Α. No, I don't think that was. No, I think you're right.
- Consideration, such as the fact that a sentence of 15 Q. 16 imprisonment or unpaid work or fine would now have been completed and therefore you shouldn't look at them, do 17
- 18 you look back at them and think that wasn't the best advice? 19
- 20 Α. Yeah, I think probably I do.
- Q. A separate criticism of the review is regarding 21
- 22 independence and an alleged lack of independence; what 23 do you say about that?
- 24 Α. Generally or specifically? In general terms, I don't
- 25 think there was any real issue of conflict in the

67

- "I agree with the start date chosen by Mr Clarke", that
- vindicated my decision. If he had said, "No I think you
- should go back 10, 15, 20 years", I have no doubt that
- 4 that's what we would have done.
- 5 Q. If we look at this now, though, the very first phone 6 call you had with Gareth Jenkins, he said he can't rule
- 7 out there being other problems, which made a lot of
- sense to you; second Sight Interim Report had identified 8
- two bugs impacting 76 branches, admittedly involving 9 10 Horizon Online; Helen Rose Report, it's not clear yet
- whether you've read it by this date or not but that also 11
- raised issues of Horizon integrity issues. 12
- 13 Did this not all cause you to think that there might
- 14 be some issues with what we know as Legacy Horizon?
- It didn't at the time, I rather suspect largely because 15 Α.
- 16 we had followed the route that 1 January 2010 was the
- 17 appropriate start date and, if you want to suggest that,
- 18 in a sense, that put blinkers on us going forward, then
- 19 I think that would probably be correct.
- 20 Q. Yes, because all prior assurances you had received had 21 proved to be wrong?
- 22 Α. Yeah.
- 23 Q. Did you at any stage, other than today, look at it and
- advise that, actually, "We might want to rethink the 24 25 start date"?
 - 66
- 1 review.

Q.

- 2 Who was carrying out the review? 3 Α. Well, there were two aspects to it. The first aspect 4 was that every case has to be sifted to determine whether or not Horizon figured in the prosecution 5 6 evidence. If Horizon didn't figure in the prosecution
- 7 evidence and an example would be there was a case where
- 8 an SPMR was taking money from the Post Office and 9
- loaning it to family members, that's clearly not 10 a Horizon case, then they were put to one side. If it
- 11
- was flagged up -- and I think the threshold was quite 12
- low -- if it was flagged up as a Horizon issue case then
- 13 it was reviewed by either me, Harry Bowyer and we had
- 14 three or four external counsel that we instructed on
- 15 an ad hoc basis to come in and conduct reviews as well.
- Q. Would you be surprised if I said that you and Harry 16 17 Bowyer, in terms of the sifts, reviewed 76 of 81 sifts?
- 18 Not at all. Α.
- You reviewing 33, him 43? 19 Q.
- 20 Α. Not at all.
- In those circumstances, do you think it can fairly be 21 Q.
- characterised as a review that's being carried out by 22
- 23 an independent firm?
- 24 Α. Yes.
- 25 Q. But the same firm that had been prosecuting on behalf of 68

1	the Post Office, do you think it can fairly be	1		were arising?
2	described even if you say, "Yes, I looked at this and	2	Α.	Yeah. Laccept that.
3	I was personally independently minded", do you think it	3	Q.	ls that also, you think, down to becoming immune or case
4	can fairly be characterised as a review being carried	4		hardened?
5	out by an independent firm?	5	Α.	That's exactly what I'm referring to. That's the point
6 A .	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	6		I'm making: that because you become slightly cynical,
7	part at the time, I didn't. But I accept that there is	7		jaded, as inevitably is going to be the case, then you
8	a view which goes, yes, it actually probably wasn't as	8		do miss things. Yes, I accept that.
9	independent as it ought to have been.	9	Q.	Moving on to the Gareth Jenkins advice, can we please
0 10 Q .		10	ч.	look at POL00297607. This is before I come on to your
11 A .		10		formal written advice, which is 15 July.
12	I would also accept, now that you've given me the	12	Α.	
13	numbers, that there might also have been a degree of	13	Q.	We're going to start on 10 July 2013, and the bottom
14	becoming case hardened by reviewing so many cases.	13	ч.	email, an email from Rodric Williams to you. He says:
15	I accept that's a possibility as well.	14		"Martin, Simon,
16 Q .		15		"Do you have some suggested wording for how we brea
17 A .		10		the [Gareth Jenkins] news to [Fujitsu], including why it
17 A. 18	it and much more vigorous, I expect. By the time you	18		is a problem for you from a criminal law perspective?"
19	get to case 35 it's inevitable, human nature tends to		•	Yeah.
	-	19	A.	
20	dictate that you've seen it all before and perhaps you	20	Q.	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
21 22	become slightly more what's the word cynical about what you're doing. I accept that, I think that's	21	•	news to Fujitsu"?
22		22	А.	Well, they had to be told that their expert had misconducted himself
	an appropriate comment to make.		^	
24 Q . 25	I mean, it might be suggested that in carrying out those sifts, you should have spotted trends and themes that	24 25		If we scroll up because they would be asking the obvious question
	69			70
1	"Why aren't you using him any more?"	1		Can we please look at the bullet points that were
2 Q .	Mr Smith responds:	2		attached to that. They can be found at POL00191967.
3	"Simon is preparing a further advice about Gareth	3		Now, these are quite brief, these bullet points.
4	Jenkins [and that's, I think, the one we'll come to].	4	Α.	Yeah.
5	However, he touched on the [Gareth Jenkins] point in his	5	Q.	Let's read them.
6	advice of the 8th."	6		"Fujitsu and Gareth Jenkins have for some time been
7	That I think we saw as well, the beginning	7		providing [the Post Office] with expert witness
8	paragraphs.	8		statements and expert evidence for criminal
9 A .	Yeah.	9		prosecutions;
10 Q .	If we could look at POL00191966, please. There's	10		"A full report which considers Fujitsu and Gareth
11	an email from Rodric Williams to Andy Parsons:	11		Jenkins' provision of expert evidence is being prepared;
12	"Andy,	12		"The initial view seems to be that statements and
13	"As discussed, please see the attached which sets	13		evidence provided by Gareth Jenkins did not contain all
14	out the high level issue which Cartwright King (our	14		that they should have done;
15	criminal law solicitors) has identified with the Fujitsu	15		"In particular there seems to have been a reluctance
16	evidence Gareth Jenkins has been providing in support of	16		to deal with known Horizon issues in the
17	the criminal prosecution cases conducted before Post	17		statements/evidence;
18	Office Limited. A more detailed note should arrive on	18		"As a consequence it has been necessary to conduct
19	Monday, which I will forward to you once I have it.	19		a review of cases so as to determine whether or not any
20	"Can you please consider this in light of the	20		particular defendant has been prejudiced by the absence
21	contractual arrangements we have with Fujitsu and draft	21		of information."
22	a suitable email to Fujitsu to put it on notice of the	22		Do you think that that's underplaying the issue
23	issue."	23		somewhat?
24	That's Rodric Williams to Andrew Parsons, copying in	24	Α.	No, I hadn't conducted my review then. I think I'm
25	a number of other individuals.	25		preparing them for what's coming.
	71			72

(18) Pages 69 - 72

	I mean, the conversation that you had with Gareth	1		that were you aware that Cartwright King operated
2	Jenkins, I described it as a bombshell	2		from a number of different offices
	Yeah.	3	Q.	
	and you agreed with that. I think you expressed to	4	Α.	and, until I was instructed and even during the
5	me serious concerns	5		course of the Samra case, I was based in the Nottingham
	Yeah.	6		office and the Post Office department, I think, was
	from that conversation and from the information you'd	7		based across Derby and Leicester. So I wouldn't have
8	received the day before. Do you think that a reluctance	8		been a party to any conversations prior to the Samra
9	to deal with known Horizon issues is an accurate	9		case, in any event. During the course of well, it
10	reflection of the strength of your feelings?	10		was during the Samra case that this arose and then, yes,
11 A .	0	11		of course, he then became pretty much the central topic
12	concerns, which I had and which I told you about, and	12	~	of discussion.
13	condemning a man before I completed my report, is quite	13	Q.	
14	important. But what I didn't want to do is point the	14		advice, were you aware or did you have any knowledge
15	finger at Gareth Jenkins in writing and say, "You have	15		about the basis on which Gareth Jenkins had been
16	misled the court" until I was certain of my position.	16		instructed?
17 Q .		17	Α.	
18	POL00006357, please, and that's 15 July.	18	Q.	You had that conversation on the 28th?
19	Were you aware involved in the instruction of Gareth	19	A.	
20	Jenkins?	20	Q.	, ,
21 A .		21		been put forward as a witness
22 Q .	3	22		
23	a topic of conversation within the office at all with	23		in those proceedings? Just not at all.
24 25 A .	your colleagues? Not that I'm aware of. You've got to again remember	24 25	A.	Would you have expected those at Cartwright King, who
	73			74
1	were involved in his cases, to have known about how to	1		that's what I was concerned with.
2	properly instruct him?	2		So I didn't look to see whether he'd been instructed
	Yes.	3		properly in the first place because that's in the past
4 Q.		4		and that was of no concern to me. My concern was: he
5	legal requirements; were you surprised by that?	5		hasn't told the court what he ought to have told them.
	When I saw him say that the other day, I was surprised,	6	~	How do we deal with that?
7	yes.	7	Q.	Can we look at page 14. We've seen this advice, I'm not
8 Q .	,	8		going to go take you through every paragraph
	sufficient to have that kind of knowledge?	9	Α.	•
9		10		
10 A .	I think "assumed" is a better word. I had assumed at	10	Q.	of the advice, the Chair has it. If we look at
10 A . 11	the time that things had been done properly, yes.	11	Q.	page 14, there are some conclusions. If we could scroll
10 A . 11 12 Q .	the time that things had been done properly, yes. One thing that you point into your witness statement was	11 12	Q.	page 14, there are some conclusions. If we could scroll up, please. It says:
10 A . 11 12 Q . 13	the time that things had been done properly, yes. One thing that you point into your witness statement was that Gareth Jenkins had signed off his witness	11 12 13	Q.	page 14, there are some conclusions. If we could scroll up, please. It says: "Notwithstanding the failure is that of [Gareth
10 A . 11 12 Q . 13 14	the time that things had been done properly, yes. One thing that you point into your witness statement was that Gareth Jenkins had signed off his witness statements, that he understood his role was to assist	11 12 13 14	Q.	page 14, there are some conclusions. If we could scroll up, please. It says: "Notwithstanding the failure is that of [Gareth Jenkins] and, arguably, of Fujitsu Services Limited
10 A . 11 12 Q . 13 14 15	the time that things had been done properly, yes. One thing that you point into your witness statement was that Gareth Jenkins had signed off his witness statements, that he understood his role was to assist the court?	11 12 13 14 15	Q.	page 14, there are some conclusions. If we could scroll up, please. It says: "Notwithstanding the failure is that of [Gareth Jenkins] and, arguably, of Fujitsu Services Limited being his employer, this failure has a profound effect
10 A . 11 Q . 13 Q . 14 15 16 A .	the time that things had been done properly, yes. One thing that you point into your witness statement was that Gareth Jenkins had signed off his witness statements, that he understood his role was to assist the court? Yes.	11 12 13 14 15 16	Q.	page 14, there are some conclusions. If we could scroll up, please. It says: "Notwithstanding the failure is that of [Gareth Jenkins] and, arguably, of Fujitsu Services Limited being his employer, this failure has a profound effect upon [the Post Office] and [Post Office] prosecutions,
10 A. 11 Q. 12 Q. 13 14 15 16 A. 17 Q.	the time that things had been done properly, yes. One thing that you point into your witness statement was that Gareth Jenkins had signed off his witness statements, that he understood his role was to assist the court? Yes. Did you, at that point, on reading those statements,	11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q.	page 14, there are some conclusions. If we could scroll up, please. It says: "Notwithstanding the failure is that of [Gareth Jenkins] and, arguably, of Fujitsu Services Limited being his employer, this failure has a profound effect upon [the Post Office] and [Post Office] prosecutions, not least because by reason of [Gareth Jenkins']
10 A. 111 12 Q. 13 14 15 16 A. 17 Q. 18	the time that things had been done properly, yes. One thing that you point into your witness statement was that Gareth Jenkins had signed off his witness statements, that he understood his role was to assist the court? Yes. Did you, at that point, on reading those statements, question why he didn't have the usual expert declaration	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q.	page 14, there are some conclusions. If we could scroll up, please. It says: "Notwithstanding the failure is that of [Gareth Jenkins] and, arguably, of Fujitsu Services Limited being his employer, this failure has a profound effect upon [the Post Office] and [Post Office] prosecutions, not least because by reason of [Gareth Jenkins'] failure, material which should have been disclosed to
10 A. 111 12 Q. 13 14 15 16 A. 17 Q. 18 19	the time that things had been done properly, yes. One thing that you point into your witness statement was that Gareth Jenkins had signed off his witness statements, that he understood his role was to assist the court? Yes. Did you, at that point, on reading those statements, question why he didn't have the usual expert declaration within those statements?	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q.	page 14, there are some conclusions. If we could scroll up, please. It says: "Notwithstanding the failure is that of [Gareth Jenkins] and, arguably, of Fujitsu Services Limited being his employer, this failure has a profound effect upon [the Post Office] and [Post Office] prosecutions, not least because by reason of [Gareth Jenkins'] failure, material which should have been disclosed to defendants was not disclosed thereby placing [the Post
10 A. 111 12 Q. 13 14 15 16 A. 17 Q. 18 19 20 A.	the time that things had been done properly, yes. One thing that you point into your witness statement was that Gareth Jenkins had signed off his witness statements, that he understood his role was to assist the court? Yes. Did you, at that point, on reading those statements, question why he didn't have the usual expert declaration within those statements? No, because I wasn't, at that point, concerned with	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q.	page 14, there are some conclusions. If we could scroll up, please. It says: "Notwithstanding the failure is that of [Gareth Jenkins] and, arguably, of Fujitsu Services Limited being his employer, this failure has a profound effect upon [the Post Office] and [Post Office] prosecutions, not least because by reason of [Gareth Jenkins'] failure, material which should have been disclosed to defendants was not disclosed thereby placing [the Post Office] in breach of their duty as a prosecutor."
10 A. 111 12 Q. 13 14 15 16 A. 17 Q. 18 19 20 A. 21	the time that things had been done properly, yes. One thing that you point into your witness statement was that Gareth Jenkins had signed off his witness statements, that he understood his role was to assist the court? Yes. Did you, at that point, on reading those statements, question why he didn't have the usual expert declaration within those statements? No, because I wasn't, at that point, concerned with whether or not he'd been instructed properly. That	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21		page 14, there are some conclusions. If we could scroll up, please. It says: "Notwithstanding the failure is that of [Gareth Jenkins] and, arguably, of Fujitsu Services Limited being his employer, this failure has a profound effect upon [the Post Office] and [Post Office] prosecutions, not least because by reason of [Gareth Jenkins'] failure, material which should have been disclosed to defendants was not disclosed thereby placing [the Post Office] in breach of their duty as a prosecutor." Very strong words there.
10 A. 111 12 Q. 13 14 15 16 A. 17 Q. 18 19 20 A. 21 22	the time that things had been done properly, yes. One thing that you point into your witness statement was that Gareth Jenkins had signed off his witness statements, that he understood his role was to assist the court? Yes. Did you, at that point, on reading those statements, question why he didn't have the usual expert declaration within those statements? No, because I wasn't, at that point, concerned with whether or not he'd been instructed properly. That was I was instructed I was interested in effect,	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q.	page 14, there are some conclusions. If we could scroll up, please. It says: "Notwithstanding the failure is that of [Gareth Jenkins] and, arguably, of Fujitsu Services Limited being his employer, this failure has a profound effect upon [the Post Office] and [Post Office] prosecutions, not least because by reason of [Gareth Jenkins'] failure, material which should have been disclosed to defendants was not disclosed thereby placing [the Post Office] in breach of their duty as a prosecutor." Very strong words there. I don't know where I get "Dr" from but, yes, very strong
10 A. 111 12 Q. 13 14 15 16 A. 17 Q. 18 19 20 A. 21	the time that things had been done properly, yes. One thing that you point into your witness statement was that Gareth Jenkins had signed off his witness statements, that he understood his role was to assist the court? Yes. Did you, at that point, on reading those statements, question why he didn't have the usual expert declaration within those statements? No, because I wasn't, at that point, concerned with whether or not he'd been instructed properly. That	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21		 page 14, there are some conclusions. If we could scroll up, please. It says: "Notwithstanding the failure is that of [Gareth Jenkins] and, arguably, of Fujitsu Services Limited being his employer, this failure has a profound effect upon [the Post Office] and [Post Office] prosecutions, not least because by reason of [Gareth Jenkins'] failure, material which should have been disclosed to defendants was not disclosed thereby placing [the Post Office] in breach of their duty as a prosecutor." Very strong words there. I don't know where I get "Dr" from but, yes, very strong words.

(19) Pages 73 - 76

1		existence of bugs should have been disclosed but was	1
2		not. Those defendants remain entitled to have	2
3		disclosure of that material notwithstanding their now	3
4		convicted status."	4
5		As you say, powerful stuff. Are you aware of who	5
6		this advice was shared with within the Post Office?	6
7	Α.	I can't remember how it got to Post Office. I don't	7
8		know whether I sent it or whether I gave it to Martin to	8
9		forward to Jarnail. To my direct knowledge, Jarnail	9
10		Singh had it and Rodric Williams had it. Where it went	10
11		thereafter, I can't say. I would add, with hindsight,	11
12		which I've already said in my statement is a cruel	12
13		master but, with hindsight, I now know that a number of	13
14		the advices that I wrote did not go where they ought to	14
15		have gone, even though I had expected that they would.	15
16	Q.	Even if you're not aware of where that actual written	16
17		document went, are you aware of any other names within	17
18		the Post Office who you are aware received the substance	18
19		of your advice?	19
20	Α.	No. I can't say who did and who didn't see it or who	20
21		did or who didn't receive the import of the advice.	21
22	Q.	I'm going to move on to the Criminal Cases Review	22
23		Commission. Can we please look at POL00039994. This is	23
24		a letter you'll have seen me take Mr Smith to.	24
25	Α.	Yeah.	25
		77	
1		legal argument available to the defendant for which	1
2		see below."	2
3		If we scroll down, we can see a comment by you:	3
4		"As to the second, the Second Sight Interim Report	4
5		would fall within the scope of that criterion on the	5
6		basis that it was important information not known at the	6
7		time of the original trial and which has emerged since	7
8		conviction."	8
9		It seems as though, as at 16 July 2013, it was	9
10		pretty clear to you that the Second Sight Interim Report	10
11		fell within that second limb of important new evidence?	11
12	Α.	That must be right, mustn't it? Not that it was clear	12
13		to me but it fell within that category, yes, I agree.	13
14	Q.	Can we please look at POL00039995. This is the draft	14
15		reply. If we scroll down, you say there at that bottom	15
16		paragraph:	16
17		"Where a defendant asserts, rightly or wrongly, that	17
18		Horizon is at fault, it is for the prosecution to	18
19		demonstrate the integrity of the system and the	19
20		evidential audit trail derived from Horizon."	20
21		Now, were you aware, anecdotally, at least, from	21
22		those involved in those prosecutions, that in reality,	22
23		the burden was largely put on the defendants themselves.	23
24	Α.	I became aware of that after my involvement in Post	24
25		Office, yes.	25
		70	

	Q.	It's a letter from the CCRC to Paula Vennells, 12 July
		2013. If we scroll down, we can see it's after the
		publication of the Second Sight Report and, they say:
		"For obvious reasons, we have read the recent media
		coverage concerning the Post Office Horizon computer
		system with interest", and they would like more
		information.
		Could we look at POL00039998, please. Top email
		says:
		"Please find attached documents prepared by Simon in
		response to that letter"
		So it seems as though you have received a copy of
		that letter and drafted two documents, one is a draft
		response and another is another document that I'll take
		you to first, that is POL00039993. Thank you.
		What was the purpose of this document?
	Α.	I think they asked me what the ambit of or scope of
		the role of the CCRC was and I think here I summarised
		as best I can, in fairly plain language, layman's
		language, what the role of the commission was.
	Q.	There are two criteria that are applied. The first
,	ч.	being that they had tried to appeal?
	Α.	Yeah.
	Q.	The second:
	α.	"There must also be some important new evidence or
		78
	~	When you only ofter your involvement?
	Q.	When you say after your involvement?
	Α.	Well, I didn't know before May 2013 because I had
	_	nothing to do with it, Post Office.
	Q.	At the time of writing this, in July 2013, were you
		aware that that was the case, having presumably already
		been sifting a number of files?
	Α.	Early on in the sift, I don't think I'd formed
		I formed that view later. I don't think I'd fully
		formed that view then but I think it's fair to say that
		there were indications emerging that those who were
		prosecuting were not doing that which they should have
		done.
	Q.	We then move on to Gareth Jenkins. It says:
		"This is usually accomplished by the serving of

expert evidence. For many years both [the Royal Mail

a single expert witness provided by Fujitsu Services,

the Horizon manufacturer, maintenance and support contractor. That witness has provided expert evidence

integrity of the Horizon system. He has done so both [the Post Office] and in expert witness statements and

in oral evidence to the court. In particular he has:

80

Group] and latterly [the Post Office] has relied on

in many cases where the defendant has asserted

irregularities with Horizon to be the cause of

unexplained shortfalls, as to the operation and

79

(20) Pages 77 - 80

		The Post
1		attested to the presence of defect detection and
2		rectification systems; the robustness of the prosecution
3		audit trail; and stated that, in his expert opinion,
4		Horizon accurately records and processes all information
5		submitted into the system. The Second Sight Interim
6		Report demonstrates that this was not the case."
7		You knew by the point at which you were drafting
8		this letter that Mr Jenkins wasn't to be relied upon
9		because, as you've explained, he was the very source of
10		those bugs that were disclosed to Second Sight.
11	Α.	Yes, I agree.
12	Q.	Why do you think that wasn't set out in this letter?
13	Α.	What, that I knew
14	Q.	That there was a real concern not simply that there was
15		new information that had appeared but that the very
16		expert that had been instructed in prosecutions was, in
17		your view, by that stage, unreliable?
18	Α.	Well, I think this letter does say that.
19	Q.	If it does that, it does that in a very subtle or
20		unclear way, in fact, doesn't it? I mean, it doesn't
21		raise there any real concerns about the integrity of
22		Gareth Jenkins?
23	Α.	I'm going to have to disagree with you. I think that
24		last paragraph you read does precisely that.
25	Q.	I mean, you had written the very day before, 15 July
		81
1		has been published after the expert has given evidence,
2		prosecutions have concluded, has proved that information
3		that he had provided is now no longer the case?
4	Α.	Yes.
5	Q.	But it doesn't raise any concerns about the actual
6		information that he was giving to the court?
7	Α.	I think that's read into that paragraph. We can get

- 7 A. I think that's read into that paragraph. We can get
 8 bogged down by this but I think --
- 9 **Q.** Let's have a look at this, if we could zoom out perhaps
- and look at the words "Where a defendant" down to "thiswas not the case", where do you say that was reflected
- 12 in this paragraph?13 A. "For many years ... RMG and latterly POL has relied on
- a single expert witness", and then it goes on to saywhat the expert witness says:
- 16 "That witness has provided expert evidence in many
- 17 cases where the defendant has asserted irregularities
- 18 ... He has done so both to POL and in expert witness
- 19 statements and in oral evidence to the court. In
- 20 particular he has: attested to the presence of defect
- 21 detection and rectification systems; the robustness of
- 22 the prosecution audit trail; and stated that, in his
- 23 expert opinion, Horizon accurately records and processes
- 24 all information submitted into the system."
- 25 That is setting out what the expert has said in his 83

1 A. Yeah.

2

3

4

7

- Q. -- a very significant piece of advice with very strong words -- I took you to those last two conclusions -- placing Post Office in breach of their duty as
- 5 prosecutor, et cetera. Do you think that the sentence,
- 6 the paragraph I've just taken you to, do you think that
- accurately reflects the strength of your advice to the
- 8 Post Office?
- 9 A. That's a different question, isn't it? The question you
- 10 were asking me -- forgive me, I don't want to be rude --
- 11 the question you were asking me was whether or not I was
- 12 advising in terms that the CCRC be told about Gareth
- 13 Jenkins. And the answer to that question is they are
- 14 here, I agree with you that I don't say it in such
- trenchant terms as I do in my written advice to Post
 Office, but --
- 17 Q. It is a particularly tepid response to the CCRC in
- circumstances where you had real concerns about thereliability of Mr Jenkins, isn't it?
- 20 A. I don't agree with your choice of words.
- 21 Q. Do you think it is reflective of the advice that you22 gave to the Post Office?
- 23 A. It tells the CCRC that the expert that has been relied
- 24 upon has not done that which he ought to have done.
- 25 **Q.** It suggests that the Interim Second Sight Report, which 82
- 1 reports. The following sentence, "The Second Sight
- 2 Interim Report demonstrates this was not the case", very
- 3 clearly in my view says that that gives the lie to
- 4 what's been said in the preceding paragraph.
- 5 Q. Does it say, "He knew it at the time"?
- 6 A. No, it doesn't.
- 7 Q. Why doesn't it?
- 8 A. I thought that was sufficient.
- 9 Q. Do you think that conveyed your opinion that he knew it
- 10 at the time.
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Looking back at it, do you stand by that?
- 13 A. Yes.

- 14 **Q.** If we scroll down, please, page 2:
- 15 "To that end [the Post Office] has instructed
- 16 an independent firm of criminal specialist solicitors to
- 17 identify every criminal case prosecuted by [the Post
- 18 Office] and [Royal Mail Group] prior to their separation19 ..."
 - That's the point I was asking you about before. Do
- 21 you think that is a fair description of the role of
- 22 Cartwright King or do you think that is somewhat putting
- a gloss on Cartwright King?
- 24 **A.** Well, I think I'd already answered that question and you
- know my view now. At the time, I thought it was right;84

1		my view now is perhaps not.	1
2	Q.	Was it intentionally drafted that way to give the	2
3		appearance that it was something that it wasn't?	3
4	Α.	No. I've just told you: at the time, I thought it was	4
5		the correct view.	5
6	Q.	If we could go over the page, please, to page 3. If we	6
7		scroll down, please. It says:	7
8		"Where counsel has advised the possibility of	8
9		grounds of appeal, letters have been written to	9
10		solicitors who defended, informing them of the issues	10
11		and providing copies of the Second Sight Interim Report	11
12		and such other material as they ought to have received	12
13		during the currency of the prosecution, had we then been	13
14		possessed of that material. It would then be for the	14
15		defendant and his lawyers to determine whether or not	15
16		they wished to launch an application for leave to appeal	16
17		out-of-time; we would certainly support grounds to allow	17
18		the application out-of-time."	18
19		So reference there to "the Second Sight Report and	19
20		such other materials", I think, actually, that phrase is	20
21		lifted from Brian Altman's or it certainly appears in	21
22		Brian Altman's interim review. I don't know if you	22
23		recall taking it	23
24	Α.	It's entirely possible.	24
25	Q.	We still there don't have any mention beyond Second	25
		85	
1		says to Andrew Parsons:	1
2		"Andy we received a letter from the CCRC	2
2 3		"Andy we received a letter from the CCRC yesterday which I have asked Cartwright King to review.	2 3
2 3 4		"Andy we received a letter from the CCRC yesterday which I have asked Cartwright King to review. Their advice feels odd to me as if given on a take it or	2 3 4
2 3 4 5		"Andy we received a letter from the CCRC yesterday which I have asked Cartwright King to review. Their advice feels odd to me as if given on a take it or leave it basis and I am not comfortable that's	2 3 4 5
2 3 4 5 6		"Andy we received a letter from the CCRC yesterday which I have asked Cartwright King to review. Their advice feels odd to me as if given on a take it or leave it basis and I am not comfortable that's particularly useful in this context. Could we discuss,	2 3 4 5 6
2 3 4 5 6 7		"Andy we received a letter from the CCRC yesterday which I have asked Cartwright King to review. Their advice feels odd to me as if given on a take it or leave it basis and I am not comfortable that's particularly useful in this context. Could we discuss, I am happy to go to another firm that specialises in	2 3 4 5 6 7
2 3 4 5 6 7 8		"Andy we received a letter from the CCRC yesterday which I have asked Cartwright King to review. Their advice feels odd to me as if given on a take it or leave it basis and I am not comfortable that's particularly useful in this context. Could we discuss, I am happy to go to another firm that specialises in criminal law or a barrister, somehow it feels as if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		"Andy we received a letter from the CCRC yesterday which I have asked Cartwright King to review. Their advice feels odd to me as if given on a take it or leave it basis and I am not comfortable that's particularly useful in this context. Could we discuss, I am happy to go to another firm that specialises in criminal law or a barrister, somehow it feels as if there is a conflict here which I am not sure	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		"Andy we received a letter from the CCRC yesterday which I have asked Cartwright King to review. Their advice feels odd to me as if given on a take it or leave it basis and I am not comfortable that's particularly useful in this context. Could we discuss, I am happy to go to another firm that specialises in criminal law or a barrister, somehow it feels as if there is a conflict here which I am not sure I understand."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		"Andy we received a letter from the CCRC yesterday which I have asked Cartwright King to review. Their advice feels odd to me as if given on a take it or leave it basis and I am not comfortable that's particularly useful in this context. Could we discuss, I am happy to go to another firm that specialises in criminal law or a barrister, somehow it feels as if there is a conflict here which I am not sure I understand." Were you aware that the Post Office had concerns	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11		"Andy we received a letter from the CCRC yesterday which I have asked Cartwright King to review. Their advice feels odd to me as if given on a take it or leave it basis and I am not comfortable that's particularly useful in this context. Could we discuss, I am happy to go to another firm that specialises in criminal law or a barrister, somehow it feels as if there is a conflict here which I am not sure I understand." Were you aware that the Post Office had concerns about the strength of your response or the content of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	۸	"Andy we received a letter from the CCRC yesterday which I have asked Cartwright King to review. Their advice feels odd to me as if given on a take it or leave it basis and I am not comfortable that's particularly useful in this context. Could we discuss, I am happy to go to another firm that specialises in criminal law or a barrister, somehow it feels as if there is a conflict here which I am not sure I understand." Were you aware that the Post Office had concerns about the strength of your response or the content of your response?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13	А.	"Andy we received a letter from the CCRC yesterday which I have asked Cartwright King to review. Their advice feels odd to me as if given on a take it or leave it basis and I am not comfortable that's particularly useful in this context. Could we discuss, I am happy to go to another firm that specialises in criminal law or a barrister, somehow it feels as if there is a conflict here which I am not sure I understand." Were you aware that the Post Office had concerns about the strength of your response or the content of your response? No.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q.	"Andy we received a letter from the CCRC yesterday which I have asked Cartwright King to review. Their advice feels odd to me as if given on a take it or leave it basis and I am not comfortable that's particularly useful in this context. Could we discuss, I am happy to go to another firm that specialises in criminal law or a barrister, somehow it feels as if there is a conflict here which I am not sure I understand." Were you aware that the Post Office had concerns about the strength of your response or the content of your response? No. Looking at that now and the discussion we've just had,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16		"Andy we received a letter from the CCRC yesterday which I have asked Cartwright King to review. Their advice feels odd to me as if given on a take it or leave it basis and I am not comfortable that's particularly useful in this context. Could we discuss, I am happy to go to another firm that specialises in criminal law or a barrister, somehow it feels as if there is a conflict here which I am not sure I understand." Were you aware that the Post Office had concerns about the strength of your response or the content of your response? No. Looking at that now and the discussion we've just had, do you think, actually, looking back at that draft, it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17		"Andy we received a letter from the CCRC yesterday which I have asked Cartwright King to review. Their advice feels odd to me as if given on a take it or leave it basis and I am not comfortable that's particularly useful in this context. Could we discuss, I am happy to go to another firm that specialises in criminal law or a barrister, somehow it feels as if there is a conflict here which I am not sure I understand." Were you aware that the Post Office had concerns about the strength of your response or the content of your response? No. Looking at that now and the discussion we've just had, do you think, actually, looking back at that draft, it was too I was going to use the word "robust",	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16		"Andy we received a letter from the CCRC yesterday which I have asked Cartwright King to review. Their advice feels odd to me as if given on a take it or leave it basis and I am not comfortable that's particularly useful in this context. Could we discuss, I am happy to go to another firm that specialises in criminal law or a barrister, somehow it feels as if there is a conflict here which I am not sure I understand." Were you aware that the Post Office had concerns about the strength of your response or the content of your response? No. Looking at that now and the discussion we've just had, do you think, actually, looking back at that draft, it was too I was going to use the word "robust", I wouldn't necessarily use the word robust but it was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18		"Andy we received a letter from the CCRC yesterday which I have asked Cartwright King to review. Their advice feels odd to me as if given on a take it or leave it basis and I am not comfortable that's particularly useful in this context. Could we discuss, I am happy to go to another firm that specialises in criminal law or a barrister, somehow it feels as if there is a conflict here which I am not sure I understand." Were you aware that the Post Office had concerns about the strength of your response or the content of your response? No. Looking at that now and the discussion we've just had, do you think, actually, looking back at that draft, it was too I was going to use the word "robust", I wouldn't necessarily use the word robust but it was too punchy?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q.	"Andy we received a letter from the CCRC yesterday which I have asked Cartwright King to review. Their advice feels odd to me as if given on a take it or leave it basis and I am not comfortable that's particularly useful in this context. Could we discuss, I am happy to go to another firm that specialises in criminal law or a barrister, somehow it feels as if there is a conflict here which I am not sure I understand." Were you aware that the Post Office had concerns about the strength of your response or the content of your response? No. Looking at that now and the discussion we've just had, do you think, actually, looking back at that draft, it was too I was going to use the word "robust", I wouldn't necessarily use the word robust but it was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A.	"Andy we received a letter from the CCRC yesterday which I have asked Cartwright King to review. Their advice feels odd to me as if given on a take it or leave it basis and I am not comfortable that's particularly useful in this context. Could we discuss, I am happy to go to another firm that specialises in criminal law or a barrister, somehow it feels as if there is a conflict here which I am not sure I understand." Were you aware that the Post Office had concerns about the strength of your response or the content of your response? No. Looking at that now and the discussion we've just had, do you think, actually, looking back at that draft, it was too I was going to use the word "robust", I wouldn't necessarily use the word robust but it was too punchy? What, my draft response?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q.	"Andy we received a letter from the CCRC yesterday which I have asked Cartwright King to review. Their advice feels odd to me as if given on a take it or leave it basis and I am not comfortable that's particularly useful in this context. Could we discuss, I am happy to go to another firm that specialises in criminal law or a barrister, somehow it feels as if there is a conflict here which I am not sure I understand." Were you aware that the Post Office had concerns about the strength of your response or the content of your response? No. Looking at that now and the discussion we've just had, do you think, actually, looking back at that draft, it was too I was going to use the word "robust", I wouldn't necessarily use the word robust but it was too punchy? What, my draft response? Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A.	"Andy we received a letter from the CCRC yesterday which I have asked Cartwright King to review. Their advice feels odd to me as if given on a take it or leave it basis and I am not comfortable that's particularly useful in this context. Could we discuss, I am happy to go to another firm that specialises in criminal law or a barrister, somehow it feels as if there is a conflict here which I am not sure I understand." Were you aware that the Post Office had concerns about the strength of your response or the content of your response? No. Looking at that now and the discussion we've just had, do you think, actually, looking back at that draft, it was too I was going to use the word "robust", I wouldn't necessarily use the word robust but it was too punchy? What, my draft response? Yes. That it was too punchy?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A.	"Andy we received a letter from the CCRC yesterday which I have asked Cartwright King to review. Their advice feels odd to me as if given on a take it or leave it basis and I am not comfortable that's particularly useful in this context. Could we discuss, I am happy to go to another firm that specialises in criminal law or a barrister, somehow it feels as if there is a conflict here which I am not sure I understand." Were you aware that the Post Office had concerns about the strength of your response or the content of your response? No. Looking at that now and the discussion we've just had, do you think, actually, looking back at that draft, it was too I was going to use the word "robust", I wouldn't necessarily use the word robust but it was too punchy? What, my draft response? Yes. That it was too punchy?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23

3		information that was very clearly apparent to you from
4		that Gareth Jenkins conversation on the 28th. Do you
5		think that is sufficient information that was being
6		provided at that stage?
7	Α.	Well, the only information we had was the Second Sight
8	^ .	Report, the fact that it was Gareth Jenkins who had
9 10		informed Second Sight of the existence of the bugs and
10		the Lepton report. That, I think, was the extent of
11	~	that which we had.
12	Q.	Was the Helen Rose Report mentioned there?
13	A.	No, it's not.
14	Q.	Are the concerns that were immediately apparent to you,
15		the bombshell conversation from the 28 June; is that
16		reflected there at all?
17	Α.	I think it's a more measured response.
18	Q.	A more measured response or a carefully worded response
19		to make it seem as though there wasn't very much
20		material to be handing over?
21	Α.	Two answers. Yes, it was carefully worded. Everything
22		I write I try to word as carefully as I can. But, no,
23		it was not carefully worded in order to minimise.
24	Q.	Can we please turn to POL00192214, bottom of page 3.
25		Susan Crichton has received your draft letter and she 86
		00
1		to the CCRC's request for information?
2	Α.	No, I don't agree with that.
3	Q.	Did anybody at the Post Office ever raise with you
4		concerns in respect of that letter?
5	Α.	They didn't, but I read this email as Post Office taking
6		the view that it was too strong. This looks to me as
7		though they're suggesting that they might want to water
8		it down. I speculate.
9	Q.	When you say "water it down", what do you mean by that?
10	Α.	Well, they clearly didn't like what I'd written.
11		Looking back from what I know now, from what I've heard
12		during these proceedings, it rather looks to me as
13		though they were thinking I was going too far.
14	Q.	Providing too much information?
15	A.	Yes, but that's me speculating.
16	MR	BLAKE: Thank you, sir. I think that's an appropriate
17		moment to take our second mid-morning break. Perhaps we
18		could come back at 12.10.
19		I think you're on mute, sir.
20		Sorry, sir, we can't hear you.
21	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, sorry, unless it interferes with
22	•	your train of questioning, in which case I don't need to
23		know the answer to this question now, but what, in fact,
24		happened to that draft? Was it sent in that form or
25		not?
-0		88

Sight, of, for example, the Helen Rose Report, we don't have any mention of any other information, the kind of

1	MR	BLAKE: I don't think we have a final letter. Certainly,
2		there was not a letter sent for a very long period after
3		that.
4	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: Right. Fine. Thank you. Do you need
5		an extra minute now, Mr Blake, after my intervention?
6		BLAKE: 12.10 will be fine, thank you, sir.
7		R WYN WILLIAMS: Right.
8	(12	.00 pm)
9		(A short break)
10	•	.10 pm)
11	MR	BLAKE: Thank you, sir. For your benefit, there is
12		correspondence with the CCRC at POL00040190. I won't
13		bring it up on screen, and, sir, we can look at that in
14		longer time
15		NYN WILLIAMS: Right.
16	WR	BLAKE: as to whether it's a holding response or
17	010	something more substantive.
18		NYN WILLIAMS: Yes, sure.
19 20	IVIT	BLAKE: Also, Mr Clarke, you asked about the Helen Rose
20		Report and whether that was mentioned in your advice of 15 July 2013. It was mentioned, it's at paragraph 26 of
22		that advice.
23	Α.	Fine, so I got it before then. Yes, that's fine. Thank
24	Λ.	you.
25	Q.	I'm going to move on now to your document retention or
		89
1	~	From conversations you had at the time, was it your
1	Q.	From conversations you had at the time, was it your
2		understanding that it would happen?
2 3	Q. A.	understanding that it would happen? Post Office appeared to me to have accepted the advice
2 3 4	Α.	understanding that it would happen? Post Office appeared to me to have accepted the advice and protocol wholesale.
2 3 4 5		understanding that it would happen? Post Office appeared to me to have accepted the advice and protocol wholesale. Thank you. I'm going to go through chronologically the
2 3 4 5 6	Α.	understanding that it would happen? Post Office appeared to me to have accepted the advice and protocol wholesale. Thank you. I'm going to go through chronologically the issue with John Scott and conversation with John Scott.
2 3 4 5 6 7	Α.	understanding that it would happen? Post Office appeared to me to have accepted the advice and protocol wholesale. Thank you. I'm going to go through chronologically the issue with John Scott and conversation with John Scott. That's POL00139745, it's a document I took Mr Smith to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Α.	understanding that it would happen? Post Office appeared to me to have accepted the advice and protocol wholesale. Thank you. I'm going to go through chronologically the issue with John Scott and conversation with John Scott. That's POL00139745, it's a document I took Mr Smith to and that just sets the scene. 31 July 2013, we have
2 3 4 5 6 7	Α.	understanding that it would happen? Post Office appeared to me to have accepted the advice and protocol wholesale. Thank you. I'm going to go through chronologically the issue with John Scott and conversation with John Scott. That's POL00139745, it's a document I took Mr Smith to
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q.	understanding that it would happen? Post Office appeared to me to have accepted the advice and protocol wholesale. Thank you. I'm going to go through chronologically the issue with John Scott and conversation with John Scott. That's POL00139745, it's a document I took Mr Smith to and that just sets the scene. 31 July 2013, we have that conversation between Jarnail Singh and Mr Smith.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q.	understanding that it would happen? Post Office appeared to me to have accepted the advice and protocol wholesale. Thank you. I'm going to go through chronologically the issue with John Scott and conversation with John Scott. That's POL00139745, it's a document I took Mr Smith to and that just sets the scene. 31 July 2013, we have that conversation between Jarnail Singh and Mr Smith. Oh yeah.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q.	understanding that it would happen? Post Office appeared to me to have accepted the advice and protocol wholesale. Thank you. I'm going to go through chronologically the issue with John Scott and conversation with John Scott. That's POL00139745, it's a document I took Mr Smith to and that just sets the scene. 31 July 2013, we have that conversation between Jarnail Singh and Mr Smith. Oh yeah. The summary there is:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q.	understanding that it would happen? Post Office appeared to me to have accepted the advice and protocol wholesale. Thank you. I'm going to go through chronologically the issue with John Scott and conversation with John Scott. That's POL00139745, it's a document I took Mr Smith to and that just sets the scene. 31 July 2013, we have that conversation between Jarnail Singh and Mr Smith. Oh yeah. The summary there is: "Discussing disclosure issues: [John Scott] has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q.	understanding that it would happen? Post Office appeared to me to have accepted the advice and protocol wholesale. Thank you. I'm going to go through chronologically the issue with John Scott and conversation with John Scott. That's POL00139745, it's a document I took Mr Smith to and that just sets the scene. 31 July 2013, we have that conversation between Jarnail Singh and Mr Smith. Oh yeah. The summary there is: "Discussing disclosure issues: [John Scott] has instructed that typed minutes be scrapped."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q.	understanding that it would happen? Post Office appeared to me to have accepted the advice and protocol wholesale. Thank you. I'm going to go through chronologically the issue with John Scott and conversation with John Scott. That's POL00139745, it's a document I took Mr Smith to and that just sets the scene. 31 July 2013, we have that conversation between Jarnail Singh and Mr Smith. Oh yeah. The summary there is: "Discussing disclosure issues: [John Scott] has instructed that typed minutes be scrapped." Then we move on to POL00139746, Jarnail Singh emails
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q.	understanding that it would happen? Post Office appeared to me to have accepted the advice and protocol wholesale. Thank you. I'm going to go through chronologically the issue with John Scott and conversation with John Scott. That's POL00139745, it's a document I took Mr Smith to and that just sets the scene. 31 July 2013, we have that conversation between Jarnail Singh and Mr Smith. Oh yeah. The summary there is: "Discussing disclosure issues: [John Scott] has instructed that typed minutes be scrapped." Then we move on to POL00139746, Jarnail Singh emails Mr Smith the same day, and he says:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q.	understanding that it would happen? Post Office appeared to me to have accepted the advice and protocol wholesale. Thank you. I'm going to go through chronologically the issue with John Scott and conversation with John Scott. That's POL00139745, it's a document I took Mr Smith to and that just sets the scene. 31 July 2013, we have that conversation between Jarnail Singh and Mr Smith. Oh yeah. The summary there is: "Discussing disclosure issues: [John Scott] has instructed that typed minutes be scrapped." Then we move on to POL00139746, Jarnail Singh emails Mr Smith the same day, and he says: "I know Simon is advising on disclosure. As
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q.	understanding that it would happen? Post Office appeared to me to have accepted the advice and protocol wholesale. Thank you. I'm going to go through chronologically the issue with John Scott and conversation with John Scott. That's POL00139745, it's a document I took Mr Smith to and that just sets the scene. 31 July 2013, we have that conversation between Jarnail Singh and Mr Smith. Oh yeah. The summary there is: "Discussing disclosure issues: [John Scott] has instructed that typed minutes be scrapped." Then we move on to POL00139746, Jarnail Singh emails Mr Smith the same day, and he says: "I know Simon is advising on disclosure. As discussed can he look into the common myth that emails,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q.	understanding that it would happen? Post Office appeared to me to have accepted the advice and protocol wholesale. Thank you. I'm going to go through chronologically the issue with John Scott and conversation with John Scott. That's POL00139745, it's a document I took Mr Smith to and that just sets the scene. 31 July 2013, we have that conversation between Jarnail Singh and Mr Smith. Oh yeah. The summary there is: "Discussing disclosure issues: [John Scott] has instructed that typed minutes be scrapped." Then we move on to POL00139746, Jarnail Singh emails Mr Smith the same day, and he says: "I know Simon is advising on disclosure. As discussed can he look into the common myth that emails, written communications etc meetings. If its [not]
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q.	understanding that it would happen? Post Office appeared to me to have accepted the advice and protocol wholesale. Thank you. I'm going to go through chronologically the issue with John Scott and conversation with John Scott. That's POL00139745, it's a document I took Mr Smith to and that just sets the scene. 31 July 2013, we have that conversation between Jarnail Singh and Mr Smith. Oh yeah. The summary there is: "Discussing disclosure issues: [John Scott] has instructed that typed minutes be scrapped." Then we move on to POL00139746, Jarnail Singh emails Mr Smith the same day, and he says: "I know Simon is advising on disclosure. As discussed can he look into the common myth that emails, written communications etc meetings. If its [not] produced its then available for disclosure. If it's not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q.	understanding that it would happen? Post Office appeared to me to have accepted the advice and protocol wholesale. Thank you. I'm going to go through chronologically the issue with John Scott and conversation with John Scott. That's POL00139745, it's a document I took Mr Smith to and that just sets the scene. 31 July 2013, we have that conversation between Jarnail Singh and Mr Smith. Oh yeah. The summary there is: "Discussing disclosure issues: [John Scott] has instructed that typed minutes be scrapped." Then we move on to POL00139746, Jarnail Singh emails Mr Smith the same day, and he says: "I know Simon is advising on disclosure. As discussed can he look into the common myth that emails, written communications etc meetings. If its [not] produced its then available for disclosure. If it's not then technically it isn't? [Possibly] true of civil
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q.	understanding that it would happen? Post Office appeared to me to have accepted the advice and protocol wholesale. Thank you. I'm going to go through chronologically the issue with John Scott and conversation with John Scott. That's POL00139745, it's a document I took Mr Smith to and that just sets the scene. 31 July 2013, we have that conversation between Jarnail Singh and Mr Smith. Oh yeah. The summary there is: "Discussing disclosure issues: [John Scott] has instructed that typed minutes be scrapped." Then we move on to POL00139746, Jarnail Singh emails Mr Smith the same day, and he says: "I know Simon is advising on disclosure. As discussed can he look into the common myth that emails, written communications etc meetings. If its [not] produced its then available for disclosure. If it's not then technically it isn't? [Possibly] true of civil case NOT CRIMINAL CASES?"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q.	understanding that it would happen? Post Office appeared to me to have accepted the advice and protocol wholesale. Thank you. I'm going to go through chronologically the issue with John Scott and conversation with John Scott. That's POL00139745, it's a document I took Mr Smith to and that just sets the scene. 31 July 2013, we have that conversation between Jarnail Singh and Mr Smith. Oh yeah. The summary there is: "Discussing disclosure issues: [John Scott] has instructed that typed minutes be scrapped." Then we move on to POL00139746, Jarnail Singh emails Mr Smith the same day, and he says: "I know Simon is advising on disclosure. As discussed can he look into the common myth that emails, written communications etc meetings. If its [not] produced its then available for disclosure. If it's not then technically it isn't? [Possibly] true of civil case NOT CRIMINAL CASES?" You're not a named recipient there, is this is

what's been referred to as the "shredding advice"?

2 Α. Oh, yeah.

1

7

- You had advised a central hub to be created? Q. 3
- Yes. 4 Δ
- Was it your understanding that all Horizon related, for 5 Q.
- 6 example, bugs, errors and defects and remedies would be kept in that hub?
- 8 A. It was my understanding, I wrote a protocol which required that. 9
- 10 Q. Participants could bring to those meetings any concerns
- 11 about Horizon, however critical they were of the Horizon system? 12
- 13 A. I repeat: that was a requirement of the process and it 14 appears in the document, the protocol that I wrote,
- which was to apply to these meetings. 15
- 16 Minutes were to be kept? Q.
- 17 Α. Yes.
- Q. Minutes were to be disseminated? 18
- 19 Α. Yes.

25

- 20 Q. Was it your understanding, save for the fact that it was
- 21 written down in a protocol, that it would, in fact, 22 happen?
- 23 A. That was the point of the protocol. I required it to --
- in so much as I could, as an advising barrister, 24
 - I required it to happen. 90
- 1 these proceedings when it was sent to me.
- 2 Q. Did you understand that Mr Singh had requested advice of
- 3 that nature?
- 4 A. No.
- 5 Q. He says there, "I know Simon is advising on disclosure", 6 what was your understanding, as at 1 August, as to any 7 request for advice on disclosure? Was it the shredding 8 advice that we see or was it something else?
- A. It wasn't the shredding advice. It was the -- I presume 9
- it's a reference to the advice I'd done earlier on about 10
- setting up the hub and Post Office's general disclosure 11
- duties. I presume that's what he was referring to. 12
- Thank you. Can we move on, then, to POL00006799, and 13 Q. 14 that is the advice on disclosure, "The Duty to Record 15 and Retain Material". That's written by you on 2 August
- 16 2013?
- 17 A. It was
- Q. You've addressed it at paragraph 47 of your statement 18 and also at 93 to 95 of your statement. I don't need to 19 take you to those. 20
- 21 A. Okay.
- 22 Q. We can have a look at the advice itself, page 2,
- 23 paragraph 5, please. So you say there, you're
- 24 describing, you're summarising your state of knowledge
- 25 at that time, and you say:

<u>^</u>	"At some point following the conclusion of the third	1		m
2	conference call, which I understand to have taken place	2		W
3	on the morning of Wednesday, 31 July, it became unclear	3		ha
4	as to whether and to what extent material was either	4		be
5	being retained centrally or disseminated. The following	5		th
6	information has been relayed to me:	6	Q.	TI
7	"i. The minutes of a previous conference call had	7		in
8	been typed and emailed to a number of persons.	8		W
9	An instruction was then given that those emails and	9		W
10	minutes should be, and have been destroyed: the word	10		re
11	'shredded' was conveyed to me."	11	Α.	ΤI
12	Now, can you assist us with where that came from,	12		С
13	and the word "shredded"; who was it who conveyed those	13		а
14	words to you?	14		w
15 A .	That came from Martin Smith. I remember particularly	15	Q.	"ii
16	because I was going on holiday. That was the day my	16		sł
17	leave was to start and I postponed my departure upon	17		
18	receiving that information from Martin Smith because	18		Si
19	I took the view that that was just too serious to	19		ls
20	ignore.	20	Α.	Y
21 Q .	Martin Smith said he couldn't quite remember the exact	21	Q.	
22	words used. The fact that you've used that in speech	22	Α.	l'r
23	marks, does that imply that it was, in fact, the word	23		Μ
24	that was used by Martin Smith?	24	Q.	"ii
25 A .	I'm certain that that is the word that was conveyed to 93	25		[у
1	"If it's not minuted it's not in the public domain	1		CE
2	and therefore not disclosable.	2	Q.	W
3	"If it's produced it's available for disclosure	3		0
4	if not minuted then technically it's not'."	4	Α.	lo
5	I think you said in your statement that Jarnail	5		bı
	Singh said that that was Mr Parsons. Again, was it			in
		6		
7	Mr Smith telling you that he had been told by Jarnail	7		١v
7 8	Mr Smith telling you that he had been told by Jarnail Singh or is that direct from Mr Smith?	7 8	Q.	۱۱ TI
7 8 9 A .	Mr Smith telling you that he had been told by Jarnail Singh or is that direct from Mr Smith? I would have sorry, I'm frowning because I'm thinking	7 8 9	Α.	Гл ТГ То
7 8 9 A . 10	Mr Smith telling you that he had been told by Jarnail Singh or is that direct from Mr Smith? I would have sorry, I'm frowning because I'm thinking of the shorthand writer who has told me off already.	7 8 9 10		۱۱ TI
9 A. 10 11	Mr Smith telling you that he had been told by Jarnail Singh or is that direct from Mr Smith? I would have sorry, I'm frowning because I'm thinking of the shorthand writer who has told me off already. That was from Mr Smith, all of those instructions came	7 8 9 10 11	Α.	I N TI TC C
7 8 9 A . 10 11	Mr Smith telling you that he had been told by Jarnail Singh or is that direct from Mr Smith? I would have sorry, I'm frowning because I'm thinking of the shorthand writer who has told me off already. That was from Mr Smith, all of those instructions came from Mr Smith but I've got a scratchy memory that	7 8 9 10 11	Α.	Ι \ ΤΙ Τα Ca
7 8 9 A . 10 11 12 13	Mr Smith telling you that he had been told by Jarnail Singh or is that direct from Mr Smith? I would have sorry, I'm frowning because I'm thinking of the shorthand writer who has told me off already. That was from Mr Smith, all of those instructions came from Mr Smith but I've got a scratchy memory that I might have telephoned Jarnail Singh to confirm. I can	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Α.	I V TI TC C at ar
7 8 9 A . 10 11 12 13 14	Mr Smith telling you that he had been told by Jarnail Singh or is that direct from Mr Smith? I would have sorry, I'm frowning because I'm thinking of the shorthand writer who has told me off already. That was from Mr Smith, all of those instructions came from Mr Smith but I've got a scratchy memory that I might have telephoned Jarnail Singh to confirm. I can see myself in the Nottingham office on the telephone and	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Α.	IN TI TC at ar br
7 8 9 A . 10 11 12 13 14 15	Mr Smith telling you that he had been told by Jarnail Singh or is that direct from Mr Smith? I would have sorry, I'm frowning because I'm thinking of the shorthand writer who has told me off already. That was from Mr Smith, all of those instructions came from Mr Smith but I've got a scratchy memory that I might have telephoned Jarnail Singh to confirm. I can see myself in the Nottingham office on the telephone and I have just got that scratchy recollection that I might	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Α.	I \ TI TC C ak ar br Ac
7 8 9 A . 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Mr Smith telling you that he had been told by Jarnail Singh or is that direct from Mr Smith? I would have sorry, I'm frowning because I'm thinking of the shorthand writer who has told me off already. That was from Mr Smith, all of those instructions came from Mr Smith but I've got a scratchy memory that I might have telephoned Jarnail Singh to confirm. I can see myself in the Nottingham office on the telephone and I have just got that scratchy recollection that I might have telephoned Jarnail Singh to confirm these	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Α.	IN TI C at ar br Ac ba
7 8 9 A. 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Mr Smith telling you that he had been told by Jarnail Singh or is that direct from Mr Smith? I would have sorry, I'm frowning because I'm thinking of the shorthand writer who has told me off already. That was from Mr Smith, all of those instructions came from Mr Smith but I've got a scratchy memory that I might have telephoned Jarnail Singh to confirm. I can see myself in the Nottingham office on the telephone and I have just got that scratchy recollection that I might have telephoned Jarnail Singh to confirm these instructions.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Α.	I \ TI To Co at ar br Ao ba re
7 8 9 A . 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 Q .	Mr Smith telling you that he had been told by Jarnail Singh or is that direct from Mr Smith? I would have sorry, I'm frowning because I'm thinking of the shorthand writer who has told me off already. That was from Mr Smith, all of those instructions came from Mr Smith but I've got a scratchy memory that I might have telephoned Jarnail Singh to confirm. I can see myself in the Nottingham office on the telephone and I have just got that scratchy recollection that I might have telephoned Jarnail Singh to confirm these instructions. Then at iv:	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Α.	IN TI C at ar br Ac ba re ci
7 8 9 A. 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 Q. 19	Mr Smith telling you that he had been told by Jarnail Singh or is that direct from Mr Smith? I would have sorry, I'm frowning because I'm thinking of the shorthand writer who has told me off already. That was from Mr Smith, all of those instructions came from Mr Smith but I've got a scratchy memory that I might have telephoned Jarnail Singh to confirm. I can see myself in the Nottingham office on the telephone and I have just got that scratchy recollection that I might have telephoned Jarnail Singh to confirm these instructions. Then at iv: "Some at [the Post Office] do not wish to minute the	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Α.	IN TI Co at ar br Ac ba re cii th
7 8 9 A . 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 Q . 19 20	Mr Smith telling you that he had been told by Jarnail Singh or is that direct from Mr Smith? I would have sorry, I'm frowning because I'm thinking of the shorthand writer who has told me off already. That was from Mr Smith, all of those instructions came from Mr Smith but I've got a scratchy memory that I might have telephoned Jarnail Singh to confirm. I can see myself in the Nottingham office on the telephone and I have just got that scratchy recollection that I might have telephoned Jarnail Singh to confirm these instructions. Then at iv: "Some at [the Post Office] do not wish to minute the weekly conference calls."	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Α.	IN TI C at ar br A ba re cii th or
7 8 9 A . 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 Q . 19 20 21	Mr Smith telling you that he had been told by Jarnail Singh or is that direct from Mr Smith? I would have sorry, I'm frowning because I'm thinking of the shorthand writer who has told me off already. That was from Mr Smith, all of those instructions came from Mr Smith but I've got a scratchy memory that I might have telephoned Jarnail Singh to confirm. I can see myself in the Nottingham office on the telephone and I have just got that scratchy recollection that I might have telephoned Jarnail Singh to confirm these instructions. Then at iv: "Some at [the Post Office] do not wish to minute the weekly conference calls." In your statement, I think you've said that those	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Α.	IN TI Cu at ar br Au ba re cii th or ar
7 8 9 A . 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 Q . 21 22	Mr Smith telling you that he had been told by Jarnail Singh or is that direct from Mr Smith? I would have sorry, I'm frowning because I'm thinking of the shorthand writer who has told me off already. That was from Mr Smith, all of those instructions came from Mr Smith but I've got a scratchy memory that I might have telephoned Jarnail Singh to confirm. I can see myself in the Nottingham office on the telephone and I have just got that scratchy recollection that I might have telephoned Jarnail Singh to confirm these instructions. Then at iv: "Some at [the Post Office] do not wish to minute the weekly conference calls." In your statement, I think you've said that those were Jarnail Singh's own views; is that right?	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Α.	In Ti Cu at ar br Au ba re ciii th or ar Au
7 8 9 A. 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 Q. 20 21 22 23 A.	Mr Smith telling you that he had been told by Jarnail Singh or is that direct from Mr Smith? I would have sorry, I'm frowning because I'm thinking of the shorthand writer who has told me off already. That was from Mr Smith, all of those instructions came from Mr Smith but I've got a scratchy memory that I might have telephoned Jarnail Singh to confirm. I can see myself in the Nottingham office on the telephone and I have just got that scratchy recollection that I might have telephoned Jarnail Singh to confirm these instructions. Then at iv: "Some at [the Post Office] do not wish to minute the weekly conference calls." In your statement, I think you've said that those were Jarnail Singh's own views; is that right? That tends to suggest that my scratchy memory is	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Α.	IN TI C at ar br ba c i th or ar ar ar
7 8 9 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 Q . 22	Mr Smith telling you that he had been told by Jarnail Singh or is that direct from Mr Smith? I would have sorry, I'm frowning because I'm thinking of the shorthand writer who has told me off already. That was from Mr Smith, all of those instructions came from Mr Smith but I've got a scratchy memory that I might have telephoned Jarnail Singh to confirm. I can see myself in the Nottingham office on the telephone and I have just got that scratchy recollection that I might have telephoned Jarnail Singh to confirm these instructions. Then at iv: "Some at [the Post Office] do not wish to minute the weekly conference calls." In your statement, I think you've said that those were Jarnail Singh's own views; is that right?	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Α.	In Ti Cu at ar br Au ba re ciii th or ar Au

1		me and the reason I'm certain is because this was
2		written 1/2 August, and it was 1/2 August that I would
3		have received this instruction, and so it would have
4		been fresh in my mind. This, in effect, is a record of
5		the conversation I had with Martin Smith.
6	Q.	Thank you. Mr Singh said that those were John Scott's
7		instructions. To your understanding and from what you
8		were told at that time, was John Scott seen as a lone
9		wolf or someone who was working with others in that
10		respect?
11	Α.	The impression I got from within Post Office and within
12		Cartwright King, that he was regarded as being a bit of
13		a power unto himself, which is effectively the same as
14		what you've just suggested, I think.
15	Q.	"ii. Handwritten minutes were not to be typed and
16		should be forwarded to [Post Office] Head of Security."
17		I think you've said in your statement that Jarnail
18		Singh said that was John Scott who had conveyed that.
19		Is that secondhand
20	Α.	Yes.
21	Q.	through Mr Smith?
22	Α.	I'm thinking of the yes, it's secondhand through
23		Mr Smith.
24	Q.	"iii. Advice had been given to [the Post Office] which
25		[you] report as relayed to [you] verbatim: 94
		94
		94
1		sq certainly, that was the information I received, yes.
1 2	Q.	certainly, that was the information I received, yes.
	Q.	certainly, that was the information I received, yes.
2	Q. A.	certainly, that was the information I received, yes. Who did you understand to be the "some" at the Post
2 3		certainly, that was the information I received, yes. Who did you understand to be the "some" at the Post Office?
2 3 4		certainly, that was the information I received, yes. Who did you understand to be the "some" at the Post Office? I don't think anybody identified who the "some" were
2 3 4 5		certainly, that was the information I received, yes. Who did you understand to be the "some" at the Post Office? I don't think anybody identified who the "some" were but, given that it was John Scott who gave the
2 3 4 5 6		certainly, that was the information I received, yes. Who did you understand to be the "some" at the Post Office? I don't think anybody identified who the "some" were but, given that it was John Scott who gave the instruction to shred, looking back, I suspect it was
2 3 4 5 6 7	A.	certainly, that was the information I received, yes. Who did you understand to be the "some" at the Post Office? I don't think anybody identified who the "some" were but, given that it was John Scott who gave the instruction to shred, looking back, I suspect it was I was thinking, at least in part, of John Scott.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q.	certainly, that was the information I received, yes. Who did you understand to be the "some" at the Post Office? I don't think anybody identified who the "some" were but, given that it was John Scott who gave the instruction to shred, looking back, I suspect it was I was thinking, at least in part, of John Scott. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A.	certainly, that was the information I received, yes. Who did you understand to be the "some" at the Post Office? I don't think anybody identified who the "some" were but, given that it was John Scott who gave the instruction to shred, looking back, I suspect it was I was thinking, at least in part, of John Scott. Thank you. To suggest anybody else would be speculation. Could we please turn to page 5 and paragraph 9. "The duty to record and retain material cannot be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A.	certainly, that was the information I received, yes. Who did you understand to be the "some" at the Post Office? I don't think anybody identified who the "some" were but, given that it was John Scott who gave the instruction to shred, looking back, I suspect it was I was thinking, at least in part, of John Scott. Thank you. To suggest anybody else would be speculation. Could we please turn to page 5 and paragraph 9.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A.	certainly, that was the information I received, yes. Who did you understand to be the "some" at the Post Office? I don't think anybody identified who the "some" were but, given that it was John Scott who gave the instruction to shred, looking back, I suspect it was I was thinking, at least in part, of John Scott. Thank you. To suggest anybody else would be speculation. Could we please turn to page 5 and paragraph 9. "The duty to record and retain material cannot be abrogated. To do so would amount to a breach of the law and, in the case of solicitors and counsel, serious
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A.	certainly, that was the information I received, yes. Who did you understand to be the "some" at the Post Office? I don't think anybody identified who the "some" were but, given that it was John Scott who gave the instruction to shred, looking back, I suspect it was I was thinking, at least in part, of John Scott. Thank you. To suggest anybody else would be speculation. Could we please turn to page 5 and paragraph 9. "The duty to record and retain material cannot be abrogated. To do so would amount to a breach of the law and, in the case of solicitors and counsel, serious breaches of their respective codes of conduct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A.	certainly, that was the information I received, yes. Who did you understand to be the "some" at the Post Office? I don't think anybody identified who the "some" were but, given that it was John Scott who gave the instruction to shred, looking back, I suspect it was I was thinking, at least in part, of John Scott. Thank you. To suggest anybody else would be speculation. Could we please turn to page 5 and paragraph 9. "The duty to record and retain material cannot be abrogated. To do so would amount to a breach of the law and, in the case of solicitors and counsel, serious breaches of their respective codes of conduct. Accordingly no solicitor, no firm of solicitors and no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A.	certainly, that was the information I received, yes. Who did you understand to be the "some" at the Post Office? I don't think anybody identified who the "some" were but, given that it was John Scott who gave the instruction to shred, looking back, I suspect it was I was thinking, at least in part, of John Scott. Thank you. To suggest anybody else would be speculation. Could we please turn to page 5 and paragraph 9. "The duty to record and retain material cannot be abrogated. To do so would amount to a breach of the law and, in the case of solicitors and counsel, serious breaches of their respective codes of conduct. Accordingly no solicitor, no firm of solicitors and no barrister may be a party to a breach of the duty to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A.	certainly, that was the information I received, yes. Who did you understand to be the "some" at the Post Office? I don't think anybody identified who the "some" were but, given that it was John Scott who gave the instruction to shred, looking back, I suspect it was I was thinking, at least in part, of John Scott. Thank you. To suggest anybody else would be speculation. Could we please turn to page 5 and paragraph 9. "The duty to record and retain material cannot be abrogated. To do so would amount to a breach of the law and, in the case of solicitors and counsel, serious breaches of their respective codes of conduct. Accordingly no solicitor, no firm of solicitors and no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A.	certainly, that was the information I received, yes. Who did you understand to be the "some" at the Post Office? I don't think anybody identified who the "some" were but, given that it was John Scott who gave the instruction to shred, looking back, I suspect it was I was thinking, at least in part, of John Scott. Thank you. To suggest anybody else would be speculation. Could we please turn to page 5 and paragraph 9. "The duty to record and retain material cannot be abrogated. To do so would amount to a breach of the law and, in the case of solicitors and counsel, serious breaches of their respective codes of conduct. Accordingly no solicitor, no firm of solicitors and no barrister may be a party to a breach of the duty to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A.	certainly, that was the information I received, yes. Who did you understand to be the "some" at the Post Office? I don't think anybody identified who the "some" were but, given that it was John Scott who gave the instruction to shred, looking back, I suspect it was I was thinking, at least in part, of John Scott. Thank you. To suggest anybody else would be speculation. Could we please turn to page 5 and paragraph 9. "The duty to record and retain material cannot be abrogated. To do so would amount to a breach of the law and, in the case of solicitors and counsel, serious breaches of their respective codes of conduct. Accordingly no solicitor, no firm of solicitors and no barrister may be a party to a breach of the duty to record and retain. Neither may they act in circumstances where they are aware, or become aware, that a practice has developed within the investigative
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A.	certainly, that was the information I received, yes. Who did you understand to be the "some" at the Post Office? I don't think anybody identified who the "some" were but, given that it was John Scott who gave the instruction to shred, looking back, I suspect it was I was thinking, at least in part, of John Scott. Thank you. To suggest anybody else would be speculation. Could we please turn to page 5 and paragraph 9. "The duty to record and retain material cannot be abrogated. To do so would amount to a breach of the law and, in the case of solicitors and counsel, serious breaches of their respective codes of conduct. Accordingly no solicitor, no firm of solicitors and no barrister may be a party to a breach of the duty to record and retain. Neither may they act in circumstances where they are aware, or become aware, that a practice has developed within the investigative or prosecutorial function such that the duty to record
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A.	certainly, that was the information I received, yes. Who did you understand to be the "some" at the Post Office? I don't think anybody identified who the "some" were but, given that it was John Scott who gave the instruction to shred, looking back, I suspect it was I was thinking, at least in part, of John Scott. Thank you. To suggest anybody else would be speculation. Could we please turn to page 5 and paragraph 9. "The duty to record and retain material cannot be abrogated. To do so would amount to a breach of the law and, in the case of solicitors and counsel, serious breaches of their respective codes of conduct. Accordingly no solicitor, no firm of solicitors and no barrister may be a party to a breach of the duty to record and retain. Neither may they act in circumstances where they are aware, or become aware, that a practice has developed within the investigative or prosecutorial function such that the duty to record and retain is being deliberately flouted, or avoided.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A.	certainly, that was the information I received, yes. Who did you understand to be the "some" at the Post Office? I don't think anybody identified who the "some" were but, given that it was John Scott who gave the instruction to shred, looking back, I suspect it was I was thinking, at least in part, of John Scott. Thank you. To suggest anybody else would be speculation. Could we please turn to page 5 and paragraph 9. "The duty to record and retain material cannot be abrogated. To do so would amount to a breach of the law and, in the case of solicitors and counsel, serious breaches of their respective codes of conduct. Accordingly no solicitor, no firm of solicitors and no barrister may be a party to a breach of the duty to record and retain. Neither may they act in circumstances where they are aware, or become aware, that a practice has developed within the investigative or prosecutorial function such that the duty to record and retain is being deliberately flouted, or avoided. Again to do so would amount to breaches of both the law
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A.	certainly, that was the information I received, yes. Who did you understand to be the "some" at the Post Office? I don't think anybody identified who the "some" were but, given that it was John Scott who gave the instruction to shred, looking back, I suspect it was I was thinking, at least in part, of John Scott. Thank you. To suggest anybody else would be speculation. Could we please turn to page 5 and paragraph 9. "The duty to record and retain material cannot be abrogated. To do so would amount to a breach of the law and, in the case of solicitors and counsel, serious breaches of their respective codes of conduct. Accordingly no solicitor, no firm of solicitors and no barrister may be a party to a breach of the duty to record and retain. Neither may they act in circumstances where they are aware, or become aware, that a practice has developed within the investigative or prosecutorial function such that the duty to record and retain is being deliberately flouted, or avoided. Again to do so would amount to breaches of both the law and Codes of Conduct. A decision-based failure to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A.	certainly, that was the information I received, yes. Who did you understand to be the "some" at the Post Office? I don't think anybody identified who the "some" were but, given that it was John Scott who gave the instruction to shred, looking back, I suspect it was I was thinking, at least in part, of John Scott. Thank you. To suggest anybody else would be speculation. Could we please turn to page 5 and paragraph 9. "The duty to record and retain material cannot be abrogated. To do so would amount to a breach of the law and, in the case of solicitors and counsel, serious breaches of their respective codes of conduct. Accordingly no solicitor, no firm of solicitors and no barrister may be a party to a breach of the duty to record and retain. Neither may they act in circumstances where they are aware, or become aware, that a practice has developed within the investigative or prosecutorial function such that the duty to record and retain is being deliberately flouted, or avoided. Again to do so would amount to breaches of both the law

The Post Office Horizor

1		or wholly in order to avoid future disclosure
2		obligations, may well amount to a conspiracy to pervert
3		the course of justice on the part of those both taking
4		such a decision, and those who implement such a decision
5		where they do so in the knowledge that it was taken
6		partly or wholly for that purpose."
7		Again, very strong words used by you in that advice.
8		Do you agree with the advice you have given here?
9	Α.	Yes, of course.
10	Q.	Next paragraph, paragraph 10:
11		"In view of the matters referred to in the previous
12		paragraph, were the issue of disclosure to be raised in
13		court in circumstances where an investigator or [Post
14		Office] officer/employee suggest that advice different
15		from that contained within this document had been given,
16		such would amount to a waiver of Legal Professional
17		Privilege so that this document would itself become
18		admissible in proceedings."
19		What was your concern here?
20	Α.	Andrew Parsons' advice, I think, because it was Andrew
21		Parsons who gave that ludicrous advice about if it's not
22		written down it's not disclosable, I think that was
23		directed to him as a warning of the path he was
24 25	0	apparently contemplating.
25	Q.	I suppose this all raises the question of why wasn't 97
1		told that over in the discussion of these issues, there
1		told that, even in the discussion of these issues, there
2		is a shredding taking place in relation to the minutes
2 3		is a shredding taking place in relation to the minutes of those meetings that you had personally advised should
2 3 4	Δ	is a shredding taking place in relation to the minutes of those meetings that you had personally advised should be recorded.
2 3 4 5	A. Q.	is a shredding taking place in relation to the minutes of those meetings that you had personally advised should be recorded. Yeah.
2 3 4 5 6	A. Q.	is a shredding taking place in relation to the minutes of those meetings that you had personally advised should be recorded. Yeah. Did that not raise, for you, an issue of whether you
2 3 4 5 6 7		is a shredding taking place in relation to the minutes of those meetings that you had personally advised should be recorded. Yeah.
2 3 4 5 6	Q.	is a shredding taking place in relation to the minutes of those meetings that you had personally advised should be recorded. Yeah. Did that not raise, for you, an issue of whether you should still be acting for the Post Office?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A.	is a shredding taking place in relation to the minutes of those meetings that you had personally advised should be recorded. Yeah. Did that not raise, for you, an issue of whether you should still be acting for the Post Office? No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q.	is a shredding taking place in relation to the minutes of those meetings that you had personally advised should be recorded. Yeah. Did that not raise, for you, an issue of whether you should still be acting for the Post Office? No. Why not?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q.	is a shredding taking place in relation to the minutes of those meetings that you had personally advised should be recorded. Yeah. Did that not raise, for you, an issue of whether you should still be acting for the Post Office? No. Why not? For the reason I've just explained. On the shredding
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q.	is a shredding taking place in relation to the minutes of those meetings that you had personally advised should be recorded. Yeah. Did that not raise, for you, an issue of whether you should still be acting for the Post Office? No. Why not? For the reason I've just explained. On the shredding point, I took the view, and I think the view was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q.	is a shredding taking place in relation to the minutes of those meetings that you had personally advised should be recorded. Yeah. Did that not raise, for you, an issue of whether you should still be acting for the Post Office? No. Why not? For the reason I've just explained. On the shredding point, I took the view, and I think the view was confirmed, that it was John Scott on a frolic of his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q.	is a shredding taking place in relation to the minutes of those meetings that you had personally advised should be recorded. Yeah. Did that not raise, for you, an issue of whether you should still be acting for the Post Office? No. Why not? For the reason I've just explained. On the shredding point, I took the view, and I think the view was confirmed, that it was John Scott on a frolic of his own. In terms of the earlier material, I saw my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q.	is a shredding taking place in relation to the minutes of those meetings that you had personally advised should be recorded. Yeah. Did that not raise, for you, an issue of whether you should still be acting for the Post Office? No. Why not? For the reason I've just explained. On the shredding point, I took the view, and I think the view was confirmed, that it was John Scott on a frolic of his own. In terms of the earlier material, I saw my function as being one to advise Post Office as to how
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q.	is a shredding taking place in relation to the minutes of those meetings that you had personally advised should be recorded. Yeah. Did that not raise, for you, an issue of whether you should still be acting for the Post Office? No. Why not? For the reason I've just explained. On the shredding point, I took the view, and I think the view was confirmed, that it was John Scott on a frolic of his own. In terms of the earlier material, I saw my function as being one to advise Post Office as to how they ought to remedy the situation they had got
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q.	is a shredding taking place in relation to the minutes of those meetings that you had personally advised should be recorded. Yeah. Did that not raise, for you, an issue of whether you should still be acting for the Post Office? No. Why not? For the reason I've just explained. On the shredding point, I took the view, and I think the view was confirmed, that it was John Scott on a frolic of his own. In terms of the earlier material, I saw my function as being one to advise Post Office as to how they ought to remedy the situation they had got themselves into and help them find a way through it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q.	is a shredding taking place in relation to the minutes of those meetings that you had personally advised should be recorded. Yeah. Did that not raise, for you, an issue of whether you should still be acting for the Post Office? No. Why not? For the reason I've just explained. On the shredding point, I took the view, and I think the view was confirmed, that it was John Scott on a frolic of his own. In terms of the earlier material, I saw my function as being one to advise Post Office as to how they ought to remedy the situation they had got themselves into and help them find a way through it. I don't think I was if the real question is did
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q.	is a shredding taking place in relation to the minutes of those meetings that you had personally advised should be recorded. Yeah. Did that not raise, for you, an issue of whether you should still be acting for the Post Office? No. Why not? For the reason I've just explained. On the shredding point, I took the view, and I think the view was confirmed, that it was John Scott on a frolic of his own. In terms of the earlier material, I saw my function as being one to advise Post Office as to how they ought to remedy the situation they had got themselves into and help them find a way through it. I don't think I was if the real question is did I consider that I was in conflict or that a conflict
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q.	is a shredding taking place in relation to the minutes of those meetings that you had personally advised should be recorded. Yeah. Did that not raise, for you, an issue of whether you should still be acting for the Post Office? No. Why not? For the reason I've just explained. On the shredding point, I took the view, and I think the view was confirmed, that it was John Scott on a frolic of his own. In terms of the earlier material, I saw my function as being one to advise Post Office as to how they ought to remedy the situation they had got themselves into and help them find a way through it. I don't think I was if the real question is did I consider that I was in conflict or that a conflict existed such that I ought to have withdrawn? No,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A.	is a shredding taking place in relation to the minutes of those meetings that you had personally advised should be recorded. Yeah. Did that not raise, for you, an issue of whether you should still be acting for the Post Office? No. Why not? For the reason I've just explained. On the shredding point, I took the view, and I think the view was confirmed, that it was John Scott on a frolic of his own. In terms of the earlier material, I saw my function as being one to advise Post Office as to how they ought to remedy the situation they had got themselves into and help them find a way through it. I don't think I was if the real question is did I consider that I ought to have withdrawn? No, I didn't.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A.	is a shredding taking place in relation to the minutes of those meetings that you had personally advised should be recorded. Yeah. Did that not raise, for you, an issue of whether you should still be acting for the Post Office? No. Why not? For the reason I've just explained. On the shredding point, I took the view, and I think the view was confirmed, that it was John Scott on a frolic of his own. In terms of the earlier material, I saw my function as being one to advise Post Office as to how they ought to remedy the situation they had got themselves into and help them find a way through it. I don't think I was if the real question is did I consider that I was in conflict or that a conflict existed such that I ought to have withdrawn? No, I didn't. Not so much a conflict but, certainly, what might seem a maddening situation, by that time, that everything that you had been told about the reliability of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A.	is a shredding taking place in relation to the minutes of those meetings that you had personally advised should be recorded. Yeah. Did that not raise, for you, an issue of whether you should still be acting for the Post Office? No. Why not? For the reason I've just explained. On the shredding point, I took the view, and I think the view was confirmed, that it was John Scott on a frolic of his own. In terms of the earlier material, I saw my function as being one to advise Post Office as to how they ought to remedy the situation they had got themselves into and help them find a way through it. I don't think I was if the real question is did I consider that I was in conflict or that a conflict existed such that I ought to have withdrawn? No, I didn't. Not so much a conflict but, certainly, what might seem a maddening situation, by that time, that everything

on IT	' Inq	uiry 9 May 2024
1		this the very last piece of work that you ever carried
2		out for the Post Office?
3	Α.	Because my understanding was this was not a Post Office
4		policy or instruction. This was John Scott on a frolic
5		of his own and forgive me for interrupting you and
6		I saw it as my function to bring it to the attention of
7		Post Office in a formal advice document so that they
8		could then take the necessary steps to make sure that
9		the policy that he seemed to be advocating was not put
10		in place.
11		And I rather saw my role as telling Post Office what
12		one of their staff was contemplating and for them to
13		take the appropriate action to deal with it, and
14		I understand that they did. I know it sat in a drawer
15		for a couple of weeks but they did.
16	Q.	You've explained that you were pretty new to Post Office
17		prosecutions
18	Α.	Yes.
19	Q.	in the summer of 2013?
20	Α.	Yes.
21	Q.	You've had this bombshell from Gareth Jenkins, you've
22		found out about bugs in Horizon that were said not to
23		have been there; you've had concerns about the
24		reliability of evidence given in previous prosecutions;
25		you've had the Helen Rose Report, and now you're being 98
1	A.	I'm just a bit old-fashioned about this: barristers
2		don't walk away from their clients when life gets
3		difficult. I saw my role as to be their barrister
4		through Cartwright King and to give them palatable or
5		unpalatable advice, whichever, in the hope that I could
6		do some it's trite but in the hope that I could do
7		some good for them. I don't walk away from clients
8		because life gets difficult. I didn't then and I don't
9	_	now.
10	Q.	You wrote this advice; who did expect to have seen the
11		advice?
12	A.	In a word? Everybody.
13 14	Q.	Did you yourself follow up to ensure that it had been
14 15	٨	seen by everybody?
15 16	Α.	I did. I think I told you, I was just about to go on

- 16 leave the day I wrote it. I did. When I came back --
- 17 I think I went to Gibraltar, which is home. When I came
- 18 back, about two weeks later, I asked Martin what had
- resulted, had we heard anything back, what was the 19 20
 - effect? And he said he hadn't heard anything, and
- I think he contacted Jarnail Singh to find out what the 21 22 position was.
- 23 That's a vague recollection but I think that's how
- 24 we learned that it had sat in a drawer for a couple of
- 25 weeks, rather than gone to the people it ought to have

		The Po	st Office Horizon I
1		gone to. I think I deal with that in my witness	1
2		statement.	2
3	Q.		3
4	щ.	Mr Cash, for the attention of Susan Crichton and Hugh	4
5		Flemington only. Would it have been unusual for Mr Cas	
6		to have been taking the lead on this?	6
7	A.	Can I just read it, sorry?	7
8	Q.	Absolutely.	8
9	Α.	It would have been unusual for him to get involved but,	9
10		recalling the immediate prelude to writing the advice,	10
11		I was in the Nottingham office at the time, effectively	11
12		saying my goodbyes, and Martin was there as well and	12
13		I think Stephen Gelsthorpe, who was the senior equity	13
14		partner, overheard what Martin was telling me and	14
15		I think Stephen Gelsthorpe suggested that the advice	15
16		be now, you've reminded me of this that the advice	16
17		be sent by Andy Cash because he was the senior lead at	17
18		Cartwright King for Post Office. I think that's how	18
19		that came about.	19
20	Q.	So was it intentionally sent by somebody senior to give	20
21		the impression that it was a significant piece?	21
22	Α.	Oh, I see. I can't say. I wrote the advice, I gave it	22
23		to Martin and said "That has to go", and then I went on	23
24		holiday. I wasn't a party to the decision that Andy	24
25		Cash send it but I can quite see why he was chosen to be 101	e 25
1		First of all, I think you've said you didn't see	1
2		this letter; is that right?	2
3	Α.	I don't think I did, no. I don't recognise it, other	3
4		than having seen it during these proceedings.	4
5	Q.	Was it communicated in some way to you that the Post	5
6		Office had responded	6
7	Α.	Yes.	7
8	Q.	to your advice?	8
9	Α.	Yes.	9
10	Q.	What was said about the response?	10
11	Α.	That's why I set that enquiry in train when I returned	11
12		from holiday, and what came back was, effectively, this	12
13		was John Scott on a frolic of his own and it was not	13
14		Post Office policy.	14
15	Q.	So if we scroll up, in fact, the point about it being	15
16		Susan Crichton not having seen it, I think yes, she	16
17		says:	17
18		"Unfortunately, I had not seen your letter and was	18
19		not aware of it until Martin's email on 14 August."	19
20		So presumably 14 August was when you returned fro	om 20
21		holiday?	21
22	Α.	Yes, and that's me asking Martin to chase it up, I would	22
23		think.	23
24	Q.	If we scroll down again, I mean, it's referred to in	24

- 24 Q. If we scroll down again, I mean, it's referred to in
- 25 this letter as "purported statements". From

- the sender.
- **Q.** It's marked there as for the attention of Susan Crichton and Hugh Flemington only. Had you selected those as the recipients?
- **A.** No.
- **A.** NO
- Q. What is your understanding as to why they would have been the recipients, rather than, for example, Jarnail
- 8 Singh?
- **A.** Well, I can only speculate but Hugh Flemington was Head
- 0 of Legal and Susan Crichton was General Counsel. So
- it's going to the people who really ought to have seen it.
- 12
- Q. Thank you. Can we please turn to POL00006797. This was
 the response to Mr Cash of Susan Crichton. I don't know
- 5 if you saw the evidence of Susan Crichton?
- 16 **A.** No.
- 7 Q. I took her to this document. If we scroll down, perhaps8 I'll read from the penultimate paragraph. That says:
- 9 "Post Office Limited is committed to conducting its
- business in an open, transparent and lawful manner. Any
- suggestion to the contrary would not reflect Post Office
- Limited policy, and would not be authorised or endorsed
- 3 by Post Office Limited. Accordingly, the purported
- 24 statements referred to in Simon's note do not reflect or
- 25 represent Post Office Limited's position."
 - 102

1		conversations that you had with Jarnail Singh, for
2		example, was your understanding that they were purported
3		statements or definitive?
4	Α.	They were definitive.
5	Q.	Were you aware, outside of Jarnail Singh's knowledge,
6		the knowledge of others within the Post Office, as the
7		same, effectively?
8	Α.	No, the impression that Jarnail Singh conveyed to me,
9		I think during that phone call I thought I'd had, was
10		that this was John Scott doing what John Scott does.
11	Q.	Did Jarnail Singh seem concerned about it?
12	Α.	Yes. I think the proper word is frightened.
13	Q.	It was your impression that it was going to go any
14		further?
15	Α.	Sorry, in what sense?
16	Q.	That it was going to be taken further within the Post
17		Office or
18	Α.	What
19	Q.	Your advice?
20	Α.	Oh, yes. Well, I expected it to be. I expected it to
21		go to the very highest levels of Post Office and for
22		them to deal with John Scott.

- 23 **Q.** Can we please look at POL00006485. This is a meeting of
- 24 9 September 2013, with Brian Altman KC, Susan Crichton
- 25 is there, Rodric Williams is there, Jarnail Singh is

				_	
1		there, and you and the others from Cartwright King are	1	Q.	Cultural issues: there's no reference there to
2		in attendance. If we look at the final paragraph of	2		shredding, destruction of documents. It doesn
3		that page:	3		serious as perhaps your advice was, when it re
4		"[Rodric Williams] then confirmed that the weekly	4		"cultural issues' [that] had now been overcome
5		hub meetings were started to bed in, picking up any	5	Α.	Well, this is not my note of the meeting. I would have acid "Oh there's been a few outturel income
6		issues across the business which may relate to Horizon."	6		have said, "Oh, there's been a few cultural iss
7		Now "SC", it seems that is a reference to you. It's	7		moved on, not least because Brian Altman wo
8		slightly confusing because both Susan Crichton and Simon Clarke are "SC"?	8		needed to know what the cultural issues were.
9	•		9		cultural issues went beyond John Scott's shree
10	A.	Yes.	10		instruction. The distinct impression I got from
11	Q.	But if we scroll down, it looks as though it was you who	11		conduct of the early hub meetings was that mo
12		said there had been some cultural issues at the start	12		attendees from Post Office were quite reluctar
13		which have now been overcome but you thought that it was	13		discuss and bring to the table what they knew
14		necessary to put duties on individuals:	14		I don't think, culturally, they understood that th
15		"Consequently [Cartwright King] are in the process	15		to be had to be a complete, open and transp
16		of writing a protocol to explain the purpose of the	16		forum, otherwise there was no point in the exe
17		weekly hub meetings, the roles and responsibilities of	17		I think that's what I meant by "cultural issu
18		individuals."	18		generally. They had to understand that they h
19		Can you assist us with what you meant by "cultural	19	~	full and frank about what was going on at the r
20		issues"? First of all, does this accurately reflect the	20	Q.	Were your real concerns about the destruction
21		conversation you had at that meeting?	21		documents discussed at that meeting?
22	Α.	I was going to say I think that likely is me speaking.	22	А.	I can't say. I don't recall. It's likely they were to
23		I think it I don't recall the specifics of the	23		I'm not going to nail my colours to the mast on
24 25		meeting but I think that it does certainly record my	24 25	~	I can't say. It says that the cultural issues have now "been
25		concerns and so, yes, it is an accurate note. 105	25	Q.	106
1		overcome"; how did you know that they had been overcome?	1		on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which we didn
2	Α.	Well, Martin would have reported back to me about the	2		because that removed continuity, and so we w
3		status of the meetings.	3		message to go out. I'm not referring to being o
4	Q.	Did you think that by 9 September all of those issues	4		message here. We wanted the message to ge
5		that you had raised in your advice had been overcome?	5		same people must attend every time.
6	Α.	Well, that was the reports that I'd received. We'd	6	Q.	Thank you. I'm going to now look at Martin Sn
7		dealt with the shredding issue, including the delay in	7		notes of the same meeting. Those are at POL
8		Post Office higher echelons seeing it, and Martin was	8		I think you've said that Martin Smith was a con
9		reporting that people were bringing things to the table,	9		notetaker, I think, was
10		so to speak, at the weekly meetings.	10	Α.	I think so, yes.
11	Q.	That paragraph continues:	11	Q.	If we go over to page 2, I'm just going to read
12		"[The Post Office] were picking up issues which were	12		what looks like the discussion of the cultural is
13		compiled"	13		It says:
14	Α.	Sorry, I don't see that oh.	14		"Simon: We discussed last Friday: main p
15	Q.	" in the matrix and it was observed that there had to	15		cultural. People in different departments. Nee
16		be continuity of individual attendance at the meeting	16		a proper coming together.
17		and everyone must be on message."	17		"Rod [says]: A lot of issues not important -
18	Α.	Yeah.	18		eg turn computer off and then on again. And t
19	Q.	Can you assist us with what's meant by "continuity of	19		which may affect continuity still need a steer
20		individual attendance and everyone must be on	20		You say: "We said we would write a proto
21		message"?	21		and responsibilities etc, centrally archived: ow
22	Α.	Yeah, when the meetings first started, attendees would	22		issues."
23		change. I think the idea was that each department had	23		Then it says: "QC: Refers to a couple of
24		an appointed representative at the meetings and I think	24		non-identified individuals, (referring to [Simon
25		we noted that appointed representatives changed perhaps 107	25		Clarke's] Advice on Disclosure and Duty to Re 108

	ω.	
2		shredding, destruction of documents. It doesn't look as
3		serious as perhaps your advice was, when it refers to
4		"cultural issues' [that] had now been overcome"?
5	Α.	Well, this is not my note of the meeting. I would not
6		have said, "Oh, there's been a few cultural issues", and
7		moved on, not least because Brian Altman would have
8		needed to know what the cultural issues were. And the
9		cultural issues went beyond John Scott's shredding
9 10		
		instruction. The distinct impression I got from the
11		conduct of the early hub meetings was that most of the
12		attendees from Post Office were quite reluctant to
13		discuss and bring to the table what they knew and
14		I don't think, culturally, they understood that this has
15		to be had to be a complete, open and transparent
16		forum, otherwise there was no point in the exercise.
17		I think that's what I meant by "cultural issues"
18		generally. They had to understand that they had to be
19		full and frank about what was going on at the meeting.
20	Q.	Were your real concerns about the destruction of
21		documents discussed at that meeting?
22	Α.	I can't say. I don't recall. It's likely they were but
23		I'm not going to nail my colours to the mast on that.
24		l can't say.
25	Q.	It says that the cultural issues have now "been
		106
		100
		100
4		
1		on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which we didn't want,
2		on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which we didn't want, because that removed continuity, and so we wanted the
2 3		on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which we didn't want, because that removed continuity, and so we wanted the message to go out. I'm not referring to being on
2 3 4		on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which we didn't want, because that removed continuity, and so we wanted the message to go out. I'm not referring to being on message here. We wanted the message to go out that the
2 3 4 5		on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which we didn't want, because that removed continuity, and so we wanted the message to go out. I'm not referring to being on message here. We wanted the message to go out that the same people must attend every time.
2 3 4	Q.	on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which we didn't want, because that removed continuity, and so we wanted the message to go out. I'm not referring to being on message here. We wanted the message to go out that the same people must attend every time. Thank you. I'm going to now look at Martin Smith's
2 3 4 5	Q.	on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which we didn't want, because that removed continuity, and so we wanted the message to go out. I'm not referring to being on message here. We wanted the message to go out that the same people must attend every time. Thank you. I'm going to now look at Martin Smith's notes of the same meeting. Those are at POL00139866.
2 3 4 5 6	Q.	on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which we didn't want, because that removed continuity, and so we wanted the message to go out. I'm not referring to being on message here. We wanted the message to go out that the same people must attend every time. Thank you. I'm going to now look at Martin Smith's
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q.	on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which we didn't want, because that removed continuity, and so we wanted the message to go out. I'm not referring to being on message here. We wanted the message to go out that the same people must attend every time. Thank you. I'm going to now look at Martin Smith's notes of the same meeting. Those are at POL00139866.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q.	on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which we didn't want, because that removed continuity, and so we wanted the message to go out. I'm not referring to being on message here. We wanted the message to go out that the same people must attend every time. Thank you. I'm going to now look at Martin Smith's notes of the same meeting. Those are at POL00139866. I think you've said that Martin Smith was a competent notetaker, I think, was I think so, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which we didn't want, because that removed continuity, and so we wanted the message to go out. I'm not referring to being on message here. We wanted the message to go out that the same people must attend every time. Thank you. I'm going to now look at Martin Smith's notes of the same meeting. Those are at POL00139866. I think you've said that Martin Smith was a competent notetaker, I think, was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Α.	on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which we didn't want, because that removed continuity, and so we wanted the message to go out. I'm not referring to being on message here. We wanted the message to go out that the same people must attend every time. Thank you. I'm going to now look at Martin Smith's notes of the same meeting. Those are at POL00139866. I think you've said that Martin Smith was a competent notetaker, I think, was I think so, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Α.	on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which we didn't want, because that removed continuity, and so we wanted the message to go out. I'm not referring to being on message here. We wanted the message to go out that the same people must attend every time. Thank you. I'm going to now look at Martin Smith's notes of the same meeting. Those are at POL00139866. I think you've said that Martin Smith was a competent notetaker, I think, was I think so, yes. If we go over to page 2, I'm just going to read to you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Α.	on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which we didn't want, because that removed continuity, and so we wanted the message to go out. I'm not referring to being on message here. We wanted the message to go out that the same people must attend every time. Thank you. I'm going to now look at Martin Smith's notes of the same meeting. Those are at POL00139866. I think you've said that Martin Smith was a competent notetaker, I think, was I think so, yes. If we go over to page 2, I'm just going to read to you what looks like the discussion of the cultural issues.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Α.	on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which we didn't want, because that removed continuity, and so we wanted the message to go out. I'm not referring to being on message here. We wanted the message to go out that the same people must attend every time. Thank you. I'm going to now look at Martin Smith's notes of the same meeting. Those are at POL00139866. I think you've said that Martin Smith was a competent notetaker, I think, was I think so, yes. If we go over to page 2, I'm just going to read to you what looks like the discussion of the cultural issues. It says:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Α.	on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which we didn't want, because that removed continuity, and so we wanted the message to go out. I'm not referring to being on message here. We wanted the message to go out that the same people must attend every time. Thank you. I'm going to now look at Martin Smith's notes of the same meeting. Those are at POL00139866. I think you've said that Martin Smith was a competent notetaker, I think, was I think so, yes. If we go over to page 2, I'm just going to read to you what looks like the discussion of the cultural issues. It says: "Simon: We discussed last Friday: main problem is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Α.	on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which we didn't want, because that removed continuity, and so we wanted the message to go out. I'm not referring to being on message here. We wanted the message to go out that the same people must attend every time. Thank you. I'm going to now look at Martin Smith's notes of the same meeting. Those are at POL00139866. I think you've said that Martin Smith was a competent notetaker, I think, was I think so, yes. If we go over to page 2, I'm just going to read to you what looks like the discussion of the cultural issues. It says: "Simon: We discussed last Friday: main problem is cultural. People in different departments. Needs to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Α.	on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which we didn't want, because that removed continuity, and so we wanted the message to go out. I'm not referring to being on message here. We wanted the message to go out that the same people must attend every time. Thank you. I'm going to now look at Martin Smith's notes of the same meeting. Those are at POL00139866. I think you've said that Martin Smith was a competent notetaker, I think, was I think so, yes. If we go over to page 2, I'm just going to read to you what looks like the discussion of the cultural issues. It says: "Simon: We discussed last Friday: main problem is cultural. People in different departments. Needs to be a proper coming together.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Α.	on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which we didn't want, because that removed continuity, and so we wanted the message to go out. I'm not referring to being on message here. We wanted the message to go out that the same people must attend every time. Thank you. I'm going to now look at Martin Smith's notes of the same meeting. Those are at POL00139866. I think you've said that Martin Smith was a competent notetaker, I think, was I think so, yes. If we go over to page 2, I'm just going to read to you what looks like the discussion of the cultural issues. It says: "Simon: We discussed last Friday: main problem is cultural. People in different departments. Needs to be a proper coming together. "Rod [says]: A lot of issues not important eg turn computer off and then on again. And then things
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Α.	on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which we didn't want, because that removed continuity, and so we wanted the message to go out. I'm not referring to being on message here. We wanted the message to go out that the same people must attend every time. Thank you. I'm going to now look at Martin Smith's notes of the same meeting. Those are at POL00139866. I think you've said that Martin Smith was a competent notetaker, I think, was I think so, yes. If we go over to page 2, I'm just going to read to you what looks like the discussion of the cultural issues. It says: "Simon: We discussed last Friday: main problem is cultural. People in different departments. Needs to be a proper coming together. "Rod [says]: A lot of issues not important eg turn computer off and then on again. And then things which may affect continuity still need a steer."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Α.	on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which we didn't want, because that removed continuity, and so we wanted the message to go out. I'm not referring to being on message here. We wanted the message to go out that the same people must attend every time. Thank you. I'm going to now look at Martin Smith's notes of the same meeting. Those are at POL00139866. I think you've said that Martin Smith was a competent notetaker, I think, was I think so, yes. If we go over to page 2, I'm just going to read to you what looks like the discussion of the cultural issues. It says: "Simon: We discussed last Friday: main problem is cultural. People in different departments. Needs to be a proper coming together. "Rod [says]: A lot of issues not important eg turn computer off and then on again. And then things which may affect continuity still need a steer." You say: "We said we would write a protocol: roles
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Α.	on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which we didn't want, because that removed continuity, and so we wanted the message to go out. I'm not referring to being on message here. We wanted the message to go out that the same people must attend every time. Thank you. I'm going to now look at Martin Smith's notes of the same meeting. Those are at POL00139866. I think you've said that Martin Smith was a competent notetaker, I think, was I think so, yes. If we go over to page 2, I'm just going to read to you what looks like the discussion of the cultural issues. It says: "Simon: We discussed last Friday: main problem is cultural. People in different departments. Needs to be a proper coming together. "Rod [says]: A lot of issues not important eg turn computer off and then on again. And then things which may affect continuity still need a steer."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Α.	on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which we didn't want, because that removed continuity, and so we wanted the message to go out. I'm not referring to being on message here. We wanted the message to go out that the same people must attend every time. Thank you. I'm going to now look at Martin Smith's notes of the same meeting. Those are at POL00139866. I think you've said that Martin Smith was a competent notetaker, I think, was I think so, yes. If we go over to page 2, I'm just going to read to you what looks like the discussion of the cultural issues. It says: "Simon: We discussed last Friday: main problem is cultural. People in different departments. Needs to be a proper coming together. "Rod [says]: A lot of issues not important eg turn computer off and then on again. And then things which may affect continuity still need a steer." You say: "We said we would write a protocol: roles and responsibilities etc, centrally archived: owners of issues."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Α.	on a meeting-by-meeting basis, which we didn't want, because that removed continuity, and so we wanted the message to go out. I'm not referring to being on message here. We wanted the message to go out that the same people must attend every time. Thank you. I'm going to now look at Martin Smith's notes of the same meeting. Those are at POL00139866. I think you've said that Martin Smith was a competent notetaker, I think, was I think so, yes. If we go over to page 2, I'm just going to read to you what looks like the discussion of the cultural issues. It says: "Simon: We discussed last Friday: main problem is cultural. People in different departments. Needs to be a proper coming together. "Rod [says]: A lot of issues not important eg turn computer off and then on again. And then things which may affect continuity still need a steer." You say: "We said we would write a protocol: roles and responsibilities etc, centrally archived: owners of

Clarke's] Advice on Disclosure and Duty to Retain).

(27) Pages 105 - 108

1		"Simon: Think POL have resolved those issues.
2		"QC [says]: Different individuals on call."
3		Susan Crichton then says: "People then dump
4		[something]."
5		Is that likely to be the extent of the discussion
6		about your advice on disclosure at that meeting?
7	Α.	No. These, I think, are shorthand notes.
8	Q.	Can you assist us with what Mr Altman may have been
9		talking about there where it says, "Refers to a couple
10		of non-identified individuals"?
11	Α.	I think that has to be Andrew Parsons and John Scott.
12	Q.	Do you think that, if this is an accurate note of that
13		meeting, the issue was first of all not dealt in any
14		great depth and also somewhat minimised?
15	Α.	No, it certainly wasn't minimised. There's a reference
16		here where Mr Altman says "Refers to a couple of
17		non-individuals (referring to Advice Disclosure
18		Duty to Retain)", that's clearly referring to the
19		shredding advice or the stop shredding advice. My
20		response, "[I] Think POL have resolved those issues", is
21		my response to I think POL have dealt with John Scott
22	_	and there is no shredding going on.
23	Q.	5
24		back, please, to POL00006485 that confines the issue
25		to that one paragraph and quotes "cultural issues". 109
		100
1		Telephone Conferences held for the purpose of the
2		Identification, Recording and Retention of Material
2 3		Identification, Recording and Retention of Material which may be subject to the Duties of Disclosure."
2 3 4		Identification, Recording and Retention of Material which may be subject to the Duties of Disclosure." You set out in the preamble how very important
2 3 4 5		Identification, Recording and Retention of Material which may be subject to the Duties of Disclosure." You set out in the preamble how very important disclosure is to the criminal justice system. Then, in
2 3 4		Identification, Recording and Retention of Material which may be subject to the Duties of Disclosure." You set out in the preamble how very important disclosure is to the criminal justice system. Then, in the first substantive paragraph, you say:
2 3 4 5 6 7		Identification, Recording and Retention of Material which may be subject to the Duties of Disclosure." You set out in the preamble how very important disclosure is to the criminal justice system. Then, in the first substantive paragraph, you say: "As a prosecutor, Post Office Limited is under
2 3 4 5 6 7 8		Identification, Recording and Retention of Material which may be subject to the Duties of Disclosure." You set out in the preamble how very important disclosure is to the criminal justice system. Then, in the first substantive paragraph, you say: "As a prosecutor, Post Office Limited is under a positive duty to identify, record and retain any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		Identification, Recording and Retention of Material which may be subject to the Duties of Disclosure." You set out in the preamble how very important disclosure is to the criminal justice system. Then, in the first substantive paragraph, you say: "As a prosecutor, Post Office Limited is under a positive duty to identify, record and retain any information which might assist a defendant in preparing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		Identification, Recording and Retention of Material which may be subject to the Duties of Disclosure." You set out in the preamble how very important disclosure is to the criminal justice system. Then, in the first substantive paragraph, you say: "As a prosecutor, Post Office Limited is under a positive duty to identify, record and retain any information which might assist a defendant in preparing or presenting his case or which might undermine the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11		Identification, Recording and Retention of Material which may be subject to the Duties of Disclosure." You set out in the preamble how very important disclosure is to the criminal justice system. Then, in the first substantive paragraph, you say: "As a prosecutor, Post Office Limited is under a positive duty to identify, record and retain any information which might assist a defendant in preparing or presenting his case or which might undermine the prosecution case against him. In addition we must also
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		Identification, Recording and Retention of Material which may be subject to the Duties of Disclosure." You set out in the preamble how very important disclosure is to the criminal justice system. Then, in the first substantive paragraph, you say: "As a prosecutor, Post Office Limited is under a positive duty to identify, record and retain any information which might assist a defendant in preparing or presenting his case or which might undermine the prosecution case against him. In addition we must also be able to prove that, where we rely on information
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		Identification, Recording and Retention of Material which may be subject to the Duties of Disclosure." You set out in the preamble how very important disclosure is to the criminal justice system. Then, in the first substantive paragraph, you say: "As a prosecutor, Post Office Limited is under a positive duty to identify, record and retain any information which might assist a defendant in preparing or presenting his case or which might undermine the prosecution case against him. In addition we must also be able to prove that, where we rely on information provided by Horizon Online to prosecute, that system is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		Identification, Recording and Retention of Material which may be subject to the Duties of Disclosure." You set out in the preamble how very important disclosure is to the criminal justice system. Then, in the first substantive paragraph, you say: "As a prosecutor, Post Office Limited is under a positive duty to identify, record and retain any information which might assist a defendant in preparing or presenting his case or which might undermine the prosecution case against him. In addition we must also be able to prove that, where we rely on information provided by Horizon Online to prosecute, that system is reliable and accurate", et cetera.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15		Identification, Recording and Retention of Material which may be subject to the Duties of Disclosure." You set out in the preamble how very important disclosure is to the criminal justice system. Then, in the first substantive paragraph, you say: "As a prosecutor, Post Office Limited is under a positive duty to identify, record and retain any information which might assist a defendant in preparing or presenting his case or which might undermine the prosecution case against him. In addition we must also be able to prove that, where we rely on information provided by Horizon Online to prosecute, that system is reliable and accurate", et cetera. Now, in terms of the first, is this in some way you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16		Identification, Recording and Retention of Material which may be subject to the Duties of Disclosure." You set out in the preamble how very important disclosure is to the criminal justice system. Then, in the first substantive paragraph, you say: "As a prosecutor, Post Office Limited is under a positive duty to identify, record and retain any information which might assist a defendant in preparing or presenting his case or which might undermine the prosecution case against him. In addition we must also be able to prove that, where we rely on information provided by Horizon Online to prosecute, that system is reliable and accurate", et cetera. Now, in terms of the first, is this in some way you and Cartwright King making clear that, in criminal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17		Identification, Recording and Retention of Material which may be subject to the Duties of Disclosure." You set out in the preamble how very important disclosure is to the criminal justice system. Then, in the first substantive paragraph, you say: "As a prosecutor, Post Office Limited is under a positive duty to identify, record and retain any information which might assist a defendant in preparing or presenting his case or which might undermine the prosecution case against him. In addition we must also be able to prove that, where we rely on information provided by Horizon Online to prosecute, that system is reliable and accurate", et cetera. Now, in terms of the first, is this in some way you and Cartwright King making clear that, in criminal cases, the duty of disclosure is very different to civil
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18		Identification, Recording and Retention of Material which may be subject to the Duties of Disclosure." You set out in the preamble how very important disclosure is to the criminal justice system. Then, in the first substantive paragraph, you say: "As a prosecutor, Post Office Limited is under a positive duty to identify, record and retain any information which might assist a defendant in preparing or presenting his case or which might undermine the prosecution case against him. In addition we must also be able to prove that, where we rely on information provided by Horizon Online to prosecute, that system is reliable and accurate", et cetera. Now, in terms of the first, is this in some way you and Cartwright King making clear that, in criminal cases, the duty of disclosure is very different to civil cases; was that one of the purposes of this preamble,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18		Identification, Recording and Retention of Material which may be subject to the Duties of Disclosure." You set out in the preamble how very important disclosure is to the criminal justice system. Then, in the first substantive paragraph, you say: "As a prosecutor, Post Office Limited is under a positive duty to identify, record and retain any information which might assist a defendant in preparing or presenting his case or which might undermine the prosecution case against him. In addition we must also be able to prove that, where we rely on information provided by Horizon Online to prosecute, that system is reliable and accurate", et cetera. Now, in terms of the first, is this in some way you and Cartwright King making clear that, in criminal cases, the duty of disclosure is very different to civil cases; was that one of the purposes of this preamble, for example, to reference the criminal justice system?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	А.	Identification, Recording and Retention of Material which may be subject to the Duties of Disclosure." You set out in the preamble how very important disclosure is to the criminal justice system. Then, in the first substantive paragraph, you say: "As a prosecutor, Post Office Limited is under a positive duty to identify, record and retain any information which might assist a defendant in preparing or presenting his case or which might undermine the prosecution case against him. In addition we must also be able to prove that, where we rely on information provided by Horizon Online to prosecute, that system is reliable and accurate", et cetera. Now, in terms of the first, is this in some way you and Cartwright King making clear that, in criminal cases, the duty of disclosure is very different to civil cases; was that one of the purposes of this preamble, for example, to reference the criminal justice system? I don't think the civil protocol was in my mind because
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A.	Identification, Recording and Retention of Material which may be subject to the Duties of Disclosure." You set out in the preamble how very important disclosure is to the criminal justice system. Then, in the first substantive paragraph, you say: "As a prosecutor, Post Office Limited is under a positive duty to identify, record and retain any information which might assist a defendant in preparing or presenting his case or which might undermine the prosecution case against him. In addition we must also be able to prove that, where we rely on information provided by Horizon Online to prosecute, that system is reliable and accurate", et cetera. Now, in terms of the first, is this in some way you and Cartwright King making clear that, in criminal cases, the duty of disclosure is very different to civil cases; was that one of the purposes of this preamble, for example, to reference the criminal justice system? I don't think the civil protocol was in my mind because I didn't know or understand the civil protocol. This
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A.	Identification, Recording and Retention of Material which may be subject to the Duties of Disclosure." You set out in the preamble how very important disclosure is to the criminal justice system. Then, in the first substantive paragraph, you say: "As a prosecutor, Post Office Limited is under a positive duty to identify, record and retain any information which might assist a defendant in preparing or presenting his case or which might undermine the prosecution case against him. In addition we must also be able to prove that, where we rely on information provided by Horizon Online to prosecute, that system is reliable and accurate", et cetera. Now, in terms of the first, is this in some way you and Cartwright King making clear that, in criminal cases, the duty of disclosure is very different to civil cases; was that one of the purposes of this preamble, for example, to reference the criminal justice system? I don't think the civil protocol was in my mind because I didn't know or understand the civil protocol. This was me saying to Post Office, "As prosecutors, this is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		Identification, Recording and Retention of Material which may be subject to the Duties of Disclosure." You set out in the preamble how very important disclosure is to the criminal justice system. Then, in the first substantive paragraph, you say: "As a prosecutor, Post Office Limited is under a positive duty to identify, record and retain any information which might assist a defendant in preparing or presenting his case or which might undermine the prosecution case against him. In addition we must also be able to prove that, where we rely on information provided by Horizon Online to prosecute, that system is reliable and accurate", et cetera. Now, in terms of the first, is this in some way you and Cartwright King making clear that, in criminal cases, the duty of disclosure is very different to civil cases; was that one of the purposes of this preamble, for example, to reference the criminal justice system? I don't think the civil protocol was in my mind because I didn't know or understand the civil protocol. This was me saying to Post Office, "As prosecutors, this is your duty".
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A. Q.	Identification, Recording and Retention of Material which may be subject to the Duties of Disclosure." You set out in the preamble how very important disclosure is to the criminal justice system. Then, in the first substantive paragraph, you say: "As a prosecutor, Post Office Limited is under a positive duty to identify, record and retain any information which might assist a defendant in preparing or presenting his case or which might undermine the prosecution case against him. In addition we must also be able to prove that, where we rely on information provided by Horizon Online to prosecute, that system is reliable and accurate", et cetera. Now, in terms of the first, is this in some way you and Cartwright King making clear that, in criminal cases, the duty of disclosure is very different to civil cases; was that one of the purposes of this preamble, for example, to reference the criminal justice system? I don't think the civil protocol was in my mind because I didn't know or understand the civil protocol. This was me saying to Post Office, "As prosecutors, this is your duty". We see there reference to Horizon Online and, if we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		Identification, Recording and Retention of Material which may be subject to the Duties of Disclosure." You set out in the preamble how very important disclosure is to the criminal justice system. Then, in the first substantive paragraph, you say: "As a prosecutor, Post Office Limited is under a positive duty to identify, record and retain any information which might assist a defendant in preparing or presenting his case or which might undermine the prosecution case against him. In addition we must also be able to prove that, where we rely on information provided by Horizon Online to prosecute, that system is reliable and accurate", et cetera. Now, in terms of the first, is this in some way you and Cartwright King making clear that, in criminal cases, the duty of disclosure is very different to civil cases; was that one of the purposes of this preamble, for example, to reference the criminal justice system? I don't think the civil protocol was in my mind because I didn't know or understand the civil protocol. This was me saying to Post Office, "As prosecutors, this is your duty".

1	Α.	Yeah.

1	Α.	Yeah.
2	Q.	Do you think that their minute of this meeting was in
3		some way minimised about the I mean, to begin with,
4		I think there was some criticism of a Bond Dickinson
5		lawyer in respect of the retention of information?
6	Α.	There was.
7	Q.	So to what extent do you think that paragraph was
8		intentionally brief?
9	Α.	It would be speculation to be firm about that but it
10		certainly looks as though there's minimisation going on
11		there. I would agree with your proposition that they
12		are not telling the whole story.
13	Q.	I'm now going to look at the protocol you drafted, that
14		was POL00128993, please. So this is the protocol. Was
15		there a protocol earlier then, before the information
16		you had been given about shredding or only after?
17	Α.	I believe this is it.
18	Q.	Were you specifically instructed to do this or was this
19		another piece of work that you were carrying out because
20		you thought it was necessary?
21	Α.	The latter. I did it because I thought it was necessary
22		and I thought it was necessary because I thought Post
23		Office needed guidance on how to conduct the issue.
24	Q.	It's entitled:
25		"Protocol for the conduct of Wednesday morning 110
1		sentence of that paragraph, it says:
2		"Accordingly we will with future collect and retain
2 3		"Accordingly we will with future collect and retain any and all information which might suggest that Horizon
2 3 4		"Accordingly we will with future collect and retain any and all information which might suggest that Horizon Online may not be working as it should, or that our
2 3 4 5		"Accordingly we will with future collect and retain any and all information which might suggest that Horizon Online may not be working as it should, or that our training and back-up systems are less than we would
2 3 4 5 6		"Accordingly we will with future collect and retain any and all information which might suggest that Horizon Online may not be working as it should, or that our training and back-up systems are less than we would wish."
2 3 4 5 6 7		"Accordingly we will with future collect and retain any and all information which might suggest that Horizon Online may not be working as it should, or that our training and back-up systems are less than we would wish." Now, I appreciate that any future prosecutions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8		"Accordingly we will with future collect and retain any and all information which might suggest that Horizon Online may not be working as it should, or that our training and back-up systems are less than we would wish." Now, I appreciate that any future prosecutions would, of course, be based on Horizon Online but was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		"Accordingly we will with future collect and retain any and all information which might suggest that Horizon Online may not be working as it should, or that our training and back-up systems are less than we would wish." Now, I appreciate that any future prosecutions would, of course, be based on Horizon Online but was there, at that stage, a bit of a blinkering in respect
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	٨	"Accordingly we will with future collect and retain any and all information which might suggest that Horizon Online may not be working as it should, or that our training and back-up systems are less than we would wish." Now, I appreciate that any future prosecutions would, of course, be based on Horizon Online but was there, at that stage, a bit of a blinkering in respect of Legacy Horizon and a focus limited to Horizon Online.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A.	"Accordingly we will with future collect and retain any and all information which might suggest that Horizon Online may not be working as it should, or that our training and back-up systems are less than we would wish." Now, I appreciate that any future prosecutions would, of course, be based on Horizon Online but was there, at that stage, a bit of a blinkering in respect of Legacy Horizon and a focus limited to Horizon Online. No, this was looking forward, the whole function of this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A.	"Accordingly we will with future collect and retain any and all information which might suggest that Horizon Online may not be working as it should, or that our training and back-up systems are less than we would wish." Now, I appreciate that any future prosecutions would, of course, be based on Horizon Online but was there, at that stage, a bit of a blinkering in respect of Legacy Horizon and a focus limited to Horizon Online. No, this was looking forward, the whole function of this hub was to deal with disclosure duties going forward
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A.	"Accordingly we will with future collect and retain any and all information which might suggest that Horizon Online may not be working as it should, or that our training and back-up systems are less than we would wish." Now, I appreciate that any future prosecutions would, of course, be based on Horizon Online but was there, at that stage, a bit of a blinkering in respect of Legacy Horizon and a focus limited to Horizon Online. No, this was looking forward, the whole function of this hub was to deal with disclosure duties going forward and, therefore, any issues with the Horizon system
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A.	"Accordingly we will with future collect and retain any and all information which might suggest that Horizon Online may not be working as it should, or that our training and back-up systems are less than we would wish." Now, I appreciate that any future prosecutions would, of course, be based on Horizon Online but was there, at that stage, a bit of a blinkering in respect of Legacy Horizon and a focus limited to Horizon Online. No, this was looking forward, the whole function of this hub was to deal with disclosure duties going forward and, therefore, any issues with the Horizon System generically would have arisen out of Horizon Online
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A.	"Accordingly we will with future collect and retain any and all information which might suggest that Horizon Online may not be working as it should, or that our training and back-up systems are less than we would wish." Now, I appreciate that any future prosecutions would, of course, be based on Horizon Online but was there, at that stage, a bit of a blinkering in respect of Legacy Horizon and a focus limited to Horizon Online. No, this was looking forward, the whole function of this hub was to deal with disclosure duties going forward and, therefore, any issues with the Horizon System generically would have arisen out of Horizon Online because that was the system in use going forward. This
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A.	"Accordingly we will with future collect and retain any and all information which might suggest that Horizon Online may not be working as it should, or that our training and back-up systems are less than we would wish." Now, I appreciate that any future prosecutions would, of course, be based on Horizon Online but was there, at that stage, a bit of a blinkering in respect of Legacy Horizon and a focus limited to Horizon Online. No, this was looking forward, the whole function of this hub was to deal with disclosure duties going forward and, therefore, any issues with the Horizon System generically would have arisen out of Horizon Online because that was the system in use going forward. This bore no relationship to I think they called it Legacy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17		"Accordingly we will with future collect and retain any and all information which might suggest that Horizon Online may not be working as it should, or that our training and back-up systems are less than we would wish." Now, I appreciate that any future prosecutions would, of course, be based on Horizon Online but was there, at that stage, a bit of a blinkering in respect of Legacy Horizon and a focus limited to Horizon Online. No, this was looking forward, the whole function of this hub was to deal with disclosure duties going forward and, therefore, any issues with the Horizon System generically would have arisen out of Horizon Online because that was the system in use going forward. This bore no relationship to I think they called it Legacy Horizon because they weren't using Legacy Horizon.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q.	"Accordingly we will with future collect and retain any and all information which might suggest that Horizon Online may not be working as it should, or that our training and back-up systems are less than we would wish." Now, I appreciate that any future prosecutions would, of course, be based on Horizon Online but was there, at that stage, a bit of a blinkering in respect of Legacy Horizon and a focus limited to Horizon Online. No, this was looking forward, the whole function of this hub was to deal with disclosure duties going forward and, therefore, any issues with the Horizon system generically would have arisen out of Horizon Online because that was the system in use going forward. This bore no relationship to I think they called it Legacy Horizon because they weren't using Legacy Horizon. At those meetings, though, people could bring forward
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q.	"Accordingly we will with future collect and retain any and all information which might suggest that Horizon Online may not be working as it should, or that our training and back-up systems are less than we would wish." Now, I appreciate that any future prosecutions would, of course, be based on Horizon Online but was there, at that stage, a bit of a blinkering in respect of Legacy Horizon and a focus limited to Horizon Online. No, this was looking forward, the whole function of this hub was to deal with disclosure duties going forward and, therefore, any issues with the Horizon system generically would have arisen out of Horizon Online because that was the system in use going forward. This bore no relationship to I think they called it Legacy Horizon because they weren't using Legacy Horizon. At those meetings, though, people could bring forward issues that related to Legacy Horizon, couldn't they?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18		"Accordingly we will with future collect and retain any and all information which might suggest that Horizon Online may not be working as it should, or that our training and back-up systems are less than we would wish." Now, I appreciate that any future prosecutions would, of course, be based on Horizon Online but was there, at that stage, a bit of a blinkering in respect of Legacy Horizon and a focus limited to Horizon Online. No, this was looking forward, the whole function of this hub was to deal with disclosure duties going forward and, therefore, any issues with the Horizon system generically would have arisen out of Horizon Online because that was the system in use going forward. This bore no relationship to I think they called it Legacy Horizon because they weren't using Legacy Horizon. At those meetings, though, people could bring forward issues that related to Legacy Horizon, couldn't they? I would certainly hope so.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A.	"Accordingly we will with future collect and retain any and all information which might suggest that Horizon Online may not be working as it should, or that our training and back-up systems are less than we would wish." Now, I appreciate that any future prosecutions would, of course, be based on Horizon Online but was there, at that stage, a bit of a blinkering in respect of Legacy Horizon and a focus limited to Horizon Online. No, this was looking forward, the whole function of this hub was to deal with disclosure duties going forward and, therefore, any issues with the Horizon system generically would have arisen out of Horizon Online because that was the system in use going forward. This bore no relationship to I think they called it Legacy Horizon because they weren't using Legacy Horizon. At those meetings, though, people could bring forward issues that related to Legacy Horizon, couldn't they?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q.	"Accordingly we will with future collect and retain any and all information which might suggest that Horizon Online may not be working as it should, or that our training and back-up systems are less than we would wish." Now, I appreciate that any future prosecutions would, of course, be based on Horizon Online but was there, at that stage, a bit of a blinkering in respect of Legacy Horizon and a focus limited to Horizon Online. No, this was looking forward, the whole function of this hub was to deal with disclosure duties going forward and, therefore, any issues with the Horizon system generically would have arisen out of Horizon Online because that was the system in use going forward. This bore no relationship to I think they called it Legacy Horizon because they weren't using Legacy Horizon. At those meetings, though, people could bring forward issues that related to Legacy Horizon, couldn't they? I would certainly hope so. This policy doesn't mention Legacy Horizon at all?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q.	"Accordingly we will with future collect and retain any and all information which might suggest that Horizon Online may not be working as it should, or that our training and back-up systems are less than we would wish." Now, I appreciate that any future prosecutions would, of course, be based on Horizon Online but was there, at that stage, a bit of a blinkering in respect of Legacy Horizon and a focus limited to Horizon Online. No, this was looking forward, the whole function of this hub was to deal with disclosure duties going forward and, therefore, any issues with the Horizon system generically would have arisen out of Horizon Online because that was the system in use going forward. This bore no relationship to I think they called it Legacy Horizon because they weren't using Legacy Horizon. At those meetings, though, people could bring forward issues that related to Legacy Horizon, couldn't they? I would certainly hope so. This policy doesn't mention Legacy Horizon at all? No, because it wasn't directed to Legacy Horizon. It
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q.	"Accordingly we will with future collect and retain any and all information which might suggest that Horizon Online may not be working as it should, or that our training and back-up systems are less than we would wish." Now, I appreciate that any future prosecutions would, of course, be based on Horizon Online but was there, at that stage, a bit of a blinkering in respect of Legacy Horizon and a focus limited to Horizon Online. No, this was looking forward, the whole function of this hub was to deal with disclosure duties going forward and, therefore, any issues with the Horizon system generically would have arisen out of Horizon Online because that was the system in use going forward. This bore no relationship to I think they called it Legacy Horizon because they weren't using Legacy Horizon. At those meetings, though, people could bring forward issues that related to Legacy Horizon, couldn't they? I would certainly hope so. This policy doesn't mention Legacy Horizon at all? No, because it wasn't directed to Legacy Horizon. It was directed to collating and retaining and disclosing

(28) Pages 109 - 112

Q.

Α.

Do you think that there may have been a lack of interest	1		perhaps we could bring that on to screen WITN08130100
or a lack of thinking about the impact on those Legacy	2		and it's page 23. Page 23, paragraph 67. You say
cases?	3		there, I think that's:
Not for this because this was a wholly different	4		"[In] some point in mid-2013 ([you] can't recall
purpose. But in a more to answer your question in	5		when) [you] asked Martin Smith to obtain a copy of [the
a more general sense, I think possibly, yes.	6		Post Office's] formal Prosecutions Policy. Martin Smith
Although I appreciate that this for going forward, does	7		asked Jarnail Singh to send a copy and in due course
it not reflect, in general, that attitude that the focus	8		[you were] provided with a copy of what [you] considered
at that time was on Horizon Online?	9		to be a wholly inadequate policy. [You] therefore
Just going back to what you suggested earlier, you've	10		commenced drafting a detailed policy intended to at
used the phrase "lack of interest and blinkered".	11		least meet the standards set out in the Code for Crown
I don't accept "lack of interest", I accept "blinkered".	12		Prosecutors, including the then two-part test for
Yes, we were looking forward, I'm not convinced I agree	13		commencing a prosecution."
with you that this document reflects that blinkered	14		Was it surprising to you, in mid-2013, that
approach because this document was produced for	15		Cartwright King didn't hold a copy of the Post Office's
a specific purpose, the specific purpose being the	16		prosecution policy?
collation and retention of material derived from Horizon	17	Α.	Yes, this was part of my ongoing learning process, early
Online, looking forward. And so I separate that issue	18		on in my involvement in the whole of the Post Office
out from what had gone before. But I, again, say	19		work, if you like. And at some point it occurred to me,
I accept your criticism that goes "You are being a bit	20		I need to see what their prosecution policy was.
blinkered about what had gone before".	21		I asked for one and was told that there wasn't one with
I'm going to move on to a different topic and that is	22		Cartwright King. So I said "Well, Post Office must have
the redrafting of the Post Office Prosecution Policy.	23		one", and I asked Martin Smith to obtain one from Post
Yeah.	24		Office.
You've addressed that in your witness statement, in fact	25	Q.	As a firm that had, by then, been prosecuting Post
113			114
Office cases for a few years, was it surprising that the	1		upon which any sensible solicitor could say. "We will
Office cases for a few years, was it surprising that the firm didn't hold a copy?	1 2		upon which any sensible solicitor could say, "We will apply this and, if the answer comes out yes, we'll
firm didn't hold a copy?	2		apply this and, if the answer comes out yes, we'll
firm didn't hold a copy? Yes.	2 3		apply this and, if the answer comes out yes, we'll prosecute and, if it comes out no, we won't prosecute".
firm didn't hold a copy? Yes. You've described it as wholly inadequate. What, in	2 3 4		apply this and, if the answer comes out yes, we'll prosecute and, if it comes out no, we won't prosecute". There was I can't recall what it said but it was not
firm didn't hold a copy? Yes. You've described it as wholly inadequate. What, in particular, stood out as being wholly inadequate?	2 3 4 5	0.	apply this and, if the answer comes out yes, we'll prosecute and, if it comes out no, we won't prosecute". There was I can't recall what it said but it was not a prosecution policy.
firm didn't hold a copy? Yes. You've described it as wholly inadequate. What, in particular, stood out as being wholly inadequate? Oh, all of it, it's you know, you see sometimes	2 3 4 5 6	Q.	apply this and, if the answer comes out yes, we'll prosecute and, if it comes out no, we won't prosecute". There was I can't recall what it said but it was not a prosecution policy. Can we please look at the POL you drafted that's at
firm didn't hold a copy? Yes. You've described it as wholly inadequate. What, in particular, stood out as being wholly inadequate? Oh, all of it, it's you know, you see sometimes and it happens in this case occasionally a badly	2 3 4 5 6 7	Q.	apply this and, if the answer comes out yes, we'll prosecute and, if it comes out no, we won't prosecute". There was I can't recall what it said but it was not a prosecution policy. Can we please look at the POL you drafted that's at POL00030686. This is effective from 1 November 2013, so
firm didn't hold a copy? Yes. You've described it as wholly inadequate. What, in particular, stood out as being wholly inadequate? Oh, all of it, it's you know, you see sometimes and it happens in this case occasionally a badly photocopied document, so that I remember it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q.	apply this and, if the answer comes out yes, we'll prosecute and, if it comes out no, we won't prosecute". There was I can't recall what it said but it was not a prosecution policy. Can we please look at the POL you drafted that's at POL00030686. This is effective from 1 November 2013, so is that likely to be the kind of time that you drafted
firm didn't hold a copy? Yes. You've described it as wholly inadequate. What, in particular, stood out as being wholly inadequate? Oh, all of it, it's you know, you see sometimes and it happens in this case occasionally a badly photocopied document, so that I remember it distinctly so that the wording is at a slight angle	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		apply this and, if the answer comes out yes, we'll prosecute and, if it comes out no, we won't prosecute". There was I can't recall what it said but it was not a prosecution policy. Can we please look at the POL you drafted that's at POL00030686. This is effective from 1 November 2013, so is that likely to be the kind of time that you drafted the policy?
firm didn't hold a copy? Yes. You've described it as wholly inadequate. What, in particular, stood out as being wholly inadequate? Oh, all of it, it's you know, you see sometimes and it happens in this case occasionally a badly photocopied document, so that I remember it distinctly so that the wording is at a slight angle to the edges of the this is what I received.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A.	apply this and, if the answer comes out yes, we'll prosecute and, if it comes out no, we won't prosecute". There was I can't recall what it said but it was not a prosecution policy. Can we please look at the POL you drafted that's at POL00030686. This is effective from 1 November 2013, so is that likely to be the kind of time that you drafted the policy? I would probably look I would have been looking
firm didn't hold a copy? Yes. You've described it as wholly inadequate. What, in particular, stood out as being wholly inadequate? Oh, all of it, it's you know, you see sometimes and it happens in this case occasionally a badly photocopied document, so that I remember it distinctly so that the wording is at a slight angle to the edges of the this is what I received. A single A4 document, badly photocopied with slanting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11		apply this and, if the answer comes out yes, we'll prosecute and, if it comes out no, we won't prosecute". There was I can't recall what it said but it was not a prosecution policy. Can we please look at the POL you drafted that's at POL00030686. This is effective from 1 November 2013, so is that likely to be the kind of time that you drafted the policy? I would probably look I would have been looking forward a couple of weeks or a month, so this would have
firm didn't hold a copy? Yes. You've described it as wholly inadequate. What, in particular, stood out as being wholly inadequate? Oh, all of it, it's you know, you see sometimes and it happens in this case occasionally a badly photocopied document, so that I remember it distinctly so that the wording is at a slight angle to the edges of the this is what I received. A single A4 document, badly photocopied with slanting writing and writing on both sides. I can't remember	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		apply this and, if the answer comes out yes, we'll prosecute and, if it comes out no, we won't prosecute". There was I can't recall what it said but it was not a prosecution policy. Can we please look at the POL you drafted that's at POL00030686. This is effective from 1 November 2013, so is that likely to be the kind of time that you drafted the policy? I would probably look I would have been looking forward a couple of weeks or a month, so this would have been drafted if that says November
firm didn't hold a copy? Yes. You've described it as wholly inadequate. What, in particular, stood out as being wholly inadequate? Oh, all of it, it's you know, you see sometimes and it happens in this case occasionally a badly photocopied document, so that I remember it distinctly so that the wording is at a slight angle to the edges of the this is what I received. A single A4 document, badly photocopied with slanting writing and writing on both sides. I can't remember what it said but it wasn't a prosecution policy. It had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Α.	apply this and, if the answer comes out yes, we'll prosecute and, if it comes out no, we won't prosecute". There was I can't recall what it said but it was not a prosecution policy. Can we please look at the POL you drafted that's at POL00030686. This is effective from 1 November 2013, so is that likely to be the kind of time that you drafted the policy? I would probably look I would have been looking forward a couple of weeks or a month, so this would have been drafted if that says November September/October-ish, I think.
firm didn't hold a copy? Yes. You've described it as wholly inadequate. What, in particular, stood out as being wholly inadequate? Oh, all of it, it's you know, you see sometimes and it happens in this case occasionally a badly photocopied document, so that I remember it distinctly so that the wording is at a slight angle to the edges of the this is what I received. A single A4 document, badly photocopied with slanting writing and writing on both sides. I can't remember what it said but it wasn't a prosecution policy. It had that title but it wasn't the prosecution policy.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13		apply this and, if the answer comes out yes, we'll prosecute and, if it comes out no, we won't prosecute". There was I can't recall what it said but it was not a prosecution policy. Can we please look at the POL you drafted that's at POL00030686. This is effective from 1 November 2013, so is that likely to be the kind of time that you drafted the policy? I would probably look I would have been looking forward a couple of weeks or a month, so this would have been drafted if that says November September/October-ish, I think. Thank you. Can we please turn to page 6, where you set
firm didn't hold a copy? Yes. You've described it as wholly inadequate. What, in particular, stood out as being wholly inadequate? Oh, all of it, it's you know, you see sometimes and it happens in this case occasionally a badly photocopied document, so that I remember it distinctly so that the wording is at a slight angle to the edges of the this is what I received. A single A4 document, badly photocopied with slanting writing and writing on both sides. I can't remember what it said but it wasn't a prosecution policy. It had that title but it wasn't the prosecution policy. What do you mean by that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Α.	 apply this and, if the answer comes out yes, we'll prosecute and, if it comes out no, we won't prosecute". There was I can't recall what it said but it was not a prosecution policy. Can we please look at the POL you drafted that's at POL00030686. This is effective from 1 November 2013, so is that likely to be the kind of time that you drafted the policy? I would probably look I would have been looking forward a couple of weeks or a month, so this would have been drafted if that says November September/October-ish, I think. Thank you. Can we please turn to page 6, where you set out some general principles. You say at 3.2:
firm didn't hold a copy? Yes. You've described it as wholly inadequate. What, in particular, stood out as being wholly inadequate? Oh, all of it, it's you know, you see sometimes and it happens in this case occasionally a badly photocopied document, so that I remember it distinctly so that the wording is at a slight angle to the edges of the this is what I received. A single A4 document, badly photocopied with slanting writing and writing on both sides. I can't remember what it said but it wasn't a prosecution policy. It had that title but it wasn't the prosecution policy. What do you mean by that? Well, it just wasn't.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Α.	apply this and, if the answer comes out yes, we'll prosecute and, if it comes out no, we won't prosecute". There was I can't recall what it said but it was not a prosecution policy. Can we please look at the POL you drafted that's at POL00030686. This is effective from 1 November 2013, so is that likely to be the kind of time that you drafted the policy? I would probably look I would have been looking forward a couple of weeks or a month, so this would have been drafted if that says November September/October-ish, I think. Thank you. Can we please turn to page 6, where you set out some general principles. You say at 3.2: "The decision as to whether to prosecute in
firm didn't hold a copy? Yes. You've described it as wholly inadequate. What, in particular, stood out as being wholly inadequate? Oh, all of it, it's you know, you see sometimes and it happens in this case occasionally a badly photocopied document, so that I remember it distinctly so that the wording is at a slight angle to the edges of the this is what I received. A single A4 document, badly photocopied with slanting writing and writing on both sides. I can't remember what it said but it wasn't a prosecution policy. It had that title but it wasn't the prosecution policy. What do you mean by that? Well, it just wasn't. You say there that you drafted a new policy with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Α.	apply this and, if the answer comes out yes, we'll prosecute and, if it comes out no, we won't prosecute". There was I can't recall what it said but it was not a prosecution policy. Can we please look at the POL you drafted that's at POL00030686. This is effective from 1 November 2013, so is that likely to be the kind of time that you drafted the policy? I would probably look I would have been looking forward a couple of weeks or a month, so this would have been drafted if that says November September/October-ish, I think. Thank you. Can we please turn to page 6, where you set out some general principles. You say at 3.2: "The decision as to whether to prosecute in a particular case, or to continue with any prosecution,
firm didn't hold a copy? Yes. You've described it as wholly inadequate. What, in particular, stood out as being wholly inadequate? Oh, all of it, it's you know, you see sometimes and it happens in this case occasionally a badly photocopied document, so that I remember it distinctly so that the wording is at a slight angle to the edges of the this is what I received. A single A4 document, badly photocopied with slanting writing and writing on both sides. I can't remember what it said but it wasn't a prosecution policy. It had that title but it wasn't the prosecution policy. What do you mean by that? Well, it just wasn't. You say there that you drafted a new policy with a two-stage test, for example.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Α.	apply this and, if the answer comes out yes, we'll prosecute and, if it comes out no, we won't prosecute". There was I can't recall what it said but it was not a prosecution policy. Can we please look at the POL you drafted that's at POL00030686. This is effective from 1 November 2013, so is that likely to be the kind of time that you drafted the policy? I would probably look I would have been looking forward a couple of weeks or a month, so this would have been drafted if that says November September/October-ish, I think. Thank you. Can we please turn to page 6, where you set out some general principles. You say at 3.2: "The decision as to whether to prosecute in a particular case, or to continue with any prosecution, will always be taken by Post Office Limited."
firm didn't hold a copy? Yes. You've described it as wholly inadequate. What, in particular, stood out as being wholly inadequate? Oh, all of it, it's you know, you see sometimes and it happens in this case occasionally a badly photocopied document, so that I remember it distinctly so that the wording is at a slight angle to the edges of the this is what I received. A single A4 document, badly photocopied with slanting writing and writing on both sides. I can't remember what it said but it wasn't a prosecution policy. It had that title but it wasn't the prosecution policy. What do you mean by that? Well, it just wasn't. You say there that you drafted a new policy with a two-stage test, for example. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Α.	apply this and, if the answer comes out yes, we'll prosecute and, if it comes out no, we won't prosecute". There was I can't recall what it said but it was not a prosecution policy. Can we please look at the POL you drafted that's at POL00030686. This is effective from 1 November 2013, so is that likely to be the kind of time that you drafted the policy? I would probably look I would have been looking forward a couple of weeks or a month, so this would have been drafted if that says November September/October-ish, I think. Thank you. Can we please turn to page 6, where you set out some general principles. You say at 3.2: "The decision as to whether to prosecute in a particular case, or to continue with any prosecution, will always be taken by Post Office Limited." Then you say:
firm didn't hold a copy? Yes. You've described it as wholly inadequate. What, in particular, stood out as being wholly inadequate? Oh, all of it, it's you know, you see sometimes and it happens in this case occasionally a badly photocopied document, so that I remember it distinctly so that the wording is at a slight angle to the edges of the this is what I received. A single A4 document, badly photocopied with slanting writing and writing on both sides. I can't remember what it said but it wasn't a prosecution policy. It had that title but it wasn't the prosecution policy. What do you mean by that? Well, it just wasn't. You say there that you drafted a new policy with a two-stage test, for example. Yes. What was the test set out	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Α.	apply this and, if the answer comes out yes, we'll prosecute and, if it comes out no, we won't prosecute". There was I can't recall what it said but it was not a prosecution policy. Can we please look at the POL you drafted that's at POL00030686. This is effective from 1 November 2013, so is that likely to be the kind of time that you drafted the policy? I would probably look I would have been looking forward a couple of weeks or a month, so this would have been drafted if that says November September/October-ish, I think. Thank you. Can we please turn to page 6, where you set out some general principles. You say at 3.2: "The decision as to whether to prosecute in a particular case, or to continue with any prosecution, will always be taken by Post Office Limited." Then you say: "The decision taker will be:
firm didn't hold a copy? Yes. You've described it as wholly inadequate. What, in particular, stood out as being wholly inadequate? Oh, all of it, it's you know, you see sometimes and it happens in this case occasionally a badly photocopied document, so that I remember it distinctly so that the wording is at a slight angle to the edges of the this is what I received. A single A4 document, badly photocopied with slanting writing and writing on both sides. I can't remember what it said but it wasn't a prosecution policy. It had that title but it wasn't the prosecution policy. What do you mean by that? Well, it just wasn't. You say there that you drafted a new policy with a two-stage test, for example. Yes. What was the test set out In that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Α.	apply this and, if the answer comes out yes, we'll prosecute and, if it comes out no, we won't prosecute". There was I can't recall what it said but it was not a prosecution policy. Can we please look at the POL you drafted that's at POL00030686. This is effective from 1 November 2013, so is that likely to be the kind of time that you drafted the policy? I would probably look I would have been looking forward a couple of weeks or a month, so this would have been drafted if that says November September/October-ish, I think. Thank you. Can we please turn to page 6, where you set out some general principles. You say at 3.2: "The decision as to whether to prosecute in a particular case, or to continue with any prosecution, will always be taken by Post Office Limited." Then you say: "The decision taker will be: "i. A qualified lawyer.
firm didn't hold a copy? Yes. You've described it as wholly inadequate. What, in particular, stood out as being wholly inadequate? Oh, all of it, it's you know, you see sometimes and it happens in this case occasionally a badly photocopied document, so that I remember it distinctly so that the wording is at a slight angle to the edges of the this is what I received. A single A4 document, badly photocopied with slanting writing and writing on both sides. I can't remember what it said but it wasn't a prosecution policy. It had that title but it wasn't the prosecution policy. What do you mean by that? Well, it just wasn't. You say there that you drafted a new policy with a two-stage test, for example. Yes. What was the test set out In that? Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Α.	apply this and, if the answer comes out yes, we'll prosecute and, if it comes out no, we won't prosecute". There was I can't recall what it said but it was not a prosecution policy. Can we please look at the POL you drafted that's at POL00030686. This is effective from 1 November 2013, so is that likely to be the kind of time that you drafted the policy? I would probably look I would have been looking forward a couple of weeks or a month, so this would have been drafted if that says November September/October-ish, I think. Thank you. Can we please turn to page 6, where you set out some general principles. You say at 3.2: "The decision as to whether to prosecute in a particular case, or to continue with any prosecution, will always be taken by Post Office Limited." Then you say: "The decision taker will be: "i. A qualified lawyer. "ii. Independent of any Post Office Limited
firm didn't hold a copy? Yes. You've described it as wholly inadequate. What, in particular, stood out as being wholly inadequate? Oh, all of it, it's you know, you see sometimes and it happens in this case occasionally a badly photocopied document, so that I remember it distinctly so that the wording is at a slight angle to the edges of the this is what I received. A single A4 document, badly photocopied with slanting writing and writing on both sides. I can't remember what it said but it wasn't a prosecution policy. It had that title but it wasn't the prosecution policy. It had that title but it wasn't. You say there that you drafted a new policy with a two-stage test, for example. Yes. What was the test set out In that? Yes. There wasn't one. There was no test, there was no	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Α.	apply this and, if the answer comes out yes, we'll prosecute and, if it comes out no, we won't prosecute". There was I can't recall what it said but it was not a prosecution policy. Can we please look at the POL you drafted that's at POL00030686. This is effective from 1 November 2013, so is that likely to be the kind of time that you drafted the policy? I would probably look I would have been looking forward a couple of weeks or a month, so this would have been drafted if that says November September/October-ish, I think. Thank you. Can we please turn to page 6, where you set out some general principles. You say at 3.2: "The decision as to whether to prosecute in a particular case, or to continue with any prosecution, will always be taken by Post Office Limited." Then you say: "The decision taker will be: "i. A qualified lawyer. "ii. Independent of any Post Office Limited department having a direct financial or other interest
firm didn't hold a copy? Yes. You've described it as wholly inadequate. What, in particular, stood out as being wholly inadequate? Oh, all of it, it's you know, you see sometimes and it happens in this case occasionally a badly photocopied document, so that I remember it distinctly so that the wording is at a slight angle to the edges of the this is what I received. A single A4 document, badly photocopied with slanting writing and writing on both sides. I can't remember what it said but it wasn't a prosecution policy. It had that title but it wasn't the prosecution policy. What do you mean by that? Well, it just wasn't. You say there that you drafted a new policy with a two-stage test, for example. Yes. What was the test set out In that? Yes. There wasn't one. There was no test, there was no threshold test for whether or not you ought to consider	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Α.	apply this and, if the answer comes out yes, we'll prosecute and, if it comes out no, we won't prosecute". There was I can't recall what it said but it was not a prosecution policy. Can we please look at the POL you drafted that's at POL00030686. This is effective from 1 November 2013, so is that likely to be the kind of time that you drafted the policy? I would probably look I would have been looking forward a couple of weeks or a month, so this would have been drafted if that says November September/October-ish, I think. Thank you. Can we please turn to page 6, where you set out some general principles. You say at 3.2: "The decision as to whether to prosecute in a particular case, or to continue with any prosecution, will always be taken by Post Office Limited." Then you say: "The decision taker will be: "i. A qualified lawyer. "ii. Independent of any Post Office Limited department having a direct financial or other interest in the prosecution."
firm didn't hold a copy? Yes. You've described it as wholly inadequate. What, in particular, stood out as being wholly inadequate? Oh, all of it, it's you know, you see sometimes and it happens in this case occasionally a badly photocopied document, so that I remember it distinctly so that the wording is at a slight angle to the edges of the this is what I received. A single A4 document, badly photocopied with slanting writing and writing on both sides. I can't remember what it said but it wasn't a prosecution policy. It had that title but it wasn't the prosecution policy. It had that title but it wasn't. You say there that you drafted a new policy with a two-stage test, for example. Yes. What was the test set out In that? Yes. There wasn't one. There was no test, there was no	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Α.	apply this and, if the answer comes out yes, we'll prosecute and, if it comes out no, we won't prosecute". There was I can't recall what it said but it was not a prosecution policy. Can we please look at the POL you drafted that's at POL00030686. This is effective from 1 November 2013, so is that likely to be the kind of time that you drafted the policy? I would probably look I would have been looking forward a couple of weeks or a month, so this would have been drafted if that says November September/October-ish, I think. Thank you. Can we please turn to page 6, where you set out some general principles. You say at 3.2: "The decision as to whether to prosecute in a particular case, or to continue with any prosecution, will always be taken by Post Office Limited." Then you say: "The decision taker will be: "i. A qualified lawyer. "ii. Independent of any Post Office Limited department having a direct financial or other interest

1		says:	
2		"This practice mirrors the approach of the Crown	
3		Prosecution Service, and is designed to ensure that the	
4		decision to prosecute is taken by someone who is	
5		independent of the victim/loser and of the	
6		investigation."	
7		What awareness did you have of who actually was the	
8		decision maker in the Post Office prosecutions, prior to	
9		this policy being drafted?	
10	Α.	I recall asking Martin Smith. I didn't really get	
11		a coherent answer. I don't blame him for that because	
12		I think he didn't get a coherent answer from those he	
13		asked at Post Office. But the distinct impression I got	
14		was that John Scott had some sort of say in it and	
15		I thought Rodric Williams had some sort of say in it,	
16		but there was never a clear answer given to me.	
17	Q.	Were you concerned at all as to whether decisions had	
18		been taken outside of the Post Office not by the Post	
19		Office?	
20	Α.	I've no evidence to support that. It didn't occur to me	
21		that that might be when you say outside, what	
22	Q.	Let's say Cartwright King were carrying out prosecutions	
23		for the prosecution	
24	Α.	Yes.	
25	Q.	and we're discussing here the decision to prosecute;	
		117	
1		of all, I felt that a prosecution policy ought to have	
2		discretion where discretion was merited but there ought	
3		to have been certain hard and fast rules, as well,	
4		particularly about thresholds. And I derived that from	
5		the Code for Crown Prosecutors, which works in exactly	
6		that way: it provides certain areas of discretion but	
7		there are some very hard and fast thresholds.	
8		And when I saw Brian Altman's draft policy and	
9		it's clear in some of advices I wrote I rather	
10		thought he was watering down some of those hard and fast	
11		requirements that should have been there. I didn't	
12		agree with some of what he said.	
13	Q.	Was that in some way due to your understanding of the	
14		way that the Post Office worked? Was there something	
15		specific to them that required hard and fast rules or	
16		was there some other reason why you thought it was	
17		important?	
18	Α.	I wanted the Post Office policy to reflect general	
19		public policy, and general public policy was set down in	
20		the Code for Crown Prosecutors. And I thought that the	2
21		Post Office should, at the very least, set itself at the	2
22		same level as the Code for Crown Prosecutors, if not	2
23		more so.	2
24	Q.	We can very briefly look at the advice that you gave at	2
25		DOL 00105010 There may have been more responses to	

POL00125210. There may have been more responses to 119

25

- 1 did you have any concerns that Cartwright King
 - themselves may have actually --
- 3 A. Right.

2

- 4 Q. -- ultimately been the decision maker in a decision to
 - prosecute because of a lack of instruction?
- 6 Α. In terms of straight-line thinking, Cartwright King
- 7 would, as I understood it, advise Post Office as to
- 8 whether or not a prosecution ought to proceed, and Post
- 9 Office would respond yes or no. In reality, I rather
- 10 suspect your alternative is quite likely.
- 11 Q. What do you mean by that?
- A. I mean, it is likely that, in the absence of clear 12
- 13 instructions from Post Office, Cartwright King made
- 14 a decision themselves. But I hasten to add -- forgive
- 15 me -- I have no direct evidence of that. I was looking
- backwards at what had gone on before my time but that is 16
- 17 a distinct impression that I have.
- Q. Thank you. Ultimately, I think, the Post Office asked 18 19
 - Mr Altman to draft the policy?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. I think you have said that you took a more prescriptive 22
 - approach than Mr Altman?
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. Can you assist us with what you mean by that? 24
- 25 A. Yes, I disagree with his policy. I felt -- well, first 118

1		Mr Altman's draft policy but this is what looks like
2		a more formal response. If I could please turn to
3		paragraphs 5 and 6 on page 1, the bottom of page 1. You
4		say as follows, you say:
5		"In considering the formulation of this policy, we
6		observe that, whilst the principles to be applied are
7		clear and concise, much of the policy is couched in
8		terms of generality so that a decision-maker is here
9		granted a wide discretion in interpreting and applying
10		those principles.
11		"Such a wide discretion, whilst advantageous in some
12		respects, may in fact provide unhelpful consequences,
13		for any decision is open to review and the wider the
14		discretion granted to decision-makers the more amenable
15		to review the decision will be."
16		Can you assist us; is that the same concern? As
17		l say
18	Α.	I am being polite about it but that expresses the
19		concern I have just expressed to you.
20	Q.	Was there something particular about Post Office that
21		caused you a concern giving them wide discretion or was
22		it a general concern that that's just simply how it
23		should be in a criminal prosecution?
24	Α.	It was my view as to how a criminal a prosecution
25		policy ought to work, and I go back you may recall 120

1	from one of the advices I wrote about this is that, in	1	
2	drafting the policy I drafted, I had considered not just	2	
3	the Code for Crown Prosecutors but I'd obtained copies	3	
4	of the policy used by the RSPCA, for instance, and	4	
5	I think the NSPCC, who are recognised prosecutors or, at	5	
6	that time, were recognised prosecutors, and one or two	6	
7	others, and I sought to distil all of those into what	7	
8	I hoped was a proper policy for Post Office. I was	8	A.
9	disappointed when it was watered down.	9	Q.
10	MR BLAKE: Thank you.	10	A.
11	Sir, I'm going to move on to a new topic so that	11	Q.
12	might be an appropriate time to take our lunch break.	12	
13	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, by all means.	13	
14	MR BLAKE: Thank you very much. Perhaps we could come up	14	
15	back at 1.55, please.	15	
16	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, fine.	16	
17	MR BLAKE: Thank you.	17	
18	(12.55 pm)	18	
19	(The Short Adjournment)	19	
20	(1.54 pm)	20	
21	MR BLAKE: Good afternoon, sir, can you see and hear me?	21	
22	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes.	22	
23	MR BLAKE: Thank you.	23	
24	Mr Clarke, we're going to move now to January 2014.	24	
25	Just to recap as to where we are, by the beginning of	25	
	121		
1	first trial listing."	1	
2	You say:	2	
3	" Mrs Misra partially resiled from the allegation	3	
4	that staff members were stealing from the office, and	4	
5	instead asserted that her training was deficient; again	5	
6	allegation was made that the Horizon system was at fault	6	
7	for the now unexplained losses."	7	
8	Paragraph 9, you record certain details from the	8	
9	defence statement, including at subparagraph (ii):	9	
10	"She telephoned the helpline repeatedly and despite		A.
10	these calls the losses increased."	10	А.
12		11	
12	Over the page: "Training was mentioned but seemingly not	12	
13	criticised."		^
14			Q.
	Then at paragraph 10, you say:		A.
16	"On the first day of her trial, listed in June 2009,	16 17	Q.
17	Mrs Misra raised issues of Horizon fallibility for the		
18	first time. She explained in the October trial that she	18	
19	had learned about Horizon failings from an article in		A.
20	Computer Weekly magazine she read this on the day		Q.
21	before her first trial and realised that the	21	
22	'doubling-up' errors described there had happened to		Α.
23	her. That is why the judge postponed the trial."	23	
24	You then go through the evidence that was adduced at	24	
25	trial and, if we could keep scrolling down, please, to 123	25	
	120		

1		2014, you've had that conversation with Gareth Jenkins;
2		you've written the advice on the issue of his evidence
3		that it had been I think the word was fatally
4		undermined; you had the Second Sight Report; you had the
5		Helen Rose Report; the shredding advice; and the issue
6		you were just addressing before lunch was a historically
7		inadequate prosecution policy
8	Α.	Yes.
9	Q.	that wasn't even really a policy in itself?
10	Α.	Yes.
11	Q.	Can we please look at POL00108223. This is a case
12		review that you carried out in respect of Seema Misra.
13		The date of this review is 22 January 2014. If we
14		scroll down, we can see, well known to this Inquiry, the
15		offence for which she was sentenced to a term of
16		imprisonment, 15 months' imprisonment. If we scroll
17		down, please, you have a look at the case history,
18		various timelines, you look at the defence statement at
19		paragraph 7, and I'd like to look at paragraph 8 to
20		begin with.
20		At paragraph 8 you say there was a first defence
22		statement and then:
23		"Mrs Misra changed her solicitors and a second
23		defence statement was served rather late in the day,
24		either just prior to or perhaps on the first day of the
20		122
1		
		page 8 and the summary of the evidence of Gareth
2		Jenkins. The evidence of Gareth Jenkins is set out from
2 3		Jenkins. The evidence of Gareth Jenkins is set out from paragraph 20 onwards. Paragraph 23 says:
2		Jenkins. The evidence of Gareth Jenkins is set out from paragraph 20 onwards. Paragraph 23 says: "There is no evidence to support any of the
2 3		Jenkins. The evidence of Gareth Jenkins is set out from paragraph 20 onwards. Paragraph 23 says: "There is no evidence to support any of the hypotheses [that had been put forward]. There is no
2 3 4		Jenkins. The evidence of Gareth Jenkins is set out from paragraph 20 onwards. Paragraph 23 says: "There is no evidence to support any of the
2 3 4 5		Jenkins. The evidence of Gareth Jenkins is set out from paragraph 20 onwards. Paragraph 23 says: "There is no evidence to support any of the hypotheses [that had been put forward]. There is no
2 3 4 5 6		Jenkins. The evidence of Gareth Jenkins is set out from paragraph 20 onwards. Paragraph 23 says: "There is no evidence to support any of the hypotheses [that had been put forward]. There is no evidence to suggest that the system is corrupt."
2 3 4 5 6 7		Jenkins. The evidence of Gareth Jenkins is set out from paragraph 20 onwards. Paragraph 23 says: "There is no evidence to support any of the hypotheses [that had been put forward]. There is no evidence to suggest that the system is corrupt." Then you address the Callendar Square issue. By
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	А.	Jenkins. The evidence of Gareth Jenkins is set out from paragraph 20 onwards. Paragraph 23 says: "There is no evidence to support any of the hypotheses [that had been put forward]. There is no evidence to suggest that the system is corrupt." Then you address the Callendar Square issue. By this stage, January 2014, what do you know about the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	А.	Jenkins. The evidence of Gareth Jenkins is set out from paragraph 20 onwards. Paragraph 23 says: "There is no evidence to support any of the hypotheses [that had been put forward]. There is no evidence to suggest that the system is corrupt." Then you address the Callendar Square issue. By this stage, January 2014, what do you know about the Callendar Square bug?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A.	Jenkins. The evidence of Gareth Jenkins is set out from paragraph 20 onwards. Paragraph 23 says: "There is no evidence to support any of the hypotheses [that had been put forward]. There is no evidence to suggest that the system is corrupt." Then you address the Callendar Square issue. By this stage, January 2014, what do you know about the Callendar Square bug? I think I knew that it was a Horizon Legacy bug and that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A.	Jenkins. The evidence of Gareth Jenkins is set out from paragraph 20 onwards. Paragraph 23 says: "There is no evidence to support any of the hypotheses [that had been put forward]. There is no evidence to suggest that the system is corrupt." Then you address the Callendar Square issue. By this stage, January 2014, what do you know about the Callendar Square bug? I think I knew that it was a Horizon Legacy bug and that it produced false balances, and I think that was the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q.	Jenkins. The evidence of Gareth Jenkins is set out from paragraph 20 onwards. Paragraph 23 says: "There is no evidence to support any of the hypotheses [that had been put forward]. There is no evidence to suggest that the system is corrupt." Then you address the Callendar Square issue. By this stage, January 2014, what do you know about the Callendar Square bug? I think I knew that it was a Horizon Legacy bug and that it produced false balances, and I think that was the extent of it. I never claimed to be an expert on what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		Jenkins. The evidence of Gareth Jenkins is set out from paragraph 20 onwards. Paragraph 23 says: "There is no evidence to support any of the hypotheses [that had been put forward]. There is no evidence to suggest that the system is corrupt." Then you address the Callendar Square issue. By this stage, January 2014, what do you know about the Callendar Square bug? I think I knew that it was a Horizon Legacy bug and that it produced false balances, and I think that was the extent of it. I never claimed to be an expert on what these bugs did or didn't do.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q.	Jenkins. The evidence of Gareth Jenkins is set out from paragraph 20 onwards. Paragraph 23 says: "There is no evidence to support any of the hypotheses [that had been put forward]. There is no evidence to suggest that the system is corrupt." Then you address the Callendar Square issue. By this stage, January 2014, what do you know about the Callendar Square bug? I think I knew that it was a Horizon Legacy bug and that it produced false balances, and I think that was the extent of it. I never claimed to be an expert on what these bugs did or didn't do. No, but you knew about the two in Horizon Online
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A.	Jenkins. The evidence of Gareth Jenkins is set out from paragraph 20 onwards. Paragraph 23 says: "There is no evidence to support any of the hypotheses [that had been put forward]. There is no evidence to suggest that the system is corrupt." Then you address the Callendar Square issue. By this stage, January 2014, what do you know about the Callendar Square bug? I think I knew that it was a Horizon Legacy bug and that it produced false balances, and I think that was the extent of it. I never claimed to be an expert on what these bugs did or didn't do. No, but you knew about the two in Horizon Online Yeah.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A.	Jenkins. The evidence of Gareth Jenkins is set out from paragraph 20 onwards. Paragraph 23 says: "There is no evidence to support any of the hypotheses [that had been put forward]. There is no evidence to suggest that the system is corrupt." Then you address the Callendar Square issue. By this stage, January 2014, what do you know about the Callendar Square bug? I think I knew that it was a Horizon Legacy bug and that it produced false balances, and I think that was the extent of it. I never claimed to be an expert on what these bugs did or didn't do. No, but you knew about the two in Horizon Online Yeah. and the issues of reliability with Mr Jenkins and we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A.	Jenkins. The evidence of Gareth Jenkins is set out from paragraph 20 onwards. Paragraph 23 says: "There is no evidence to support any of the hypotheses [that had been put forward]. There is no evidence to suggest that the system is corrupt." Then you address the Callendar Square issue. By this stage, January 2014, what do you know about the Callendar Square bug? I think I knew that it was a Horizon Legacy bug and that it produced false balances, and I think that was the extent of it. I never claimed to be an expert on what these bugs did or didn't do. No, but you knew about the two in Horizon Online Yeah. and the issues of reliability with Mr Jenkins and we now have here a third bug, one that is in fact affecting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q.	Jenkins. The evidence of Gareth Jenkins is set out from paragraph 20 onwards. Paragraph 23 says: "There is no evidence to support any of the hypotheses [that had been put forward]. There is no evidence to suggest that the system is corrupt." Then you address the Callendar Square issue. By this stage, January 2014, what do you know about the Callendar Square bug? I think I knew that it was a Horizon Legacy bug and that it produced false balances, and I think that was the extent of it. I never claimed to be an expert on what these bugs did or didn't do. No, but you knew about the two in Horizon Online Yeah. and the issues of reliability with Mr Jenkins and we now have here a third bug, one that is in fact affecting Legacy Horizon.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A.	Jenkins. The evidence of Gareth Jenkins is set out from paragraph 20 onwards. Paragraph 23 says: "There is no evidence to support any of the hypotheses [that had been put forward]. There is no evidence to suggest that the system is corrupt." Then you address the Callendar Square issue. By this stage, January 2014, what do you know about the Callendar Square bug? I think I knew that it was a Horizon Legacy bug and that it produced false balances, and I think that was the extent of it. I never claimed to be an expert on what these bugs did or didn't do. No, but you knew about the two in Horizon Online Yeah. and the issues of reliability with Mr Jenkins and we now have here a third bug, one that is in fact affecting Legacy Horizon. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A.	Jenkins. The evidence of Gareth Jenkins is set out from paragraph 20 onwards. Paragraph 23 says: "There is no evidence to support any of the hypotheses [that had been put forward]. There is no evidence to suggest that the system is corrupt." Then you address the Callendar Square issue. By this stage, January 2014, what do you know about the Callendar Square bug? I think I knew that it was a Horizon Legacy bug and that it produced false balances, and I think that was the extent of it. I never claimed to be an expert on what these bugs did or didn't do. No, but you knew about the two in Horizon Online Yeah. and the issues of reliability with Mr Jenkins and we now have here a third bug, one that is in fact affecting Legacy Horizon. Yes. Did that not cause you to rethink that 2010 start date
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. Q.	Jenkins. The evidence of Gareth Jenkins is set out from paragraph 20 onwards. Paragraph 23 says: "There is no evidence to support any of the hypotheses [that had been put forward]. There is no evidence to suggest that the system is corrupt." Then you address the Callendar Square issue. By this stage, January 2014, what do you know about the Callendar Square bug? I think I knew that it was a Horizon Legacy bug and that it produced false balances, and I think that was the extent of it. I never claimed to be an expert on what these bugs did or didn't do. No, but you knew about the two in Horizon Online Yeah. and the issues of reliability with Mr Jenkins and we now have here a third bug, one that is in fact affecting Legacy Horizon. Yes. Did that not cause you to rethink that 2010 start date for the Sift Review?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. Q.	Jenkins. The evidence of Gareth Jenkins is set out from paragraph 20 onwards. Paragraph 23 says: "There is no evidence to support any of the hypotheses [that had been put forward]. There is no evidence to suggest that the system is corrupt." Then you address the Callendar Square issue. By this stage, January 2014, what do you know about the Callendar Square bug? I think I knew that it was a Horizon Legacy bug and that it produced false balances, and I think that was the extent of it. I never claimed to be an expert on what these bugs did or didn't do. No, but you knew about the two in Horizon Online Yeah. and the issues of reliability with Mr Jenkins and we now have here a third bug, one that is in fact affecting Legacy Horizon. Yes. Did that not cause you to rethink that 2010 start date for the Sift Review? I think I raised that with Brian Altman after I did this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. Q.	Jenkins. The evidence of Gareth Jenkins is set out from paragraph 20 onwards. Paragraph 23 says: "There is no evidence to support any of the hypotheses [that had been put forward]. There is no evidence to suggest that the system is corrupt." Then you address the Callendar Square issue. By this stage, January 2014, what do you know about the Callendar Square bug? I think I knew that it was a Horizon Legacy bug and that it produced false balances, and I think that was the extent of it. I never claimed to be an expert on what these bugs did or didn't do. No, but you knew about the two in Horizon Online Yeah. and the issues of reliability with Mr Jenkins and we now have here a third bug, one that is in fact affecting Legacy Horizon. Yes. Did that not cause you to rethink that 2010 start date for the Sift Review? I think I raised that with Brian Altman after I did this advice in one of our conferences but that was pretty
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. Q.	Jenkins. The evidence of Gareth Jenkins is set out from paragraph 20 onwards. Paragraph 23 says: "There is no evidence to support any of the hypotheses [that had been put forward]. There is no evidence to suggest that the system is corrupt." Then you address the Callendar Square issue. By this stage, January 2014, what do you know about the Callendar Square bug? I think I knew that it was a Horizon Legacy bug and that it produced false balances, and I think that was the extent of it. I never claimed to be an expert on what these bugs did or didn't do. No, but you knew about the two in Horizon Online Yeah. and the issues of reliability with Mr Jenkins and we now have here a third bug, one that is in fact affecting Legacy Horizon. Yes. Did that not cause you to rethink that 2010 start date for the Sift Review? I think I raised that with Brian Altman after I did this advice in one of our conferences but that we ought to have

1

2

3

4

5 6

7

8 **A**.

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24 **Q**.

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

Q. Yes.

"It becomes apparent in cross-examination of

Professor McLachlan, he had done so on in a piecemeal

Now, isn't that exactly what was happening to you

and heard reference to a document on the Misra, Seema

has been erroneously attributed to Harry Bowyer. What in fact happened was that -- I can't remember whether

I asked to review the Seema Misra case or they asked me

to review it but it came up for renew and, in December 2013, I did a very short form initial review and I think

that's the document that was attributed to Harry Bowyer

A. And that review suggested -- advised disclosure of the

Absolutely, and that's a document I'll take you to in

126

sent out under the Cartwright King banner rather than

under my name. But if you look at the document it's

clearly my writing style, my narrative. It's my

case produced in December, a very short document, which

back in June 2013, late disclosure of information that

Mr Jenkins that, whilst he had disclosed material to

basis, only when asked to do so and very late."

Q. Is it consistent with the view that you had taken back

in 2013 that he was an unreliable witness? **A.** Well, there's a sort of time line to this. I've seen

you weren't aware of? No, non-disclosure in 2013.

because I didn't sign it.

material we were --

a moment.

document.

1	Q.	What was Mr Altman's response?
2	Α.	I think he was receptive to the suggestion but I don't
3		think we did enough to make it happen at that stage. It
4		happened later on but I accept it should have happened
5		earlier.
6	Q.	It says there, about halfway down 24:
7		"Mr Jenkins researched the Callendar Square problem
8		and, whilst he did not examine the data logs, determined
9		the problem was fixed."
10		Over the page to paragraph 26, halfway through that
11		paragraph it says:
12		"The Callendar Square issue as it may have affected
13		West Byfleet was then dealt with in some considerable
14		detail. Importantly, Mr Jenkins said he had identified
15		two isolated events similar to the root cause of the
16		Callendar Square problem but not in the tens of
17		thousands of events as had manifested at Callendar
18		Square."
19		So it seems as though there were some events, some
20		issues, albeit not as serious as Callendar Square:
21		"27. In his analysis of just under half a million
22 23		transactions from West Byfleet, Mr Jenkins had found no
23 24		evidence of any computer malfunction other than the already mentioned Callendar Square problem."
24		Then 29, you say as follows:
20		125
1	Δ	Okay That document was written off the back of and
1 2	Α.	5
1 2 3	Α.	Okay. That document was written off the back of and this is going to take me onto another concern I've had since then that document was written off the back of
2	A.	this is going to take me onto another concern I've had
2 3	А.	this is going to take me onto another concern I've had since then that document was written off the back of
2 3 4	Α.	this is going to take me onto another concern I've had since then that document was written off the back of a transcript only of the judge's summing-up in the Seema Misra trial. I'd asked for the entire file, was told it
2 3 4 5	Α.	this is going to take me onto another concern I've had since then that document was written off the back of a transcript only of the judge's summing-up in the Seema
2 3 4 5 6	Α.	this is going to take me onto another concern I've had since then that document was written off the back of a transcript only of the judge's summing-up in the Seema Misra trial. I'd asked for the entire file, was told it wasn't available. I wasn't told why it wasn't available
2 3 4 5 6 7	Α.	this is going to take me onto another concern I've had since then that document was written off the back of a transcript only of the judge's summing-up in the Seema Misra trial. I'd asked for the entire file, was told it wasn't available. I wasn't told why it wasn't available but I was told they had a transcript of the summing-up.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Α.	this is going to take me onto another concern I've had since then that document was written off the back of a transcript only of the judge's summing-up in the Seema Misra trial. I'd asked for the entire file, was told it wasn't available. I wasn't told why it wasn't available but I was told they had a transcript of the summing-up. Frankly, it never occurred to me to ask why have you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Α.	this is going to take me onto another concern I've had since then that document was written off the back of a transcript only of the judge's summing-up in the Seema Misra trial. I'd asked for the entire file, was told it wasn't available. I wasn't told why it wasn't available but I was told they had a transcript of the summing-up. Frankly, it never occurred to me to ask why have you only got a transcript of the summing-up? But there you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Α.	this is going to take me onto another concern I've had since then that document was written off the back of a transcript only of the judge's summing-up in the Seema Misra trial. I'd asked for the entire file, was told it wasn't available. I wasn't told why it wasn't available but I was told they had a transcript of the summing-up. Frankly, it never occurred to me to ask why have you only got a transcript of the summing-up? But there you are.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A.	this is going to take me onto another concern I've had since then that document was written off the back of a transcript only of the judge's summing-up in the Seema Misra trial. I'd asked for the entire file, was told it wasn't available. I wasn't told why it wasn't available but I was told they had a transcript of the summing-up. Frankly, it never occurred to me to ask why have you only got a transcript of the summing-up? But there you are. The first the December document I wrote off the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Α.	this is going to take me onto another concern I've had since then that document was written off the back of a transcript only of the judge's summing-up in the Seema Misra trial. I'd asked for the entire file, was told it wasn't available. I wasn't told why it wasn't available but I was told they had a transcript of the summing-up. Frankly, it never occurred to me to ask why have you only got a transcript of the summing-up? But there you are. The first the December document I wrote off the back of the judge's summing-up and the judge's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q.	this is going to take me onto another concern I've had since then that document was written off the back of a transcript only of the judge's summing-up in the Seema Misra trial. I'd asked for the entire file, was told it wasn't available. I wasn't told why it wasn't available but I was told they had a transcript of the summing-up. Frankly, it never occurred to me to ask why have you only got a transcript of the summing-up? But there you are. The first the December document I wrote off the back of the judge's summing-up and the judge's summing-up, the way in which that was crafted suggested
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		this is going to take me onto another concern I've had since then that document was written off the back of a transcript only of the judge's summing-up in the Seema Misra trial. I'd asked for the entire file, was told it wasn't available. I wasn't told why it wasn't available but I was told they had a transcript of the summing-up. Frankly, it never occurred to me to ask why have you only got a transcript of the summing-up? But there you are. The first the December document I wrote off the back of the judge's summing-up and the judge's summing-up, the way in which that was crafted suggested that disclosure ought to be made.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15		this is going to take me onto another concern I've had since then that document was written off the back of a transcript only of the judge's summing-up in the Seema Misra trial. I'd asked for the entire file, was told it wasn't available. I wasn't told why it wasn't available but I was told they had a transcript of the summing-up. Frankly, it never occurred to me to ask why have you only got a transcript of the summing-up? But there you are. The first the December document I wrote off the back of the judge's summing-up and the judge's summing-up, the way in which that was crafted suggested that disclosure ought to be made. It was very clear in that December advice that your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q.	this is going to take me onto another concern I've had since then that document was written off the back of a transcript only of the judge's summing-up in the Seema Misra trial. I'd asked for the entire file, was told it wasn't available. I wasn't told why it wasn't available but I was told they had a transcript of the summing-up. Frankly, it never occurred to me to ask why have you only got a transcript of the summing-up? But there you are. The first the December document I wrote off the back of the judge's summing-up and the judge's summing-up, the way in which that was crafted suggested that disclosure ought to be made. It was very clear in that December advice that your view, or Cartwright King's view, as it was put Yeah. was that disclosure should be made to Mrs Misra?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A.	this is going to take me onto another concern I've had since then that document was written off the back of a transcript only of the judge's summing-up in the Seema Misra trial. I'd asked for the entire file, was told it wasn't available. I wasn't told why it wasn't available but I was told they had a transcript of the summing-up. Frankly, it never occurred to me to ask why have you only got a transcript of the summing-up? But there you are. The first the December document I wrote off the back of the judge's summing-up and the judge's summing-up, the way in which that was crafted suggested that disclosure ought to be made. It was very clear in that December advice that your view, or Cartwright King's view, as it was put Yeah. was that disclosure should be made to Mrs Misra? Yeah, well, Martin Smith was right to the extent that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q.	this is going to take me onto another concern I've had since then that document was written off the back of a transcript only of the judge's summing-up in the Seema Misra trial. I'd asked for the entire file, was told it wasn't available. I wasn't told why it wasn't available but I was told they had a transcript of the summing-up. Frankly, it never occurred to me to ask why have you only got a transcript of the summing-up? But there you are. The first the December document I wrote off the back of the judge's summing-up and the judge's summing-up, the way in which that was crafted suggested that disclosure ought to be made. It was very clear in that December advice that your view, or Cartwright King's view, as it was put Yeah. was that disclosure should be made to Mrs Misra? Yeah, well, Martin Smith was right to the extent that I always sign my own documents. That was signed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q.	this is going to take me onto another concern I've had since then that document was written off the back of a transcript only of the judge's summing-up in the Seema Misra trial. I'd asked for the entire file, was told it wasn't available. I wasn't told why it wasn't available but I was told they had a transcript of the summing-up. Frankly, it never occurred to me to ask why have you only got a transcript of the summing-up? But there you are. The first the December document I wrote off the back of the judge's summing-up and the judge's summing-up, the way in which that was crafted suggested that disclosure ought to be made. It was very clear in that December advice that your view, or Cartwright King's view, as it was put Yeah. was that disclosure should be made to Mrs Misra? Yeah, well, Martin Smith was right to the extent that I always sign my own documents. That was signed Cartwright King because I suspect there was sometimes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q.	this is going to take me onto another concern I've had since then that document was written off the back of a transcript only of the judge's summing-up in the Seema Misra trial. I'd asked for the entire file, was told it wasn't available. I wasn't told why it wasn't available but I was told they had a transcript of the summing-up. Frankly, it never occurred to me to ask why have you only got a transcript of the summing-up? But there you are. The first the December document I wrote off the back of the judge's summing-up and the judge's summing-up, the way in which that was crafted suggested that disclosure ought to be made. It was very clear in that December advice that your view, or Cartwright King's view, as it was put Yeah. was that disclosure should be made to Mrs Misra? Yeah, well, Martin Smith was right to the extent that I always sign my own documents. That was signed Cartwright King because I suspect there was sometimes I would write the bare bones of something and then give
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q.	this is going to take me onto another concern I've had since then that document was written off the back of a transcript only of the judge's summing-up in the Seema Misra trial. I'd asked for the entire file, was told it wasn't available. I wasn't told why it wasn't available but I was told they had a transcript of the summing-up. Frankly, it never occurred to me to ask why have you only got a transcript of the summing-up? But there you are. The first the December document I wrote off the back of the judge's summing-up and the judge's summing-up, the way in which that was crafted suggested that disclosure ought to be made. It was very clear in that December advice that your view, or Cartwright King's view, as it was put Yeah. was that disclosure should be made to Mrs Misra? Yeah, well, Martin Smith was right to the extent that I always sign my own documents. That was signed Cartwright King because I suspect there was sometimes I would write the bare bones of something and then give it to Harry Bowyer or Martin Smith and say, "Right,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q.	this is going to take me onto another concern I've had since then that document was written off the back of a transcript only of the judge's summing-up in the Seema Misra trial. I'd asked for the entire file, was told it wasn't available. I wasn't told why it wasn't available but I was told they had a transcript of the summing-up. Frankly, it never occurred to me to ask why have you only got a transcript of the summing-up? But there you are. The first the December document I wrote off the back of the judge's summing-up and the judge's summing-up, the way in which that was crafted suggested that disclosure ought to be made. It was very clear in that December advice that your view, or Cartwright King's view, as it was put Yeah. was that disclosure should be made to Mrs Misra? Yeah, well, Martin Smith was right to the extent that I always sign my own documents. That was signed Cartwright King because I suspect there was sometimes I would write the bare bones of something and then give

127

What then happened was I was delivered the transcripts of the evidence of the trial in January 2014 and this document effectively was written off the back of those transcripts. Again, no file, no prosecution papers, no witness statements, nothing. Just those documents, and I wrote this off the back of the transcripts of the entire trial, and what I'm doing is recalling the evidence here, as it appeared in the transcripts, and I came to a different conclusion, which why disclosure wasn't directed at that time. So that's the time line between -- and then there was a -- I think there was a third look at the Seema Misra case later on in the year by Brian Altman and Brian Altman said, in terms, "You're wrong, you should order disclosure in this case", and so we did. That's the time line of what happened but I don't want people to think that Harry Bowyer produced a document

- 22 I produced.
- 23 Q. That's quite a long answer to quite a simple question --
- 24 A. It is, sorry, yes.
- 25 **Q.** -- which is: paragraph 29, wasn't it clear to you, by 128

25

1		that stage, you had formed the view that Gareth Jenkins'
2		evidence had been fatally undermined and he was
3		an unreliable witness
4	Α.	Yes, that
5	Q.	and, combined with paragraph 29, that what, in fact,
6		happened in that Seema Misra case, you had formed the
7		view that he disclosed material on a piecemeal basis
8	Α.	Yes.
9	Q.	only when asked to do so and very late?
10	Α.	Yeah.
11	Q.	Do you not look at that trial, at that point in time,
12		knowing the conversation you had personally had with
13		Gareth Jenkins, and knowing all of the various points
14		that I've taken you to a number of times that happened
15		after that, and think "We need to be disclosing material
16		to Seema Misra"?
17	Α.	I've looked at that paragraph several times since and
18		questioned myself as to why I wrote it and didn't ask
19		for disclosure. The only and it's not
20		a justification but maybe it's an explanation the
21		only explanation I can come up with is that I can
22		imagine myself looking at the transcripts of the trial
23		which went back to 2010 and asking myself the question:
24		what was the position in 2010? At that point, according
25		to the time line, if you like, Gareth Jenkins was not
		129
1		than a generalised indictment of Horizon; I mean you
2		were in the same position, weren't you, back then?
3	Α.	Yeah.
4	Q.	You weren't aware of how Legacy Horizon could cause
5		issues with balancing?
6	Α.	Yes.
7	Q.	So do you think that's an unfair statement?
8	Α.	Yes.
9	Q.	At the bottom of the page, paragraph 58, the final
10		sentence on that page says:
11		"Accordingly I conclude that no meaningful criticism
12		can be made of the disclosure process taken by [Royal
13		Mail Group] during the pre-trial and ongoing disclosure
14		
15		phases of this prosecution."
16		phases of this prosecution." Am I to understand that, on reflection, you disagree
10		
17	Α.	Am I to understand that, on reflection, you disagree
	A.	Am I to understand that, on reflection, you disagree with that?
17	A.	Am I to understand that, on reflection, you disagree with that? Yes, at the time I was overinfluenced by the views of
17 18	A. Q.	Am I to understand that, on reflection, you disagree with that? Yes, at the time I was overinfluenced by the views of the trial judge, that was an error, and I agree with
17 18 19	_	Am I to understand that, on reflection, you disagree with that? Yes, at the time I was overinfluenced by the views of the trial judge, that was an error, and I agree with your characterisation that that is a wrong view.
17 18 19 20	_	Am I to understand that, on reflection, you disagree with that? Yes, at the time I was overinfluenced by the views of the trial judge, that was an error, and I agree with your characterisation that that is a wrong view. Thank you. Can we please turn to page 19, paragraph 68
17 18 19 20 21	_	Am I to understand that, on reflection, you disagree with that? Yes, at the time I was overinfluenced by the views of the trial judge, that was an error, and I agree with your characterisation that that is a wrong view. Thank you. Can we please turn to page 19, paragraph 68 onwards:
17 18 19 20 21 22	_	Am I to understand that, on reflection, you disagree with that? Yes, at the time I was overinfluenced by the views of the trial judge, that was an error, and I agree with your characterisation that that is a wrong view. Thank you. Can we please turn to page 19, paragraph 68 onwards: "68. Having considered both Mrs Misra's case and
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	_	Am I to understand that, on reflection, you disagree with that? Yes, at the time I was overinfluenced by the views of the trial judge, that was an error, and I agree with your characterisation that that is a wrong view. Thank you. Can we please turn to page 19, paragraph 68 onwards: "68. Having considered both Mrs Misra's case and the details of the Second Sight Interim Report, I can

on II	「 Inq	uiry 9 May 2024
1		a tainted witness, and he had given evidence and,
2		according to the transcripts there had been three
3		separate attempts at litigating in front of the judge
4		the disclosure issue, and the Falkirk bug had been
5		litigated and the judge had, on three occasions, ruled
6		no disclosure.
7		Now, I accept that was looking at things the
8		reasoning way now but I think that must have been my
9		thought process then. Now, I can't reconcile this
10		document with what should have happened. I accept that.
11		So the short answer to your question is: yes, you're
12		right.
13	Q.	Could we please turn to page 15.
14		Paragraph 57, you're setting out here various
15		conclusions:
16		"In coming to my conclusion on this aspect of the
17		disclosure process, I have considered Ms Misra's failure
18		to raise Horizon as a defence until so late in the day;
19		her inability or unwillingness to offer anything more
20		than a generalised and incoherent indictment of Horizon;
21		the approach taken by Professor McLachlan; and the
22		duties relating to disclosure placed upon the shoulders
23		of any prosecutor."
24		Just pausing there, the failures of her to raise
25		Horizon as a defence, inability to offer anything more
		130
1		fallibility. It is not the function of the prosecution
2		to respond to general and unspecified allegations and
3		request for disclosure in the hope that material may
4		turn up to make them good. And in this case I conclude
5		that this is precisely the test to be applied on issues
6		of post-trial disclosure. I am also of the view that
7		the Second Sight Interim Report does not and cannot cast
8		doubt on the safety of the conviction, not least because
9		the vast majority of matters dealt with in the report
10		post-date this trial by several years and those that fit
11		the chronology of this case bear little or no factual
12		resemblance to Mrs Misra's circumstances. In any event
13		the report is now in the public domain and most likely
14 15		in the hands of Mrs Misra."
16		Pausing there, reflecting on that, do you agree that the advice there or your conclusion there is
17		problematic?
17	Α.	It's not problematic; it's wrong. The first part of the
10 19	А.	paragraph is a paraphrasing of the decision in <i>Re H and</i>
20		Re C and the second part of the decision is wrong.
20 21	Q.	Thank you. Paragraph 69:
21	હ.	"As for the Helen Rose Report, that matter goes
22		solely to Gareth Jenkins' knowledge of Horizon concerns
20		

arising some 5 years after the events considered in

132

Mrs Misra's trial and his credibility as an expert

(33) Pages 129 - 132

2

1		witness in 2013. An analysis of the events dealt with
2		in that report, and the potential that Gareth Jenkins'
3		credibility as a witness might be undermined in 2013,
4		does not in my view lead to the conclusion that the
5		material which might undermine his credibility now ought
6		to be made available so as to do so in relation to
7		a trial which occurred in October of 2010."
8		Again, do you disagree
9	Α.	Yeah.
10	Q.	with that now?
11	Α.	Yes, it's wrong.
12	Q.	"Conclusion
13		" I advise that neither the Second Sight Interim
14		Report nor the Helen Rose Report meet the test for
15		disclosure in this case and neither report should be
16		disclosed to Mrs Misra's representatives."
17		The focus in this and in all of, I think, the other
18		similar cases that you looked at was on disclosure of
19 20		the Second Sight Report and the Helen Rose Report. Do
20 21		you think that was also an error because there was more
21 22		information that you were aware of that related to, for
22		example, thing the jigsaw together, regarding the
23 24	A.	unreliability of Gareth Jenkins?
24 25	А.	Well, I think that you say there was more information. To my mind, there were three strands of
25		133
1		L pover sow it
1	SIR	I never saw it.
2	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: Is it your view let me ask you the
2 3	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: Is it your view let me ask you the direct question that the file, whether in electronic
2 3 4	_	WYN WILLIAMS: Is it your view let me ask you the direct question that the file, whether in electronic or paper form, was deliberately withheld from you?
2 3 4 5	Α.	WYN WILLIAMS: Is it your view let me ask you the direct question that the file, whether in electronic or paper form, was deliberately withheld from you? That is now my view.
2 3 4 5 6	Α.	WYN WILLIAMS: Is it your view let me ask you the direct question that the file, whether in electronic or paper form, was deliberately withheld from you? That is now my view. WYN WILLIAMS: Is that now your view, in the sense of
2 3 4 5 6 7	Α.	WYN WILLIAMS: Is it your view let me ask you the direct question that the file, whether in electronic or paper form, was deliberately withheld from you? That is now my view. WYN WILLIAMS: Is that now your view, in the sense of a view you've come to, having no doubt listened to parts
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Α.	WYN WILLIAMS: Is it your view let me ask you the direct question that the file, whether in electronic or paper form, was deliberately withheld from you? That is now my view. WYN WILLIAMS: Is that now your view, in the sense of a view you've come to, having no doubt listened to parts of the Inquiry and looked at various documents, or was
2 3 4 5 6 7	Α.	WYN WILLIAMS: Is it your view let me ask you the direct question that the file, whether in electronic or paper form, was deliberately withheld from you? That is now my view. WYN WILLIAMS: Is that now your view, in the sense of a view you've come to, having no doubt listened to parts of the Inquiry and looked at various documents, or was that a view which you formed earlier than that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: Is it your view let me ask you the direct question that the file, whether in electronic or paper form, was deliberately withheld from you? That is now my view. WYN WILLIAMS: Is that now your view, in the sense of a view you've come to, having no doubt listened to parts of the Inquiry and looked at various documents, or was that a view which you formed earlier than that? I think it crystallised I'll be frank. I watched
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: Is it your view let me ask you the direct question that the file, whether in electronic or paper form, was deliberately withheld from you? That is now my view. WYN WILLIAMS: Is that now your view, in the sense of a view you've come to, having no doubt listened to parts of the Inquiry and looked at various documents, or was that a view which you formed earlier than that? I think it crystallised I'll be frank. I watched Rodric Williams, I watched Jarnail Singh twice,
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	A. SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: Is it your view let me ask you the direct question that the file, whether in electronic or paper form, was deliberately withheld from you? That is now my view. WYN WILLIAMS: Is that now your view, in the sense of a view you've come to, having no doubt listened to parts of the Inquiry and looked at various documents, or was that a view which you formed earlier than that? I think it crystallised I'll be frank. I watched
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. SIR	 WYN WILLIAMS: Is it your view let me ask you the direct question that the file, whether in electronic or paper form, was deliberately withheld from you? That is now my view. WYN WILLIAMS: Is that now your view, in the sense of a view you've come to, having no doubt listened to parts of the Inquiry and looked at various documents, or was that a view which you formed earlier than that? I think it crystallised I'll be frank. I watched Rodric Williams, I watched Jarnail Singh twice, I watched Martin Smith and I watched Harry Bowyer and,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. SIR	 WYN WILLIAMS: Is it your view let me ask you the direct question that the file, whether in electronic or paper form, was deliberately withheld from you? That is now my view. WYN WILLIAMS: Is that now your view, in the sense of a view you've come to, having no doubt listened to parts of the Inquiry and looked at various documents, or was that a view which you formed earlier than that? I think it crystallised I'll be frank. I watched Rodric Williams, I watched Jarnail Singh twice, I watched Martin Smith and I watched Harry Bowyer and, as a result of that, combined with the documents that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Sir	WYN WILLIAMS: Is it your view let me ask you the direct question that the file, whether in electronic or paper form, was deliberately withheld from you? That is now my view. WYN WILLIAMS: Is that now your view, in the sense of a view you've come to, having no doubt listened to parts of the Inquiry and looked at various documents, or was that a view which you formed earlier than that? I think it crystallised I'll be frank. I watched Rodric Williams, I watched Jarnail Singh twice, I watched Martin Smith and I watched Harry Bowyer and, as a result of that, combined with the documents that I've seen in this process, that crystallises my view
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Sir	 WYN WILLIAMS: Is it your view let me ask you the direct question that the file, whether in electronic or paper form, was deliberately withheld from you? That is now my view. WYN WILLIAMS: Is that now your view, in the sense of a view you've come to, having no doubt listened to parts of the Inquiry and looked at various documents, or was that a view which you formed earlier than that? I think it crystallised I'll be frank. I watched Rodric Williams, I watched Jarnail Singh twice, I watched Martin Smith and I watched Harry Bowyer and, as a result of that, combined with the documents that I've seen in this process, that crystallises my view that I was misled and deceived.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. SIR A.	 WYN WILLIAMS: Is it your view let me ask you the direct question that the file, whether in electronic or paper form, was deliberately withheld from you? That is now my view. WYN WILLIAMS: Is that now your view, in the sense of a view you've come to, having no doubt listened to parts of the Inquiry and looked at various documents, or was that a view which you formed earlier than that? I think it crystallised I'll be frank. I watched Rodric Williams, I watched Jarnail Singh twice, I watched Martin Smith and I watched Harry Bowyer and, as a result of that, combined with the documents that I've seen in this process, that crystallises my view that I was misled and deceived. WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you. Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. SIR A. SIR A.	WYN WILLIAMS: Is it your view let me ask you the direct question that the file, whether in electronic or paper form, was deliberately withheld from you? That is now my view. WYN WILLIAMS: Is that now your view, in the sense of a view you've come to, having no doubt listened to parts of the Inquiry and looked at various documents, or was that a view which you formed earlier than that? I think it crystallised I'll be frank. I watched Rodric Williams, I watched Jarnail Singh twice, I watched Martin Smith and I watched Harry Bowyer and, as a result of that, combined with the documents that I've seen in this process, that crystallises my view that I was misled and deceived. WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you. Right. Forgive me, in particular in reference to the sight of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. SIR A. SIR A.	WYN WILLIAMS: Is it your view let me ask you the direct question that the file, whether in electronic or paper form, was deliberately withheld from you? That is now my view. WYN WILLIAMS: Is that now your view, in the sense of a view you've come to, having no doubt listened to parts of the Inquiry and looked at various documents, or was that a view which you formed earlier than that? I think it crystallised I'll be frank. I watched Rodric Williams, I watched Jarnail Singh twice, I watched Martin Smith and I watched Harry Bowyer and, as a result of that, combined with the documents that I've seen in this process, that crystallises my view that I was misled and deceived. WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you. Right. Forgive me, in particular in reference to the sight of the Seema Misra file.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. SIR A. SIR A.	WYN WILLIAMS: Is it your view let me ask you the direct question that the file, whether in electronic or paper form, was deliberately withheld from you? That is now my view. WYN WILLIAMS: Is that now your view, in the sense of a view you've come to, having no doubt listened to parts of the Inquiry and looked at various documents, or was that a view which you formed earlier than that? I think it crystallised I'll be frank. I watched Rodric Williams, I watched Jarnail Singh twice, I watched Martin Smith and I watched Harry Bowyer and, as a result of that, combined with the documents that I've seen in this process, that crystallises my view that I was misled and deceived. WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you. Right. Forgive me, in particular in reference to the sight of the Seema Misra file.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. SIR A. SIR A. SIR A.	 WYN WILLIAMS: Is it your view let me ask you the direct question that the file, whether in electronic or paper form, was deliberately withheld from you? That is now my view. WYN WILLIAMS: Is that now your view, in the sense of a view you've come to, having no doubt listened to parts of the Inquiry and looked at various documents, or was that a view which you formed earlier than that? I think it crystallised I'll be frank. I watched Rodric Williams, I watched Jarnail Singh twice, I watched Martin Smith and I watched Harry Bowyer and, as a result of that, combined with the documents that I've seen in this process, that crystallises my view that I was misled and deceived. WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you. Right. Forgive me, in particular in reference to the sight of the Seema Misra file. WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, that's what we were talking about. That's what I understood you to mean.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. SIR A. SIR A. SIR A.	WYN WILLIAMS: Is it your view let me ask you the direct question that the file, whether in electronic or paper form, was deliberately withheld from you? That is now my view. WYN WILLIAMS: Is that now your view, in the sense of a view you've come to, having no doubt listened to parts of the Inquiry and looked at various documents, or was that a view which you formed earlier than that? I think it crystallised I'll be frank. I watched Rodric Williams, I watched Jarnail Singh twice, I watched Martin Smith and I watched Harry Bowyer and, as a result of that, combined with the documents that I've seen in this process, that crystallises my view that I was misled and deceived. WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you. Right. Forgive me, in particular in reference to the sight of the Seema Misra file. WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, that's what we were talking about. That's what I understood you to mean. But also in general.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. SIR A. SIR A. SIR A.	 WYN WILLIAMS: Is it your view let me ask you the direct question that the file, whether in electronic or paper form, was deliberately withheld from you? That is now my view. WYN WILLIAMS: Is that now your view, in the sense of a view you've come to, having no doubt listened to parts of the Inquiry and looked at various documents, or was that a view which you formed earlier than that? I think it crystallised I'll be frank. I watched Rodric Williams, I watched Jarnail Singh twice, I watched Martin Smith and I watched Harry Bowyer and, as a result of that, combined with the documents that I've seen in this process, that crystallises my view that I was misled and deceived. WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you. Right. Forgive me, in particular in reference to the sight of the Seema Misra file. WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, that's what we were talking about. That's what I understood you to mean. But also in general. WYN WILLIAMS: All right. So that I'm clear about what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. SIR A. SIR A. SIR A.	WYN WILLIAMS: Is it your view let me ask you the direct question that the file, whether in electronic or paper form, was deliberately withheld from you? That is now my view. WYN WILLIAMS: Is that now your view, in the sense of a view you've come to, having no doubt listened to parts of the Inquiry and looked at various documents, or was that a view which you formed earlier than that? I think it crystallised I'll be frank. I watched Rodric Williams, I watched Jarnail Singh twice, I watched Martin Smith and I watched Harry Bowyer and, as a result of that, combined with the documents that I've seen in this process, that crystallises my view that I was misled and deceived. WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you. Right. Forgive me, in particular in reference to the sight of the Seema Misra file. WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, that's what we were talking about. That's what I understood you to mean. But also in general. WYN WILLIAMS: All right. So that I'm clear about what I am saying, you are asserting that you were misled

3 conclusion that Gareth Jenkins was a wholly unreliable witness. I accept that -- now that that was wholly 4 5 disclosable from day one. 6 Q. I think I can probably take you through the rest quite 7 quickly in that case. Can we have a quick look at 8 POL00066850. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Before that comes on the screen, can 9 10 I just confirm that you have understood you correctly: 11 in both your appraisals of the Seema Misra case, the information that you were acting on, in the sense of the 12 13 paper before you, was simply various transcripts: in 14 December a transcript of the summing-up; in January 15 a transcript of the evidence given. At no stage, did 16 you see the prosecution file; is that correct? 17 A. That is correct. I had asked for it on a number of occasions. I learned from this process that somewhere 18 19 there is a digital file. I came to the conclusion, 20 during the course of this process, that it was 21 deliberately withheld from me. I could not understand 22 why Post Office had a transcript of the summing-up and 23 later were able to produce a transcript of the trial 24 proceedings but, according to them, did not have their 25 own file, their own prosecution file, and papers. But 134 1 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: -- by the withholding of the file, in 2 effect? 3 A. That is my belief, yes. 4 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: But you also say that you have a belief 5 that you were misled on a wider basis? 6 Yes, the Post Office repeated their protestations that, Α. 7 since day dot, there was nothing wrong with Horizon, 8 when they clearly knew that there were issues with 9 Horizon. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: All right. Thank you. 10 11 Sorry, Mr Blake. 12 MR BLAKE: Not at all. 13 Just following on from that, can you assist us with 14 who it was that you were communicating with at the Post 15 Office in respect of the Seema Misra file? A. Jarnail Singh, Rodric Williams, at arm's length, first 16 17 of all, Susan Crichton and Christopher Aujard. I think that's probably about it. We had meetings 18 occasionally -- I had no direct -- I think I had 19 20 a meeting with Christopher Aujard and I had maybe one or 21 two meetings with Susan Crichton. By and large, 22 everything I got came through Jarnail Singh and Rodric 23 Williams, but you could see from the emails that those 24 two individuals were very regularly copied in to this 25 correspondence, so that's why I include them as well.

136

information. There was the Second Sight Report; the

Helen Rose Report; and the third strand was the -- my

(34) Pages 133 - 136

1 Q .	Thank you. We see from the document that is currently	1		gut instinct was the right one?
2	on screen that you completed the Misra full review on	2	Α.	Yes, clearly.
3	22 January 2014 is that correct or thereabouts?	3	Q.	I'm going to look at one other case review, it's earlier
	That's what it says, yes.	4		in time. It's POL00060715. We're going back to 19 July
5 Q .	Can we please go to POL00066853. This is an email that	5		2013, and this is the case of Hutchings. If we could
6	you will have seen in your preparation.	6		look at page 2, please. At the bottom of page 2, you
	Yes.	7		set out Mrs Hutchings' defence at trial sorry, in her
	The bottom email, from you, says, "Phew". Now, the	8		prepared statement at interview. She said that she
9	suggestion might be that that was "Phew, we don't need	9		migrated to Horizon Online in 2010:
0	to disclose anything to Seema Misra"?	10		"Ever since we have been with [Horizon Online] the
	Yes, that's not what it meant. I had just conducted	11		balances have been wrong
12	a review of the case, from probably 8 or 9 inches of	12		"At no stage have we stolen money nor are we
3	transcript of evidence. The "phew" was in reference to	13		aware of making mistakes in our day-to-day [operations].
4	that task.	14		"Because of this we have always believed that the
15 Q .		15		incorrect balances would be sorted out through
6	document, that's POL00198595. This is the December	16		transaction corrections."
17	advice, I think you were talking about, where, at	17		She then, over the page, please, sets out various
8	page 11, it addresses Seema Misra's case at the	18		other issues: difficulty with the helpline and various
9	bottom of the page, and scrolling down and a very	19		other hardware as well.
20	clear picture is painted there that there should be	20		Page 5, please, is your conclusion. If we scroll up
21	disclosure to Seema Misra.	21		to page 15, you say:
	Yeah.	22		" given the chronology and circumstances of the
23 Q .		23		guilty plea, and the reference in the Basis of Plea to
24	for having formed that view but is it now, on	24		the leading case on the topic of the charging of False
25	reflection, your view that, actually, in effect, your 137	25		Accounting, the Second Sight Interim Report and the 138
1	Helen Rose Report would not have been disclosable during	1		disclosure to people who had been convicted of criminal
1 2	Helen Rose Report would not have been disclosable during the currency of the prosecution and accordingly do not	1 2		disclosure to people who had been convicted of criminal offences?
			А.	
2	the currency of the prosecution and accordingly do not	2	Α.	offences?
2 3	the currency of the prosecution and accordingly do not now fall to be disclosed." Is that a conclusion that you stand by?	2 3	A.	offences? Yes, I think I suggested this morning that we probably
2 3 4 5 A .	the currency of the prosecution and accordingly do not now fall to be disclosed." Is that a conclusion that you stand by?	2 3 4	A.	offences? Yes, I think I suggested this morning that we probably got a bit case hardened, a bit cynical, and we shouldn't
2 3 4 5 A .	the currency of the prosecution and accordingly do not now fall to be disclosed." Is that a conclusion that you stand by? No. Why not?	2 3 4 5	Α.	offences? Yes, I think I suggested this morning that we probably got a bit case hardened, a bit cynical, and we shouldn't have done, and I think these are good examples of
2 3 4 5 A. 6 Q .	the currency of the prosecution and accordingly do not now fall to be disclosed." Is that a conclusion that you stand by? No. Why not?	2 3 4 5 6	A. Q.	Yes, I think I suggested this morning that we probably got a bit case hardened, a bit cynical, and we shouldn't have done, and I think these are good examples of that well, for my part. I don't speak for my
2 3 4 5 A. 6 Q. 7 A.	the currency of the prosecution and accordingly do not now fall to be disclosed." Is that a conclusion that you stand by? No. Why not? On the face of it, if you look at the case of <i>Eden</i> ,	2 3 4 5 6 7		offences? Yes, I think I suggested this morning that we probably got a bit case hardened, a bit cynical, and we shouldn't have done, and I think these are good examples of that well, for my part. I don't speak for my colleagues.
2 3 4 5 A . 6 Q . 7 A . 8	the currency of the prosecution and accordingly do not now fall to be disclosed." Is that a conclusion that you stand by? No. Why not? On the face of it, if you look at the case of <i>Eden</i> , which is the case that's being referred to here, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8		offences? Yes, I think I suggested this morning that we probably got a bit case hardened, a bit cynical, and we shouldn't have done, and I think these are good examples of that well, for my part. I don't speak for my colleagues. I'm going to turn now to the topic of mediation, and the
2 3 4 5 A. 6 Q. 7 A. 8 9	the currency of the prosecution and accordingly do not now fall to be disclosed." Is that a conclusion that you stand by? No. Why not? On the face of it, if you look at the case of <i>Eden</i> , which is the case that's being referred to here, and I paraphrase, the Court of Appeal talks about it being	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		offences? Yes, I think I suggested this morning that we probably got a bit case hardened, a bit cynical, and we shouldn't have done, and I think these are good examples of that well, for my part. I don't speak for my colleagues. I'm going to turn now to the topic of mediation, and the mediating of cases where convictions had occurred. Ca
2 3 4 5 A. 6 Q. 7 A. 8 9	the currency of the prosecution and accordingly do not now fall to be disclosed." Is that a conclusion that you stand by? No. Why not? On the face of it, if you look at the case of <i>Eden</i> , which is the case that's being referred to here, and I paraphrase, the Court of Appeal talks about it being culpable, if you like, to let's rewind slightly.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		offences? Yes, I think I suggested this morning that we probably got a bit case hardened, a bit cynical, and we shouldn't have done, and I think these are good examples of that well, for my part. I don't speak for my colleagues. I'm going to turn now to the topic of mediation, and the mediating of cases where convictions had occurred. Ca we please turn to POL00125222. This is an advice of
2 3 4 5 A. 6 Q. 7 A. 8 9 10	the currency of the prosecution and accordingly do not now fall to be disclosed." Is that a conclusion that you stand by? No. Why not? On the face of it, if you look at the case of <i>Eden</i> , which is the case that's being referred to here, and I paraphrase, the Court of Appeal talks about it being culpable, if you like, to let's rewind slightly. People will false account in order to explain	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11		offences? Yes, I think I suggested this morning that we probably got a bit case hardened, a bit cynical, and we shouldn't have done, and I think these are good examples of that well, for my part. I don't speak for my colleagues. I'm going to turn now to the topic of mediation, and the mediating of cases where convictions had occurred. Ca we please turn to POL00125222. This is an advice of 9 July 2014. So we're moving on now to the summer of
2 3 4 5 A. 6 Q. 7 A. 8 9 10 11	the currency of the prosecution and accordingly do not now fall to be disclosed." Is that a conclusion that you stand by? No. Why not? On the face of it, if you look at the case of <i>Eden</i> , which is the case that's being referred to here, and I paraphrase, the Court of Appeal talks about it being culpable, if you like, to let's rewind slightly. People will false account in order to explain losses. The case of <i>Eden</i> , deals with that proposition	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		offences? Yes, I think I suggested this morning that we probably got a bit case hardened, a bit cynical, and we shouldn't have done, and I think these are good examples of that well, for my part. I don't speak for my colleagues. I'm going to turn now to the topic of mediation, and the mediating of cases where convictions had occurred. Ca we please turn to POL00125222. This is an advice of 9 July 2014. So we're moving on now to the summer of 2014. You were asked to advise on the differentiation
2 3 4 5 A. 6 Q. 7 A. 8 9 10 11 12 13	the currency of the prosecution and accordingly do not now fall to be disclosed." Is that a conclusion that you stand by? No. Why not? On the face of it, if you look at the case of <i>Eden</i> , which is the case that's being referred to here, and I paraphrase, the Court of Appeal talks about it being culpable, if you like, to let's rewind slightly. People will false account in order to explain losses. The case of <i>Eden</i> , deals with that proposition by indicating that people who have done that will be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		offences? Yes, I think I suggested this morning that we probably got a bit case hardened, a bit cynical, and we shouldn't have done, and I think these are good examples of that well, for my part. I don't speak for my colleagues. I'm going to turn now to the topic of mediation, and the mediating of cases where convictions had occurred. Ca we please turn to POL00125222. This is an advice of 9 July 2014. So we're moving on now to the summer of 2014. You were asked to advise on the differentiation between a caution, guilty plea and a full trial verdict,
2 3 4 5 6 0 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the currency of the prosecution and accordingly do not now fall to be disclosed." Is that a conclusion that you stand by? No. Why not? On the face of it, if you look at the case of <i>Eden</i> , which is the case that's being referred to here, and I paraphrase, the Court of Appeal talks about it being culpable, if you like, to let's rewind slightly. People will false account in order to explain losses. The case of <i>Eden</i> , deals with that proposition by indicating that people who have done that will be guilty of the offence regardless, even if the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13		offences? Yes, I think I suggested this morning that we probably got a bit case hardened, a bit cynical, and we shouldn't have done, and I think these are good examples of that well, for my part. I don't speak for my colleagues. I'm going to turn now to the topic of mediation, and the mediating of cases where convictions had occurred. Ca we please turn to POL00125222. This is an advice of 9 July 2014. So we're moving on now to the summer of 2014. You were asked to advise on the differentiation between a caution, guilty plea and a full trial verdict, "appeal rights exhausted", and whether there is an impact on the risk level to the Post Office.
2 3 4 5 6 Q. 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 14 15	the currency of the prosecution and accordingly do not now fall to be disclosed." Is that a conclusion that you stand by? No. Why not? On the face of it, if you look at the case of <i>Eden</i> , which is the case that's being referred to here, and I paraphrase, the Court of Appeal talks about it being culpable, if you like, to let's rewind slightly. People will false account in order to explain losses. The case of <i>Eden</i> , deals with that proposition by indicating that people who have done that will be guilty of the offence regardless, even if the falsification is simply to put off the fateful day when	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15		offences? Yes, I think I suggested this morning that we probably got a bit case hardened, a bit cynical, and we shouldn't have done, and I think these are good examples of that well, for my part. I don't speak for my colleagues. I'm going to turn now to the topic of mediation, and the mediating of cases where convictions had occurred. Ca we please turn to POL00125222. This is an advice of 9 July 2014. So we're moving on now to the summer of 2014. You were asked to advise on the differentiation between a caution, guilty plea and a full trial verdict, "appeal rights exhausted", and whether there is an impact on the risk level to the Post Office.
2 3 4 5 6 0 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the currency of the prosecution and accordingly do not now fall to be disclosed." Is that a conclusion that you stand by? No. Why not? On the face of it, if you look at the case of <i>Eden</i> , which is the case that's being referred to here, and I paraphrase, the Court of Appeal talks about it being culpable, if you like, to let's rewind slightly. People will false account in order to explain losses. The case of <i>Eden</i> , deals with that proposition by indicating that people who have done that will be guilty of the offence regardless, even if the falsification is simply to put off the fateful day when they have to account for their actions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q.	offences? Yes, I think I suggested this morning that we probably got a bit case hardened, a bit cynical, and we shouldn't have done, and I think these are good examples of that well, for my part. I don't speak for my colleagues. I'm going to turn now to the topic of mediation, and the mediating of cases where convictions had occurred. Ca we please turn to POL00125222. This is an advice of 9 July 2014. So we're moving on now to the summer of 2014. You were asked to advise on the differentiation between a caution, guilty plea and a full trial verdict, "appeal rights exhausted", and whether there is an impact on the risk level to the Post Office. Can you assist us with why this advice was produce
2 3 4 5 6 0 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the currency of the prosecution and accordingly do not now fall to be disclosed." Is that a conclusion that you stand by? No. Why not? On the face of it, if you look at the case of <i>Eden</i> , which is the case that's being referred to here, and I paraphrase, the Court of Appeal talks about it being culpable, if you like, to let's rewind slightly. People will false account in order to explain losses. The case of <i>Eden</i> , deals with that proposition by indicating that people who have done that will be guilty of the offence regardless, even if the falsification is simply to put off the fateful day when they have to account for their actions. I think I was overly influenced by what the Court of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q.	offences? Yes, I think I suggested this morning that we probably got a bit case hardened, a bit cynical, and we shouldn't have done, and I think these are good examples of that well, for my part. I don't speak for my colleagues. I'm going to turn now to the topic of mediation, and the mediating of cases where convictions had occurred. Ca we please turn to POL00125222. This is an advice of 9 July 2014. So we're moving on now to the summer of 2014. You were asked to advise on the differentiation between a caution, guilty plea and a full trial verdict, "appeal rights exhausted", and whether there is an impact on the risk level to the Post Office. Can you assist us with why this advice was produce I think that Post Office wanted some help with the way
2 3 4 5 A. 6 Q. 7 A. 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the currency of the prosecution and accordingly do not now fall to be disclosed." Is that a conclusion that you stand by? No. Why not? On the face of it, if you look at the case of <i>Eden</i> , which is the case that's being referred to here, and I paraphrase, the Court of Appeal talks about it being culpable, if you like, to let's rewind slightly. People will false account in order to explain losses. The case of <i>Eden</i> , deals with that proposition by indicating that people who have done that will be guilty of the offence regardless, even if the falsification is simply to put off the fateful day when they have to account for their actions. I think I was overly influenced by what the Court of Appeal said in that case, without paying enough	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q.	offences? Yes, I think I suggested this morning that we probably got a bit case hardened, a bit cynical, and we shouldn't have done, and I think these are good examples of that well, for my part. I don't speak for my colleagues. I'm going to turn now to the topic of mediation, and the mediating of cases where convictions had occurred. Ca we please turn to POL00125222. This is an advice of 9 July 2014. So we're moving on now to the summer of 2014. You were asked to advise on the differentiation between a caution, guilty plea and a full trial verdict, "appeal rights exhausted", and whether there is an impact on the risk level to the Post Office. Can you assist us with why this advice was produce I think that Post Office wanted some help with the way in which the courts, the process, approaches these
2 3 4 5 6 7 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the currency of the prosecution and accordingly do not now fall to be disclosed." Is that a conclusion that you stand by? No. Why not? On the face of it, if you look at the case of <i>Eden</i> , which is the case that's being referred to here, and I paraphrase, the Court of Appeal talks about it being culpable, if you like, to let's rewind slightly. People will false account in order to explain losses. The case of <i>Eden</i> , deals with that proposition by indicating that people who have done that will be guilty of the offence regardless, even if the falsification is simply to put off the fateful day when they have to account for their actions. I think I was overly influenced by what the Court of Appeal said in that case, without paying enough attention to the reasons behind the pleas themselves,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q.	offences? Yes, I think I suggested this morning that we probably got a bit case hardened, a bit cynical, and we shouldn't have done, and I think these are good examples of that well, for my part. I don't speak for my colleagues. I'm going to turn now to the topic of mediation, and the mediating of cases where convictions had occurred. Ca we please turn to POL00125222. This is an advice of 9 July 2014. So we're moving on now to the summer of 2014. You were asked to advise on the differentiation between a caution, guilty plea and a full trial verdict, "appeal rights exhausted", and whether there is an impact on the risk level to the Post Office. Can you assist us with why this advice was produced I think that Post Office wanted some help with the way in which the courts, the process, approaches these individual issues. I think there was a deficit of
2 3 4 5 A. 6 Q. 7 A. 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the currency of the prosecution and accordingly do not now fall to be disclosed." Is that a conclusion that you stand by? No. Why not? On the face of it, if you look at the case of <i>Eden</i> , which is the case that's being referred to here, and I paraphrase, the Court of Appeal talks about it being culpable, if you like, to let's rewind slightly. People will false account in order to explain losses. The case of <i>Eden</i> , deals with that proposition by indicating that people who have done that will be guilty of the offence regardless, even if the falsification is simply to put off the fateful day when they have to account for their actions. I think I was overly influenced by what the Court of Appeal said in that case, without paying enough attention to the reasons behind the pleas themselves, and the reason behind the pleas themselves were patent:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q.	offences? Yes, I think I suggested this morning that we probably got a bit case hardened, a bit cynical, and we shouldn't have done, and I think these are good examples of that well, for my part. I don't speak for my colleagues. I'm going to turn now to the topic of mediation, and the mediating of cases where convictions had occurred. Ca we please turn to POL00125222. This is an advice of 9 July 2014. So we're moving on now to the summer of 2014. You were asked to advise on the differentiation between a caution, guilty plea and a full trial verdict, "appeal rights exhausted", and whether there is an impact on the risk level to the Post Office. Can you assist us with why this advice was produce. I think that Post Office wanted some help with the way in which the courts, the process, approaches these individual issues. I think there was a deficit of knowledge in criminal procedure in Post Office and in
2 3 4 5 A. 6 Q. 7 A. 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the currency of the prosecution and accordingly do not now fall to be disclosed." Is that a conclusion that you stand by? No. Why not? On the face of it, if you look at the case of <i>Eden</i> , which is the case that's being referred to here, and I paraphrase, the Court of Appeal talks about it being culpable, if you like, to let's rewind slightly. People will false account in order to explain losses. The case of <i>Eden</i> , deals with that proposition by indicating that people who have done that will be guilty of the offence regardless, even if the falsification is simply to put off the fateful day when they have to account for their actions. I think I was overly influenced by what the Court of Appeal said in that case, without paying enough attention to the reasons behind the pleas themselves, and the reason behind the pleas themselves were patent: Ms Hutchings didn't know why the errors were occurring	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q.	offences? Yes, I think I suggested this morning that we probably got a bit case hardened, a bit cynical, and we shouldn't have done, and I think these are good examples of that well, for my part. I don't speak for my colleagues. I'm going to turn now to the topic of mediation, and the mediating of cases where convictions had occurred. Ca we please turn to POL00125222. This is an advice of 9 July 2014. So we're moving on now to the summer of 2014. You were asked to advise on the differentiation between a caution, guilty plea and a full trial verdict, "appeal rights exhausted", and whether there is an impact on the risk level to the Post Office. Can you assist us with why this advice was produce I think that Post Office wanted some help with the way in which the courts, the process, approaches these individual issues. I think there was a deficit of knowledge in criminal procedure in Post Office and in the Mediation Scheme and they wanted to understand h
2 3 4 5 A. 6 Q. 7 A. 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the currency of the prosecution and accordingly do not now fall to be disclosed." Is that a conclusion that you stand by? No. Why not? On the face of it, if you look at the case of <i>Eden</i> , which is the case that's being referred to here, and I paraphrase, the Court of Appeal talks about it being culpable, if you like, to let's rewind slightly. People will false account in order to explain losses. The case of <i>Eden</i> , deals with that proposition by indicating that people who have done that will be guilty of the offence regardless, even if the falsification is simply to put off the fateful day when they have to account for their actions. I think I was overly influenced by what the Court of Appeal said in that case, without paying enough attention to the reasons behind the pleas themselves, and the reason behind the pleas themselves were patent: Ms Hutchings didn't know why the errors were occurring but was seeking to as it's describes in <i>Eden</i> put off the fateful day.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q.	offences? Yes, I think I suggested this morning that we probably got a bit case hardened, a bit cynical, and we shouldn't have done, and I think these are good examples of that well, for my part. I don't speak for my colleagues. I'm going to turn now to the topic of mediation, and the mediating of cases where convictions had occurred. Ca we please turn to POL00125222. This is an advice of 9 July 2014. So we're moving on now to the summer of 2014. You were asked to advise on the differentiation between a caution, guilty plea and a full trial verdict, "appeal rights exhausted", and whether there is an impact on the risk level to the Post Office. Can you assist us with why this advice was produced I think that Post Office wanted some help with the way in which the courts, the process, approaches these individual issues. I think there was a deficit of knowledge in criminal procedure in Post Office and in the Mediation Scheme and they wanted to understand he things worked.

1		"Given that no applicant has thus far sought to
2		obtain permission to appeal from the Court of Appeal, it
3		may properly be inferred that none will do so save in
4		the event that some new circumstances arises which
5		alters the position. The request by some applicants
6		that [the Post Office] assists in this process is
7		an example of where, if [the Post Office] were to accede
8		to such a request, such a change could result in
9		an appeal.
10		"Of more concern in the context of appeals launched
11		off the back of the Mediation Scheme, is the potential
12		for inadvertently placing a different gloss or
13		interpretation on facts, or otherwise saying anything
14		which may be said to be inconsistent with the way in
15		which the case most originally prosecuted. There, the
16		risk to [the Post Office] is substantial a concession
17		for instance that a Horizon shortage was or may have
18		been the result of human error, could fatally undermine
19		the original basis for the prosecution and conviction.
20		Such a concession might well lead to an appeal."
21		"Thus in the context of the risk of mediating a case
22		if the [subpostmaster] has a caution or conviction, the
23		risk is twofold:
24		"i. Whilst no [subpostmaster] or clerk convicted of
25		an offence prosecuted by [the Post Office] has sought to 141
		141
1		can mediate with somebody whom you have caused to be
2		convicted and sentenced for a criminal offence. To do
3		so would undermine the very proposition that you had
4		properly prosecuted and caused them to be convicted in
5		
		the first place. The proper place for a complaint
6		against the conviction and sentence was the Court of
7		against the conviction and sentence was the Court of Appeal and I very strongly felt that, by allowing people
7 8		against the conviction and sentence was the Court of Appeal and I very strongly felt that, by allowing people who had been convicted into the Mediation Scheme, was
7 8 9		against the conviction and sentence was the Court of Appeal and I very strongly felt that, by allowing people who had been convicted into the Mediation Scheme, was trespassing upon the territory that was properly the
7 8 9 10		against the conviction and sentence was the Court of Appeal and I very strongly felt that, by allowing people who had been convicted into the Mediation Scheme, was trespassing upon the territory that was properly the Court of Appeal's.
7 8 9 10 11	Q.	against the conviction and sentence was the Court of Appeal and I very strongly felt that, by allowing people who had been convicted into the Mediation Scheme, was trespassing upon the territory that was properly the Court of Appeal's. The way that it's phrased though, in this advice and
7 8 9 10 11 12	Q.	against the conviction and sentence was the Court of Appeal and I very strongly felt that, by allowing people who had been convicted into the Mediation Scheme, was trespassing upon the territory that was properly the Court of Appeal's. The way that it's phrased though, in this advice and future advices, relates to giving potential appellants
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q.	against the conviction and sentence was the Court of Appeal and I very strongly felt that, by allowing people who had been convicted into the Mediation Scheme, was trespassing upon the territory that was properly the Court of Appeal's. The way that it's phrased though, in this advice and future advices, relates to giving potential appellants the material upon which they can found their appeal.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		against the conviction and sentence was the Court of Appeal and I very strongly felt that, by allowing people who had been convicted into the Mediation Scheme, was trespassing upon the territory that was properly the Court of Appeal's. The way that it's phrased though, in this advice and future advices, relates to giving potential appellants the material upon which they can found their appeal. How is that improper?
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A.	against the conviction and sentence was the Court of Appeal and I very strongly felt that, by allowing people who had been convicted into the Mediation Scheme, was trespassing upon the territory that was properly the Court of Appeal's. The way that it's phrased though, in this advice and future advices, relates to giving potential appellants the material upon which they can found their appeal. How is that improper? Because the disclosure process that we were operating
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	А.	against the conviction and sentence was the Court of Appeal and I very strongly felt that, by allowing people who had been convicted into the Mediation Scheme, was trespassing upon the territory that was properly the Court of Appeal's. The way that it's phrased though, in this advice and future advices, relates to giving potential appellants the material upon which they can found their appeal. How is that improper? Because the disclosure process that we were operating was intended to deal with that problem.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17		against the conviction and sentence was the Court of Appeal and I very strongly felt that, by allowing people who had been convicted into the Mediation Scheme, was trespassing upon the territory that was properly the Court of Appeal's. The way that it's phrased though, in this advice and future advices, relates to giving potential appellants the material upon which they can found their appeal. How is that improper? Because the disclosure process that we were operating was intended to deal with that problem. The concern that you've raised here, though, is wider
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	А.	against the conviction and sentence was the Court of Appeal and I very strongly felt that, by allowing people who had been convicted into the Mediation Scheme, was trespassing upon the territory that was properly the Court of Appeal's. The way that it's phrased though, in this advice and future advices, relates to giving potential appellants the material upon which they can found their appeal. How is that improper? Because the disclosure process that we were operating was intended to deal with that problem. The concern that you've raised here, though, is wider than just disclosure of, say, the Gareth Jenkins, the
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	А.	against the conviction and sentence was the Court of Appeal and I very strongly felt that, by allowing people who had been convicted into the Mediation Scheme, was trespassing upon the territory that was properly the Court of Appeal's. The way that it's phrased though, in this advice and future advices, relates to giving potential appellants the material upon which they can found their appeal. How is that improper? Because the disclosure process that we were operating was intended to deal with that problem. The concern that you've raised here, though, is wider than just disclosure of, say, the Gareth Jenkins, the Second Sight Report or the Helen Rose Report, which is
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	А.	against the conviction and sentence was the Court of Appeal and I very strongly felt that, by allowing people who had been convicted into the Mediation Scheme, was trespassing upon the territory that was properly the Court of Appeal's. The way that it's phrased though, in this advice and future advices, relates to giving potential appellants the material upon which they can found their appeal. How is that improper? Because the disclosure process that we were operating was intended to deal with that problem. The concern that you've raised here, though, is wider than just disclosure of, say, the Gareth Jenkins, the Second Sight Report or the Helen Rose Report, which is what your review was looking at. It's simply
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	А.	against the conviction and sentence was the Court of Appeal and I very strongly felt that, by allowing people who had been convicted into the Mediation Scheme, was trespassing upon the territory that was properly the Court of Appeal's. The way that it's phrased though, in this advice and future advices, relates to giving potential appellants the material upon which they can found their appeal. How is that improper? Because the disclosure process that we were operating was intended to deal with that problem. The concern that you've raised here, though, is wider than just disclosure of, say, the Gareth Jenkins, the Second Sight Report or the Helen Rose Report, which is what your review was looking at. It's simply a concession that, for example, a shortage may have been
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	А.	against the conviction and sentence was the Court of Appeal and I very strongly felt that, by allowing people who had been convicted into the Mediation Scheme, was trespassing upon the territory that was properly the Court of Appeal's. The way that it's phrased though, in this advice and future advices, relates to giving potential appellants the material upon which they can found their appeal. How is that improper? Because the disclosure process that we were operating was intended to deal with that problem. The concern that you've raised here, though, is wider than just disclosure of, say, the Gareth Jenkins, the Second Sight Report or the Helen Rose Report, which is what your review was looking at. It's simply a concession that, for example, a shortage may have been the result of human error. So it's small pieces of
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	А.	against the conviction and sentence was the Court of Appeal and I very strongly felt that, by allowing people who had been convicted into the Mediation Scheme, was trespassing upon the territory that was properly the Court of Appeal's. The way that it's phrased though, in this advice and future advices, relates to giving potential appellants the material upon which they can found their appeal. How is that improper? Because the disclosure process that we were operating was intended to deal with that problem. The concern that you've raised here, though, is wider than just disclosure of, say, the Gareth Jenkins, the Second Sight Report or the Helen Rose Report, which is what your review was looking at. It's simply a concession that, for example, a shortage may have been the result of human error. So it's small pieces of information is your concern, going to potential
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	А.	against the conviction and sentence was the Court of Appeal and I very strongly felt that, by allowing people who had been convicted into the Mediation Scheme, was trespassing upon the territory that was properly the Court of Appeal's. The way that it's phrased though, in this advice and future advices, relates to giving potential appellants the material upon which they can found their appeal. How is that improper? Because the disclosure process that we were operating was intended to deal with that problem. The concern that you've raised here, though, is wider than just disclosure of, say, the Gareth Jenkins, the Second Sight Report or the Helen Rose Report, which is what your review was looking at. It's simply a concession that, for example, a shortage may have been the result of human error. So it's small pieces of

1		lodge an appeal mediating a case has, off the
2		back of the scheme, already appealed and lost,
3		a [subpostmaster] may receive material on which he might
4		base a further appeal.
5		"ii. An applicant [subpostmaster] who has not
6		sought to appeal against his conviction may nevertheless
7		do so in circumstances where he received material upon
8		which he could found proper grounds of appeal.
9		"We judge the risk to the Post Office of the former
10		as being minimal, if non-existent. We judge the risk to
11		[the Post Office] of the latter occurring as being
12		substantial, and only mitigated by very careful
13		consideration of [the Post Office] Mediation Responses
14		prior to publication to the Working Group or the
15		applicant."
16		Reflecting on what is said there and we'll come
17		to look at more of your advice in respect of the
18		Mediation Scheme do you think that it was right to
19		caution against mediation that would provide people with
20		material upon which they could found proper grounds of
21		appeal?
22	Α.	I was fundamentally opposed to the proposition that
23		those who had been convicted of criminal offences ought
24		to be allowed into the Mediation Scheme. My view has
25		always been, and remains: I cannot understand how you 142
		142
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1	A.	I think it goes beyond that. The very proposition that
2	A.	you are mediating with the a convicted postmaster can be
2 3	A.	you are mediating with the a convicted postmaster can be taken to the Court of Appeal as a ground of appeal, was
2 3 4		you are mediating with the a convicted postmaster can be taken to the Court of Appeal as a ground of appeal, was the concern I had.
2 3 4 5	A. Q.	you are mediating with the a convicted postmaster can be taken to the Court of Appeal as a ground of appeal, was the concern I had. Looking back at it now, do you still hold that view or
2 3 4 5 6	Q.	you are mediating with the a convicted postmaster can be taken to the Court of Appeal as a ground of appeal, was the concern I had. Looking back at it now, do you still hold that view or do you think that was unduly restrictive?
2 3 4 5 6 7		you are mediating with the a convicted postmaster can be taken to the Court of Appeal as a ground of appeal, was the concern I had. Looking back at it now, do you still hold that view or do you think that was unduly restrictive? Two answers: my view now about trespassing on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q.	you are mediating with the a convicted postmaster can be taken to the Court of Appeal as a ground of appeal, was the concern I had. Looking back at it now, do you still hold that view or do you think that was unduly restrictive? Two answers: my view now about trespassing on the territory of the Court of Appeal remains. I'm a bit
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	you are mediating with the a convicted postmaster can be taken to the Court of Appeal as a ground of appeal, was the concern I had. Looking back at it now, do you still hold that view or do you think that was unduly restrictive? Two answers: my view now about trespassing on the territory of the Court of Appeal remains. I'm a bit straight line like that, as I think I suggested earlier.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	you are mediating with the a convicted postmaster can be taken to the Court of Appeal as a ground of appeal, was the concern I had. Looking back at it now, do you still hold that view or do you think that was unduly restrictive? Two answers: my view now about trespassing on the territory of the Court of Appeal remains. I'm a bit straight line like that, as I think I suggested earlier. But I agree that what I formulated here is too
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q.	you are mediating with the a convicted postmaster can be taken to the Court of Appeal as a ground of appeal, was the concern I had. Looking back at it now, do you still hold that view or do you think that was unduly restrictive? Two answers: my view now about trespassing on the territory of the Court of Appeal remains. I'm a bit straight line like that, as I think I suggested earlier. But I agree that what I formulated here is too restrictive but it all encapsulates the very basis of my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q.	you are mediating with the a convicted postmaster can be taken to the Court of Appeal as a ground of appeal, was the concern I had. Looking back at it now, do you still hold that view or do you think that was unduly restrictive? Two answers: my view now about trespassing on the territory of the Court of Appeal remains. I'm a bit straight line like that, as I think I suggested earlier. But I agree that what I formulated here is too restrictive but it all encapsulates the very basis of my opposition to mediating with those who had been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q.	you are mediating with the a convicted postmaster can be taken to the Court of Appeal as a ground of appeal, was the concern I had. Looking back at it now, do you still hold that view or do you think that was unduly restrictive? Two answers: my view now about trespassing on the territory of the Court of Appeal remains. I'm a bit straight line like that, as I think I suggested earlier. But I agree that what I formulated here is too restrictive but it all encapsulates the very basis of my opposition to mediating with those who had been convicted in the first place.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q.	you are mediating with the a convicted postmaster can be taken to the Court of Appeal as a ground of appeal, was the concern I had. Looking back at it now, do you still hold that view or do you think that was unduly restrictive? Two answers: my view now about trespassing on the territory of the Court of Appeal remains. I'm a bit straight line like that, as I think I suggested earlier. But I agree that what I formulated here is too restrictive but it all encapsulates the very basis of my opposition to mediating with those who had been convicted in the first place. I just thought it was well, there were two things
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q.	you are mediating with the a convicted postmaster can be taken to the Court of Appeal as a ground of appeal, was the concern I had. Looking back at it now, do you still hold that view or do you think that was unduly restrictive? Two answers: my view now about trespassing on the territory of the Court of Appeal remains. I'm a bit straight line like that, as I think I suggested earlier. But I agree that what I formulated here is too restrictive but it all encapsulates the very basis of my opposition to mediating with those who had been convicted in the first place. I just thought it was well, there were two things I thought: the first was I thought it was the wrong way
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q.	you are mediating with the a convicted postmaster can be taken to the Court of Appeal as a ground of appeal, was the concern I had. Looking back at it now, do you still hold that view or do you think that was unduly restrictive? Two answers: my view now about trespassing on the territory of the Court of Appeal remains. I'm a bit straight line like that, as I think I suggested earlier. But I agree that what I formulated here is too restrictive but it all encapsulates the very basis of my opposition to mediating with those who had been convicted in the first place. I just thought it was well, there were two things I thought: the first was I thought it was the wrong way round; and the second and this is why I was opposed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q.	you are mediating with the a convicted postmaster can be taken to the Court of Appeal as a ground of appeal, was the concern I had. Looking back at it now, do you still hold that view or do you think that was unduly restrictive? Two answers: my view now about trespassing on the territory of the Court of Appeal remains. I'm a bit straight line like that, as I think I suggested earlier. But I agree that what I formulated here is too restrictive but it all encapsulates the very basis of my opposition to mediating with those who had been convicted in the first place. I just thought it was well, there were two things I thought: the first was I thought it was the wrong way round; and the second and this is why I was opposed to the Mediation Scheme, in general, as far as those who
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q.	you are mediating with the a convicted postmaster can be taken to the Court of Appeal as a ground of appeal, was the concern I had. Looking back at it now, do you still hold that view or do you think that was unduly restrictive? Two answers: my view now about trespassing on the territory of the Court of Appeal remains. I'm a bit straight line like that, as I think I suggested earlier. But I agree that what I formulated here is too restrictive but it all encapsulates the very basis of my opposition to mediating with those who had been convicted in the first place. I just thought it was well, there were two things I thought: the first was I thought it was the wrong way round; and the second and this is why I was opposed to the Mediation Scheme, in general, as far as those who were convicted is because I saw it as a way of Post
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q.	you are mediating with the a convicted postmaster can be taken to the Court of Appeal as a ground of appeal, was the concern I had. Looking back at it now, do you still hold that view or do you think that was unduly restrictive? Two answers: my view now about trespassing on the territory of the Court of Appeal remains. I'm a bit straight line like that, as I think I suggested earlier. But I agree that what I formulated here is too restrictive but it all encapsulates the very basis of my opposition to mediating with those who had been convicted in the first place. I just thought it was well, there were two things I thought: the first was I thought it was the wrong way round; and the second and this is why I was opposed to the Mediation Scheme, in general, as far as those who were convicted is because I saw it as a way of Post Office keeping them quiet, and I thought that was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A.	you are mediating with the a convicted postmaster can be taken to the Court of Appeal as a ground of appeal, was the concern I had. Looking back at it now, do you still hold that view or do you think that was unduly restrictive? Two answers: my view now about trespassing on the territory of the Court of Appeal remains. I'm a bit straight line like that, as I think I suggested earlier. But I agree that what I formulated here is too restrictive but it all encapsulates the very basis of my opposition to mediating with those who had been convicted in the first place. I just thought it was well, there were two things I thought: the first was I thought it was the wrong way round; and the second and this is why I was opposed to the Mediation Scheme, in general, as far as those who were convicted is because I saw it as a way of Post Office keeping them quiet, and I thought that was improper as well.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q.	you are mediating with the a convicted postmaster can be taken to the Court of Appeal as a ground of appeal, was the concern I had. Looking back at it now, do you still hold that view or do you think that was unduly restrictive? Two answers: my view now about trespassing on the territory of the Court of Appeal remains. I'm a bit straight line like that, as I think I suggested earlier. But I agree that what I formulated here is too restrictive but it all encapsulates the very basis of my opposition to mediating with those who had been convicted in the first place. I just thought it was well, there were two things I thought: the first was I thought it was the wrong way round; and the second and this is why I was opposed to the Mediation Scheme, in general, as far as those who were convicted is because I saw it as a way of Post Office keeping them quiet, and I thought that was improper as well. Can we please turn to WBON0000870. I'm taking you to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A.	you are mediating with the a convicted postmaster can be taken to the Court of Appeal as a ground of appeal, was the concern I had. Looking back at it now, do you still hold that view or do you think that was unduly restrictive? Two answers: my view now about trespassing on the territory of the Court of Appeal remains. I'm a bit straight line like that, as I think I suggested earlier. But I agree that what I formulated here is too restrictive but it all encapsulates the very basis of my opposition to mediating with those who had been convicted in the first place. I just thought it was well, there were two things I thought: the first was I thought it was the wrong way round; and the second and this is why I was opposed to the Mediation Scheme, in general, as far as those who were convicted is because I saw it as a way of Post Office keeping them quiet, and I thought that was improper as well. Can we please turn to WBON0000870. I'm taking you to this version just because there was a redaction to, for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A.	you are mediating with the a convicted postmaster can be taken to the Court of Appeal as a ground of appeal, was the concern I had. Looking back at it now, do you still hold that view or do you think that was unduly restrictive? Two answers: my view now about trespassing on the territory of the Court of Appeal remains. I'm a bit straight line like that, as I think I suggested earlier. But I agree that what I formulated here is too restrictive but it all encapsulates the very basis of my opposition to mediating with those who had been convicted in the first place. I just thought it was well, there were two things I thought: the first was I thought it was the wrong way round; and the second and this is why I was opposed to the Mediation Scheme, in general, as far as those who were convicted is because I saw it as a way of Post Office keeping them quiet, and I thought that was improper as well. Can we please turn to WBON0000870. I'm taking you to this version just because there was a redaction to, for the purpose of the transcript, POL00148710, although
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A.	you are mediating with the a convicted postmaster can be taken to the Court of Appeal as a ground of appeal, was the concern I had. Looking back at it now, do you still hold that view or do you think that was unduly restrictive? Two answers: my view now about trespassing on the territory of the Court of Appeal remains. I'm a bit straight line like that, as I think I suggested earlier. But I agree that what I formulated here is too restrictive but it all encapsulates the very basis of my opposition to mediating with those who had been convicted in the first place. I just thought it was well, there were two things I thought: the first was I thought it was the wrong way round; and the second and this is why I was opposed to the Mediation Scheme, in general, as far as those who were convicted is because I saw it as a way of Post Office keeping them quiet, and I thought that was improper as well. Can we please turn to WBON0000870. I'm taking you to this version just because there was a redaction to, for the purpose of the transcript, POL00148710, although I believe that redaction may now be lifted.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A.	you are mediating with the a convicted postmaster can be taken to the Court of Appeal as a ground of appeal, was the concern I had. Looking back at it now, do you still hold that view or do you think that was unduly restrictive? Two answers: my view now about trespassing on the territory of the Court of Appeal remains. I'm a bit straight line like that, as I think I suggested earlier. But I agree that what I formulated here is too restrictive but it all encapsulates the very basis of my opposition to mediating with those who had been convicted in the first place. I just thought it was well, there were two things I thought: the first was I thought it was the wrong way round; and the second and this is why I was opposed to the Mediation Scheme, in general, as far as those who were convicted is because I saw it as a way of Post Office keeping them quiet, and I thought that was improper as well. Can we please turn to WBON0000870. I'm taking you to this version just because there was a redaction to, for the purpose of the transcript, POL00148710, although

1		the bottom of page yes. If we could scroll down	1		the v
2		slightly, thank you. There's an email from Martin Smith	2		
3		to Andrew Parsons:	3		Worl
4		"Please find attached the Advice of Simon Clarke	4		med
5		which contains speaking notes as requested."	5		
6		Can you recall what the purpose of the speaking	6		
7		notes was?	7		goin
8	Α.	I think it was set out in the earlier email. Wasn't it	8		for S
9		because there was a going to be a meeting of the Working	9		need
10		Group and somebody wanted a shorthand way of describing	10		a me
11		what I was saying in my advice? I am slightly	11		your
12		speculating but I think that's what the idea of the	12		
13		speaking note. So I did the advice in full and then	13		Hoop
14		I think at the end I gave some bullet points as to how	14		favo
15		to encapsulate these in short form.	15	Α.	l dor
16	Q.	If we scroll up, please, we then have an email from	16		favo
17		Andrew Parsons to Mr Smith, and he says, as follows, he	17	Q.	Wes
18		says:	18		That
19		"At the Working Group meeting last Thursday, the	19		advio
20		Post Office floated the idea of not mediating criminal	20	Α.	l thin
21		cases (as per your advice) and received fierce pushback	21	Q.	so
22		from the Justice for Subpostmasters Alliance and some	22	Α.	I thin
23		resistance from Tony Hooper. For various reasons we	23	Q.	Ther
24		never directly addressed the questions of mediating [two	24		Offe
25		named cases] those questions are likely to be raised on	25		-
		145			
1		of a criminal offence committed against the Post Office	1		are r
2		should be allowed into the Scheme, for to mediate such	2		
3		applications will be to leave [the Post Office] open to	3		an o
4		a number of alarming consequences. These consequences	4		Post
5		include, but are not limited to	5		cauti
6		"The fact of entry into the scheme indicates	6		to ar
7		that [the Post Office] is at least prepared to concede	7		
8		that they may have erred.	8		
9		"Similarly, the fact that one such applicant has	9		
10		been allowed to enter into the scheme sets	10		[app
11		an unfortunate precedent"	11		Hone
12		Then we have iii, it says as follows, I'm going to	12		feel
13		read to you the final sentence in iii. It says:	13		
14		"Hear the risk to POL is substantial a concession	14		likely
15		for instance that a Horizon shortage was or may have	15		of pu
16		been the result of human error would certainly undermine	16		
17		the original basis for a prosecution and conviction	17		crimi
18		founded upon the reliable and integrity of Horizon,	18		pote
19		perhaps fatally."	19		med
20		That's an expansion of the point	20		wher
21	Α.	Yes.	21		[the
22	Q.	that we were previously looking at.	22		- ,
23		Then if we scroll down to iv, you say:	23		at iii
24		"The very process of mediating gives rise to the	24		exer
24					
25		possibility that [it] may yield results the risks	25		com

1		the weekly Working Group call on Thursday.
2		"The Post Office would prefer to avoid leaving the
3		Working Group with a 'yes/no' decision on whether to
4		mediate a criminal case or not."
5		He says further down, he says:
6		"Please bear in mind that [the Post Office] are
7		going to get pushed hard on this topic by the Justice
8		for Subpostmasters Alliance/Tony Hooper so your advice
9		needs to be very robust. We may need to set up
10		a meeting/call with you and Post Office so they can test
11		your thinking."
12		So you were aware at this stage that Sir Anthony
13		Hooper, former Court of Appeal judge, was strongly in
14		favour of mediating cases?
15	Α.	I don't know about strongly in favour. I knew he was in
16		favour of it, yes.
17	Q.	We see then another advice, the second advice, 15 July.
18		That's POL00148720. What was the purpose of this second
19		advice? Was this to set out in more detail
20	Α.	I think.
21	Q.	so the information you had already set out?
22	Α.	I think so, yes.
23	Q.	There's a section, if we scroll down, "Criminal
24		Offenders and Mediation":
25		"It is our considered view that no applicant guilty
		146
1		are manifest:
1 2		are manifest: "i. Any competent lawyer would advise that such
2		"i. Any competent lawyer would advise that such
2 3		"i. Any competent lawyer would advise that such an outcome represented a substantial concession by [the
2 3 4		"i. Any competent lawyer would advise that such an outcome represented a substantial concession by [the Post Office] to the effect that the conviction or
2 3 4 5		"i. Any competent lawyer would advise that such an outcome represented a substantial concession by [the Post Office] to the effect that the conviction or caution was 'unsafe'. Such advice would inevitably lead
2 3 4 5 6		"i. Any competent lawyer would advise that such an outcome represented a substantial concession by [the Post Office] to the effect that the conviction or caution was 'unsafe'. Such advice would inevitably lead to an appeal.
2 3 4 5 6 7		 "i. Any competent lawyer would advise that such an outcome represented a substantial concession by [the Post Office] to the effect that the conviction or caution was 'unsafe'. Such advice would inevitably lead to an appeal. "ii. The setting of a precedent"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8		 "i. Any competent lawyer would advise that such an outcome represented a substantial concession by [the Post Office] to the effect that the conviction or caution was 'unsafe'. Such advice would inevitably lead to an appeal. "ii. The setting of a precedent" If we scroll down:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		 "i. Any competent lawyer would advise that such an outcome represented a substantial concession by [the Post Office] to the effect that the conviction or caution was 'unsafe'. Such advice would inevitably lead to an appeal. "ii. The setting of a precedent" If we scroll down: "iii. The message sent by the mediation of such
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		 "i. Any competent lawyer would advise that such an outcome represented a substantial concession by [the Post Office] to the effect that the conviction or caution was 'unsafe'. Such advice would inevitably lead to an appeal. "ii. The setting of a precedent" If we scroll down: "iii. The message sent by the mediation of such [applicants] will, in our view, never be a positive one.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11		 "i. Any competent lawyer would advise that such an outcome represented a substantial concession by [the Post Office] to the effect that the conviction or caution was 'unsafe'. Such advice would inevitably lead to an appeal. "ii. The setting of a precedent" If we scroll down: "iii. The message sent by the mediation of such [applicants] will, in our view, never be a positive one. Honest [postmasters], staff agents and employees may
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		 "i. Any competent lawyer would advise that such an outcome represented a substantial concession by [the Post Office] to the effect that the conviction or caution was 'unsafe'. Such advice would inevitably lead to an appeal. "ii. The setting of a precedent" If we scroll down: "iii. The message sent by the mediation of such [applicants] will, in our view, never be a positive one. Honest [postmasters], staff agents and employees may feel undermined and devalued."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		 "i. Any competent lawyer would advise that such an outcome represented a substantial concession by [the Post Office] to the effect that the conviction or caution was 'unsafe'. Such advice would inevitably lead to an appeal. "ii. The setting of a precedent" If we scroll down: "iii. The message sent by the mediation of such [applicants] will, in our view, never be a positive one. Honest [postmasters], staff agents and employees may feel undermined and devalued." Then you offer further potential and, in your view,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		 "i. Any competent lawyer would advise that such an outcome represented a substantial concession by [the Post Office] to the effect that the conviction or caution was 'unsafe'. Such advice would inevitably lead to an appeal. "ii. The setting of a precedent" If we scroll down: "iii. The message sent by the mediation of such [applicants] will, in our view, never be a positive one. Honest [postmasters], staff agents and employees may feel undermined and devalued." Then you offer further potential and, in your view, likely, side effects. This is where we get to the issue
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15		 "i. Any competent lawyer would advise that such an outcome represented a substantial concession by [the Post Office] to the effect that the conviction or caution was 'unsafe'. Such advice would inevitably lead to an appeal. "ii. The setting of a precedent" If we scroll down: "iii. The message sent by the mediation of such [applicants] will, in our view, never be a positive one. Honest [postmasters], staff agents and employees may feel undermined and devalued." Then you offer further potential and, in your view, likely, side effects. This is where we get to the issue of publicity, and you say as follows, you say:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16		 "i. Any competent lawyer would advise that such an outcome represented a substantial concession by [the Post Office] to the effect that the conviction or caution was 'unsafe'. Such advice would inevitably lead to an appeal. "ii. The setting of a precedent" If we scroll down: "iii. The message sent by the mediation of such [applicants] will, in our view, never be a positive one. Honest [postmasters], staff agents and employees may feel undermined and devalued." Then you offer further potential and, in your view, likely, side effects. This is where we get to the issue of publicity, and you say as follows, you say: "Whilst the issue is strictly outside of our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17		 "i. Any competent lawyer would advise that such an outcome represented a substantial concession by [the Post Office] to the effect that the conviction or caution was 'unsafe'. Such advice would inevitably lead to an appeal. "ii. The setting of a precedent" If we scroll down: "iii. The message sent by the mediation of such [applicants] will, in our view, never be a positive one. Honest [postmasters], staff agents and employees may feel undermined and devalued." Then you offer further potential and, in your view, likely, side effects. This is where we get to the issue of publicity, and you say as follows, you say: "Whilst the issue is strictly outside of our criminal purview, we feel bound to point out the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18		 "i. Any competent lawyer would advise that such an outcome represented a substantial concession by [the Post Office] to the effect that the conviction or caution was 'unsafe'. Such advice would inevitably lead to an appeal. "ii. The setting of a precedent" If we scroll down: "iii. The message sent by the mediation of such [applicants] will, in our view, never be a positive one. Honest [postmasters], staff agents and employees may feel undermined and devalued." Then you offer further potential and, in your view, likely, side effects. This is where we get to the issue of publicity, and you say as follows, you say: "Whilst the issue is strictly outside of our criminal purview, we feel bound to point out the potential for adverse publicity, generated by the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18		 "i. Any competent lawyer would advise that such an outcome represented a substantial concession by [the Post Office] to the effect that the conviction or caution was 'unsafe'. Such advice would inevitably lead to an appeal. "ii. The setting of a precedent" If we scroll down: "iii. The message sent by the mediation of such [applicants] will, in our view, never be a positive one. Honest [postmasters], staff agents and employees may feel undermined and devalued." Then you offer further potential and, in your view, likely, side effects. This is where we get to the issue of publicity, and you say as follows, you say: "Whilst the issue is strictly outside of our criminal purview, we feel bound to point out the potential for adverse publicity, generated by the mediating of criminal applications and particularly
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20		 "i. Any competent lawyer would advise that such an outcome represented a substantial concession by [the Post Office] to the effect that the conviction or caution was 'unsafe'. Such advice would inevitably lead to an appeal. "ii. The setting of a precedent" If we scroll down: "iii. The message sent by the mediation of such [applicants] will, in our view, never be a positive one. Honest [postmasters], staff agents and employees may feel undermined and devalued." Then you offer further potential and, in your view, likely, side effects. This is where we get to the issue of publicity, and you say as follows, you say: "Whilst the issue is strictly outside of our criminal purview, we feel bound to point out the potential for adverse publicity, generated by the mediating of criminal applications and particularly where some concession, agreement or payment is made by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21		 "i. Any competent lawyer would advise that such an outcome represented a substantial concession by [the Post Office] to the effect that the conviction or caution was 'unsafe'. Such advice would inevitably lead to an appeal. "ii. The setting of a precedent" If we scroll down: "iii. The message sent by the mediation of such [applicants] will, in our view, never be a positive one. Honest [postmasters], staff agents and employees may feel undermined and devalued." Then you offer further potential and, in your view, likely, side effects. This is where we get to the issue of publicity, and you say as follows, you say: "Whilst the issue is strictly outside of our criminal purview, we feel bound to point out the potential for adverse publicity, generated by the mediating of criminal applications and particularly where some concession, agreement or payment is made by [the Post Office], is inestimable."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22		 "i. Any competent lawyer would advise that such an outcome represented a substantial concession by [the Post Office] to the effect that the conviction or caution was 'unsafe'. Such advice would inevitably lead to an appeal. "ii. The setting of a precedent" If we scroll down: "iii. The message sent by the mediation of such [applicants] will, in our view, never be a positive one. Honest [postmasters], staff agents and employees may feel undermined and devalued." Then you offer further potential and, in your view, likely, side effects. This is where we get to the issue of publicity, and you say as follows, you say: "Whilst the issue is strictly outside of our criminal purview, we feel bound to point out the potential for adverse publicity, generated by the mediating of criminal applications and particularly where some concession, agreement or payment is made by [the Post Office], is inestimable."

compensation for incarceration, loss of reputation, loss

(37) Pages 145 - 148

The Post Office Horizon IT Inquiry

1		of income and assets, and for general loss."	1	
2		Looking back at those four topics, do you think that	2	Α.
3		they were appropriately contained within your advice?	3	Q.
4	Α.	These represent my fundamental opposition to those	4	
5		convicted of criminal offences being entertained in the	5	Α.
6		Mediation Scheme at all. But, yes, I agree with the	6	Q.
7		proposition you advance. They're not really proper	7	
8		considerations, are they?	8	Α.
9	Q.	Because if, for example, in respect of publicity, if	9	
10		somebody has properly been given information that allows	10	
11		them to appeal and others find out about it, there's no	11	
12		problem with that, is there?	12	Q.
13	Α.	No. No. I think my concern my more valid concern	13	
14		was the fundamental one that I've already expressed,	14	
15		which goes, if you mediate with somebody with whom	15	
16		you've been involved in convicting and sentencing, you	16	
17		are immediately saying to them: "We haven't done our job	17	
18		properly and you should go to the Court of Appeal". And	18	
19		my view has always been that is the venue for such	19	
20	_	a complaint.	20	
21	Q.	That is a risk that is identified in this advice.	21	
22	Α.	Yes.	22	
23	Q.	But do you agree or accept that, in fact, if you look at	23	
24		this advice in the round, there are number of other	24	
25		factors that you've highlighted and relied upon that are 149	25	
1		Mr Parsons?	1	
2	Α.	I don't recall it but it seems likely.	2	
3	Q.	Why is that? Were you here justifying a position that	3	
4		Bond Dickinson had taken?	4	
5	Α.	Well, can you move it up a bit to see what I said?	5	
6	Q.	Yes. Perhaps we can see it side by side with WBON	6	Q.
7	Α.	No, no, forgive me. This particular document, can I see	7	
8		paragraph 8, please?	8	
9	Q.	Yes, absolutely.	9	
10	Α.	Yeah.	10	
11	Q.	It's phrased in the terms of "We are of the view of X,	11	
12		Y, Z", but, in fact, it also seems to have been the view	12	
13		of Mr Parsons, prior to this being written. Are you in	13	
14		some way selling a combined approach that avoids	14	
15		mediation with those who had been convicted?	15	
16	Α.	No, I'm setting out at paragraph 7 the proposal that	16	
17		appears in the Bond Dickinson email, and, in paragraph 8	17	
18		I'm saying it should not happen. I was and remain	18	
19		"horrified" is the wrong word, but I did not like the	19	
20		proposition that went "We should have discussions of any	20	
21		sort with those who had been convicted by Post Office of	21	
22		criminal offences", because (a) it gave those persons	22	
23		false hope as to what may or may not be the outcome of	23	
24				
24		those discussions, but (b) it goes back to my central	24	

- not proper --
- **A.** Yeah, I think went too far. Yes, I agree with that.
- Q. Could we please look at page 4. You say you went toofar; why did you go so far?
- A. That's difficult to assess this far down the line.
- **Q.** Was there a concern within your firm that, in fact, you had been involved in the prosecution of subpostmasters?
- A. No. I think it was more to do with the concern within
- Post Office that they were keen to avoid adverse
- 0 publicity. And I suppose, to a degree, therefore, we
- 1 and I are pandering to that concern here.
- **Q.** There's then an alternative approach set out in
- 13 paragraph 7, and it says:
 - "It is suggested that rather than mediate
 - applications for criminal applicants, an alternative
- 6 process be adopted. That proposed process consists of
- 17 the holding of face-to-face meeting with the criminal
- 18 applicant so as to permit [the Post Office] to both
- 9 frame a different agenda and to 'explain POL's findings'
- rather than to 'settle' a dispute, in circumstances
- where it is made clear that no compromise is being
 offered."
- Those exact words are contained in the email from
- Mr Parsons that I took you to before. Do you recall
- 25 copying the alternative approach that was suggested by 150

1		Court of Appeal and for Post Office to pretend to
2		discuss potential remedies for people who had been
3		convicted without those remedies coming from the Court
4		of Appeal, was frankly dishonest. I felt and feel that
5		this was an attempt by Post Office to keep people quiet.
6	Q.	Thank you. I'm going to take you to a couple of emails
7		of 8 October 2014. Can we start with POL00349361,
8		please. It's the bottom email. You say to Jarnail
9		Singh:
10		"I suggest that strenuous efforts are made to
11		dissuade Sir Anthony Hooper from exercising his casting
12		vote in favour of permitting any criminal applicant into
13		the Mediation Scheme, particularly where the issue is
14		' whether the [Post Office] would agree to support
15		an application for permission to appeal that
16		conviction'. If not:
17		"Many of the remaining 37 criminal Applicants will
18		seek a similar concession, no doubt spurred on by
19		[Second Sight].
20		"If an appeal succeeds: Horizon's reputation would
21		be fatally damaged; a further disclosure exercise would
22		be required; and further appeals would be launched
23		including some of those 300+ criminal convictions we
24		have reviewed.
25		"Whilst [the Post Office] could refuse to mediate

1		this issue, the publicity generate by [Second Sight]
2		would be unfortunate."
3		Do you think those concerns were appropriate?
4	Α.	This is me again saying to Post Office "You should not
5		include convicted postmasters in the Mediation Scheme".
6	Q.	Taking, for example, number 2, "Horizon's reputation
7		being damaged, further disclosure exercise, further
8		appeals", they in themselves would not have been a bad
9		thing, would they
10	Α.	No.
11	Q.	if they were based on
12	Α.	Sorry, I'm talking over you.
13	Q.	If they were based on new disclosures being made, that
14		wouldn't be a bad thing?
15	Α.	No, item number 2 is a statement of fact. If you went
16	_	down this path, this is likely what would happen.
17	Q.	But it's part of your reasoning why strenuous efforts to
18		should be made to dissuade Sir Anthony Hooper?
19	Α.	It's part of my efforts to stop them from doing that
20	_	which I thought they ought not to do.
21	Q.	Do you think, looking back at number 2, those were
22		appropriate
00	Α.	No.
23	-	considerations to have had?
24	Q.	considerations to have had?
	-	No.
24	Q.	
24 25	Q. A.	No. 153
24 25 1	Q.	No. 153 Yes. Because I'm seeking to dissuade them from
24 25 1 2	Q. A.	No. 153 Yes. Because I'm seeking to dissuade them from following that path and this is one of the tools with
24 25 1 2 3	Q. A.	No. 153 Yes. Because I'm seeking to dissuade them from following that path and this is one of the tools with which I sought to dissuade them. I accept, it's not
24 25 1 2 3 4	Q. A.	No. 153 Yes. Because I'm seeking to dissuade them from following that path and this is one of the tools with which I sought to dissuade them. I accept, it's not a proper consideration in the decision as to whether or
24 25 1 2 3 4 5	Q. A.	No. 153 Yes. Because I'm seeking to dissuade them from following that path and this is one of the tools with which I sought to dissuade them. I accept, it's not a proper consideration in the decision as to whether or not to mediate. My concern was that those convicted of
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6	Q. A.	No. 153 Yes. Because I'm seeking to dissuade them from following that path and this is one of the tools with which I sought to dissuade them. I accept, it's not a proper consideration in the decision as to whether or not to mediate. My concern was that those convicted of criminal offences ought not to be in the Mediation
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A.	No. 153 Yes. Because I'm seeking to dissuade them from following that path and this is one of the tools with which I sought to dissuade them. I accept, it's not a proper consideration in the decision as to whether or not to mediate. My concern was that those convicted of criminal offences ought not to be in the Mediation Scheme at all, and this is a further effort on my part
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A.	No. 153 Yes. Because I'm seeking to dissuade them from following that path and this is one of the tools with which I sought to dissuade them. I accept, it's not a proper consideration in the decision as to whether or not to mediate. My concern was that those convicted of criminal offences ought not to be in the Mediation Scheme at all, and this is a further effort on my part to prevent that happening and, in that context,
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A.	No. 153 Yes. Because I'm seeking to dissuade them from following that path and this is one of the tools with which I sought to dissuade them. I accept, it's not a proper consideration in the decision as to whether or not to mediate. My concern was that those convicted of criminal offences ought not to be in the Mediation Scheme at all, and this is a further effort on my part to prevent that happening and, in that context, I thought it was an appropriate tool. This is what will
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A.	No. 153 Yes. Because I'm seeking to dissuade them from following that path and this is one of the tools with which I sought to dissuade them. I accept, it's not a proper consideration in the decision as to whether or not to mediate. My concern was that those convicted of criminal offences ought not to be in the Mediation Scheme at all, and this is a further effort on my part to prevent that happening and, in that context, I thought it was an appropriate tool. This is what will happen if you don't follow my advice.
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A.	No. 153 Yes. Because I'm seeking to dissuade them from following that path and this is one of the tools with which I sought to dissuade them. I accept, it's not a proper consideration in the decision as to whether or not to mediate. My concern was that those convicted of criminal offences ought not to be in the Mediation Scheme at all, and this is a further effort on my part to prevent that happening and, in that context, I thought it was an appropriate tool. This is what will happen if you don't follow my advice. We do see, and we've seen from some very early documents
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A.	No. 153 Yes. Because I'm seeking to dissuade them from following that path and this is one of the tools with which I sought to dissuade them. I accept, it's not a proper consideration in the decision as to whether or not to mediate. My concern was that those convicted of criminal offences ought not to be in the Mediation Scheme at all, and this is a further effort on my part to prevent that happening and, in that context, I thought it was an appropriate tool. This is what will happen if you don't follow my advice. We do see, and we've seen from some very early documents that I've taken you today, the repetition of concerns
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A.	No. 153 Yes. Because I'm seeking to dissuade them from following that path and this is one of the tools with which I sought to dissuade them. I accept, it's not a proper consideration in the decision as to whether or not to mediate. My concern was that those convicted of criminal offences ought not to be in the Mediation Scheme at all, and this is a further effort on my part to prevent that happening and, in that context, I thought it was an appropriate tool. This is what will happen if you don't follow my advice. We do see, and we've seen from some very early documents
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. A. Q.	No. 153 Yes. Because I'm seeking to dissuade them from following that path and this is one of the tools with which I sought to dissuade them. I accept, it's not a proper consideration in the decision as to whether or not to mediate. My concern was that those convicted of criminal offences ought not to be in the Mediation Scheme at all, and this is a further effort on my part to prevent that happening and, in that context, I thought it was an appropriate tool. This is what will happen if you don't follow my advice. We do see, and we've seen from some very early documents that I've taken you today, the repetition of concerns about the press, concerns about Yeah.
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. A.	No. 153 Yes. Because I'm seeking to dissuade them from following that path and this is one of the tools with which I sought to dissuade them. I accept, it's not a proper consideration in the decision as to whether or not to mediate. My concern was that those convicted of criminal offences ought not to be in the Mediation Scheme at all, and this is a further effort on my part to prevent that happening and, in that context, I thought it was an appropriate tool. This is what will happen if you don't follow my advice. We do see, and we've seen from some very early documents that I've taken you today, the repetition of concerns about the press, concerns about Yeah. about publicity, we have that public interest
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. A. Q.	No. 153 Yes. Because I'm seeking to dissuade them from following that path and this is one of the tools with which I sought to dissuade them. I accept, it's not a proper consideration in the decision as to whether or not to mediate. My concern was that those convicted of criminal offences ought not to be in the Mediation Scheme at all, and this is a further effort on my part to prevent that happening and, in that context, I thought it was an appropriate tool. This is what will happen if you don't follow my advice. We do see, and we've seen from some very early documents that I've taken you today, the repetition of concerns about the press, concerns about Yeah.
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. A. Q.	No. 153 Yes. Because I'm seeking to dissuade them from following that path and this is one of the tools with which I sought to dissuade them. I accept, it's not a proper consideration in the decision as to whether or not to mediate. My concern was that those convicted of criminal offences ought not to be in the Mediation Scheme at all, and this is a further effort on my part to prevent that happening and, in that context, I thought it was an appropriate tool. This is what will happen if you don't follow my advice. We do see, and we've seen from some very early documents that I've taken you today, the repetition of concerns about the press, concerns about Yeah. - about publicity, we have that public interest immunity hearing, avoiding press reported on issues that
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. A. Q.	No. 153 Yes. Because I'm seeking to dissuade them from following that path and this is one of the tools with which I sought to dissuade them. I accept, it's not a proper consideration in the decision as to whether or not to mediate. My concern was that those convicted of criminal offences ought not to be in the Mediation Scheme at all, and this is a further effort on my part to prevent that happening and, in that context, I thought it was an appropriate tool. This is what will happen if you don't follow my advice. We do see, and we've seen from some very early documents that I've taken you today, the repetition of concerns about the press, concerns about Yeah. - about publicity, we have that public interest immunity hearing, avoiding press reported on issues that were then arising. Do you think you were unduly or
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. Q.	No. 153 Yes. Because I'm seeking to dissuade them from following that path and this is one of the tools with which I sought to dissuade them. I accept, it's not a proper consideration in the decision as to whether or not to mediate. My concern was that those convicted of criminal offences ought not to be in the Mediation Scheme at all, and this is a further effort on my part to prevent that happening and, in that context, I thought it was an appropriate tool. This is what will happen if you don't follow my advice. We do see, and we've seen from some very early documents that I've taken you today, the repetition of concerns about the press, concerns about Yeah. - about publicity, we have that public interest immunity hearing, avoiding press reported on issues that were then arising. Do you think you were unduly or overly concerned about press intrusion?
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. Q.	No. 153 Yes. Because I'm seeking to dissuade them from following that path and this is one of the tools with which I sought to dissuade them. I accept, it's not a proper consideration in the decision as to whether or not to mediate. My concern was that those convicted of criminal offences ought not to be in the Mediation Scheme at all, and this is a further effort on my part to prevent that happening and, in that context, I thought it was an appropriate tool. This is what will happen if you don't follow my advice. We do see, and we've seen from some very early documents that I've taken you today, the repetition of concerns about the press, concerns about Yeah. - about publicity, we have that public interest immunity hearing, avoiding press reported on issues that were then arising. Do you think you were unduly or overly concerned about press intrusion? I think the PII hearing goes into a separate category
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. Q.	No. 153 Yes. Because I'm seeking to dissuade them from following that path and this is one of the tools with which I sought to dissuade them. I accept, it's not a proper consideration in the decision as to whether or not to mediate. My concern was that those convicted of criminal offences ought not to be in the Mediation Scheme at all, and this is a further effort on my part to prevent that happening and, in that context, I thought it was an appropriate tool. This is what will happen if you don't follow my advice. We do see, and we've seen from some very early documents that I've taken you today, the repetition of concerns about the press, concerns about Yeah. - about publicity, we have that public interest immunity hearing, avoiding press reported on issues that were then arising. Do you think you were unduly or overly concerned about press intrusion? I think the PII hearing goes into a separate category but, putting that to one side, all of the rest of it, it
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 21 3 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. Q.	No. 153 Yes. Because I'm seeking to dissuade them from following that path and this is one of the tools with which I sought to dissuade them. I accept, it's not a proper consideration in the decision as to whether or not to mediate. My concern was that those convicted of criminal offences ought not to be in the Mediation Scheme at all, and this is a further effort on my part to prevent that happening and, in that context, I thought it was an appropriate tool. This is what will happen if you don't follow my advice. We do see, and we've seen from some very early documents that I've taken you today, the repetition of concerns about the press, concerns about Yeah. - about publicity, we have that public interest immunity hearing, avoiding press reported on issues that were then arising. Do you think you were unduly or overly concerned about press intrusion? I think the PII hearing goes into a separate category but, putting that to one side, all of the rest of it, it was made very clear to us by Post Office that that was
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. Q.	No. 153 Yes. Because I'm seeking to dissuade them from following that path and this is one of the tools with which I sought to dissuade them. I accept, it's not a proper consideration in the decision as to whether or not to mediate. My concern was that those convicted of criminal offences ought not to be in the Mediation Scheme at all, and this is a further effort on my part to prevent that happening and, in that context, I thought it was an appropriate tool. This is what will happen if you don't follow my advice. We do see, and we've seen from some very early documents that I've taken you today, the repetition of concerns about the press, concerns about Yeah. - about publicity, we have that public interest immunity hearing, avoiding press reported on issues that were then arising. Do you think you were unduly or overly concerned about press intrusion? I think the PII hearing goes into a separate category but, putting that to one side, all of the rest of it, it was made very clear to us by Post Office that that was a major concern of theirs and I've used the word
24 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A.	No. 153 Yes. Because I'm seeking to dissuade them from following that path and this is one of the tools with which I sought to dissuade them. I accept, it's not a proper consideration in the decision as to whether or not to mediate. My concern was that those convicted of criminal offences ought not to be in the Mediation Scheme at all, and this is a further effort on my part to prevent that happening and, in that context, I thought it was an appropriate tool. This is what will happen if you don't follow my advice. We do see, and we've seen from some very early documents that I've taken you today, the repetition of concerns about the press, concerns about Yeah. - about publicity, we have that public interest immunity hearing, avoiding press reported on issues that were then arising. Do you think you were unduly or overly concerned about press intrusion? I think the PII hearing goes into a separate category but, putting that to one side, all of the rest of it, it was made very clear to us by Post Office that that was a major concern of theirs and I've used the word "pandering" and I don't resile from that.

n IT	n IT Inquiry		
	•		
1	Q.	No? We then see at POL00349378, I think Mr Singh has	
2		asked you to email again on, if we scroll down, we can	
3		see the same issues, same day. Do you recall, it's	
4		a later email, I think despite the time stamp here	
5		showing 12.34, it is, in fact, a later email to the one	
6		we've just been seeing. Might you have been asked to	
7		send one that could be forwarded on, for example?	
8	Α.	It's likely.	
9	Q.	We see there very similar points being made.	
10	Α.	Yes.	
11	Q.	If we scroll down, please. If we have a look at, for	
12		example, 2(iv), it says:	
13		"The Court of Appeal sits in open hearing and the	
14		press are permitted to attend and report upon	
15		proceedings. Given media interest thus far it is	
16		inevitable that a (largely hostile) press would attend	
17		and report widely on the proceedings."	
18		Do you think that was an appropriate consideration?	
19	Α.	It's a statement of fact as to what would happen. It's	
20		not a proper consideration. But it's a statement of	
21		fact as to what I thought would happen.	
22	Q.	Is it proper you to have advised the Post Office that	
23	-	an implication of conducting mediation with those who	
24		are convicted is that there could be effectively bad	
25		press?	
20		154	
1		Singh.	
2	Q.	Could we please turn to POL00150390. This a draft	
3		letter to Sir Anthony Hooper, 19 December 2014. You	
4		say:	
5		"We are asked to suggest the text of a letter to	
6		Sir Anthony Hooper"	
7		Halfway down 2, please. Halfway down, there's just	
8		a sentence there that I'd like a little bit of clarity	
9		on, you say:	
10		"For Sir Anthony to suggest that, because an offence	
11		of false accounting could have been founded upon	
12		a pre-existing but unidentified Horizon fault such that	
13		culpability of the offender is reduced because there may	
14		be no real loss, takes matters no further and indeed	
15		misses the point."	
16		Can you assist us with what you meant there?	
17	Α.	It is parroting or paraphrasing what was said in <i>Eden</i> ,	
18		wasn't it?	
19	Q.	Can you expand on that, slightly?	
20	Q. A.	Going back to the authority of <i>Eden</i> , about false	
20	<i>.</i>	accounting to hide unexplained loss, thereby putting off	
22		the fateful day is still false accounting, is	

23 essentially what Eden says, and I'm paraphrasing that 24 here.

25 **Q.** If we scroll down, it's paragraph 4 that has the 156

Over the page, please, to the penultimate paragraph

1		proposed wording. I'm just going to take you to a few	1		
2		paragraphs from this. The second paragraph down ends as	2		c
3		follows, it says:	3		t
4		" I would point out that in every case the	4		
5		available evidence has been considered and nothing has	5		t
6		been identified which could be said to render the	6		p
7		conviction unsafe."	7		c
8		"We are concerned that by permitting the hearing of	8		r
9		one convicted applicant's case, we may be setting	9		s
10		a precedent which others would wish to follow, where	10		l
11		necessarily they could not. This is particularly true	11		a
12		of those charged with fraud as opposed to false	12		c
13		accounting in many cases the facts were similar, cash	13		e
14		was being declared as on the premises when it was not.	14		
15		"We are further troubled by the possible	15		
16		implications which may arise once an applicant has had	16		r
17		his or her their hearing. We consider that there	17		a
18		emerges a clear potential for the launching of appeal	18		[
19		proceedings in circumstances where there should be none.	19		٧
20		The suggestion that the identification of some fault or	20		r
21		root cause in the Horizon system in order to determine	21		a
22		liability for an underlying loss might permit a mediated	22		k
23		settlement with those convicted of false accounting	23		c
24		outside of, or exclusive from, the criminal legal	24		a
25		process is in our view plainly misconceived." 157	25		
1		to a former Court of Appeal judge. Why did you consider	1		
2		your view to have been better than Sir Anthony Hooper's?	2		۷
3	Α.	We're all lawyers. We're all entitled to take contrary	3		0
4		views.	4		r
5	Q.	I'm going to read to you the final paragraph on this	5	Α.	I
6		page. You refer there to an alternative process and	6		C
7		then, if we scroll down at the very end, you say, or you	7		ł
8		propose saying, sorry, at the top of page 5 you're	8		t
9		commending an alternative approach as:	9	Q.	I
10		" the best method of achieving a just and	10		۷
11		equitable outcome for all concerned, without engendering	11	Α.	I
12		any false hope and the launching of misconceived	12	Q.	-
13		appeals."	13	Α.	I
14		Are you aware that the Post Office considered this	14	Q.	I
15		to be too strongly worded?	15		I
16	Α.	I didn't know that.	16		f
17	Q.	Could we please look at POL00150493, at the bottom of	17		
18		page 1. This is an internal Post Office email and it	18		t
19		says, as follows:	19		1
20		"Earlier in the week Chris asked me to draft him	20		
21		a letter to Tony Hooper fulfilling the request to look	21		C
22		again at Post Office's approach to mediating criminal	22		[
23		cases. We had a draft from [Cartwright King] that	23		
24		contained some helpful material but tone was not ideal	24		t
25		"	25	Α.	٢
		159			

on page 3. You then point to substantial constraints, that's halfway down this paragraph, to the process: " "... both by reason of the ages of some cases and the consequent limited available of information and papers. Further complications arise because of number of applications contain, at best, significant misrepresentations as to law and asserted fact, and in some cases, manifest lies. Finally on this point, the logistics and expenditure required to complete such an exercise would not be inconsiderable and clearly outweigh any possible benefit, which we do not in any event consider there to be." Finally, this paragraph: "In terms of likely appeals arising out of the mediation settlement, we are of the firm view that such an exercise would be an exercise in futility, for as you [are] aware, the Court of Appeal are concerned only with whether, upon all the evidence presented, a conviction may be safe. Evidence of a guilty plea, tendered by a defendant with the benefit of legal advice and in full knowledge of the consequences, would be clear evidence of guilt notwithstanding that there may have been an unidentified Horizon fault." These are all very strong words proposed in a letter 158 I mean, it doesn't say that it was too strongly worded, I suppose, but were you aware that the Post Office took a different view to you on the concerns raised in your letter? I am now because I was taken to this in -- during the disclosure process of these proceedings but I certainly hadn't seen that before. Forgive me, the short answer to your question is: no, I had no idea. I think it's fair to say from your evidence today you very much stand by your view on --I do. -- mediation? I do, yes. I'm going to take you to two very brief topics before I finish and then we will take a break before questions from Core Participants. The first is stopping prosecutions. Can we please turn to POL00114253. This is advice from you of 12 September 2013, and it starts: "We have been provided with a copy of Bond Dickinson's helpful note entitled 'Civil claims by [subpostmasters]' ..." You're commenting on that note. Do you recall what that note was about? Not at this stage but this will help.

160

(40) Pages 157 - 160

1	Q.	If we scroll down, "Cases terminated", you say as
2		follows:
3		"To clarify, whilst a number of criminal
4		prosecutions against subpostmasters and clerks have been
5		terminated since the publication of the Second Sight
6		Interim Report, none was stopped because of errors found
7		in the Horizon system. In all cases the prosecution was
8		stopped because it was considered that the continued
9		prosecution of a particular subpostmaster or clerk no
10		longer remained in the public interest."
11		Do you think that is accurate?
12	Α.	Yes.
13	Q.	Do you think it was also because of an evidential issue
14		with regards to being able to prove the reliability of
15		the Horizon system?
16	Α.	By and large, that is the reason why the prosecutions
17		were stopped. That's different from being stopped
18		because of errors. It's because Post Office were not
19		able to demonstrate the integrity of the system because
20		they didn't have an expert witness who was able to do so
21		and, therefore, it we took the view it was not in the
22		public interest to continue those prosecutions.
23	Q.	But is that a public interest issue or is that
24		an evidential issue?
25	Α.	I think it's both.
		161

161

1 mainly by Harry Bowyer, but I may have written one or

- 2 two, which in terms said, "This case has been sitting
- 3 around for too long because of our inability to find
- 4 an expert witness", which I can deal with separately,
- 5 I have some comments about that. But, because of our
- 6 inability and because it's therefore been sitting around
 7 too long, it ought to be stopped, because it's not in
- 8 the public interest to continue it.
- 9 Q. Very briefly, because we are running out of time, what
- was your view in terms of the failure to find an expertwitness? You've said you had some views.
- 12 A. Well, I thought we were strung along for that. My very
- 13 firm advice right at the beginning was "You find
- 14 an expert witness", post Office said to me "Identify
- 15 candidates". I identified candidates, I recommended
- 16 a particular organisation as being the most independent.
- 17 I think it was Imperial College professors,
- 18 I recommended. I advanced that recommendation to Post
- 19 Office, they -- I repeatedly said to Rodric Williams
- 20 "When are we going to hear? When are we going to hear?"
- 21 and it all came to naught, and I eventually heard on the
- 22 Grapevine that the reason it all came to naught was
- 23 because it was too expensive.

25

- 24 Q. Thank you. Very finally, theft and false accounting,
 - I probably don't need to take you to --

163

	···· , ··· , ··· , ··· , ··· , ··· , ··· , ···· , ··· , ··· , ··· , ··· , ··· , ···· , ·· , ·· , ··· , ··· , ··· , ··· , ··· , ··· , ··· , ··· , ··· , ··· , ··· , ··· , ··
Q.	Do you think here and elsewhere, it might have been sold
	internally as a public interest issue?
Α.	No, I'm not selling anything. My view was that this was
	a public interest issue. It is not in the public
	interest to prosecute people if you can't prove your
	systems were working properly.
Q.	You say here:
	"In all cases the prosecution was stopped because it
	was considered that the continued prosecution no
	longer remained in the public interest."
	It seems you're ignoring there the fact that, in
	fact, you couldn't prove the reliability of the Horizon

- 13 system?
- A. No, you have to remember that the prosecutions that werestopped were stopped after a review. They were stayed,
- 16 if you like. The investigations were pending. We
- 17 devised a system called the stacked case system and, if
- 18 I'm not mistaken, this is what we're referring to here.
- 19 And the problem with the stacked case process was that
- they remained incomplete for a period of time and therecomes a time. under the public interest test, where too
- comes a time, under the public interest test, where toolong has elapsed between the index offence, if you like,
- and whether or not it's appropriate to continue to
- 24 prosecute.

- And I know there were advices written, I think 162
- 1 A. No, you don't.
- 2 Q. -- the advice. I don't know if you're aware of 3 Sir Anthony Hooper's evidence on that issue, effectively 4 that your advice didn't reflect the real world. What do 5 you say about that? 6 A. I think in terms of pure black-letter law, I was 7 correct; I think in terms of real-world behaviour, he 8 was correct. I think that that people do see a plea of 9 guilty to false accounting as being a plea of guilty to 10 a lesser offence than one of theft. I accept that. My 11 advice was directed, because sometimes I think that way, 12 as a direct linear black line letter, both carry seven 13 years, they are both offences of dishonesty, they're 14 equal. But I think Sir Anthony was right on his 15 real-world take. 16 Q. There are those who watch this Inquiry who are 17 interested in legal ethics. 18 Α. Yes. 19 Looking back and reflecting on that, do you think it was Q. 20 part of your job to reflect also the real world as 21 opposed to the black-letter law? 22 A. Yeah, I think probably it was, yeah. 23 MR BLAKE: Thank you. 24 Sir, those are all of my questions. We do have
- 25 quite a few questions from Core Participants but perhaps 164

The Post Office Horizon IT Inquiry

 this is the moment to take our mids famemono brack. SIR WTN WILLAMS: Laff setup a plan before web (hough). How many questioners are there? SIR WTN WILLAMS: So, raiter brackly, what i do is not Suss Black WE setup. Suss Black WE setup. Suss Black Black Black Black WE from the MFSP who is going The WTN WILLAMS: So, raiter brackly, what i do is not Black WE setup. MF BLACK: Yes. SIR WTN WILLAMS: Right So what's the immon one? SIR WTN WILLAMS: Right So what's the immon? SIR WTN WILLAMS: Right So what's the i					
 How many questioners are here? SIR WTN WILLAMS: So, rather brackly, what i do is not MR BLAKE: Well, we have M K Maltom to represents to be very short. We then have Ms Allan, who represents so is think what i'm going to asy is that wall attain effectively represent the Social side of things. effectively represent the Social side of things. fit effectively represent the Social side of things. their questions in much shorter form. all ognit be relatively to fit. Then we have Ms Cliver, who has alightly more. and deal to be relatively to fit. and deal to be relatively to fit. Site WTN WILLAMS: Right. So what's the time non? Site WTN WILLAMS: Right. Woll, if were only having one the were that about the state again at a addid set ings. site WTN WILLAMS: Right. Woll, if were only having one fit and none and a quarter, or threeabouts. fit att would also hings easier? fit hat would also hings easier?	1			1	we are going significantly past 4.00.
4 MB LAKE: Well, where May Walt from the MSP who is going 4 make the witherase come back but makes the advocates ask 5 to be very shaft. We then have Ms Allan, who represents 5 the represents 5 the represents 5 the represents 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 <	2	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: Let's devise a plan before we do, though.	2	THE WITNESS: Okay.
5 Ib be very short. We then have Ms Allan, who represents 5 their questions in much shorter form. 6 Susan Binclair. Between them, they going to 6 So I think what I'm going to asy is that we'll start. 7 effectively represent the Souths side of things. 7 the process with hose advocates who intend to be five 8 We then have Mk Theny, Mr Stein, Mr Moloney, who are 8 minutes or riess, keeping strictly to that, and then, 9 and going to be relatively blief. 7 and did tup accordingly. So what's the time is left, 13 SRW TW MILLAMS: Right. Well, five only having one 13 3.5 and did tup accordingly. So what's the time now? 13 ISR WTM WILLAMS: Right. Well, five only having one 14 A short break) 15 and hour and a quarter, or thereabouts. 15 (3.5 pm) 18 RLAKE: New Moloney: 16 MR BLAKE: New MulLAMS: So or think with a list kit hat, all right? 14 A short break) 17 SIR WYM WILLAMS: So or think or the only the moles advocation the Moloney: 15 NB BLAKE: New MulLAMS: New MulLAMS: New MulLAMS: New MulLAMS: New MulLAMS: New MulLAMS:	3		How many questioners are there?	3	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So, rather brutally, what I do is not
6 Susan Sinclair. Between them, they're going to 6 So I think what I'm going to say is that we'll start 7 effectively represent the Socials allo of things. 7 the process with those advocates who intend to be five 8 We then have Mit Henry, Mi Xisun, Mi Mone, Mi Nore, 8 7 add deit tip accordingly. So we'll start add then, 9 all going to be relatively bird. 9 once they're finished, I will see who much time is left. 11 SIR WTW WILLIAMS: Right. So what's the time now? 11 3.15, and then we'll take it like adjain at adja	4	MR	BLAKE: Well, we have Ms Watt from the NFSP who is going	4	make the witness come back but make the advocates ask
7 effectively represent the Socialis acids of things. 7 the process with those advocates who intend to be five 8 We then have Mr Henry, Mr Stein, Mr Moloney, who are all origing to be relatively theft. 9 once they're finished, livil is see how much time is left. 10 Then we have Ms Oliver, who has slightly more. 10 and diel tup according. So well stat tagain at 11 Site VTM WILLIAMS: Right. So what's the time nov? 11 3.15, and then well take it like that, all right? 14 break it had better be 15 minutes, which gives us an hour and a quarter, or thereabouts. 16 (A short break) 15 MR BLAKE: So - 17 Sik WTM WILLIAMS: Right. 18 MK MoloceY. Mr Smith - sorry - 16 MR BLAKE: So - 19 MR MOLONEY: Mr Smith - sorry - 10 A first With WILLIAMS: Right. 17 Sik WTM WILLIAMS: Right. 10 A first With WILLIAMS: Right. 10 - Mr Clarke, Right. 18 WO NOLONEY 16 MR MOLONEY. Mr Smith - sorry - 10 A first were going to first hear from Mr Moloney. 19 If that sconvenine for or thores rabin than come back to common for or thores, rabin than come back to common. 10 A first were going to first hear from Mr Moloney.	5		to be very short. We then have Ms Allan, who represents	5	their questions in much shorter form.
8 We then have Mr Henry, Mr Stein, Mr Moloney, who are all going to be relatively brief. 9 minutes or less, keeping strictly to that, and then, once they by finished, i will see how much time is left, and deal tig accordingly. So well start again at 3.15, and hen well take it like that, all right? 11 INF WYN WILLIAMS: Sign WYN WILLIAMS: an hour ad quarter, or were noty having one break it had better be 15 minutes, which gives us and quarter, or horeabouts. 10 (A short break) 13 SiR WYN WILLIAMS: Break It had better be 15 minutes, which gives us and quarter, or horeabouts. 16 (A short break) 14 break It had better be 15 minutes, which gives us and quarter, or horeabouts. 16 (A short break) 15 an hour ad quarter, or horeabouts. 16 (A short break) 16 MR BLAKE: Alternatively, we can take two 10-minute breaks. 18 MR BLAKE: Thes, Short break MR NOLONEY 17 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So - 16 A fram Clarke, Right. 18 MR BLAKE: Internatively, we can take two 10-minute breaks. 18 Oussitioned by MR NOLONEY 19 If that would take things easier? 20 A. Iron M Clarke, Right. 20 21 that's convenient for others, rather than come back 21 Q. Iron Clarke, rather. That's a great start. The only matter ingoing to ask you about is the public interest immunity application on 1 with you spike to defence counsel to give antaffing at 9.45, start to wane, to put it mildy, once 185	6		Susan Sinclair. Between them, they're going to	6	So I think what I'm going to say is that we'll start
 all going to be relatively brief. Then we have Mo Oliver, who has slightly more. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right So what's the time now? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right So what's the time now? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right Well, f we're only having one MR BLAKE: Yes. MR BLAKE: Sir, we're going to first hear from Mr Moloney. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. MR BLAKE: Sir, we're going to first hear from Mr Moloney. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. MR BLAKE: Sir, we're going to first hear from Mr Moloney. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. MR BLAKE: Sir, we're going to first hear from Mr Moloney. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. MR BLAKE: Sir, we're going to first hear from Mr Moloney. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. MR BLAKE: Sir, we're going to first hear from Mr Moloney. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. MR BLAKE: Sir, we're going to first hear from Mr Moloney. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. MR BLAKE: Sir, we're going to first hear from Mr Moloney. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. MR BLAKE: Sir, we're going to first hear from Mr Moloney. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. MR BLAKE: Sir, we're going to first hear from Mr Moloney. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. MR BLAKE: Sir, we're going to first hear from Mr Moloney. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. MR BLAKE: Sir, we're going to first hear from Mr Moloney. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. MR BLAKE: Sir, we're going to first hear from Mr Moloney. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. MR BLAKE. Sir WYN WILLIAMS: Right. MR BLAKE. Sir WYN WILLIAMS: Right. MR BLAKE. Sir WYN WILLIAMS: Right. Sir WYN WILLIAMS: Right. MR BLAKE. Sir WYN WILLIAMS: Right. MR BLAKE. Sir WYN WILLIAMS: Right. Sir WYN WILLIAMS: Right. Sir WYN WILLIAMS: Right. Sir WYN WILLIAMS: Right. Sir WYN WILLIAMS: Right	7		effectively represent the Scottish side of things.	7	the process with those advocates who intend to be five
10 Ther we have Mo Oliver, who has slightly more. 10 and died it up accordings, So well start again at 11 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. So what's the time now? 11 3.15, and then well take it like that, all right? 13 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. Well, if we're only having one 13 (2.59 pm) 14 breakt thad better be 15 minutes, which gives us 14 (A short break) 15 an hour and a quarter, or thereabouts. 15 (3.15 pm) 16 MR BLAKE: Site we're going to first hear from Mr Moloney. 17 SIR WYN WILLAMS: So 17 SIR WYN WILLAMS: Right. 18 MR BLAKE: Alternatively, we can take two 10-minute breaks, 16 MR BLAKE: Site we're going to first hear from Mr Moloney. 19 if that would take things easier? 10 MR MOLONEY: Mr Smith – sorry – 20 21 THE WINNESS: Could i just say 1 don't mind running over, if 20 Mr Clarke, rather. Thate signt, the rule alter signt, the rule alter signt, we're signt site art again at a start ment we're signt site art again at a start ment we're signt site art again at a start ment we're signt site art again at a start ment we're site agrees start. The only matter may findig to ask you about is the public interest is site art again at a start ment we're signt site art again at a start ment we're signt site. 23 Sir	8		We then have Mr Henry, Mr Stein, Mr Moloney, who are	8	minutes or less, keeping strictly to that, and then,
11 Site WYW WILLIANS: Right: So what's the time now? 11 3.15, and then we'll take it like that, all right? 12 MR BEER: It's 3.00, or almost 3.00. 12 MR BELAKE: Thank you very much, sir. 13 Site WYW WILLIANS: Right: Well, five ere only having one to break thad better be 15 minutes, which gives us 14 (A short break) 14 an hour and a quarter, or threeabouts. 16 (A short break) 15 an hour and a quarter, or threeabouts. 16 MR BLAKE: Sir, we're going to first hear from Mr Moloney. 17 SiR WYN WILLIANS: Right: So - 17 SiR WYN WILLIANS: Right: So - 17 SiR WYN WILLIANS: Right: Charter, tarber 14 would take things easier? 19 MR BLAKE: New York 2000 to Mr MoloneY. 19 If that would take things easier? 19 MR MCARE. Then, rather. That's a great start. The only the tomorow. 20 THE WITNESS: Could I just say I don't mind running over, if the tom already said that my concentration levels. 24 0 Mr Clarke. 25 21 that's convenient for other, starther than come back tomorow. 25 POL00172804. First of all, in respect of this, you're tark that my concentration levels. 24 document I'm going to asky you to tok at its 22 satit dody that, you spoke to defence counsel to give not ithe mind run	9		all going to be relatively brief.	9	once they've finished, I will see how much time is left,
12 MR REFER: If's Journey Multiladys: Refer: Thank you very much, sir: 13 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right: Weil, if wa're only having one 13 (2.59 pm) 14 break it had better be 15 minutes, which gives us an hour and a quarter, or thereabouts. 13 (3.6 pm) 16 MR RLAKE: Alternatively, we can take two 10-minute breaks, with that would take things easier? 16 MR RLAKE: Alternatively, we can take two 10-minute breaks, would take things easier? 19 MR MOLONEY 17 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So - 17 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. 18 MR RLAKE: Alternatively, we can take two 10-minute breaks, would take things easier? 19 MR MOLONEY 19 If that would take things easier? 10 A. I'm Mr Clarke. 11 matter That's agreat start. The only matter more back 10 that's convenient for others, rather than come back 12 Q. I'm Going to ask you about its the public interest 13 starting at 945, start to wane, to put it midity, once 16 25 POL00172804. First of all, in respect of this, you've 165 14 said today that you spoke to defence counsel to give notice? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. May	10		Then we have Ms Oliver, who has slightly more.	10	and died it up accordingly. So we'll start again at
13 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. Well, if we're only having one break it had better be 15 minutes, which gives us the seak it had better be 15 minutes, which gives us the seak it had better be 15 minutes, which gives us the seak it had better be 15 minutes, which gives us the seak it had better be 15 minutes, which gives us the seak it had better be 15 minutes, which gives us the seak it had better be 15 minutes, which gives us the seak it had better be 15 minutes, which gives us the seak it had better be 15 minutes, which gives us the seak it had better be 15 minutes, which gives us the seak it had better be 15 minutes, seak it had better be 10 minute breaks, if that would take things easier? 16 MR BLAKE: Six, whe going to first hear from Mr Moloney. 17 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. So - 17 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. The only matter it moging to ask you about is the public interest tomorrow. 20 THE WITNESS: Could Livet say 1 don't mind running over, if that would take things easier? 20 A I'm Mr Clarke, rather. That's a great start. The only matter I'm going to ask you about is the public interest immunity application on 1 July 2013 and the only document I'm going to ask you about is the public interest 166 21 said today that you spoke to defence counsel to give notice? 1 Parliamentary privilege was the real basis for your 166 2 notice? 2 A Yes. 2 So, therefore, it was important to establish the origins and purpose of this report? 4 A I don't recall, to be honest. Usually, the response for a notice? 3 A Yes. 3 7	11	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: Right. So what's the time now?	11	3.15, and then we'll take it like that, all right?
14 break it had better be 15 minutes, which gives us 14 (A short break) 15 an hour and a quarter, or thereabouls. 15 (3.15 pm) 17 SRR WYN WILLIAMS: So - 17 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So - 18 MR BLAKE: Alternatively, we can take two 10-minute breaks, 18 Questioned by MR MOLONEY: 18 MR BLAKE: Sir, we're going to first hear from Mr Moloney. 18 20 THE WITNESS: Could Just say I don't mind running over, if 20 A. I'm Mr Clarke. 18 21 that's convenient for others, rather than come back 21 QMr Clarke, rather. That's a great start. The only 22 tomorrow. 22 immunity application on 1 July 2013 and the only 23 SR WYN WILLAMS: The sure that that's right, Mr Clarke, 23 immunity application on 1 July 2013 and the only 24 but thave already said that ny concentration levels, and the adready said that ny concentration levels, and any properties of this inportant to establish the origins any thing? 2 3 A Yeah. 3 A Yea. Yea. 4 Q. May I ask you what they said in response at all, if 4 Q. So, therefore, it was important to establish the origins any thing? 5 A Yeah.	12	MR	BEER: It's 3.00, or almost 3.00.	12	MR BLAKE: Thank you very much, sir.
15 an hour and a quarter, or thereabouts. 15 (3.15 pm) 16 MR BLAKE: Yss. 16 MR BLAKE: Yss. 16 MR BLAKE: Attematively, we can take two 10-minute breaks, 17 SIR WYN WILLAMS: So - 18 Questioned by MK MOLONEY 17 SIR WYN WILLAMS: So - 18 Questioned by MK MOLONEY 18 18 THE WITKESS: Could just say dort mind running over, if 14 A. I'm M Clarke. 21 21 THE WITKESS: Could just say dort mind running over, if 14 A. I'm M Clarke. 21 22 tomorrow. 22 matter 'm going to ask you about is the public interest 15 23 SIR WYN WILLAMS: I'm sure that that's right, Mr Clarke, 23 immunity application on 1 July 2013 and the only 24 but I have already said that my concentration levels, 24 document 'm going to ask you abouts at the public interest 25 starting at 9.4.5, start to wane, to put it mildly, once 165 7 POL00172804. First of all, in respect of this, you've 165 and purpose of this report? 6 A. Yes. 9 A lon't recall, to be honest. Usually, the response 6 A. Yes. 7 Questions. 166	13	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: Right. Well, if we're only having one	13	(2.59 pm)
16 MR BLAKE: Yes. 16 MR BLAKE: Sr, we're going to first hear from Mr Moloney. 17 Sir WYN MULLANS: So – 17 Sir WYN MULLANS: So – 18 MR BLAKE: Alternatively, we can take two 10-minute breaks. 19 If that would take things easier? 19 MR BLAKE: Sir, we're going to first hear from Mr Moloney. 19 if that would take things easier? 19 MR BLAKE: Sir, we're going to first hear from Mr Moloney. 20 THE WTINESS: Could I just say I don't mind running over, if 1 A T'm Mr Clarke. 19 21 that's convenient for others, rather than come back 21 A - T'm Mr Clarke. 23 23 SIR WYN WILLANS: I'm sure that that's right. Mr Clarke. 23 immunity application on 1 July 2013 and the only 24 but I have already said that my concentration levels. 24 document Tm going to ask you book at as 25 said today that you spoke to defence counsel to give notice? 1 Parliamentary privilege was the real basis for your 3 A. Yea. 3 A. Yea. 4 So, therefore, it was important to establish the origins anything? 5 anything? 5 and purpose of this report? 6 A. Yes. 6 <td>14</td> <td></td> <td>break it had better be 15 minutes, which gives us</td> <td>14</td> <td>(A short break)</td>	14		break it had better be 15 minutes, which gives us	14	(A short break)
17 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So - 17 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. 18 MR RLAKE: Alternatively, we can take two 10-minute breaks, 18 Questioned by MR MOLONEY 20 THE WITNESS: Could I just asy I don't mind running over, if 20 A Tim Mr Clarke, Internatively, we can take two 10-minute breaks, 21 THE WITNESS: Could I just asy I don't mind running over, if 20 A Tim Mr Clarke, 23 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm sure that that's right, Mr Clarke, 20 A Tim Mr Clarke, Item, That's a great start. The only 24 but I have already said that my concentration levels, 24 document I'm going to ask you about is the public interest 25 starting at 9.45, start wane, top ut it mildly, once 165 PolLo0172804. First of all, In respect of this, you've 26 a Neyh, 3 A Yes. 2 application? 3 A Yes. 2 saft doday that you spoke to defence counsel to give 1 Parliamentary privilege was the real basis for your 3 A Yes. 3 A Yes. 4 So you weren't sure that there really were 3 A Yes. 7 Ge Courefore, it was important to	15		an hour and a quarter, or thereabouts.	15	(3.15 pm)
18 MR BLAKE: Alternatively, we can take two 10-minute breaks, if that would take things easier? 19 MR MOLONEY: MR Smith - sorry 19 if that would take things easier? 19 MR MOLONEY: MR Smith - sorry 21 that's convenient for others, rather than come back 20 A. I'r Mr Clarke, rather. That's a great start. The only matter Tm going to ask you about is the public interest 21 that's convenient for others, rather than 's right, Mr Clarke, 23 immunity application on July 2013 and the only 24 but I have already said that my concentration levels, 24 document I'm going to ask you to look at its 25 starting at 9.45, start to wane, to put it mildy, once 165 25 POL00172804. First of all, in respect of this, you've 166 26 notice? 2 application? 3 A 3 A. Yeah. 3 A Yes. 3 A 4 Q. May 1 ask you what they said in response at all, if and purpose of this report? 6 A Yes. 7 would be 'Okay, what' on routeness, Mr Clarke, but there's tos of people to o norteness, Mr Clarke, but there's tos of people to o norteness, Mr Clarke, but there's tos of people to o sak questions. 9 been wrong to make an application for public interest iss	16	MR	BLAKE: Yes.	16	MR BLAKE: Sir, we're going to first hear from Mr Moloney.
19 if that would take things easier? 19 MR MOLONEY: Mr Smith - sorry 20 THE WITNESS: Could I just say I don't mind running over, if 20 A I'm Mr Clarke. 21 that's convenient for others, rather than come back 21 Q Mr Clarke, rather. That's a great start. The only 22 tomorrow. 22 matter I'm going to ask you about is the public interest 23 SIR WYN WILLLAMS: I'm sure that that's right, Mr Clarke. 23 immunity application on 1 July 2013 and the only 24 but I have already said that my concentration levels. 24 document I'm going to ask you about is the public interest 25 starting at 9.45, start to wane, to put it mildly, once 165 Parliamentary privilege was the real basis for your 26 notice? 2 application? 3 A. Yes. 3 A. Yes. 3 A. Yes. 3 A. Yes. 6 A. I don't recall, to be honest. Usually, the response 6 A. Yes. 6 7 would be "Okay, what" - 3 Secause. If you weren't sure that there really were 3 8 I don't recall, to be honest. Usually, the response 6 A. Yes. 10	17	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: So	17	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right.
 THE WITNESS: Could I just say I don't mind running over, if that's convenient for others, rather than come back to morrow. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm sure that that's right, Mr Clarke, but I have already said that my concentration levels, starting at 9.45, start to wane, to put it mildly, once 165 said today that you spoke to defence counsel to give 165 said today that you spoke to defence counsel to give 165 A. Yeah. May I ask you what they said in response at all, if anything? A. Yeah. Would be 'Okay, what' - Would be 'Okay, what' - I for urdeness, Mr Clarke, but there's lots of people to ask questions. I'm ask questions. I'm ask questions. I'm A Clarke. I'm about what you application was in respect of or anything ifk that? A. Okay. A. Okay. A. Okay. A. Okay. A. Okay. A. Okay. A. No any Lank our optication was in respect of or anything itk that? A. No anything if that any our optication to adjourn the train anything itk that? A. No more details? A. No m	18	MR	BLAKE: Alternatively, we can take two 10-minute breaks,	18	Questioned by MR MOLONEY
 THE WITNESS: Could I just say I don't mind running over, if that's convenient for others, rather than come back to morrow. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm sure that that's right, Mr Clarke, but I have already said that my concentration levels, starting at 9.45, start to wane, to put it mildly, once 165 said today that you spoke to defence counsel to give 165 said today that you spoke to defence counsel to give 165 A. Yeah. A. Yeah. C. May I asky ou what they said in response at all, if anything? A. Yeah. G. May I ask you what they said in response at all, if anything? A. Yeah. G. May I ask you what they said in response at all, if anything? A. Yeah. G. May I ask you don't necall, to be honest. Usually, the response shall be inderess, in Clarke, but there's lots of people to ask questions. I would be "Okay, what" – G. A. I'm diverses, Mr Clarke, but there's lots of people to ask questions. I A. Okay. A. No duot have application to adjourn the response of the response it is there's lots of people to ask questions. I as A Questions. I A. Okay. A. Okay. A. Okay. A. Okay. A. Okay. A. Okay. A. No duot necess. If Clarke, but there's lots of people to ask questions and application to adjourn the response of the response or public induiry interest it there have an application on application? A. No more details? A. No more details?	19		if that would take things easier?	19	MR MOLONEY: Mr Smith sorry
22 tomorrow. 22 matter I'm going to ask you about is the public interest 23 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm sure that that's right, Mr Clarke, 23 immunity application on 1 July 2013 and the only 24 but I have already said that my concentration levels, 24 document I'm going to ask you to look at its 25 starting at 9.45, start to wane, to put it mildly, once 25 POL00172804. First of all, in respect of this, you've 1 said today that you spoke to defence counsel to give 1 Parliamentary privilege was the real basis for your 3 A. Yeah. 3 A. Yees. 4 Q. May I ask you what they said in response at all, if 4 Q. So, therefore, it was important to establish the origins 5 anything? 6 A. Yees. 7 Q. Because, if you weren't sure that there really were 8 Q. I'm just going to try and keep it tight here. So I mean 8 issues of Parliamentary privilege, then it would have 9 no rudeness, Mr Clarke, but there's lots of people to 9 been wrong to make an application or public interest 11 A. Okay. 11 A. Oh, I agree. 12 Q. So what steps did you take to confirm with Post Office 13 them about w	20	THE	EWITNESS: Could I just say I don't mind running over, if	20	A. I'm Mr Clarke.
22 tomorrow. 22 matter I'm going to ask you about is the public interest 23 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm sure that that's right, Mr Clarke, 23 immunity application on 1 July 2013 and the only 24 but I have already said that my concentration levels, 24 document I'm going to ask you to look at its 25 starting at 9.45, start to wane, to put it mildly, once 25 POL00172804. First of all, in respect of this, you've 1 said today that you spoke to defence counsel to give 1 Partiamentary privilege was the real basis for your 2 notice? 2 application? 3 A. Yeah. 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. May I ask you what they said in response at all, if 4 Q. So, therefore, it was important to establish the origins and purpose of this report? 5 anything? 6 A. Yes. 7 would be "Okay, what" – 7 Q. Because, if you weren't sure that there really were 8 Q. I'm just going to try and keep it tigh there. So I mean 8 issues of Parliamentary privilege, then it would have 9 no rudeness, Mr Clarke, but there's lots of people to 9 been wrong to make an application for public interest 10 ask que	21		that's convenient for others, rather than come back	21	Q Mr Clarke, rather. That's a great start. The only
 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I'm sure that that's right, Mr Clarke, but I have already said that my concentration levels, starting at 9.45, start to wane, to put it mildly, once starting at 9.45, start to wane, to put it mildly, once said today that you spoke to defence counsel to give said today that you spoke to defence counsel to give said today that you spoke to defence counsel to give A. Yees. Q. May I ask you what they said in response at all, if A. Yees. Q. May I ask you what they said in response at all, if A. Yees. A. Yees. A. Yeah. A. Yees. C. May I ask you what they said in response at all, if A. Yees. A. I don't recall, to be honest. Usually, the response A. Yees. C. I'm just going to try and keep it tight here. So I mean anything? A. Oh, I agree. C. Buct you don't recall. Do you recall what you said to B. Wyou dhave said I'm making a public inquiry interest A. I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest A. I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest A. Iwould have said I'm making a public inquiry interest A. I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest A. I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest A. I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest A. I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest A. I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest A. I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest A. I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest A. I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest A. I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest A. I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest A. No more detall than that. B. Rodific Williams and Jananil Sing that	22		tomorrow.	22	
24 but I have already said that my concentration levels, starting at 9.45, start to wane, to put it mildly, once 165 24 document I'm going to ask you to look at its POL00172804. First of all, in respect of this, you've 166 1 said today that you spoke to defence counsel to give 1 Parliamentary privilege was the real basis for your application? 3 A. Yeah. 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. May I ask you what they said in response at all, if anything? 5 and purpose of this report? 6 A. I don't recall, to be honest. Usually, the response 6 A. Yes. 7 would be "Okay, what" - 7 Q. Because, if you weren't sure that there really were 8 Q. I'm just going to try and keep it tight here. So I mean 9 issues of Parliamentary privilege, then it would have 9 no rudeness, M. Clarke, but there's lost of people to 9 been wrong to make an application for public interest 10 ask questions. 11 A. Okay. 11 A. Oh, I agree. 12 Q. But you don't recall. Do you recall what you said to 12 Q. So what steps did you take to confirm with Post Office 14 anything like that? 14 privilege had any relevance or application? 15 A. I would have said I'm making	23	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: I'm sure that that's right, Mr Clarke,	23	
25 starting at 9.45, start to wane, to put it mildly, once 165 25 POL00172804. First of all, in respect of this, you've 166 1 said today that you spoke to defence counsel to give notice? 1 Parliamentary privilege was the real basis for your application? 2 notice? 2 application? 3 A. Yeah. 4 Q. 4 Q. May I ask you what they said in response at all, if anything? 5 and purpose of this report? 6 A. I don't recall, to be honest. Usually, the response 6 A. Yes. 7 Would be "Okay, what" 7 Q. Because, if you weren't sure that there really were issues of Parliamentary privilege, then it would have por rudeness, Mr Clarke, but there's lots of people to ask questions. 9 been wrong to make an application for public interest immunity? 11 A. Okay. 11 A. Okay. 12 Q. So what steps did you take to confirm with Post Office that the report was a report where Parliamentary privilege had any relevance or application? 15 A. I would have said i'm making a public inquiry interest (sid) application and an application to adjourn the (sid) application and an application to adjourn the for did parliamentary, and that 1 should ask for it I gave my advice, on the back of them telling me that Parliamentary, and that 1 should ask for it I gave my advice, on the back of them telling me that Parliam	24		-	24	
165 166 1 Parilamentary privilege was the real basis for your 2 application? 3 A. Yeah. 4 Q. May I ask you what they said in response at all, if 4 5 anything? 6 A. I don't recall, to be honest. Usually, the response 6 7 would be "Okay, what" 7 8 Q. I'm just going to try and keep it tight here. So I mean 9 9 no rudeness, Mr Clarke, but there's lots of people to 9 9 no rudeness, Mr Clarke, but there's lots of people to 9 11 A. On, I agree. 12 12 Q. So, what steps did you take to confirm with Post Office 13 them about what your application was in respect of or 13 13 them about what your application to adjourn the 15 15 A. I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest 15 16 Ryptilege Parliamentary, and that I should ask for 18 It – I gave my advice, on the back of them telling me 19 That's where that information came from. I was told by 16 Right but no more details? 18	25			25	
2 notice? 2 application? 3 A. Yeah. 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. May I ask you what they said in response at all, if anything? 5 and purpose of this report? 6 A. I don't recall, to be honest. Usually, the response 6 A. Yes. 7 would be "Okay, what" 7 Q. Because, if you weren't sure that there really were issues of Parliamentary privilege, then it would have been wrong to make an application for public interest immunity? 10 ask questions. 10 immunity? 11 A. Okay. 14 A. Oh, I agree. 12 Q. But you don't recall. Do you recall what you said to 12 Q. So what steps did you take to confirm with Post Office 13 them about what your application was in respect of or 13 that the report was a report where Parliamentary 14 anything like that? 14 privilege had any relevance or application? 15 A. I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest trial. 17 Fight but no more details? 15 A. I solur any any going ot the waterial to be disclosed: 19 that Parliamentary, and that I should ask for 16 Q. Sight but no more details? 18 that					
2 notice? 2 application? 3 A. Yeah. 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. May I ask you what they said in response at all, if anything? 5 and purpose of this report? 6 A. I don't recall, to be honest. Usually, the response 6 A. Yes. 7 would be "Okay, what" 7 Q. Because, if you weren't sure that there really were issues of Parliamentary privilege, then it would have been wrong to make an application for public interest immunity? 10 ask questions. 10 immunity? 11 A. Okay. 14 A. Oh, I agree. 12 Q. But you don't recall. Do you recall what you said to 12 Q. So what steps did you take to confirm with Post Office 13 them about what your application was in respect of or 13 that the report was a report where Parliamentary 14 anything like that? 14 privilege had any relevance or application? 15 A. I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest trial. 17 Fight but no more details? 15 A. I solur any any going ot the waterial to be disclosed: 19 that Parliamentary, and that I should ask for 16 Q. Sight but no more details? 18 that					
2 notice? 2 application? 3 A. Yeah. 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. May I ask you what they said in response at all, if anything? 5 and purpose of this report? 6 A. I don't recall, to be honest. Usually, the response 6 A. Yes. 7 would be "Okay, what" 7 Q. Because, if you weren't sure that there really were issues of Parliamentary privilege, then it would have been wrong to make an application for public interest immunity? 10 ask questions. 10 immunity? 11 A. Okay. 14 A. Oh, I agree. 12 Q. But you don't recall. Do you recall what you said to 12 Q. So what steps did you take to confirm with Post Office 13 them about what your application was in respect of or 13 that the report was a report where Parliamentary 14 anything like that? 14 privilege had any relevance or application? 15 A. I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest trial. 17 Fight but no more details? 15 A. I solur any any going ot the waterial to be disclosed: 19 that Parliamentary, and that I should ask for 16 Q. Sight but no more details? 18 that	1		said today that you spoke to defence counsel to give	1	Parliamentary privilege was the real basis for your
3A.Yeah.3A.Yes.4Q.May I ask you what they said in response at all, ifand purpose of this report?5anything?5and purpose of this report?6A.I don't recall, to be honest. Usually, the response6A.7would be "Okay, what"7Q.Because, if you weren't sure that there really were8Q.I'm just going to try and keep it tight here. So I mean8issues of Parliamentary privilege, then it would have9no rudeness, Mr Clarke, but there's lots of people to9been wrong to make an application for public interest10ask questions.10immunity?11A.Okay.14A.12Q.But you don't recall. Do you recall what you said to12Q.So what steps did you take to confirm with Post Office13them about what your application was in respect of or13that the report was a report where Parliamentary14anything like that?14privilege had any relevance or application?15A.I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest15A.18I would have said I'm making a public adjourn the16Rodric Williams and Jarnall Singh that the report was17rail.No more details?18it I gave my advice, on the back of them telling me19A.No more detail than that.19that Parliament were going to get the report on 1 July.19A.No more detail then that.19					
4 Q. May I ask you what they said in response at all, if 4 Q. So, therefore, it was important to establish the origins 5 anything? 5 and purpose of this report? 6 A. I don't recall, to be honest. Usually, the response 6 A. Yes. 7 would be "Okay, what" 7 Q. Because, if you weren't sure that there really were 8 Q. I'm just going to try and keep it tight here. So I mean 8 issues of Parliamentary privilege, then it would have 9 no rudeness, Mr Clarke, but there's lots of people to 9 been wrong to make an application for public interest 10 ask questions. 10 immunity? 11 A. Okay. 11 A. Oh, 1 agree. 12 Q. But you don't recall. Do you recall what you said to 12 Q. So what steps did you take to confirm with Post Office 13 them about what your application was in respect of or 13 that the report was a report where Parliamentary 14 arything like that? 14 privilege had any relevance or application? 15 A. I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest 15 A. That's where that information came from. I was told by 16 (sic) application and an		Δ			
5 anything? 5 and purpose of this report? 6 A. I don't recall, to be honest. Usually, the response 6 A. Yes. 7 would be "Okay, what" 7 Q. Because, if you weren't sure that there really were 8 Q. I'm just going to try and keep it tight here. So I mean 8 issues of Parliamentary privilege, then it would have 9 no rudeness, Mr Clarke, but there's lots of people to 9 been wrong to make an application for public interest 10 ask questions. 10 immunity? 11 A. Okay. 11 A. 12 Q. But you don't recall. Do you recall what you said to 12 Q. So what steps did you take to confirm with Post Office 13 that about what your application was in respect of or 13 that the report was a report where Parliamentary 14 anything like that? 14 privilege had any relevance or application? 15 A. I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest 15 A. 16 (sic) application and an application to adjourn the 16 Rodric Williams and Jarnail Singh that the report was <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>					
6A.I don't recall, to be honest. Usually, the response6A.Yes.7would be "Okay, what"7Q.Because, if you weren't sure that there really were8Q.I'm just going to try and keep it tight here. So I mean8issues of Parliamentary privilege, then it would have9no rudeness, Mr Clarke, but there's lots of people to9been wrong to make an application for public interest10ask questions.10immunity?11A.Okay.11A.Oh, I agree.12Q.But you don't recall. Do you recall what you said to12Q.So what steps did you take to confirm with Post Office13them about what your application was in respect of or13that the report was a report where Parliamentary14anything like that?14privilege had any relevance or application?15A.I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest15A.That's where that information came from. I was told by16(sic) application and an application to adjourn the16Rodric Williams and Jarnail Singh that the report was17trial.17privileged Parliamentary, and that I should ask for18it I gave my advice, on the back of them telling me19A.No more details?1810usa seled "Could you apply or a certificate20you were always of the view that the information in the2121because it was privileged", that I thinkI can't23second Sigh		щ.			
7would be "Okay, what"7Q.Because, if you weren't sure that there really were8Q.I'm just going to try and keep it tight here. So I mean8issues of Parliamentary privilege, then it would have9no rudeness, Mr Clarke, but there's lots of people to9been wrong to make an application for public interest10ask questions.10immunity?11A.Okay.11A.12Q.But you don't recall. Do you recall what you said to12Q.So what steps did you take to confirm with Post Office13them about what your application was in respect of or13that the report was a report where Parliamentary14anything like that?14privilege had any relevance or application?15A.I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest15A.16(sic) application and an application to adjourn the16Rodric Williams and Jamail Singh that the report was17trial.17privileged Parliamentary, and that I should ask for18Q.Right but no more details?18it I gave my advice, on the back of them telling me19A.No more detail than that.19that Parliament were going to get the report on 1 July.10Q.Thank you very much. Now, the material to be disclosed:20In the end, I don't think they did but that's what I was20you were always of the view that the information in the21told, and I was asked "Could you apply for a certificate22Secon		۸	, ,		
 8 Q. I'm just going to try and keep it tight here. So I mean no rudeness, Mr Clarke, but there's lots of people to ask questions. 10 ask questions. 11 A. Okay. 11 A. Okay. 11 A. Okay. 12 Q. But you don't recall. Do you recall what you said to them about what your application was in respect of or anything like that? 14 anything like that? 15 A. I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest 15 A. I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest 16 (<i>sic</i>) application and an application to adjourn the trial. 17 trial. 18 Q. Right but no more details? 19 A. No more detail than that. 19 A. No more detail than that. 19 A. No more detail than that. 19 A. No more details the view that the information in the you were always of the view that the information in the Second Sight Interim Report, as you understood it, was 10 La cest of Samra? 21 You said that the necessity not to infringe 25 Parliament has authorised it". 		~ .			
9no rudeness, Mr Clarke, but there's lots of people to ask questions.9been wrong to make an application for public interest immunity?11A.Okay.11A.Oh, I agree.12Q.But you don't recall. Do you recall what you said to them about what your application was in respect of or anything like that?11A.Oh, I agree.14anything like that?14privilege had any relevance or application?15A.I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest trial.15A.That's where that information came from. I was told by16(sic) application and an application to adjourn the trial.16Rodric Williams and Jarnail Singh that the report was17trial.17privileged Parliamentary, and that I should ask for18Q.Right but no more details?18it - I gave my advice, on the back of them telling me19A.No more detail than that.19that Parliament were going to get the report on 1 July.20Q.Thank you very much. Now, the material to be disclosed: you were always of the view that the information in the you were always of the view that the information in the second Sight Interim Report, as you understood it, was disclosable in the case of Samra?23remember the exact wording but the wording was along the24A.Yes.24lines, I paraphrase, "Because we can't publish it before25Q.You said that the necessity not to infringe25Parliament has authorised it".		^	-		
10ask questions.10immunity?11A.Okay.11A.Oh, I agree.12Q.But you don't recall. Do you recall what you said to them about what your application was in respect of or anything like that?12Q.So what steps did you take to confirm with Post Office that the report was a report where Parliamentary privilege had any relevance or application?14anything like that?14privilege had any relevance or application?15A.I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest (sic) application and an application to adjourn the trial.16Rodric Williams and Jarnail Singh that the report was report was privileged Parliamentary, and that I should ask for trial.18Q.Right but no more details?18it I gave my advice, on the back of them telling me that Parliament were going to get the report on 1 July.20Q.Thank you very much. Now, the material to be disclosed: you were always of the view that the information in the you were always of the view that the information in the second Sight Interim Report, as you understood it, was disclosable in the case of Samra?23remember the exact wording but the wording was along the24A.Yes.24Ines, I paraphrase, "Because we can't publish it before25Q.You said that the necessity not to infringe25Parliament has authorised it".		α.			
11A.Okay.11A.Oh, I agree.12Q.But you don't recall. Do you recall what you said to12Q.So what steps did you take to confirm with Post Office13them about what your application was in respect of or13that the report was a report where Parliamentary14anything like that?14privilege had any relevance or application?15A.I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest15A.16(sic) application and an application to adjourn the16Rodric Williams and Jarnail Singh that the report was17trial.17privileged Parliamentary, and that I should ask for18Q.Right but no more details?18it I gave my advice, on the back of them telling me19A.No more detail than that.19that Parliament were going to get the report on 1 July.20Q.Thank you very much. Now, the material to be disclosed:20In the end, I don't think they did but that's what I was21you were always of the view that the information in the21told, and I was asked "Could you apply for a certificate22Second Sight Interim Report, as you understood it, was22because it was privileged", that I think I can't23disclosable in the case of Samra?23remember the exact wording but the wording was along the24A.Yeu.Ines, I paraphrase, "Because we can't publish it before25Q.You said that the necessity not to infringe25Parliament has authorised it". <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
12Q.But you don't recall. Do you recall what you said to12Q.So what steps did you take to confirm with Post Office13them about what your application was in respect of or13that the report was a report where Parliamentary14anything like that?14privilege had any relevance or application?15A.I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest15A.16(sic) application and an application to adjourn the16Rodric Williams and Jarnail Singh that the report was17trial.17privileged Parliamentary, and that I should ask for18Q.Right but no more details?18it I gave my advice, on the back of them telling me19A.No more detail than that.19that Parliament were going to get the report on 1 July.20Q.Thank you very much. Now, the material to be disclosed:20In the end, I don't think they did but that's what I was21you were always of the view that the information in the21told, and I was asked "Could you apply for a certificate22Second Sight Interim Report, as you understood it, was22because it was privileged", that I think I can't23disclosable in the case of Samra?23remember the exact wording but the wording was along the24A.Yes.24lines, I paraphrase, "Because we can't publish it before25Parliament has authorised it".		•	-		-
13them about what your application was in respect of or anything like that?13that the report was a report where Parliamentary privilege had any relevance or application?14anything like that?14privilege had any relevance or application?15A.I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest15A.That's where that information came from. I was told by Rodric Williams and Jarnail Singh that the report was 			-		-
14anything like that?14privilege had any relevance or application?15A.I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest15A.That's where that information came from. I was told by16(sic) application and an application to adjourn the16Rodric Williams and Jarnail Singh that the report was17trial.17privileged Parliamentary, and that I should ask for18Q.Right but no more details?18it I gave my advice, on the back of them telling me19A.No more detail than that.19that Parliament were going to get the report on 1 July.20Q.Thank you very much. Now, the material to be disclosed:20In the end, I don't think they did but that's what I was21you were always of the view that the information in the21told, and I was asked "Could you apply for a certificate22Second Sight Interim Report, as you understood it, was22because it was privileged", that I think I can't23disclosable in the case of Samra?23remember the exact wording but the wording was along the24A.Yes.24lines, I paraphrase, "Because we can't publish it before25Q.You said that the necessity not to infringe25Parliament has authorised it".		Q.			
15A.I would have said I'm making a public inquiry interest (sic) application and an application to adjourn the trial.15A.That's where that information came from. I was told by Rodric Williams and Jarnail Singh that the report was privileged Parliamentary, and that I should ask for17trial.17privileged Parliamentary, and that I should ask for18Q.Right but no more details?18it I gave my advice, on the back of them telling me19A.No more detail than that.19that Parliament were going to get the report on 1 July.20Q.Thank you very much. Now, the material to be disclosed: you were always of the view that the information in the Second Sight Interim Report, as you understood it, was disclosable in the case of Samra?23remember the exact wording but the wording was along the Innes, I paraphrase, "Because we can't publish it before24A.Yes.24Inse, I paraphrase, "Because we can't publish it before25Q.You said that the necessity not to infringe25Parliament has authorised it".					
16(sic) application and an application to adjourn the trial.16Rodric Williams and Jarnail Singh that the report was privileged Parliamentary, and that I should ask for17trial.17privileged Parliamentary, and that I should ask for18Q.Right but no more details?18it I gave my advice, on the back of them telling me19A.No more detail than that.19that Parliament were going to get the report on 1 July.20Q.Thank you very much. Now, the material to be disclosed: you were always of the view that the information in the Second Sight Interim Report, as you understood it, was21told, and I was asked "Could you apply for a certificate23disclosable in the case of Samra?23remember the exact wording but the wording was along the24A.Yes.24lines, I paraphrase, "Because we can't publish it before25Q.You said that the necessity not to infringe25Parliament has authorised it".					
17trial.17privileged Parliamentary, and that I should ask for18Q.Right but no more details?18it I gave my advice, on the back of them telling me19A.No more detail than that.19that Parliament were going to get the report on 1 July.20Q.Thank you very much. Now, the material to be disclosed: you were always of the view that the information in the Second Sight Interim Report, as you understood it, was20In the end, I don't think they did but that's what I was21Second Sight Interim Report, as you understood it, was22because it was privileged", that I think I can't23disclosable in the case of Samra?23remember the exact wording but the wording was along the24A.Yes.24lines, I paraphrase, "Because we can't publish it before25Q.You said that the necessity not to infringe25Parliament has authorised it".		Α.			
18Q.Right but no more details?18it I gave my advice, on the back of them telling me19A.No more detail than that.19that Parliament were going to get the report on 1 July.20Q.Thank you very much. Now, the material to be disclosed:20In the end, I don't think they did but that's what I was21you were always of the view that the information in the21told, and I was asked "Could you apply for a certificate22Second Sight Interim Report, as you understood it, was22because it was privileged", that I think I can't23disclosable in the case of Samra?23remember the exact wording but the wording was along the24A.Yes.24lines, I paraphrase, "Because we can't publish it before25Q.You said that the necessity not to infringe25Parliament has authorised it".					
19A.No more detail than that.19that Parliament were going to get the report on 1 July.20Q.Thank you very much. Now, the material to be disclosed: you were always of the view that the information in the Second Sight Interim Report, as you understood it, was disclosable in the case of Samra?20In the end, I don't think they did but that's what I was told, and I was asked "Could you apply for a certificate because it was privileged", that I think I can't remember the exact wording but the wording was along the I ines, I paraphrase, "Because we can't publish it before24A.Yes.24Ines, I paraphrase, "Because we can't publish it before25Q.You said that the necessity not to infringe25Parliament has authorised it".					
20Q.Thank you very much. Now, the material to be disclosed: you were always of the view that the information in the Second Sight Interim Report, as you understood it, was disclosable in the case of Samra?20In the end, I don't think they did but that's what I was told, and I was asked "Could you apply for a certificate because it was privileged", that I think I can't remember the exact wording but the wording was along the ines, I paraphrase, "Because we can't publish it before24A.Yes.24lines, I paraphrase, "Because we can't publish it before25Q.You said that the necessity not to infringe25Parliament has authorised it".			-		
21you were always of the view that the information in the Second Sight Interim Report, as you understood it, was21told, and I was asked "Could you apply for a certificate because it was privileged", that I think I can't disclosable in the case of Samra?23disclosable in the case of Samra?23remember the exact wording but the wording was along the lines, I paraphrase, "Because we can't publish it before24A.Yes.24lines, I paraphrase, "Because we can't publish it before25Q.You said that the necessity not to infringe25Parliament has authorised it".					
22Second Sight Interim Report, as you understood it, was22because it was privileged", that I think I can't23disclosable in the case of Samra?23remember the exact wording but the wording was along the24A.Yes.24lines, I paraphrase, "Because we can't publish it before25Q.You said that the necessity not to infringe25Parliament has authorised it".		Q.			-
23disclosable in the case of Samra?23remember the exact wording but the wording was along the24A. Yes.24lines, I paraphrase, "Because we can't publish it before25Q. You said that the necessity not to infringe25Parliament has authorised it".					
24A. Yes.24lines, I paraphrase, "Because we can't publish it before25Q. You said that the necessity not to infringe25Parliament has authorised it".					
25 Q . You said that the necessity not to infringe 25 Parliament has authorised it".					
	24	Α.			lines, I paraphrase, "Because we can't publish it before
107	25	Q.		25	
			107		100

(42) Pages 165 - 168

The Post Office Horizon IT Inquiry

1	Q.	That was both Rodric Williams and Jarnail Singh that you	1		post-hearing att
2		spoke to?	2	Α.	No.
3	Α.	I spoke to both of them about it, yes.	3	Q.	So can we just l
4	Q.	Spoke to both of them and they both asked you to make	4		paragraph 14, p
5		an application for public interest immunity?	5		there and this
6	Α.	Post Office asked through them. I don't know if you can	6		your understand
7		say they both asked me, that rather suggests that each	7		possible to appl
8		one separately asked me. I don't think that's the	8		often occurs in
9		position. I was asked by them jointly, on behalf of	9		the list is not clo
10		Post Office, to make the application and that's what	10		be the prevention
11		l did.	11		a public instituti
12	Q.	As counsel, trial counsel, as it was, the trial starting	12		basis, but there
13		1 July, same day you make the application, as trial	13		privileged, is the
14		counsel, what were the legal principles that underpinned	14	Α.	No, that's the co
15		your approach to how public interest immunity might	15		privilege in a ca
16		operate in those circumstances?	16		happen if I didn
17	Α.	Well, I followed the case of $R v H$; $R v C$, which sets it	17		l reiterate that, i
18		out very clearly, those are the principles that applied.	18		improper, the ju
19	Q.	Help me as to how that might apply, from <i>H&C</i> ?	19	Q.	Well, those are
20	Α.	In what sense?	20		publication of th
21	Q.	Well, what part of <i>H&C</i> do you suggest allows you to make	21		consequences
22		an application on the basis of Parliamentary privilege?	22		there, is there?
23	Α.	Matter of national interest.	23	Α.	If your suggesti
24	Q.	Matter of national interest. Right, okay. Now, there's	24		basis of Parliam
25		no express mention of Parliamentary privilege in your 169	25	Q.	Let's not bother
1		Can we go on to paragraph 16, and here we see:	1		systems. Our o
2		"In this case I took the view that such an approach	2		that objective w
3		to the problem might be appropriate."	3		Again, noth
4		This links into paragraph 14 and you are there	4		consequences
5		saying that, with Jarnail Singh, you took the view that	5		than, essentially
6		the best way forward was to seek a ruling, grant of PII	6		Office.
7		certificate:	7	Α.	I disagree with
8		" that we need not disclose to the defence the	8	Q.	Well, where is t
9		fact that the Second Sight Report was to be presented to	9		of breach of Pa
10		Parliament today and that the report contained	10		obliquely, over a
11		references to the existence of bugs in both Horizon past	11	Α.	It's not in that pa
12		and present to adjourn the trial."	12		but that does no
13		So no mention again there of Parliamentary	13		which I approac
14		privilege.	14	Q.	I never suggest
15		Then, at paragraph 24, we see that:	15	Α.	I think you have
16		" it's worth commenting on the reasoning behind	16	Q.	I'm just asking y
17		my advice that we seek a PII certificate in this case.	17		there?
18		[Post Office] were, rightly in my opinion, very	18	Α.	An oversight, a
19		concerned at the potential adverse publicity which would	19		there.
20		inevitably have been generated by the revelation of the	20	Q.	All right, then ju
21		existence of a (draft) Second Sight Report. To permit	21		at paragraph 18
22		this information to enter the public domain [et cetera,	22		Honour Judge (
23		et cetera]. Such speculation would have seriously	23		arguments adva
24		damaged the reputation of POL and would have greatly	24		certificate."
25		undermined public confidence in both POL and POL 171	25		Then it say

- post-hearing attendance note, is there?
- **Q.** So can we just look, just to make that clear,
- paragraph 14, please, which is on page 6 of 9. We see
 there -- and this is obviously from a distillation of
- 6 your understanding of the principles set out in *H&C*,
- possible to apply to the judge for a certificate, most
- often occurs in cases involving national security but
- 9 the list is not closed and where the public interest may
- 10 be the prevention of a widespread loss of interest in
- a public institution, et cetera, then that is your
- basis, but there's nothing there about Parliamentaryprivileged, is there?
- 14 A. No, that's the consequence of breaching Parliamentary
- 15 privilege in a case -- in this case. That's what would
- 16 happen if I didn't apply for the certificate, and
- 17 I reiterate that, if the application was in any way
- 18 improper, the judge would not have granted it.
- 19 **Q.** Well, those are the consequences of a breach of the
- publication of the report. There is no mention of theconsequences of a breach of Parliamentary privilege in
- 22 there, is there? There's no mention of it.
- 23 **A.** If your suggestion is that I was not applying on the
- basis of Parliamentary privilege, then you are mistaken.
- 25 Q. Let's not bother about suggestions, please, Mr Clarke.170

1		systems. Our objective was to avoid such consequences:
2		that objective was achieved."
3		Again, nothing about Parliamentary privilege and the
4		consequences of breaching Parliamentary privilege, other
5		than, essentially, it's not going to be great for Post
6		Office.
7	Α.	I disagree with your characterisation.
8	Q.	Well, where is there any reference of the consequences
9		of breach of Parliamentary privilege, if there is even
10		obliquely, over and above the interests of Post Office?
11	Α.	It's not in that paragraph and it's not in the document
12		but that does not mean that that was not the basis upon
13		which I approached it.
14	Q.	I never suggested that, Mr
15	Α.	I think you have.
16	Q.	I'm just asking you why it's not there. Why isn't it in
17		there?
18	Α.	An oversight, a mistake, I don't know. But it's not
19		there.
20	Q.	All right, then just to complete this, if we could look
21		at paragraph 18, please. We see that the judge, His
22		Honour Judge Chambers, was ultimately persuaded of the
23		arguments advanced in support of the grant of a PII
24		certificate."
25		Then it says "See paragraph 14 above" by

Then it says, "See paragraph 14 above", by 172

The Fost Onice	Holizon h	mq	uny 9 way 2024
	4		Co that had been provided to the Cocord Circle
iph 14	1		So that had been provided to the Second Sight
1 in	2 3		committee, two bugs that had affected Horizon; he told you that?
14. Why	4	Α.	Yes.
we	5	Q.	It told you directly that. Then at (v), if we could
	6		please, we've got the other matters there:
	7		"It is his view that, were the defence to suggest
the	8		a problem with Horizon, he cannot rule out that there
	9		may be other problems with Horizon."
ge	10		Yes?
	11	Α.	Yes.
	12	Q.	We saw as well and we've no need to go there for time
	13		reasons but at paragraph 6, a whole lot of
pect	14		information was given to you by Post Office directly,
ved	15		not looking at the Second Sight Report?
d from	16	Α.	I never said that.
	17	Q.	Well, let's just have a look at paragraph 6, please. At
	18		the top. Yes:
Report?	19		"On 27 July and through the following day I was
	20		instructed that a number of post offices the Horizon
If we	21		system may have produced false balances. I am however
ust	22		informed of the following"
	23		Then you set out your instructions in relation to
ee of two	24		information from Post Office, or at (ii), "Horizon is
	25		not 'bug' free". 174
			174
out going	1	0	Why did you have to wait for the publication of that
out going	2	۹.	Second Sight Report when that was information which
	3		undermined the prosecution case, which was known to you
	4		from the expert, commissioned by Post Office, who was
	5		the expert in Post Office's prosecutions, that had come
	6		directly to you from him, why wasn't that immediately
has	7		disclosable?
	8	Α.	Because I wanted a PII we're going to go round in
use you	9		circles here. I wanted a PII certificate on the
	10		instructions from Post Office to suppress the
	11		publication of that material until such time as
me is	12		Parliament had seen and released the document from
vhich	13		whence this information comes, and I wanted time, as
	14		I explain in the document, to consider my disclosure
've had	15		duties before commencing on a trial and, in order to do
ı've	16		that, I did not commence on a trial. And, in due
rmed	17		course, the material was disclosed within a matter of
nad	18		weeks.
	19	Q.	That had nothing to do with the Second Sight Report, did
annot	20		it, other than the fact that what their expert had
orizon?	21		directly told you was disclosable, it was there, and
	22		would eventually end up in the Second Sight Report.
efence?	23		That was the view of the expert which was disclosable,
econd	24	_	wasn't it?
	25	Α.	That is an opinion you advance. I took the view that 176
			110

- 2 that I've already taken you to that were advanced
- 3 support of the PII application, with absolutely no
- 4 mention of Parliamentary privilege in paragraph 1
- 5 didn't you say there, for example, "And of course
- 6 based all of that on the issue of Parliamentary
- 7 privilege"?
- 8 Α. Looking back, I can't say. But the judge granted the 9 certificate
- 10 Yeah, and, therefore, it was appropriate if the judg Q. granted the certificate? 11
- Well, of course. 12 Α.
- 13 Q. Right. In any event, you say that Parliamentary
- 14 privilege was the basis for your application in resp
- 15 of the Second Sight Report. Now, you had receive 16 information directly, both from Gareth Jenkins and
- 17 Post Office, hadn't you, prior to this hearing?
- Yes, I'd explained that. 18 Α.
- 19 Q. Yes, and but you hadn't seen the Second Sight Re 20 Α. No.

- 21 Q. You'd received information from Gareth Jenkins. 22 could look at, please, paragraph 7 of the report, ju
- 23 going up the page, and just at (i) there:
- 24 "He had informed the Second Sight Committee
 - bugs which had affected Horizon."

173

- 1 Then going down, and this paragraph 6 witho 2 through all of it, at (iv): 3 "A number of bugs have been identified ..." 4 Then going down, to (vii): 5 "Hurst Lane ... is not one of those post office 6 identified as having been affected", but you have 7 received information from Post Office about what 8 been discovered, haven't you? 9 A. The reason I objected to your question was becau said a lot of information had been given to me. 10 All right. 11 Q. A. It hadn't. The information that had been given to 12 13 recorded here and is about two bugs, neither of w 14 affected the Hurst Lane office. That was the --15 You've had information from Post Office and you've Q. 16 information from Gareth Jenkins directly, and you' 17 been told by Post Office's expert that he had infor 18 the Second Sight committee of two bugs, which ha 19 affected Horizon, and it's his view that, were the 20 defence to suggest a problem with Horizon, he ca 21 rule out that there may be other problems with Ho 22 Α. That's the information I was given. 23 Why wasn't that immediately disclosable to the de Q. 24 Α. Because I had to wait for the publication of the Se
- 25 Sight Report.

1		what the expert told me was what was contained in the	1		P
2		Second Sight Report.	2		а
3	MR	MOLONEY: Thank you, sir.	3		bı
4	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: Just, my memory may be playing tricks on	4		Ca
5		me, Mr Clarke, but my recollection of having made and	5		20
6		adjudicated upon PII applications, that, although	6	Α.	Y
7		they're done without the presence of the defence, they	7	Q.	R
8		are either recorded by a shorthand writer or	8		Μ
9		electronically.	9		he
10	Α.	Yes, that's right.	10		se
11	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: Was this one recorded?	11		S
12	Α.	I can't say specifically. It should have been and I	12		S
13	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: That would be your expectation, that it	13		Н
14		would	14	Α.	TI
15	Α.		15	Q.	Y
16		to be recorded.	16		CC
17		WYN WILLIAMS: Fine. That's all, thanks.	17	Α.	Y
18	MR	MOLONEY: Sir, if it assists, the evidence of Mr Smith	18	Q.	0
19		was that it was recorded.	19		28
20	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: Right. I'd forgotten he'd said that,	20		th
21		sorry.	21		G
22		Whose next, Mr Blake?	22	A.	Y
23		Questioned by MR STEIN	23	Q.	A
24	MR	STEIN: Mr Clarke, I have a few questions for you. Can	24		Je
25		I take you immediately to a document, which is 177	25		Ca
1 2 3		screen, which is dated 8 July. Okay. Now, it says under paragraph 1(i), "Alternative Fujitsu expert": "I suggest Fujitsu be told something in the	1 2 3		be w co
4		following terms:	4		ar
5		"[That Mr 'Jennings', it says here Jenkins] has	5		m
6		provided expert advice in a number of POL prosecutions	6	Q.	Y
7		he was involved [in the] Second Sight process."	7		Ca
8		Then it goes on to say basically counsel has advised	8		Μ
9		POL that there ought to be at least one degree of	9		th
10		separation between any expert witness called in support	10		do
11		of POL prosecution and the SS process.	11	Α.	Y
12		Okay?	12	Q.	
13		Just help us understand what's going on here. By	13	Α.	Y
14		this point, do you agree that you had come to the	14	Q.	ls
15		conclusion from the telephone call that Mr Jenkins had	15	Α.	lt
16		misled the courts?	16	Q.	
17	Α.	I'd come to the conclusion that he'd not fulfilled his	17	A.	It
18	~	duties as an expert witness, as he should have done.	18	Q.	W
19	Q.	As we understand it from your subsequent advice, when	19		ap
20		you came to write that, your conclusion at that point	20	A.	Y
21 22	A. 0	Yes.	21 22	Q.	0
22	Q.	was that he had not provided truthful evidence about his knowledge of bugs to a court or in his statements to	22		a
23 24		court; is that right?	23 24		e) or
24 25	Α.	I'm being careful about "not provided truthful evidence"	24 25		M
20		179	20		141

1		POL00006365, and it'll come up on your screen in
2		a moment, and we can go to the bottom of the document
3		but I'm not going to ask that the to do so, if you
4		can take it from me, that the document is dated 8 July
5		2013. Okay?
6	Α.	Yeah.
7	Q.	Right. So the sequence of events that relates to
8		Mr Jenkins, and your concerns about his evidence that
9		he's misled the court, that's what this is. So the
10		sequence of events is this: that on 27 June, Martin
11		Smith told you about an unpublished report, the Second
12		Sight Report, which stated there were bugs in the
13		Horizon system.
14	Α.	That's correct.
15	Q.	You've given your evidence earlier that you were very
16		concerned and you wanted to find out who told them that?
17	Α.	Yeah.
18	Q.	Okay? So that's those events. That then led you on
19		28 June, with Martin Smith, to have the telephone call
20		that you've given evidence about, that was recorded with
21		Gareth Jenkins. Okay, so far?
22	Α.	Yeah.
23	Q.	All right. Now, in between that time and 15 July, the
24		Jenkins advice, the Clarke/Jenkins advice that we all
25		call it, you wrote this advice, the one that's up on the 178
		1/0
1		because I'm not a judge of his position; I don't know
2		why he did or didn't do what he did. I had come to the
2 3		why he did or didn't do what he did. I had come to the conclusion that he had not complied with his duties as
2 3 4		why he did or didn't do what he did. I had come to the conclusion that he had not complied with his duties as an expert witness and I think I make that very clear in
2 3 4 5		why he did or didn't do what he did. I had come to the conclusion that he had not complied with his duties as an expert witness and I think I make that very clear in my 15 July advice.
2 3 4 5 6	Q.	why he did or didn't do what he did. I had come to the conclusion that he had not complied with his duties as an expert witness and I think I make that very clear in my 15 July advice. You do but this is quite serious, it's something that
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q.	why he did or didn't do what he did. I had come to the conclusion that he had not complied with his duties as an expert witness and I think I make that very clear in my 15 July advice. You do but this is quite serious, it's something that can't be ignored, you've got to do something about it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q.	why he did or didn't do what he did. I had come to the conclusion that he had not complied with his duties as an expert witness and I think I make that very clear in my 15 July advice. You do but this is quite serious, it's something that can't be ignored, you've got to do something about it. Mr Smith said of you that you have a bit of a tendency,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	why he did or didn't do what he did. I had come to the conclusion that he had not complied with his duties as an expert witness and I think I make that very clear in my 15 July advice. You do but this is quite serious, it's something that can't be ignored, you've got to do something about it. Mr Smith said of you that you have a bit of a tendency, that does make sense, to write advices, to write
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		why he did or didn't do what he did. I had come to the conclusion that he had not complied with his duties as an expert witness and I think I make that very clear in my 15 July advice. You do but this is quite serious, it's something that can't be ignored, you've got to do something about it. Mr Smith said of you that you have a bit of a tendency, that does make sense, to write advices, to write documents to record your thoughts and
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	A.	why he did or didn't do what he did. I had come to the conclusion that he had not complied with his duties as an expert witness and I think I make that very clear in my 15 July advice. You do but this is quite serious, it's something that can't be ignored, you've got to do something about it. Mr Smith said of you that you have a bit of a tendency, that does make sense, to write advices, to write documents to record your thoughts and Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q.	why he did or didn't do what he did. I had come to the conclusion that he had not complied with his duties as an expert witness and I think I make that very clear in my 15 July advice. You do but this is quite serious, it's something that can't be ignored, you've got to do something about it. Mr Smith said of you that you have a bit of a tendency, that does make sense, to write advices, to write documents to record your thoughts and Yes. your advice.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A.	why he did or didn't do what he did. I had come to the conclusion that he had not complied with his duties as an expert witness and I think I make that very clear in my 15 July advice. You do but this is quite serious, it's something that can't be ignored, you've got to do something about it. Mr Smith said of you that you have a bit of a tendency, that does make sense, to write advices, to write documents to record your thoughts and Yes. your advice. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q.	why he did or didn't do what he did. I had come to the conclusion that he had not complied with his duties as an expert witness and I think I make that very clear in my 15 July advice. You do but this is quite serious, it's something that can't be ignored, you've got to do something about it. Mr Smith said of you that you have a bit of a tendency, that does make sense, to write advices, to write documents to record your thoughts and Yes. your advice. Yes. Is that right
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q. A.	why he did or didn't do what he did. I had come to the conclusion that he had not complied with his duties as an expert witness and I think I make that very clear in my 15 July advice. You do but this is quite serious, it's something that can't be ignored, you've got to do something about it. Mr Smith said of you that you have a bit of a tendency, that does make sense, to write advices, to write documents to record your thoughts and Yes. your advice. Yes. Is that right It is.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 why he did or didn't do what he did. I had come to the conclusion that he had not complied with his duties as an expert witness and I think I make that very clear in my 15 July advice. You do but this is quite serious, it's something that can't be ignored, you've got to do something about it. Mr Smith said of you that you have a bit of a tendency, that does make sense, to write advices, to write documents to record your thoughts and Yes. your advice. Yes. Is that right It is. what you tended to do?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	 why he did or didn't do what he did. I had come to the conclusion that he had not complied with his duties as an expert witness and I think I make that very clear in my 15 July advice. You do but this is quite serious, it's something that can't be ignored, you've got to do something about it. Mr Smith said of you that you have a bit of a tendency, that does make sense, to write advices, to write documents to record your thoughts and Yes. your advice. Yes. Is that right It is. what you tended to do? It is.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 why he did or didn't do what he did. I had come to the conclusion that he had not complied with his duties as an expert witness and I think I make that very clear in my 15 July advice. You do but this is quite serious, it's something that can't be ignored, you've got to do something about it. Mr Smith said of you that you have a bit of a tendency, that does make sense, to write advices, to write documents to record your thoughts and Yes. your advice. Yes. Is that right It is. what you tended to do? It is. We can see a series of advices that relate to that that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 why he did or didn't do what he did. I had come to the conclusion that he had not complied with his duties as an expert witness and I think I make that very clear in my 15 July advice. You do but this is quite serious, it's something that can't be ignored, you've got to do something about it. Mr Smith said of you that you have a bit of a tendency, that does make sense, to write advices, to write documents to record your thoughts and Yes. your advice. Yes. Is that right It is. what you tended to do? It is. We can see a series of advices that relate to that that appear to show that you do exactly that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 why he did or didn't do what he did. I had come to the conclusion that he had not complied with his duties as an expert witness and I think I make that very clear in my 15 July advice. You do but this is quite serious, it's something that can't be ignored, you've got to do something about it. Mr Smith said of you that you have a bit of a tendency, that does make sense, to write advices, to write documents to record your thoughts and Yes. your advice. Yes. Is that right It is. what you tended to do? It is. We can see a series of advices that relate to that that appear to show that you do exactly that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 why he did or didn't do what he did. I had come to the conclusion that he had not complied with his duties as an expert witness and I think I make that very clear in my 15 July advice. You do but this is quite serious, it's something that can't be ignored, you've got to do something about it. Mr Smith said of you that you have a bit of a tendency, that does make sense, to write advices, to write documents to record your thoughts and Yes. your advice. Yes. Is that right It is. what you tended to do? It is. We can see a series of advices that relate to that that appear to show that you do exactly that. Yes. Okay. So where we are looking at this particular
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 why he did or didn't do what he did. I had come to the conclusion that he had not complied with his duties as an expert witness and I think I make that very clear in my 15 July advice. You do but this is quite serious, it's something that can't be ignored, you've got to do something about it. Mr Smith said of you that you have a bit of a tendency, that does make sense, to write advices, to write documents to record your thoughts and Yes. your advice. Yes. Is that right It is. what you tended to do? It is. We can see a series of advices that relate to that that appear to show that you do exactly that. Yes. Okay. So where we are looking at this particular advice, general advice here, saying "Alternative Fujitsu
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 why he did or didn't do what he did. I had come to the conclusion that he had not complied with his duties as an expert witness and I think I make that very clear in my 15 July advice. You do but this is quite serious, it's something that can't be ignored, you've got to do something about it. Mr Smith said of you that you have a bit of a tendency, that does make sense, to write advices, to write documents to record your thoughts and Yes. your advice. Yes. Is that right It is. what you tended to do? It is. We can see a series of advices that relate to that that appear to show that you do exactly that. Yes. Okay. So where we are looking at this particular advice, general advice here, saying "Alternative Fujitsu expert", can you help us understand why it doesn't say,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	 why he did or didn't do what he did. I had come to the conclusion that he had not complied with his duties as an expert witness and I think I make that very clear in my 15 July advice. You do but this is quite serious, it's something that can't be ignored, you've got to do something about it. Mr Smith said of you that you have a bit of a tendency, that does make sense, to write advices, to write documents to record your thoughts and Yes. your advice. Yes. Is that right It is. what you tended to do? It is. We can see a series of advices that relate to that that appear to show that you do exactly that. Yes. Okay. So where we are looking at this particular advice, general advice here, saying "Alternative Fujitsu

(45) Pages 177 - 180

3

6

1		to tell Fujitsu that there's a real hole opening under
2		Mr Jenkins' and Fujitsu's feet"; do you follow?
3	Α.	I follow the question. I hadn't, at that point, come to
4		that definitive conclusion. I was still processing
5		stuff. I had formed the view that Gareth Jenkins at
6		this point, 8 July, I'd formed the view that Gareth
7		Jenkins could not and should not be it a witness in the
8		future, not just because of the faults that he had
9		alluded to but because he was an employee of Fujitsu.
10	Q.	So what we're getting is we're getting layers of this:
11		you're processing what's going on in relation to
12		Mr Jenkins, you've come to the conclusion, by this
13		stage, that there needs to be an independent, truly
14		independent expert, not someone from Fujitsu?
15	Α.	Yes.
16	Q.	Then you get the 15 July advice, whereby things have
17		become more concrete in your mind
18	Α.	Yes.
19	Q.	and you're more trenchant, a word you used earlier
20		about matters relating to Mr Jenkins.
21	Α.	Yes.
22	Q.	Is, again, that fair?
23	Α.	That's fair.
24	Q.	After 15 July is Fujitsu told what has happened, and
25		your trenchant thoughts about Mr Jenkins?
		181
1		hear condid with the courts in statements and his
1		been candid with the courts in statements and his
2		evidence, we don't know why but, surely we should
2 3		evidence, we don't know why but, surely we should investigate this"; did you have that discussion with
2 3 4		evidence, we don't know why but, surely we should investigate this"; did you have that discussion with Mr Altman?
2 3 4 5	А.	evidence, we don't know why but, surely we should investigate this"; did you have that discussion with Mr Altman? He knew about it because he had seen my advices. Did
2 3 4 5 6	Α.	evidence, we don't know why but, surely we should investigate this"; did you have that discussion with Mr Altman? He knew about it because he had seen my advices. Did I have a specific discussion with him about this
2 3 4 5 6 7		evidence, we don't know why but, surely we should investigate this"; did you have that discussion with Mr Altman? He knew about it because he had seen my advices. Did I have a specific discussion with him about this subject? It seems unlikely that I wouldn't have done.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q.	evidence, we don't know why but, surely we should investigate this"; did you have that discussion with Mr Altman? He knew about it because he had seen my advices. Did I have a specific discussion with him about this subject? It seems unlikely that I wouldn't have done. Quite.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		evidence, we don't know why but, surely we should investigate this"; did you have that discussion with Mr Altman? He knew about it because he had seen my advices. Did I have a specific discussion with him about this subject? It seems unlikely that I wouldn't have done. Quite. But I don't recall one. In terms of the other theme of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	evidence, we don't know why but, surely we should investigate this"; did you have that discussion with Mr Altman? He knew about it because he had seen my advices. Did I have a specific discussion with him about this subject? It seems unlikely that I wouldn't have done. Quite. But I don't recall one. In terms of the other theme of your question, which goes, "Did you think it ought to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q.	evidence, we don't know why but, surely we should investigate this"; did you have that discussion with Mr Altman? He knew about it because he had seen my advices. Did I have a specific discussion with him about this subject? It seems unlikely that I wouldn't have done. Quite. But I don't recall one. In terms of the other theme of your question, which goes, "Did you think it ought to be investigated", it's not my function. I did not see it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q.	evidence, we don't know why but, surely we should investigate this"; did you have that discussion with Mr Altman? He knew about it because he had seen my advices. Did I have a specific discussion with him about this subject? It seems unlikely that I wouldn't have done. Quite. But I don't recall one. In terms of the other theme of your question, which goes, "Did you think it ought to be investigated", it's not my function. I did not see it then as my function to conduct an investigation into
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q.	evidence, we don't know why but, surely we should investigate this"; did you have that discussion with Mr Altman? He knew about it because he had seen my advices. Did I have a specific discussion with him about this subject? It seems unlikely that I wouldn't have done. Quite. But I don't recall one. In terms of the other theme of your question, which goes, "Did you think it ought to be investigated", it's not my function. I did not see it then as my function to conduct an investigation into whether or not Gareth Jenkins was an honest or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q.	evidence, we don't know why but, surely we should investigate this"; did you have that discussion with Mr Altman? He knew about it because he had seen my advices. Did I have a specific discussion with him about this subject? It seems unlikely that I wouldn't have done. Quite. But I don't recall one. In terms of the other theme of your question, which goes, "Did you think it ought to be investigated", it's not my function. I did not see it then as my function to conduct an investigation into whether or not Gareth Jenkins was an honest or a dishonest witness. That was the role of Fujitsu and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A.	evidence, we don't know why but, surely we should investigate this"; did you have that discussion with Mr Altman? He knew about it because he had seen my advices. Did I have a specific discussion with him about this subject? It seems unlikely that I wouldn't have done. Quite. But I don't recall one. In terms of the other theme of your question, which goes, "Did you think it ought to be investigated", it's not my function. I did not see it then as my function to conduct an investigation into whether or not Gareth Jenkins was an honest or a dishonest witness. That was the role of Fujitsu and Post Office.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q.	evidence, we don't know why but, surely we should investigate this"; did you have that discussion with Mr Altman? He knew about it because he had seen my advices. Did I have a specific discussion with him about this subject? It seems unlikely that I wouldn't have done. Quite. But I don't recall one. In terms of the other theme of your question, which goes, "Did you think it ought to be investigated", it's not my function. I did not see it then as my function to conduct an investigation into whether or not Gareth Jenkins was an honest or a dishonest witness. That was the role of Fujitsu and Post Office. Okay. Fine. You'll agree with me that, by the time
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A.	evidence, we don't know why but, surely we should investigate this"; did you have that discussion with Mr Altman? He knew about it because he had seen my advices. Did I have a specific discussion with him about this subject? It seems unlikely that I wouldn't have done. Quite. But I don't recall one. In terms of the other theme of your question, which goes, "Did you think it ought to be investigated", it's not my function. I did not see it then as my function to conduct an investigation into whether or not Gareth Jenkins was an honest or a dishonest witness. That was the role of Fujitsu and Post Office. Okay. Fine. You'll agree with me that, by the time you've reached the 15 July advice and that has then gone
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A.	evidence, we don't know why but, surely we should investigate this"; did you have that discussion with Mr Altman? He knew about it because he had seen my advices. Did I have a specific discussion with him about this subject? It seems unlikely that I wouldn't have done. Quite. But I don't recall one. In terms of the other theme of your question, which goes, "Did you think it ought to be investigated", it's not my function. I did not see it then as my function to conduct an investigation into whether or not Gareth Jenkins was an honest or a dishonest witness. That was the role of Fujitsu and Post Office. Okay. Fine. You'll agree with me that, by the time you've reached the 15 July advice and that has then gone to Mr Altman, that the position seems to be that Martin
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q.	evidence, we don't know why but, surely we should investigate this"; did you have that discussion with Mr Altman? He knew about it because he had seen my advices. Did I have a specific discussion with him about this subject? It seems unlikely that I wouldn't have done. Quite. But I don't recall one. In terms of the other theme of your question, which goes, "Did you think it ought to be investigated", it's not my function. I did not see it then as my function to conduct an investigation into whether or not Gareth Jenkins was an honest or a dishonest witness. That was the role of Fujitsu and Post Office. Okay. Fine. You'll agree with me that, by the time you've reached the 15 July advice and that has then gone to Mr Altman, that the position seems to be that Martin Smith is aware of the problems with Jenkins
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q.	evidence, we don't know why but, surely we should investigate this"; did you have that discussion with Mr Altman? He knew about it because he had seen my advices. Did I have a specific discussion with him about this subject? It seems unlikely that I wouldn't have done. Quite. But I don't recall one. In terms of the other theme of your question, which goes, "Did you think it ought to be investigated", it's not my function. I did not see it then as my function to conduct an investigation into whether or not Gareth Jenkins was an honest or a dishonest witness. That was the role of Fujitsu and Post Office. Okay. Fine. You'll agree with me that, by the time you've reached the 15 July advice and that has then gone to Mr Altman, that the position seems to be that Martin Smith is aware of the problems with Jenkins Oh, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q.	evidence, we don't know why but, surely we should investigate this"; did you have that discussion with Mr Altman? He knew about it because he had seen my advices. Did I have a specific discussion with him about this subject? It seems unlikely that I wouldn't have done. Quite. But I don't recall one. In terms of the other theme of your question, which goes, "Did you think it ought to be investigated", it's not my function. I did not see it then as my function to conduct an investigation into whether or not Gareth Jenkins was an honest or a dishonest witness. That was the role of Fujitsu and Post Office. Okay. Fine. You'll agree with me that, by the time you've reached the 15 July advice and that has then gone to Mr Altman, that the position seems to be that Martin Smith is aware of the problems with Jenkins Oh, yes. putting it neutrally, you obviously are as well,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q.	evidence, we don't know why but, surely we should investigate this"; did you have that discussion with Mr Altman? He knew about it because he had seen my advices. Did I have a specific discussion with him about this subject? It seems unlikely that I wouldn't have done. Quite. But I don't recall one. In terms of the other theme of your question, which goes, "Did you think it ought to be investigated", it's not my function. I did not see it then as my function to conduct an investigation into whether or not Gareth Jenkins was an honest or a dishonest witness. That was the role of Fujitsu and Post Office. Okay. Fine. You'll agree with me that, by the time you've reached the 15 July advice and that has then gone to Mr Altman, that the position seems to be that Martin Smith is aware of the problems with Jenkins Oh, yes. putting it neutrally, you obviously are as well, because you've written the advices that we've now been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q.	evidence, we don't know why but, surely we should investigate this"; did you have that discussion with Mr Altman? He knew about it because he had seen my advices. Did I have a specific discussion with him about this subject? It seems unlikely that I wouldn't have done. Quite. But I don't recall one. In terms of the other theme of your question, which goes, "Did you think it ought to be investigated", it's not my function. I did not see it then as my function to conduct an investigation into whether or not Gareth Jenkins was an honest or a dishonest witness. That was the role of Fujitsu and Post Office. Okay. Fine. You'll agree with me that, by the time you've reached the 15 July advice and that has then gone to Mr Altman, that the position seems to be that Martin Smith is aware of the problems with Jenkins Oh, yes. putting it neutrally, you obviously are as well, because you've written the advices that we've now been looking at, and Mr Altman is now on board.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q.	evidence, we don't know why but, surely we should investigate this"; did you have that discussion with Mr Altman? He knew about it because he had seen my advices. Did I have a specific discussion with him about this subject? It seems unlikely that I wouldn't have done. Quite. But I don't recall one. In terms of the other theme of your question, which goes, "Did you think it ought to be investigated", it's not my function. I did not see it then as my function to conduct an investigation into whether or not Gareth Jenkins was an honest or a dishonest witness. That was the role of Fujitsu and Post Office. Okay. Fine. You'll agree with me that, by the time you've reached the 15 July advice and that has then gone to Mr Altman, that the position seems to be that Martin Smith is aware of the problems with Jenkins Oh, yes. putting it neutrally, you obviously are as well, because you've written the advices that we've now been

- A. I don't know.
- 2 **Q.** Right. Just to help us a bit further, did you advise
 - eyes that Fujitsu, the employer of Mr Jenkins, should be
- 4 told what you've discovered?
- 5 A. I would have said it orally to Rodric Williams,
 - I don't -- I may be wrong, you may find something --
 - I don't know whether I put it in writing or not.
- 8 Q. Okay, so you just don't know what's happened in relation9 to Fujitsu?
- 10 **A.** No.
- 11 Q. You don't know whether the impression that was left in
- 12 this advice, which is only to tell Fujitsu about
- 13 an independent expert needed, you don't know whether
- 14 that was ever corrected into "Oh my god, there's a real
- 15 problem with Jenkins"?
- 16 **A.** No, I don't.
- 17 Q. Okay, fair enough. When Mr Altman came on board, in
- 18 relation to you, quite a much more senior barrister or
- 19 silk at that time, someone with considerable experience
- 20 with lots of quality assurance tags around him --
- 21 Treasury Counsel, Senior Treasury Counsel, First
- 22 Treasury Counsel -- he's a very well-known individual.
- 23 Did you have a discussion with Mr Altman when he first
- 24 came on board saying to him, "I've never seen anything
- 25 like this. We've got this expert, he's not, it seems, 182

1		investigated.
2	Α.	I don't think you can say that. I don't know what was
3		going on in Post Office. If your question is: did any
4		of the external lawyers, you've named them Smith, me,
5		Altman have that conversation, I don't believe we
6		did, and I don't believe we did because we would and
7		I'm convinced that Mr Altman would have taken the same
8		view it is not counsel's function to conduct
9		an investigation into the propriety of a witness.
10	Q.	Okay, I don't mean to cut you off, Mr Clarke, I just
11		want to get to the final part
12	Α.	Sure, that's fine. Carry on.
13	Q.	so that we can conclude and other people can then
14		take over.
15		Now, our work as barristers, particularly criminal
16		barristers before the courts, and solicitor advocates
17		before the Magistrates' Court and Crown Courts, and so
18		on, right, if we make a mistake and we misled the court
19		and it's an error, what do we normally do about it?
20		We
21	Α.	We confess. We tell the court we made a mistake.
22	Q.	Precisely. We immediately do so, don't we?
23	Α.	Yes.
24	Q.	I don't know whether you're like me but, in that
25		situation we've all done it, we've all made errors, 184

- we've all unknowingly, unwittingly come to say something
- 2 that then turns out to be wrong or we've made
- 3 a mistake -- frankly, if you don't correct it, it makes
- 4 you feel -- you know, you don't correct it immediately,
- 5 you're worried about it, aren't you?
- 6 A. If you don't correct it immediately, you're guilty of 7 professional misconduct.
- 8 Q. Well, quite. So what you try and do is, as soon as it
- 9 is possible, at the right moment, to intervene with the
- judge to say, "Look, there's been this problem", you put 10
- your hands up and you say sorry and try and explain, if 11
- 12 you possibly can, why; is that fair?
- 13 A. I agree.

- 14 Q. Right, okay. Now, in the situation we've got to with
- 15 Mr Jenkins, we've reached the conclusion, by 15 July,
- 16 that, for whatever reason, he does not seem to have told
- 17 courts in statements and then in his evidence, live
- 18 evidence, what he should have done. In other words,
- 19 that there are bugs in the system, right? So you agree 20 with that?
- 21 A. Sorry, I'm nodding, yes.
- 22 **Q.** You're nodding agreement with me because I'm right.
- 23 Α. But I'm saying, yes, because of the shorthand writer.
- 24 I understand. Okay, fine. Q.
 - So those courts are in an ongoing situation, whereby 185
- 1 juncture. Were you operating under the duties that
- 2 characterise an advocate working on behalf of the CPS,
- 3 in other words someone with the higher duties in
- 4 relation to prosecution, the minister of justice duties? 5 A. No.

- 6 Q. Right. So when you were providing the advice to the
- 7 Post Office in relation to Mr Jenkins, "Look, there is
- 8 this massive problem, really it's a real problem", was 9 that to a private client?
- A. Yes. 10
- 11 Q. Right. Now, thinking back, in relation to this, do you
- 12 think that you were right to apply what appears to be
- 13 a different ethical standard to the way that you dealt
- 14 with the advice regarding Mr Jenkins by providing advice 15 on the private client basis, versus the prosecution
- 16 basis?
- 17 A. I don't agree with the basis of your theory.
- Q. Okay, well, then help unpick why on earth a barrister 18 19 that has been qualified for quite some time by this
- point, you didn't immediately say to yourself and all 20
- 21 the other lawyers involved "We've got to do something
- 22 about what Jenkins has said and correct it before the
- 23 court"? Help us unpick it, if it's not a choice between 24 ethical situations?
- 25 Α. My function as a barrister in front of the court is not 187

- 1 they have not been given the right evidence by
- 2 Mr Jenkins by the time you've realised that; do you
- 3 agree?
- 4 A. I do.
- 5 Q. Right. Now, if that was you when you'd made those
- 6 errors, you'd immediately have corrected it, yes?
- 7 A. I would
- Q. Right. You're now prosecuting on behalf of the Post 8
- 9 Office, yes?
- 10 A. No.
- 11 Q. Ah. Right. Why do you say at this juncture that you're 12 not prosecuting on behalf of the Post Office?
- 13 Because I wasn't. Α.
- 14 Q. Okay.
- A. I was not a --15
- 16 Q. Unwrap that, would you?
- 17 A. Certainly, I was not a prosecuting barrister for the
- 18 Post Office. I was never a prosecuting barrister for
- 19 the Post Office. I was instructed to prosecute one
- 20 case, the case of Samra. That case got to trial on
- 21 1 July and I stopped it and I then stopped every other
- 22 case from being prosecuted thereafter. So I was not
- 23 a prosecuting barrister; I was the barrister who stopped
- 24 the prosecutions.
- 25 Q. Right, okay. So let's think about your duties at that 186
- 1 to mislead the court. There is no circumstance in this 2 Post Office saga in which I had misled a court, 3 therefore I had no duty to go back to the court and 4 correct anything I had or had not done. This was 5 an entirely different situation. This was a situation 6 where I had discovered, as I say, a witness in 7 prosecutions in which I was not involved in had misled 8 the court. It was therefore not my function to go back 9 to the court that he had misled and tell the court, "Oh, 10 by the way, court, that witness you heard from six years 11 ago had misled you". 12 My function was to advise Post Office as to what 13 they ought and ought not to do in the circumstances that 14 I had identified. 15 Q. Okay. Two last things: do you think that 16 characterisation of your position is what was, if we were to try to look at it in the way that you've looked 17 18 at it, what was really going on between yourself, 19 Mr Smith and Mr Altman, in other words, it was advice to 20 the Post Office, rather than trying to rectify problems 21 that have occurred with Jenkins in the past to the 22 courts? 23 A. No, I don't agree with that at all. I was advising the 24 Post Office on how they should deal with the problem 25 that I'd identified, and that advice consisted of 188

The Post Office Horizon IT Inquiry

1		reviewing the cases, disclosing the material that ought						
2		to have been disclosed and setting up systems in order						
3		to ensure that that didn't happen in the future. That						
4		was my function.						
5	Q.	I have, in my questions to you, built up, as you say,						
6		a sort of construct that relates to the way that ethical						
7		matters should be considered						
8	Α.	And I don't agree.						
9	Q.	or could be considered; you don't agree with that?						
10		Did you ever have that discussion with Mr Altman? Did						
11		you ever say to him "What are we doing here? Are we						
12		advising Post Office or are we acting as prosecutors?"						
13		Did that discussion ever occur?						
14	Α.	No, because I knew where my footing was. I was advising						
15		Post Office.						
16	MR	STEIN: Thank you, Mr Clarke.						
17	MR	BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Next we have Ms Watt and						
18		Ms Allan.						
19	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: When you say that, do you mean they are						
20		going to ask questions alternatively, or what?						
21	MR	BLAKE: No, Ms Watt has one very brief question and then						
22		we'll move on to Ms Allan.						
23	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: Oh, right.						
24		Questioned by MS WATT						
25	MS	WATT: Thank you, sir.						
		189						
1		Cartwright King and Jarnail Singh, Head of Criminal Law						
2		at Post Office, you took the time and trouble to go to						
3		Scotland to try to prevent the Procurator Fiscal from						
4		terminating those criminal prosecutions, didn't you?						
_								

- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. You told the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service
- 7 that you were getting an expert report that would show
- 8 Horizon was fine and so the prosecutions did not need to9 be terminated?
- 10 **A.** No, I don't agree with that.
- 11 Q. Why don't you agree with that?
- 12 A. We told the Procurator Fiscal's Office that we had
- 13 concerns about the existing expert and that we were
- 14 hoping to instruct a new expert, clearly that new
- expert, Post Office hoped, would identify that Horizonwas sound, but -- the --
- 17 Q. That never materialised, did it?
- 18 A. Sadly not, but I've explained why not. But the space
- 19 around that instructing of the new expert was to be
- 20 wide. The new expert was to look at all aspects of
- Horizon and determine whether it was working improperly,as well as properly.
- 23 $\,$ Q. $\,$ Of course, you were very pleased at the end of that $\,$
- 24 meeting to note you'd achieved the objective:
- 25 prosecutions in Scotland would not be terminated after 191

1		Good afternoon, Mr Clarke. I represent the National
2		Federation of SubPostmasters. I'll be quick.
3		You went to Scotland in September 2013 to meet with
4		the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service; do you
5		remember that?
6	Α.	l do.
7	Q.	This was because there was to be a termination of
8		Scottish criminal cases on the basis that Horizon was
9		unreliable?
10	Α.	No, it's because Post Office had been informed by the PF
11		Office that that was the route they wished to take.
12	Q.	Now, when you went to this meeting, you knew about
13		Gareth Jenkins, we've just been talking about that?
14	Α.	l did.
15	Q.	You knew about bugs in the Horizon system?
16	Α.	l did.
17	Q.	You knew about the Second Sight Report
18	Α.	l did.
19	Q.	which although it said "no systemic issues" it had
20		concerning material in it, did it not?
21	Α.	Yes.
22	Q.	And you knew that prosecutions in England had been
23	_	paused?
24	Α.	Yes.
25	Q.	But, despite this, a group effort of two lawyers from 190
1		all?
2	Α.	We didn't think they ought to be terminated because we
3		thought that they ought to be approached on
4		a case-by-case basis and that was what I sought to
5		persuade the PF's representative ought to take place
6		and, if you look at the note that was the result of that

- meeting, it explains very carefully that that is, in
- 8 fact, what the PF's Office agreed to do. They agreed to
- 9 look at it on a case-by-case basis and the reason we
- 10 advanced that proposition was because not all
- 11 prosecutions were Horizon based -- and I've given the
- 12 example already of the postmistress who was loaning Post
- 13 Office money to family members -- and I think that might
- 14 even have been a Scottish case.
- 15 I took the view, and I suspect if I'd have put it to
 16 Post Office they would have taken the same view, that it
 17 would be wrong to stop a prosecution in a case like
- 18 that.

21

- 19 Q. Well, taking all of what I've put to you together, I'm
- 20 suggesting to you that, collectively, you were all, at
 - the very least, disingenuous in the way you sought to
- 22 persuade a Crown Office officer, a representative of
- 23 Scotland's most senior law officer, the Lord Advocate,
- 24 not to terminate such prosecutions; would you accept
- 25 that?

2	MS	WATT: Thank you.
3		Questioned by MS ALLAN
4	MS	ALLAN: Mr Clarke, I represent Scottish Core Participant,
5		Susan Sinclair.
6		During your evidence, both written and oral today,
7		you have mentioned the two-stage process for disclosure
8		covered in England and Wales by the Criminal Procedure
9		and Investigations Act 1996. What is or was your
0		knowledge of the relevant continuing disclosure and
1		regulation obligations of Specialist Reporting Agencies
12		such as POL in Scots Law?
3	Α.	Such as who, sorry?
4	Q.	Post Office Limited.
15	Α.	None.
6	Q.	There is no continuing duty of disclosure
17	Α.	No, you asked me what my understanding was, I think.
8	Q.	What is your understanding?
9	Α.	I had very little. I don't know what the duties were of
20		a Scottish prosecutor.
21	Q.	What I'm asking you is, what the duties were of Post
22		Office, as a Specialist Reporting Agency in Scotland in
23		terms of disclosure?
24	Α.	Oh, to inform the PF's Office of everything they knew
25		about. 193
		195
1		in July 2013?
2	Α.	That's, forgive me, a two-part question. The first part
3		of the question, did I disclose my advice? No,
4		I wouldn't have dreamed of disclosing my advice. It was
5		privileged and it was privileged to Post Office.

- Whether or not Post Office disclosed it, which was their 6
- 7 right or not, I don't know. That's the first part of 8 your question.
- 9 In terms of the second part of your -- I'm afraid
- 10 you're going to have to remind me of it, I'm sorry.
- As it was whether you shared your concerns as to the 11 Q. reliability of Gareth Jenkins? 12
- Yes, I did. If you look at -- I don't know what the POL 13 Α.
- 14 reference number is but there's a note from BDO (sic) 15 where they conducted a meeting with -- I think Martin
- 16 Smith was involved and a representative of the
- 17
- Procurator Fiscal's office -- in which they discuss the 18 issues about Gareth Jenkins.
- Q. Do you recall when that was? 19
- 20 A. I think I had was a day or so before the meeting I had with the PF's Office. 21
- 22 Q. Okay, thank you.
- 23 A. It's in the papers, and it very clearly says that BDO
- 24 (sic) told the PF's -- Paul somebody -- the PF's
- 25 representative about Gareth Jenkins.

- Q. Were you aware of anyone within Post Office's Legal 1
- Department or, indeed, the relevant team at Cartwright 3
 - King, who was qualified to advise on issues on Scots
- Law? 4

- A. In gualified (sic) King -- forgive me, in Cartwright 5 6 King there was nobody qualified. I don't know what the
- 7 position is or was in Post Office.
- Q. Would you consider if there wasn't anybody in Scots Law 8 9 qualified that this was perhaps an oversight in Post
- 10 Office?
- **A.** Well, my understanding of the position was that you 11
- could not bring a private prosecution, which essentially 12
- 13 is what we're talking about here, in Scotland. You had
- 14 to be an appointed specialist or similar to bring the
- 15 matter you're concerned with to the attention of the
- 16 Procurator Fiscal and the PF would then be responsible
- 17 for conducting the prosecution. That was my
- 18 understanding of the process. Whether or not Post
- 19 Office understood that or not. I don't know.
- 20 Q. Thank you. Did you or the Post Office disclose your
- 21 advice document regarding Gareth Jenkins' reliability as
- 22 an expert witness -- for the record, that's
- 23 POL00006357 -- or share your concerns with your
- 24 counterparts in the devolved jurisdictions, such as the
- 25 Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service in Scotland 194
- 1 Q. Okay, thank you. During your involvement with the Post 2 Office, were you aware that the Post Office had
- instructed a Scottish firm, BTO Solicitors? 3
- 4 A. That's who I'm referring to. BTO, yes.
- 5 Q. Thank you. What was your understanding of the instruction of BTO Solicitors? 6
- 7 Α. I don't know.
- **Q.** Was BTO represented at meetings with Post Office, 8
- Cartwright King and the Crown Office and Procurator 9 Fiscal Service in Scotland? 10
- A. I think Martin Smith acted as a sort of liaison between 11 12 Post Office and the PF's Office and BTO. I had very,
- 13 very little to do, other than the meeting, with the
- 14 Scottish aspect or, indeed, the northern Ireland aspect
- 15 of this thing. I was concentrating on England and 16 Wales
- 17 **Q.** Thank you. I know Ms Watt had touched upon this but
- 18 I wanted to just touch upon your contact with the Crown
- 19 Office, on 4 and 5 September 2013. Was this meeting at
- 20 Crown Office's request, as opposed to the Post Office's?
- 21 A. I can't sav.
- 22 Q. You refer to the purpose of this meeting with the Crown
- 23 Office in Scotland being to see if anything could be
- 24 done to dissuade it from the status quo -- the stated
- 25 course of terminating all Post Office prosecutions in 196

1 2	Scotland at this time, not just those relying on Horizon-based evidence, due to concerns of public	1 2	whether or not they ought to be discontinued because, t the minds of Post Office and my mind, it would have be
	•		•
3	relations storm for Post Office.	3	wrong to stop prosecutions where the allegations were
4 A . 5 Q		4 5	not dependent upon Horizon, and I've given an example as to where that might be the case. That was my aim a
6 A.		5	that is what I achieved.
	for Post Office?	7	Q. At paragraph 194 of your witness statement, you descril
8 A .		8	being professionally and personally proud of the fact
9 Q		9	that you stopped POL prosecutions from 2013 onwards
3 u	in your witness statement at paragraph 57 to say you	10	
11	were ultimately successful in persuading it to review	10	
12	each Post Office case and make a decision on the basis	12	-
13	of each individual case. Was this approach not contrary	13	,
14	to your advice to Post Office in July 2013, that all	14	
15	ongoing or future prosecutions should be put on hold	15	-
16	until an independent expert had been properly	16	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
17	identified?	10	
18 A .		18	
19	put not the PF's Office were proposing to stop	19	
20	everything to stay all of the prosecutions. I was	20	
21	asking them not to do that. I was asking them to do	21	
22	what we had done in England and Wales, which is to	22	
23	suspend or what's the word just stop the	23	•
24	prosecutions to the extent that they should be	24	
25	considered on a case-by-case basis before determining	25	
	197		198
1	continuing in September 2013, and this was perhaps,	1	that your questions relate to one or more of your
2	would you accept, a missed opportunity and caused undue	2	clients, first of all?
3	delay in putting a halt to Scottish prosecutions?	3	MR HENRY: They do.
4 A .		4	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: In the main, is it Ms Misra?
5	took place or what I said. What I said was I was proud	5	MR HENRY: It is Mrs Misra.
6	to have stopped the Post Office prosecutions, I was	6	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Does it relate essentially to the condu
7	referring to the England and Wales jurisdiction. I had	7	of the reviews in her case or is it wider than that?
8	no power or authority to even advise or stop Scottish	8	MR HENRY: It's wider than that.
9	prosecutions. That was a matter entirely for the	9	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, if you just start, if you would,
10	Procurator Fiscal and so, no, I don't accept your	10	
11	thesis.	11	
	S ALLAN: Okay, thank you Mr Clarke.	12	
	R BLAKE: Thank you, sir. It's Mr Henry next. We have	13	
	Mr Henry and Ms Oliver left.	14	•
14		15	advising the Post Office as a corporate or were you
14	R HENRY: Sir, may I raise something very quickly? With	15 16	
14 15 M 16	R HENRY: Sir, may I raise something very quickly? With great deference to you, sir, to whom I express my		acting as part of a firm of solicitors that had
14 15 M	R HENRY: Sir, may I raise something very quickly? With great deference to you, sir, to whom I express my gratitude, but Ms Oliver and I have a substantial number	16	acting as part of a firm of solicitors that had effectively taken on board their entire prosecution
14 15 M 16 17 18	R HENRY: Sir, may I raise something very quickly? With great deference to you, sir, to whom I express my gratitude, but Ms Oliver and I have a substantial number of questions and I fear that it is simply not possible	16 17	acting as part of a firm of solicitors that had effectively taken on board their entire prosecution facility and service?
14 15 M 16 17 18 19	R HENRY: Sir, may I raise something very quickly? With great deference to you, sir, to whom I express my gratitude, but Ms Oliver and I have a substantial number of questions and I fear that it is simply not possible to conclude by 4.30, in fairness to Ms Oliver as well.	16 17 18	acting as part of a firm of solicitors that had effectively taken on board their entire prosecution facility and service?A. Well, I think the latter is a proper characterisation.
14 15 M 16 17 18	R HENRY: Sir, may I raise something very quickly? With great deference to you, sir, to whom I express my gratitude, but Ms Oliver and I have a substantial number of questions and I fear that it is simply not possible to conclude by 4.30, in fairness to Ms Oliver as well. I raise it now, without, I hope, any impertinence	16 17 18 19	 acting as part of a firm of solicitors that had effectively taken on board their entire prosecution facility and service? A. Well, I think the latter is a proper characterisation. Q. So the latter is the proper characterisation and we
14 15 M 16 17 18 19 20	R HENRY: Sir, may I raise something very quickly? With great deference to you, sir, to whom I express my gratitude, but Ms Oliver and I have a substantial number of questions and I fear that it is simply not possible to conclude by 4.30, in fairness to Ms Oliver as well. I raise it now, without, I hope, any impertinence but simply to apprise you, sir, of the gravity of the	16 17 18 19 20	 acting as part of a firm of solicitors that had effectively taken on board their entire prosecution facility and service? A. Well, I think the latter is a proper characterisation. Q. So the latter is the proper characterisation and we know, and there's no need to take you to them, unless
14 15 M 16 17 18 19 20 21	R HENRY: Sir, may I raise something very quickly? With great deference to you, sir, to whom I express my gratitude, but Ms Oliver and I have a substantial number of questions and I fear that it is simply not possible to conclude by 4.30, in fairness to Ms Oliver as well. I raise it now, without, I hope, any impertinence but simply to apprise you, sir, of the gravity of the matters that I have to put to this witness and also, of	16 17 18 19 20 21	 acting as part of a firm of solicitors that had effectively taken on board their entire prosecution facility and service? A. Well, I think the latter is a proper characterisation. Q. So the latter is the proper characterisation and we know, and there's no need to take you to them, unless you specifically wish to, that you were aware of
14 15 M 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	R HENRY: Sir, may I raise something very quickly? With great deference to you, sir, to whom I express my gratitude, but Ms Oliver and I have a substantial number of questions and I fear that it is simply not possible to conclude by 4.30, in fairness to Ms Oliver as well. I raise it now, without, I hope, any impertinence but simply to apprise you, sir, of the gravity of the	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 acting as part of a firm of solicitors that had effectively taken on board their entire prosecution facility and service? A. Well, I think the latter is a proper characterisation. Q. So the latter is the proper characterisation and we know, and there's no need to take you to them, unless you specifically wish to, that you were aware of potential civil claims?

200

(50) Pages 197 - 200

- 1 A. Yes, that's likely.
- 2 **Q.** Yes. You were aware of potential civil claims and, in
- 3 the course of that quarter between July and September,
- 4 you had written some extremely accommodating advices to
- 5 the Post Office stating that they would not be liable
- 6 for malicious prosecution, the responsibility would fall
- 7 on Cartwright King?
- 8 A. I don't agree with your characterisation about
- 9 "extremely accommodating". I wrote advices as I saw the10 position to be.
- 11 **Q.** Well, it is extremely accommodating to say, "We'll throw
- 12 ourselves under the bus for you", isn't it, Mr Clarke?
- 13 A. I don't agree with you.
- 14 **Q.** A curious thing that, in fact, they asked you to write
- a second advice on 12 September 2013 because theyprobably couldn't believe their luck, Mr Clarke. You,
- 17 on behalf of your firm, were basically saying, "We will
- 18 take the rap for malicious prosecution. POL will be
- completely absolved from responsibility". What were thepressures on you, Mr Clarke?
- 21 A. I'll answer the first point first: you are wrong. And
- 22 the second point is there were no pressures on me and
- 23 I'm not resistant to pressure. Forgive me, I won't take24 pressure
- 24 pressure.
- 25 **Q.** Well, we'll see about that. I'm afraid I'm not wrong 201
- 1 Q. Do assist us: just tell us what you said?
- A. I said that I did not think that Mrs Misra ought to havedisclosure of the documents.
- 4 Q. You're aware of your duty, aren't you, where, after the
 conclusion of proceedings material comes to light that
 might cast doubt on the safety of the conviction, the
- 7 prosecutor must consider disclosure of such material;
- 8 you were aware of that?
- 9 **A.** Yes.
- 10 Q. You had a positive duty, either as part of the firm or
- to advise the corporate, that disclosure must be made toMrs Misra as soon as possible?
- 13 A. You had my advice. You've seen it, you've read it.14 That was my view at that time.
- 15 Q. I'm going to ask you, please, to reflect on the9 September 2013. You attended a conference at
- 17 2 Bedford Row, together with Bond Dickinson, members of
- 18 the Post Office, to see Mr Brian Altman, correct?
- 19 **A.** Yes.
- 20 **Q.** Right. Mr Altman, called in 1981, just stood down as
- 21 First Senior Treasury Counsel, illustrious reputation;
- 22 did you rely on him, take a steer from him?
- 23 A. Of course.
- 24 Q. Yes. You were called in 1997. According to your
- 25 website, you've had a high level criminal defence 203

- and, therefore, I'm going to put on to the record for
- 2 you, sir, to review in due course POL00114253,
- 3 12 September 2013, and POL00198766, the 12 September
- 4 2013. But anyway, you accept that --
- 5 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Let me make sure I've got those
- 6 correctly, Mr Henry: 00114253 was the first?
- 7 MR HENRY: That's correct, sir.
- 8 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: 198766 the next, and are --
- 9 MR HENRY: Sorry, 198766 next, after two 0s.
- 10 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: That's it, yes. Are they both date
- 11 12 September?
- 12 MR HENRY: They're both date 12 September, they're both
- 13 written by this witness.
- 14 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you very much.
- 15 MR HENRY: Right. So you're advising the corporate, and you
- 16 have already given answers to Mr Stein this afternoon
- 17 that you didn't feel under any obligation at all to
- 18 inform the solicitors of a woman who had gone to jail
- 19 whilst pregnant because it was nothing to do with you?
- 20 A. I don't think that's what I said.
- 21 Q. Well, that's the gist of what you said, isn't it?
- 22 A. That is not what I said. I am not interested in gist;
- 23 I'm interested in what I said.
- 24 Q. Well, then what did you say?
- 25 A. You know what I said, you have it on record.202
- 1practice for over 25 years, so by 2013 you'd have had 162years' experience?3A. Yes.
- 4 Q. Right. It is inconceivable, I suggest, that you would
- 5 have failed to recognise the relevance of your
- 6 conversation with Mr Gareth Jenkins on 28 June, which
- 7 you distilled in your Clarke Advice of 13 July 2013, or
- 8 15 July 2013. It is inconceivable that you would not
- 9 that have recognised the importance of disclosure to
- 10 Mrs Misra.
- A. Forgive me, is that a question? Are you asking mewhether or not I agree or disagree with the proposition?
- 13 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Take it that that --
- 14 MR HENRY: Just --
- 15 **A.** I beg your pardon?
- 16 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Take it that that is question, Mr Clarke.
- 17 A. Thank you. I disagree.

18 MR HENRY: You disagree. You would have keenly appreciated

- 19 the vulnerabilities of Jenkins as a witness, whom you
- 20 described as "fatally undermined" and you would have
- 21 known the role that he played in the conviction of
- 22 Mrs Misra, and you did know the role that he played in
- 23 the conviction of Mrs Misra by 9 September 2013.
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. So did Mr Altman, didn't he?

- A. I imagine so. 1
- 2 Q. Yes, because you know that he had read all of the papers
- 3 by the time you arrived. Now, let me just ask you this:
- 4 if you were counsel for Seema Misra, what use would you
- 5 have made of the material that you then knew, Mr Clarke?
- 6 A. I wasn't counsel for Mrs Misra.
- 7 Q. Oh, come on.
- 8 A. I wasn't counsel for --
- 9 Q. You understand what I'm saying. You have to look at the
- 10 position of what the material would do if placed in the
- 11 hands of competent counsel. Don't evade: what would you 12 have done?
- 13 A. I wasn't counsel for Mrs Misra and I cannot answer that 14 auestion
- You know perfectly well that it would have given rise to 15 Q. 16 an irresistible appeal, don't you?
- 17 A. I know that's what would have been the outcome but that 18 was not your question.
- 19 Q. You're splitting hairs, Mr Clarke. You know that it's
- 20 inescapable. You know that the material that was inside
- 21 your head was absolutely dynamite; it was a bombshell;
- 22 and it would have given rise to an inevitable appeal for
- 23 Mrs Misra, as soon as it had been notified to her.
- 24 Α. What I know is that I advised that the material ought
- 25 not to be disclosed and that I now accept that that was 205
- 1 A. I had nothing to do with the civil claims and I had, at
- 2 that time, almost no knowledge of civil law, other than 3 what I've learnt at university years beforehand.
- 4 Q. You already conceded to me that you knew about the civil 5 claims, when I put that to you.
- 6 A. What I said was I wasn't part of them. I had no role in 7 the civil claims.
- 8 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Sorry to be pedantic: at the point in
- 9 time that I thought we were talking about, September
- 10 2013, there were indications of civil claims, as
- I understand it, in that a firm of solicitors had 11 12 indicated a possibility of it, that is Shoosmiths --
- MR HENRY: That is correct, sir. 13
- 14 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: -- at the beginnings of the mediation.
- Is that what you're talking about, Mr Henry? 15
- MR HENRY: I am, sir. 16
- 17 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Just so I can be clear. Right. Thank 18 vou
- 19 MR HENRY: Let's be clear about this. Bond Dickinson are
- 20 there. What were Bond Dickinson doing at the conference 21 or the consultation on 9 September 2013?
- 22 A. There came a time during that conference when -- and
- 23 there was another conference where it happened again --
- 24 where the criminal lawyers in terms were asked to leave,
- 25 and the conference continued after we had left.

an error.

- 2 Q. We'll come to that. I'm asking you now about the
- 3 9 September because I've looked at two notes of that
- 4 consultation with Mr Altman and it doesn't seem that any
- 5 discussion, either around the damaged or tainted status
- 6 of Mr Jenkins and disclosure to Mrs Misra, arose at that
- 7 conference, in either of the notes.
- 8 A. If you're asking me was there such a discussion,
- 9 I believe there was
- 10 Q. Right. So, therefore, it follows that there must have
- 11 been a discussion, as you say, you believe there was
- and, obviously, the discussion resulted in saying, 12
- 13 "We're not going to give her anything".
- 14 A. I'm not sure that's right. At some point, Mr Altman
- 15 pointed to my January advice and said -- and
- 16 I paraphrase -- "That's wrong, you ought to disclose".
- 17 I don't know whether --
- 18 Q. We're talking about 9 September.
- 19 Α. Well, if I can finish my answer. I don't know whether 20 or not that took place on or about 9 December (sic) or
- 21 after
- 22 Q. Let us go, please, to your knowledge of the civil 23 because you would have realised, wouldn't you, that, if
- 24 Mrs Misra had appealed, it would have undermined the
- 25 defence of the civil claims? 206
- 1 Q. You knew that they were the Post Office's civil lawyers?
- 2 Δ Oh, yes.
- Q. 3 Yes.
- 4 Α. Yes. That's why, I assumed, we were asked to leave.
- 5 Q. You said earlier today that you should have asked the 6
 - question why there were the transcripts of the Misra
- 7 trial; do you remember saying that?
- 8 A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Well, we can give you an answer for that and maybe 9
- 10 you've already become aware of it by watching the
- 11 Inquiry because, on 16 December 2010, Ms Talbot wrote
- 12 an email to Mr Singh saying that the Misra transcripts
- 13 will help with the civil actions. I ask you again: were
- 14 you not aware of the unique and special importance that
- 15 Seema Misra's case formed as a precedent to deter civil 16 and criminal claims?
- 17 A. The first knowledge I had about the email you've just
- 18 referred to is when you just told me just now. I didn't
- 19 know about the existence of that email or that was how
- 20 the transcripts came into being. The first I knew of
- 21 the transcripts was when I was sent the transcript of
- 22 the summing-up in, I think it was December 2013.
- 23 Frankly, what you've just told me reinforces my view
- 24 that I was drip fed the Misra file over the following
- 25 year.

The Post Office Horizon IT Inquiry

- 1 Q. Well, we'll come to what you were given in December.
- 2 But you were aware, were you not, that Mr Altman advised
- 3 that Cartwright King be kept fully informed of the civil4 litigation?
- 5 A. I don't know. If you say so then that must be right,
- but I don't know. I took no interest and no part in thecivil litigation.
- 8 Q. Right. Now, if I were to put to you that Mr Altman, by
- 9 one way or another, had had his instructions chamfered,
- 10 so that responsibility to advise on Seema Misra's case
- 11 fell squarely upon Cartwright King, what would you say?
- 12 A. I'd be surprised. It's new to me, if that's what
- 13 happened --
- 14 Q. Right.
- 15 A. -- and, frankly, from what little I know of Mr Altman,
- 16 I would be surprised if he accepted that sort of17 pressure.
- 18 Q. You did gather, however, what his approach was to theMisra appeal; would you agree?
- 20 A. I don't understand what you're referring to. You say
- his approach to the Misra appeal; you'll have to expand,l'm sorry.
- 23 Q. Well, if I were to put to you that, during the
- 24 consultation on 9 September, he expressed concern that
- 25 the slightest apology to a convicted person or the 209
- 1 Q. Why am I wrong?
- 2 A. I was not fully sighted. I --
- 3 Q. You were certainly aware of civil litigation?
- 4 A. I've told you -- at that point, I was not. I've already
 5 explained that, I took no part in the civil litigation
 6 and I was not aware that there was any pending civil
- 7 litigation in September 2013.
 2 Distant line in the literation of the literation o
- 8 Q. But you've been sent, Mr Clarke -- and you've advised
 9 upon it -- you've been sent on 11 December 2013
- an attachment which talks about civil claims against thePost Office and you were asked to advise on it?
- 12 **A.** You were asking me about September 2013.
- Q. Well, I'm talking there -- I was talking then about BondDickinson being at the consultation?
- A. Well, I'm sorry, you didn't make that clear. I did not
 know, in September 2013, of any pending civil
 litigation.
- 18 Q. Right. Do you agree or do you disagree with the fact
 19 that Mr Altman advised that the firm, Cartwright King,
 20 be kept fully informed regarding civil litigation?
- 21 A. I can't say.
- 22 Q. Right. Well, is it that you can't remember or that you23 choose not to answer?
- 24 A. I find the second proposition offensive. The first --
- 25 **Q.** Forget any construction on it, just answer the question. 211

- 1 payment of compensation could, indeed, give rise to
- 2 an appeal and he was concerned that Misra would use the
- 3 Mediation Scheme to obtain some concession to allow her
- 4 appeal.
- 5 A. Is that what it says in the note?
- 6 Q. That is what is said in a note sent by Mr Smith to Susan7 Crichton, following the consultation?
- 7 Crichton, following the const8 A. I know nothing of that note.
- 9 **Q.** But you were at the conference?
- 10 **A.** Iwas.
- 11 Q. You knew that Mr Altman was saying that he was worried
- 12 that "other Misras would crawl out of the woodwork", and
- that you shouldn't mediate with Mrs Misra under anycircumstances.
- A. I don't agree with your use of the phrase "crawl out of
 the woodwork", I think that's offensive to those who
 were convicted.
- 18 Q. I'm quoting from a note.
- 19 A. That may be so but I still don't approve of it.
- 20 **Q.** There we are. What I'm suggesting to you is that you
- 21 were fully sighted on the importance of Seema Misra's
- case and that, if Seema Misra's appeal succeeded, itwould cause pandemonium for the Post Office, wouldn't

210

24

it?

- 25 **A.** You're wrong about that.
- 1 A. I did. You offend me when you suggest that I'm not 2 being truthful. 3 Q. I'm going to suggest to you that it is absolutely 4 impossible that you could have advised in the way you 5 did, given your experience, because -- let's look at the 6 position. You knew that Horizon was essential to 7 Mrs Misra's conviction on theft, didn't you? A. I'm sorry? 8 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Sorry, Mr Henry could you stop a second, 9 10 please. 11 Let's get it out into the open. Are you suggesting 12 that the two -- I'll call them reviews of whether or not 13 disclosure to Ms Misra -- are you suggesting that those 14 two reviews were written in the way that they were for 15 a completely ulterior motive and an improper motive, as 16 opposed to being an assessment, whether right or wrong, 17 about whether disclosure should be given? MR HENRY: I'm trying to explore with the witness how he 18 19 could have reached such an untenable conclusion, sir, 20 which --21 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right. Well, he says he made 22 a mistake -- those are my words, not his. If you're 23 going to suggest to him that it's something more than 24 that, then put it in a form of direct question and then 25 we can move on. 212

1							
	MR	HENRY: Were you part of the suppression of material that					
2		would have allowed Mrs Misra to appeal promptly to the					
3		Court of Appeal?					
4	Α.	No, and I think the suggestion that you put to me is					
5		a disgraceful one.					
6	Q.	Well, then I must explore with you, therefore, you wrote					
7		the Grant Allen advice on 16 July 2013; do you remember?					
8	Α.	l don't.					
9	Q.	You don't?					
10	Α.	No, I wrote many advices, you can't					
11	Q.	I'm going to quote from it, and if you would like to					
12		have it put up on the screen, by all means, but I'm					
13		going to quote from it first:					
14		"In a case where we have relied upon Dr Jenkins as					
15		to the efficacy of Horizon, we are bound to disclose					
16		material which undermines his status as an expert					
17		witness."					
18		You wrote that on 16 July.					
19	Α.	I accept that.					
20	Q.	How on earth could you have reached a different					
21		conclusion with Mrs Misra in January 2014?					
22	Α.	Because I was talking about Horizon Online cases in					
23		which Gareth Jenkins had provided witness statements.					
24		Mrs Misra went back to pre-Horizon Online and, at that					
25		point, we weren't looking at pre-Horizon Online.					
		213					
1		say at Seema Misra's trial that everything was fine, bar					
2		one irrelevant rectified Falkirk bug? Yes, correct?					
~							
3	Α.	Are you quoting me?					
4	A. Q.	No, I'm just putting you the question: did the Post					
4 5	_	No, I'm just putting you the question: did the Post Office say, or claim, at Seema Misra's trial, through					
4 5 6	_	No, I'm just putting you the question: did the Post Office say, or claim, at Seema Misra's trial, through Gareth Jenkins, that everything was fine, bar one					
4 5 6 7	_	No, I'm just putting you the question: did the Post Office say, or claim, at Seema Misra's trial, through Gareth Jenkins, that everything was fine, bar one irrelevant rectified Falkirk bug? Your answer would be					
4 5 6 7 8	_	No, I'm just putting you the question: did the Post Office say, or claim, at Seema Misra's trial, through Gareth Jenkins, that everything was fine, bar one irrelevant rectified Falkirk bug? Your answer would be "Yes"?					
4 5 6 7	_	No, I'm just putting you the question: did the Post Office say, or claim, at Seema Misra's trial, through Gareth Jenkins, that everything was fine, bar one irrelevant rectified Falkirk bug? Your answer would be "Yes"? I can't say. Without going back to the documents,					
4 5 7 8 9 10	Q.	No, I'm just putting you the question: did the Post Office say, or claim, at Seema Misra's trial, through Gareth Jenkins, that everything was fine, bar one irrelevant rectified Falkirk bug? Your answer would be "Yes"? I can't say. Without going back to the documents, you're talking about a trial I took no part in years					
4 5 7 8 9	Q.	No, I'm just putting you the question: did the Post Office say, or claim, at Seema Misra's trial, through Gareth Jenkins, that everything was fine, bar one irrelevant rectified Falkirk bug? Your answer would be "Yes"? I can't say. Without going back to the documents,					
4 5 7 8 9 10	Q.	No, I'm just putting you the question: did the Post Office say, or claim, at Seema Misra's trial, through Gareth Jenkins, that everything was fine, bar one irrelevant rectified Falkirk bug? Your answer would be "Yes"? I can't say. Without going back to the documents, you're talking about a trial I took no part in years					
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q.	No, I'm just putting you the question: did the Post Office say, or claim, at Seema Misra's trial, through Gareth Jenkins, that everything was fine, bar one irrelevant rectified Falkirk bug? Your answer would be "Yes"? I can't say. Without going back to the documents, you're talking about a trial I took no part in years before I was anything to do with the Post Office. I can't say what was and was not said at the Seema Misra trial today.					
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q.	No, I'm just putting you the question: did the Post Office say, or claim, at Seema Misra's trial, through Gareth Jenkins, that everything was fine, bar one irrelevant rectified Falkirk bug? Your answer would be "Yes"? I can't say. Without going back to the documents, you're talking about a trial I took no part in years before I was anything to do with the Post Office. I can't say what was and was not said at the Seema Misra trial today.					
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q.	No, I'm just putting you the question: did the Post Office say, or claim, at Seema Misra's trial, through Gareth Jenkins, that everything was fine, bar one irrelevant rectified Falkirk bug? Your answer would be "Yes"? I can't say. Without going back to the documents, you're talking about a trial I took no part in years before I was anything to do with the Post Office. I can't say what was and was not said at the Seema Misra trial today.					
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q.	No, I'm just putting you the question: did the Post Office say, or claim, at Seema Misra's trial, through Gareth Jenkins, that everything was fine, bar one irrelevant rectified Falkirk bug? Your answer would be "Yes"? I can't say. Without going back to the documents, you're talking about a trial I took no part in years before I was anything to do with the Post Office. I can't say what was and was not said at the Seema Misra trial today. But you knew this, didn't you, Mr Clarke: you knew that					
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q.	No, I'm just putting you the question: did the Post Office say, or claim, at Seema Misra's trial, through Gareth Jenkins, that everything was fine, bar one irrelevant rectified Falkirk bug? Your answer would be "Yes"? I can't say. Without going back to the documents, you're talking about a trial I took no part in years before I was anything to do with the Post Office. I can't say what was and was not said at the Seema Misra trial today. But you knew this, didn't you, Mr Clarke: you knew that the person who gave evidence against Seema Misra had					
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q.	No, I'm just putting you the question: did the Post Office say, or claim, at Seema Misra's trial, through Gareth Jenkins, that everything was fine, bar one irrelevant rectified Falkirk bug? Your answer would be "Yes"? I can't say. Without going back to the documents, you're talking about a trial I took no part in years before I was anything to do with the Post Office. I can't say what was and was not said at the Seema Misra trial today. But you knew this, didn't you, Mr Clarke: you knew that the person who gave evidence against Seema Misra had failed to disclose the existence of bugs, errors and					
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q.	No, I'm just putting you the question: did the Post Office say, or claim, at Seema Misra's trial, through Gareth Jenkins, that everything was fine, bar one irrelevant rectified Falkirk bug? Your answer would be "Yes"? I can't say. Without going back to the documents, you're talking about a trial I took no part in years before I was anything to do with the Post Office. I can't say what was and was not said at the Seema Misra trial today. But you knew this, didn't you, Mr Clarke: you knew that the person who gave evidence against Seema Misra had failed to disclose the existence of bugs, errors and defects?					
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q.	No, I'm just putting you the question: did the Post Office say, or claim, at Seema Misra's trial, through Gareth Jenkins, that everything was fine, bar one irrelevant rectified Falkirk bug? Your answer would be "Yes"? I can't say. Without going back to the documents, you're talking about a trial I took no part in years before I was anything to do with the Post Office. I can't say what was and was not said at the Seema Misra trial today. But you knew this, didn't you, Mr Clarke: you knew that the person who gave evidence against Seema Misra had failed to disclose the existence of bugs, errors and defects? Yes.					
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A.	No, I'm just putting you the question: did the Post Office say, or claim, at Seema Misra's trial, through Gareth Jenkins, that everything was fine, bar one irrelevant rectified Falkirk bug? Your answer would be "Yes"? I can't say. Without going back to the documents, you're talking about a trial I took no part in years before I was anything to do with the Post Office. I can't say what was and was not said at the Seema Misra trial today. But you knew this, didn't you, Mr Clarke: you knew that the person who gave evidence against Seema Misra had failed to disclose the existence of bugs, errors and defects? Yes. You knew that he had given evidence to the contrary?					
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A.	No, I'm just putting you the question: did the Post Office say, or claim, at Seema Misra's trial, through Gareth Jenkins, that everything was fine, bar one irrelevant rectified Falkirk bug? Your answer would be "Yes"? I can't say. Without going back to the documents, you're talking about a trial I took no part in years before I was anything to do with the Post Office. I can't say what was and was not said at the Seema Misra trial today. But you knew this, didn't you, Mr Clarke: you knew that the person who gave evidence against Seema Misra had failed to disclose the existence of bugs, errors and defects? Yes. You knew that he had given evidence to the contrary? Yes.					

- 24 Q. How on earth, therefore, did you advise that she should
- 25 not get disclosure when you advised in January?

- Q. But you've already said that you were aware of bugs. 1
 - You said that to Mr Blake, that you were aware of bugs in old Horizon as well.
- 4 A. Yes, but I was looking at new Horizon.
- Q. But let's just concentrate on this. You agree that 5
- 6 Horizon was essential to Mrs Misra's conviction on
- 7 theft?

2

- A. Legacy Horizon. 8
- 9 Q. Legacy, yes.
- 10 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. "Horizon could have additional bugs, Mr Blake 11
- asked you", and you answered, "Old Horizon as well, we 12 13 did".
- 14 So are there bugs in Horizon? Your answer would be 15
 - "Yes", wouldn't it?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. Right. Horizon Online obviously, yes, but old and
- 18 Legacy Horizon, yes.
- 19 Yes. Α.
- 20 Q. Right. Was Horizon Online developed to replace a less
- robust system? You would agree yes, wouldn't you? 21
- 22 Α. I have no idea --
- 23 Q. Right.
- A. -- I'm not a computer expert. 24
- 25 **Q.** Well, let us move on, then. Did we, the Post Office, 214
- 1 Α. I think you'll find that I've already accepted that that
- 2 was an error on my part.
- 3 Q. What happened, I suggest, is that, eventually, only the 4 Second Sight Interim Report and the Helen Rose Report was handed over to the CCRC in 2015; that's correct, 5
- isn't it? 6
- 7 A. I don't know what was given to them.
- 8 Q. Right. The Second Sight Interim Report just expressed the existence of bugs but not that someone had lied 9
- about them and misled the court; you would agree with 10 that? 11
- A. That's what the Interim Report that I saw said, yes. 12
- Q. Yes. So the critical factor of lying and misleading the 13
- 14 court was not within the Second Sight Interim Report or 15 the Helen Rose Report?
- 16 A. No.
- 17 Q. No. Again, I ask you, how could you, an experienced
- barrister, have come to the conclusion, having expressed 18 19
- the view in December that she should get disclosure and in January you said that she should not? 20
- 21 A. Just as Mr Stein suggested earlier: we all make mistakes 22 and I have accepted I made a mistake.
- 23 Q. You offered as an explanation, as rationalisation, that
- 24 you only had the transcript of the summing-up at the
- 25 time you wrote the December document; do you remember? 216

1	Α.	I've told you: that was the fact of the position.					
2	Q.						
3		document. In fact, in the December document you don't					
4	say, "transcript of the summing-up" you say,						
5		"transcripts of the trial". So you had clearly read the					
6		transcripts of the trial, paragraph 33 of POL00198595.					
7		You had clearly read the transcripts of the trial by the					
8		time you wrote that advice on 5 December, hadn't you?					
9	Α.	I disagree, and my disagreement is consistent with the					
10		writing of the 20 January 2014 advice and the "Phew"					
11		email.					
12	Q.	That "Phew" email, obviously one recognises the					
13		explanation you gave but are you sure that you were not					
14		put under pressure because you knew the central					
15		foundational, the that she was the foundation stone,					
16		the Seema Misra conviction, for deterring civil claims					
17		and also deterring criminal ones?					
18	Α.	I've already told you that I do not accept that					
19		contention. I did not have that knowledge and that is					
20		not and I was placed under any pressure. And I would					
21		add, had anybody sought to place me under pressure of					
22		the sort you describe, I would have immediately					
23		withdrawn.					
24	Q.	Right. Can I just ask you then in conclusion to go back					
25		to 9 September 2013, and you've read, presumably, as 217					
		217					
1	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: No pressure on you. It's entirely for					
2		you to tell me what suits you.					
3	MR	BLAKE: We have a thumbs-up.					
4	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: So we'll have a five-minute break and					
5		then we will complete Mr Clarke, which will make him					
6		happy, as well, by 4.50.					
7		OLIVER: Thank you, sir.					
8	(4.2	2 pm)					
9		(A short break)					
10	(4.2	7 pm)					
11		Questioned by MS OLIVER					
12		WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, Ms Oliver?					
13	MS	OLIVER: Thank you, sir. Good afternoon, Mr Clarke,					
14		I ask questions on behalf of Mr Jenkins. I'm going to					
15		take this as quickly as I can, okay?					
16	A.	I know you will. Thank you.					
17	Q.	We have heard from your colleague at Cartwright King and					
18		later business partner, Martin Smith, who indicated that					
19 20		at or around the time of your 15 July 2013 advice					
20		concerning Mr Jenkins, he came to the conclusion that					
21		neither Post Office nor Cartwright King had ever					
22		instructed Mr Jenkins as to his expert duties; do you					
23		remember that aspect of his evidence?					
24 25	A.	From what I know now, I know that to be the position.					
25	Q.	All right. Is that a conclusion that he discussed with 219					
		210					

part of t	he information	on pack the i	notes taken	of the

- 2 consultation by your colleague, Mr Smith?
- 3 A. Yes.

- 4 Q. You have. There was no investigation, as you have
- 5 already explained to Mr Stein, because you didn't feel
- 6 that it was appropriate, into why Gareth Jenkins had
- 7 done what he did, correct?
- 8 A. Correct.
- 9 **Q.** Can you offer any explanation how Mr Altman came to the
- 10 conclusion, as is reported in the conference, that it
- 11 was more to do with incompetence than dishonesty?
- 12 A. No. You'd have to ask him that question.
- 13 MR HENRY: Right.
- 14 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr Henry.
- 15 MR HENRY: Thank you, sir.
- 16 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right, now then, we have one questioner
- 17 left. First of all, a time estimate please, Ms Oliver?
- 18 MS OLIVER: Sir, my time estimate to Mr Blake was
- 19 30 minutes. I think, truncating things, I could do it
- 20 in 20. I think I might struggle to do it nine.
- 21 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: No, that's fine.
- 22 Transcriber, if we have another short break, are you
- 23 prepared to sit on for 20 minutes to complete Mr Clarke
- 24 today?
- 25 MR BLAKE: We have a thumbs-up.

```
218
```

- 1 you at the time?
- 2 **A.** No.
- 3 **Q.** When did you come to your conclusion about those
- 4 failings on the part of the Post Office and Cartwright5 King?
- 6 A. In relation to whether or not Gareth Jenkins had been7 properly trained? Oh --
- 8 **Q.** Whether he'd been informed about his expert duties?
- 9 A. During the course of these proceedings.
- 10 Q. All right. We'll come on to that. Were you ever party11 to discussions within Post Office at the time of your
- 12 advice, or around that time, as to the same conclusion
- that Mr Smith had reached?
- 14 A. That he hadn't been trained?
- 15 **Q.** Yes.
- 16 **A.** No.
- 17 Q. Did you have any suspicions of your own as to the sufficiency of his instruction?
- 19 A. Truth is, I didn't turn my mind to it because I think,
- as I used the phrase earlier, I was more interested atthe time in effect rather than cause.
- 22 Q. All right. Thank you. I just want to explore that
- 23 a little bit further, if I can. We've heard from
- 24 Mr Smith that you, he and Mr Bowyer worked closely
- 25 together, as of the time of 2013?

- Pretty well, yeah. 1 Α.
- 2 Q. Thank you. He gave evidence that "we were a three";
- 3 would you agree with that characterisation?
- 4 A. No.
- 5 Q. I think you've already indicated that you don't agree 6 that he was content to follow your lead, as someone that
- 7 had more prosecution experience than him?
- 8 A. No. No I don't agree.
- 9 Q. You don't agree with that proposition?
- 10 A. Yeah.
- Q. At paragraph 35 of your statement to this Inquiry, you 11
- indicate that you discussed a range of matters 12
- 13 concerning Post Office prosecutions with Mr Bowyer and Mr Smith? 14
- A. Yeah. 15
- 16 Q. Not least because, shortly after the time of your July 17 advice, you took over running the Post Office
- Prosecutions Department at Cartwright King? 18
- 19 A. Yes, that's right.
- 20 Q. Thank you. We've seen an example this morning of 21 an email dated 10 July that was addressed to you and
- 22 Martin Smith jointly on the topic of Gareth Jenkins.
- 23 A. Okay.
- 24 Q. Do you agree with that?
- 25 Α. If I've been taken to it, yes. 221
- 1 Α. Yes.
- -- during this time around your advice? 2 Q.
- 3 Α. Yes.
- 4 Q. We know, from a manuscript note that you may have seen,
- 5 that this lack of expert instruction was something that
- 6 Mr Smith appears to have discussed with Rodric Williams
- 7 on or around 3 September 2013; do you know what I'm 8 referring to?
- 9 A. I saw that -- was it that handwritten note that was put to Mr Smith? 10
- Q. It was. 11
- 12 A. I saw that --
- 13 Q. Thank you.
- 14 Α. -- and I accept your contention.
- Q. Thank you. So it appears that both Mr Smith and 15
- 16 Mr Williams, at least, were sighted on the issue either
- 17 that Mr Jenkins had not been properly instructed or, at
- 18 the very least, there was a serious question about whether he had --19
- 20 Α. I'm afraid it does.
- Q. -- as at September 2013? 21
- 22 Α. Yeah.
- 23 Q. So, where that leaves us appears to be this: Mr Smith
- 24 had come to this wide-ranging and serious conclusion
- 25 about Post Office and Cartwright King failings towards 223

- Q. Thank you. You had also, at that time, come to your own 1
- 2 independent conclusions about Post Office's competence 3 in terms of disclosure following your meeting with them
 - on 3 July --
- 4 A. Yes. 5
- 6 Q. -- is that right?
- 7 A. Yes, I wouldn't use the word "competence".
- Q. No, I think you say at paragraph 43 of your statement 8
- 9 an "apparent failure by POL to understand their
- 10 disclosure duties"?
- A. Yes. 11
- Q. Was that a matter of concern to you? 12
- 13 Α. Well, of course.
- You talked this morning about Post Office and their 14 Q. lawyers becoming defensive when you raised the issue of
- 15 16 expert evidence with them --
- 17 Α. Yes.
- 18 Q. -- do you recall that?
- 19 Α. I do.
- 20 Q. Did that raise concerns on your part?
- 21 Α. Yes, it did.
- 22 Q. Again, just referring to your statement -- I'm not going 23 to turn it up -- if I might, it's paragraph 36. You
- 24 indicate that you worked closely with Rodric Williams of 25 Post Office --
 - 222
- 1 Mr Jenkins at or around the time of your advice, yes?
- 2 Δ Yes.
- Q. He had shared it with a Post Office lawyer? 3
- 4 Α. Yes.
- 5 Q. You too were actively engaged at the time in liaising 6
 - with the Post Office about the apparent revelation of
 - these bugs and the resulting issue with Mr Jenkins, yes?
- 8 Α. Yes.

- Q. You're making the Samra call, if I can refer to it like 9
- that, on 28 June? 10
- 11 A. Sorry, the --
- 12 Q. You and Mr Smith together are making a call to
- 13 Mr Jenkins about the case of Samra?
- 14 A. Yes, yes.
- Q. You're writing an advice in July that deals expressly 15
- with the alleged breach of expert duties? 16
- 17 Α. Yes
- Q. You have developed your own concerns about Post Office's 18 knowledge of their disclosure obligations and the way 19
- 20 they operated in these prosecutions?
- 21 Α. Yes
- 22 Q. You've said this morning that Mr Jenkins became the
- 23 central topic of discussion; do you remember giving that 24 evidence?
- 25 A. Yes.

1	Q.	And you're in regular discussions with Mr Smith and
2		Mr Williams, who it seems were sighted on this issue as
3		of September?
4	Α.	I don't link the two together. I accept I was in
5		discussions with Rodric Williams but not about that, as
6		I've explained, and you can describe this as crude, if
7		you wish, but I wasn't interested in why Gareth Jenkins
8		had done or not done what he ought to or ought not have
9		done; I was interested in how it was fixed.
10	Q.	We'll come on to the relevance of the why question.
11	Α.	Yeah, yeah.
12	Q.	But you're anticipating my next question. Given all
13		those factors that you accept, is it right that your
14		evidence is that Mr Smith never discussed with you this
15		conclusion that he had come to as to the lack of expert
16		instruction
17	Α.	That is correct.
18	Q.	and neither did Mr Williams?
19	Α.	Yes, that is correct.
20	Q.	You never came to a similar conclusion yourself?

21 Α. Not knowingly, no.

- 22 Q. It wasn't something you had any suspicions about?
- 23 Α. I didn't turn my mind to it.
- 24 Q. It wasn't a possibility to which you turned your mind at 25 all?

225

1		to get involved in that, because, not least, Post Office
2		were not going to be relying on him as an expert witness
3		in the future. So there was no need to consider the
4		issue, as far as I was concerned, of his training in
5		being an expert witness.
6	Q.	Just to be clear, it's not about training; it's about
7		instruction
8	Α.	Yes.
9	Q.	by the lawyers who commissioned his evidence; is that
10		what you mean?
11	Α.	However you want to characterise it, I was not concerned
12		because it was looking back and I wanted to look
13		forward.
14	Q.	You're saying that although you've come to that
15		realisation now, that's not something you turned your
16		mind to at the time
17	Α.	No, I
18	Q.	and you disagree with my characterisation of that as
19		being surprising?
20	Α.	Yes, I do.
21	Q.	Right. Can I turn, then, to something you say about
22		expert duties in your statement, please.
23	Α.	Please.
24	Q.	When you looked at Mr Jenkins' statements for the
25		purposes of your 15 July advice, did you note that they 227

- A. Not at all. 1 2 Q. Do you agree that, given all of those features that I've just run through, that seems surprising? 3 4 A. No. Is it, in fact, the case that you, either by yourself or 5 Q. 6 through discussion with Mr Smith or Mr Williams, came to 7 exactly the same conclusion that Mr Smith had come to around the time of your advice, that Mr Jenkins had 8 never been informed of his duties and never knew about 9 10 his duty of expert disclosure? A. No. I accept the proposition you put that he wasn't 11 trained, and that he didn't know about -- didn't know to 12 13 the extent or what his duties were or were not. 14 I accept that now because I have seen compelling evidence that that's the position. I simply did not 15 16 turn my mind to it at the time because it was of no 17 interest to me. I was only interested in putting right 18 what had gone wrong and you have to -- forgive me for 19 almost cutting you off. I was going to say you have to 20 appreciate, you don't. 21 I wasn't at that point looking back to what had --22 to why things had gone wrong. It's clear that Gareth 23 Jenkins -- it's clear to me that Gareth Jenkins had 24 clearly not been trained or instructed in his duties 25 before my involvement in Post Office. I saw no reason 226 1 were all Section 9 statements? 2 A. I don't think I did. Q. Did you note that they did not set out the instructions 3 4 he had been given or the questions which he was to 5 answer? 6 A. No. 7 Q. Did you note that they didn't set out the written 8 material which had been provided by the prosecutor or the documents, statements or evidence that he had taken 9 10 into account? A No 11 Q. Did you note that they did not contain an expert 12 13 declaration? 14 A. No.

 - 15 Q. Do you agree all of those things I've just listed are necessary inclusions for an expert report? 16
 - 17 Α. Yes
 - Q. Did any of that therefore cause you concern about 18 Mr Jenkins' level of knowledge about his expert duties 19
 - 20 when you were reviewing those statements?
 - A. I think I've already explained: my interest was in 21
 - 22 curing the damage that he had done, not in the reasons
 - 23 as to why the damage had been done and so, no, I took no 24 notice of any of that.
 - 25 With respect, the task that you were doing in your Q. 228

(57) Pages 225 - 228

1		advice of 15 July is, before you come to that	1	Α.	No, and I think I've explained why, because I wasn't
2		conclusion, analysing a certain number of the statements	2		looking back; I was looking forward to cure the defect
3		that he has provided	3	~	that had arisen.
		Yes.	4	Q.	•
	Q.	do you agree? Do I understand your evidence to be	5		question.
6		that, at the point that you were continuing that	6	A.	
7		analysis and undertaking that analysis, none of the	7	Q.	
8		absence of those necessary inclusions caused you any	8		that you've not reiterated in evidence, and I just want
9		concern?	9		to make sure whether it's something you stand by.
	Α.	No, I was analysing the evidence that he was given	10	A.	87?
11	~	sorry, that he was giving in the documents.	11 12	Q.	Paragraph 87 of your statement. You indicate that the
12 13	Q.	It didn't come to your attention that none of those			fact that Mr Jenkins' statements included the words,
		documents contained the necessary inclusions for expert	13		"I understand that my role is to assist the court rather
14		evidence?	14		than represent the views of my employers or Post Office
	Α.	No, because that wasn't my concern. My concern was what	15		Limited", informed you that, quite to the contrary of
16	~	had he told the court through the documents.	16		not turning your mind to the absence of knowledge on the
	Q.	It didn't cause you any concern about his level of	17		part of Mr Jenkins, that he did understand the duties of
18		knowledge about his expert duties?	18		an expert witness?
	Α.	No, for the same reason I was interested in what he had	19	Α.	Yes.
20		told the court through those documents, and that's where	20	Q.	Now, is that a conclusion you came to or isn't it?
21		my concern was about whether or not he had complied with	21	Α.	No, that is what prompted me to dismiss any thought of
22	~	his duty.	22	~	looking backwards.
	Q.	Do you think that was an oversight on your part	23	Q.	So it's not, in fact, the fact that you didn't turn your
	A.	No. not to turn your mind to that?	24 25		mind to it; you turned your mind to it and came to the opposite conclusion to the one that I've suggested?
	α.	229	20		230
1.	Α.	No, I disagree with that.	1		conclusion at the time that Mr Jenkins knew of his
	Q.		2		expert duties on the basis of that phrase alone being
3		have heard from Duncan Atkinson KC, who has been	3		included in his statements, that was not a safe
4		an expert instructed in this Inquiry, that those words	4		conclusion?
5		included at the end of the statements you looked at,	5	Α.	I agree with that but that was not something I was
6		without more, were insufficient to satisfy the	6		considering, as I've explained why.
7		requirements of an expert declaration, either at common	7	SIF	R WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I'm sorry, Mr Clarke, I think what
8		law or under the Criminal Procedure Rules?	8		is being put to you is that, at paragraph 87 of your
	Α.	l do.	9		statement, you concluded well, you, first of all,
	Q.	Thank you. Do you agree that it's not enough to satisfy	10		quote "I understand that my role", et cetera, and then
11		the prosecutor's obligation as to expert instruction	11		you say, on the basis of that:
12		that a statement simply bears an expert declaration	12		"This narrative informed me that Gareth Jenkins
13		because, as Mr Atkinson KC said, it is the duty of	13		understood that his witness statements and oral evidence
14		a prosecutor to ensure that the expert understands what	14		in court was provided by him as an expert witness [1].
15		expert duties entail for example, the expert duty of	15		That narrative also informed me that he understood the
16		disclosure and complies with them?	16		duties of an expert witness [2]."
	Α.	l agree with all of that, yes.	17		So, I'm sorry, but a plain reading of that does
	Q.	Thank you. So, in other words, even if Mr Jenkins'	18		suggest to me that you did, in the summer of 2013,
19		statements had included a proper expert declaration,	19		understand or you did form the view that Mr Jenkins
20		which they did not, that expert declaration in itself	20		understood his duties on the basis of that statement in
21		would be insufficient to inform you that he understood	21		his witness statements.
22		his expert duties?	22	Α.	Looking back, I think that informed me that I need
	Α.	l agree.	23		conduct no further enquiry, and the reason I didn't
	Q.	So, having agreed with all of that and bearing those	24		choose to conduct any further enquiry was because, as
	••	factors in mind, do you agree that, if it was your	25		l've explained to counsel, I wasn't interested in what

1		had gone before.	1		the expert duties of disclosure a
2	SIR	R WYN WILLIAMS: Well, all right. You carry on, then.	2		duty in that paragraph.
3		OLIVER: Do you see the difference?	3		Then, at paragraph 38, you
4		l do, yes.	4		reasons for this failure are beyo
5	Q.	I'm grateful to the Chair for distilling the difference	5		review.
6		between the absence of turning your mind to the question	6	Α.	Which as I think I've explained
7		and a positive conclusion, as you seem to indicate in	7	Q.	Thank you. If we can just very l
8		your statement, as to the question of whether there had	8		POL00172804, and it's paragra
9		been adequate expert instruction?	9		bottom of page 8. It's the advice
10	Α.	Yeah.	10		1 July in the case of Samra th
11	Q.	Do you see the difference between those two things?	11		It seems, from the very last
12	Α.	I do. It's a conflict. I see it.	12		advice, that, as of 1 July, you sa
13	Q.	Thank you. If it is the fact that you are saying you	13		"In any event I require a fac
14		came to a positive conclusion, do I understand your	14		with Gareth Jenkins upon public
15		evidence now to be that that wasn't a safe conclusion,	15		Report."
16		in light of the propositions I've put to you from	16	Α.	Yeah, never happened.
17		Mr Atkinson's evidence?	17	Q.	I was going to say: why did that
18	Α.	Oh, I think that's right, yes.	18		never happen?
19	Q.	Thank you very much.	19	Α.	l don't know.
20		Can we turn, then, to this question of why	20	Q.	Why did you go from requiring,
21		Mr Jenkins may have, as you say, failed to comply with	21		a conference with Mr Jenkins to
22		his expert duties. I'm not going to take you to the	22		advising that the reasons why h
23		advice; I'm going to summarise it on the basis that you	23		your view, to comply with the du
24		will be familiar with it. In paragraph 37, in your	24		beyond the scope of any of you
25		conclusion, you set out that there's been a breach of 233	25	Α.	Because I was looking forward. 234
1		I didn't pursue this there's a degree of speculation	1		between the very breach that yo
2		going here because these thought processes were going on	2		him and criticising him for and h
3		10/11 years ago but, thinking about the way in which	3		expert duty of disclosure?
4		I think about things, I suspect that I abandoned the	4	Α.	I think the latter part of that is rig
5		need for a face-to-face conference with Gareth Jenkins	5		only repeat, at the time, I thoug
6		because, by the time I wrote the 15 July advice, I had	6		different.
7		decided that I wanted to look forwards rather than back.	7	Q.	Also, not least because, if he ha
8		That's a bit of speculation but that's the way my	8		instructions or not given proper
9		thought processes probably worked.	9		duties, that might raise issues the
10	Q.	So rather than an intervening event, you think it was	10		impact or effect, to use your w
11		just the development and evolution of your thought	11		prosecutions, mightn't it?
12		process; is that right?	12	Α.	I'm not convinced it would have
13	Α.	Yes, yes.	13		that is we were faced with a seri
14	Q.	Why didn't you consider it vitally important to	14		which ought not to have gone a
15		understand why Mr Jenkins had, in your view, failed in	15		would have changed that. I thin
16		his expert duty of disclosure?	16		perhaps, the reasoning behind
17	Α.	Because I was concerned with the damage that he'd done	17		ought not to have gone ahead.
18		to the prosecutions and convicted status of the	18	Q.	Can I make some suggestions a
19		postmasters and correcting that. Why he had done or not	19		have changed the landscape?
20		done that which he ought to or ought not to have done	20	Α.	Please.
21		was a matter for a different inquiry.	21	Q.	Firstly, it might have revealed co
22	Q.	But wasn't it an obvious and important course for you to	22		conduct or misconduct of individ
23		check the manner in which he'd been instructed?	23		under review by Cartwright King
24	Α.	At the time, I didn't think so.	24	Α.	I'm not convinced I agree with the
25	Q.	Not least because there was a clear nexus, wasn't there, 235	25		with whether or not proper discle 236

on I1	「 Inq	uiry 9 May 202
1		the expert duties of disclosure and you quote from that
2		duty in that paragraph.
3		Then, at paragraph 38, you effectively say that the
4		reasons for this failure are beyond the scope of your
5		review.
6	Α.	Which as I think I've explained just a moment ago.
7	Q.	Thank you. If we can just very briefly, please, turn to
8		POL00172804, and it's paragraph 22 of that advice at the
9		bottom of page 8. It's the advice that you give on
10		1 July in the case of Samra thank you.
11		It seems, from the very last sentence of this
12		advice, that, as of 1 July, you say:
13		"In any event I require a face-to-face conference
14		with Gareth Jenkins upon publication of the Second Sight
15		Report."
16	Α.	Yeah, never happened.
17	Q.	I was going to say: why did that face-to-face conference
18		never happen?
19	Α.	l don't know.
20	Q.	Why did you go from requiring, in quite strong terms,
21		a conference with Mr Jenkins to, two weeks later,
22		advising that the reasons why he might have failed, in
23		your view, to comply with the duty of disclosure, was
24		beyond the scope of any of your review?
25	Α.	Because I was looking forward. It's probably why 234
1 2		between the very breach that you were alleging against him and criticising him for and his knowledge of the
2		expert duty of disclosure?
4	Α.	I think the latter part of that is right but, as I can
4 5	А.	only repeat, at the time, I thought my priority was
6		different.
7	Q.	Also, not least because, if he hadn't been given
8	α.	instructions or not given proper instructions about his
9		duties, that might raise issues that had their own
10		impact or effect, to use your words on past
11		prosecutions, mightn't it?
12	Α.	I'm not convinced it would have changed the landscape,
12	д.	that is we were faced with a series of prosecutions
14		which ought not to have gone ahead. I don't think it
14		would have changed that. I think it would have changed,
10		would have changed that. I think it would have changed,

Firstly, it might have revealed concerns about the

conduct or misconduct of individual cases which were

perhaps, the reasoning behind why those prosecutions

Can I make some suggestions as to why I say it should

under review by Cartwright King at the time?

I'm not convinced I agree with that. We were concerned with whether or not proper disclosure had been made, not 236

2

7

- 1 whether or not Gareth Jenkins had given -- because in
- 2 lots of the cases he hadn't given evidence, even by
- 3 written statement. 4
- **Q.** But if there was a case where a lawyer had failed to 5
- properly instruct their expert and you were reviewing
- 6 that, that failure on the part of that lawyer was
- 7 an important issue in that case, wasn't it?
- 8 Α. No, I wasn't looking at whether or not a lawyer had been
- 9 improperly instructed or -- sorry, forgive me -- whether
- 10 an expert had been properly instructed or had failed to
- be instructed at all. I was looking at the proposition 11
- 12 that Gareth Jenkins had, for whatever reason, failed to
- 13 tell us, the lawyers, and Post Office and the courts
- 14 about the existence of bugs when he ought to.
- 15 But another reason why it might have changed the Q. 16 landscape is, if there had been that failure, it might
- 17 have given rise to wider-ranging concerns about the
- 18 basic competency of the prosecutors within Post Office
- 19 and Cartwright King and their conduct of these past
- 20 prosecutions.
- 21 A. I think that's fair.
- 22 Q. It would also, perhaps, have nuanced the extent of the 23 taint that you attribute to Mr Jenkins, there being,
- 24 I think you would agree, a significant qualitative
- 25 difference between a witness who has deliberately 237
- 1 disclose, wouldn't they?
- 2 A. I think, looking back, that's a proper contention. At 3 the time, we were looking in a different area.
- 4 Q. You gave your advice on 15 July on your own initiative, 5 you've told us.
- 6 A. Pretty much, yeah.
- 7 Q. Post Office hadn't asked you for it?
- A. Not really, no. 8
- 9 Q. You had no terms of reference? You were in complete 10 control of its parameters --
- Yeah. 11 Α.
- Q. -- is that right? 12
- 13 A. Yeah.
- 14 Q. Is the reason why you turned your mind from this issue
- 15 in your advice and shut it down because you and Mr Smith
- 16 knew full well that a very big part of the explanation
- 17 as to why Mr Jenkins had not disclosed these matters is
- 18 because of failings attributable to Post Office and 19 Cartwright King lawyers?
- 20 Α. No, I didn't know that at the time. I have already
- 21 explained that I had no knowledge of the instructions 22 that had or had not been given to Gareth Jenkins.
- 23 Q. Do you agree, if that had become known, it would have
- 24 been professionally damaging to Cartwright King?
- 25 Α. Oh, yes.

- withheld information and a witness who has unwittingly and inadvertently failed to disclose something that he
- 3 didn't know he was supposed to disclose?
- 4 A. I never accused Mr Jenkins of misconduct. I said that
- 5 he had not complied with his duty. I was very careful.
- 6 And I've heard questions in earlier proceedings that go
 - to the question of, "Well, why wasn't Mr Jenkins
- 8 reported to the police?" There's a very specific answer
- 9 to that and it links in with your question.
- 10 Mr Jenkins wasn't reported to the police because we
- 11 didn't know why he had not done that which he ought to
- 12 have done and, frankly, your questions, and your
- 13 advocacy on behalf of Mr Jenkins demonstrates precisely
- 14 why it would have been wrong to report him to the police 15 because, clearly, at this stage, his culpability is
- 16 much, much lower than it might otherwise have been.
- 17 Q. All of those factors that I've suggested might have
- 18 changed the landscape might have impacted, mightn't
- 19 they, on the scope of the disclosure obligation that
- 20 would arise towards convicted defendants?
- 21 A. I think I've already accepted that we ought to have 22 disclosed the issues about Gareth Jenkins in addition to 23 the Second Sight and Helen Rose Reports, yes.
- 24 Q. But if you'd asked the "why" question, further issues
- 25 might have arisen that you would also have had to 238
- 1 Q. And it would have resulted in an obvious conflict for
- 2 Cartwright King continuing their review process?
- 3 A. Oh, I think that must be right.
- 4 Q. Thank you. Do you think that might be the reason why 5 Brian Altman QC was not informed of the acknowledged 6 failure on the part of instructing Mr Jenkins?
- 7 A. Well, that presupposes that I knew about it and 8 I didn't. Martin Smith clearly knew about it. Perhaps
- he ought to have told me and Brian Altman but he didn't. 9
- Q. Thank you. In the final three minutes that I have, I'm 10 11 just going to very quickly deal with the Samra call, if 12 I may.
- SIR WYN WILLIAMS: (Unclear) minutes but three minutes it 13
- 14
- 15 MS OLIVER: Thank you.
- 16 On 28 June you told us you and Mr Smith made a call
- 17 to Mr Jenkins concerning the case of Samra. It was your
- 18 idea. You asked Mr Smith to set it up. It was recorded
- 19 on his phone.

is.

- 20 Α. Yeah.
- 21 Q. Who prepared the transcript?
- 22 A. Martin Smith.
- 23 Q. Thank you. Do you know when he did that?
- 24 A. I am pretty sure I would have said "I want it done
- 25 straight away".

2		call?
3	Α.	No.
4	Q.	He had no prior knowledge of the case
5	Α.	Forgive me, I don't know whether he was given any
6		warning of the call. We just telephoned him without
7		knowing whether or not he'd been told by, for instance,
8		Jarnail Singh to expect the call.
9	Q.	Fine. He had no prior knowledge of the case of Samra?
10	Α.	I expect not, I don't know.
11	Q.	Mr Smith said that, at the time, you and he were, at the
12		very least, suspicious of Mr Jenkins?
13	Α.	I don't agree with that because the purpose of the call
14		was to find out who told Second Sight about the two bugs
15		that Second Sight spoke about.
16	Q.	To that extent, do you agree it was to test Mr Jenkins'
17		credibility?
18	Α.	No. It was to ask him whether or not he knew how Second
19		Sight learned of those bugs.
20	Q.	Mr Jenkins was not told the call was being recorded?
21	Α.	No.
22	Q.	He was given no chance to check the note for accuracy or
23		understanding?
24	Α.	I don't believe so.
25	Q.	You say to Mr Jenkins at the beginning of that call, 241
1	Α.	Oh, I
2		
	Q.	rather than we?
3	Α.	He said "we" and I inferred the "we" to be him.
4		He said "we" and I inferred the "we" to be him. All right. Can you tell us why we don't see any mention
4 5	Α.	He said "we" and I inferred the "we" to be him. All right. Can you tell us why we don't see any mention in the transcript where Mr Jenkins says one of the bugs
4 5 6	A. Q.	He said "we" and I inferred the "we" to be him. All right. Can you tell us why we don't see any mention in the transcript where Mr Jenkins says one of the bugs was extant
4 5 6 7	A. Q. A.	He said "we" and I inferred the "we" to be him. All right. Can you tell us why we don't see any mention in the transcript where Mr Jenkins says one of the bugs was extant No, I
4 5 6 7 8	A. Q.	He said "we" and I inferred the "we" to be him. All right. Can you tell us why we don't see any mention in the transcript where Mr Jenkins says one of the bugs was extant No, I or where Mr Jenkins told you that the earlier bug was
4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A.	He said "we" and I inferred the "we" to be him. All right. Can you tell us why we don't see any mention in the transcript where Mr Jenkins says one of the bugs was extant No, I or where Mr Jenkins told you that the earlier bug was historic and a patch had been applied, which remedied
4 5 7 8 9 10	A. Q. A. Q.	He said "we" and I inferred the "we" to be him. All right. Can you tell us why we don't see any mention in the transcript where Mr Jenkins says one of the bugs was extant No, I or where Mr Jenkins told you that the earlier bug was historic and a patch had been applied, which remedied the problem?
4 5 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A.	He said "we" and I inferred the "we" to be him. All right. Can you tell us why we don't see any mention in the transcript where Mr Jenkins says one of the bugs was extant No, I or where Mr Jenkins told you that the earlier bug was historic and a patch had been applied, which remedied the problem? No. As I say, Mr Smith produced the transcript.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q.	He said "we" and I inferred the "we" to be him. All right. Can you tell us why we don't see any mention in the transcript where Mr Jenkins says one of the bugs was extant No, I or where Mr Jenkins told you that the earlier bug was historic and a patch had been applied, which remedied the problem? No. As I say, Mr Smith produced the transcript. I don't know why
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q.	He said "we" and I inferred the "we" to be him. All right. Can you tell us why we don't see any mention in the transcript where Mr Jenkins says one of the bugs was extant No, I or where Mr Jenkins told you that the earlier bug was historic and a patch had been applied, which remedied the problem? No. As I say, Mr Smith produced the transcript. I don't know why So are you saying the transcript was inaccurate or your
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q. A. Q. A.	He said "we" and I inferred the "we" to be him. All right. Can you tell us why we don't see any mention in the transcript where Mr Jenkins says one of the bugs was extant No, I or where Mr Jenkins told you that the earlier bug was historic and a patch had been applied, which remedied the problem? No. As I say, Mr Smith produced the transcript. I don't know why So are you saying the transcript was inaccurate or your advice was an inaccurate summary?
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q.	He said "we" and I inferred the "we" to be him. All right. Can you tell us why we don't see any mention in the transcript where Mr Jenkins says one of the bugs was extant No, I or where Mr Jenkins told you that the earlier bug was historic and a patch had been applied, which remedied the problem? No. As I say, Mr Smith produced the transcript. I don't know why So are you saying the transcript was inaccurate or your advice was an inaccurate summary? Oh, no, my advice was an accurate summary. I don't
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A.	He said "we" and I inferred the "we" to be him. All right. Can you tell us why we don't see any mention in the transcript where Mr Jenkins says one of the bugs was extant No, I or where Mr Jenkins told you that the earlier bug was historic and a patch had been applied, which remedied the problem? No. As I say, Mr Smith produced the transcript. I don't know why So are you saying the transcript was inaccurate or your advice was an inaccurate summary? Oh, no, my advice was an accurate summary. I don't resile from my advice one jot all.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A.	He said "we" and I inferred the "we" to be him. All right. Can you tell us why we don't see any mention in the transcript where Mr Jenkins says one of the bugs was extant No, I or where Mr Jenkins told you that the earlier bug was historic and a patch had been applied, which remedied the problem? No. As I say, Mr Smith produced the transcript. I don't know why So are you saying the transcript was inaccurate or your advice was an inaccurate summary? Oh, no, my advice was an accurate summary. I don't resile from my advice one jot all. OLIVER: Thank you, those are my questions.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. MS SIR	He said "we" and I inferred the "we" to be him. All right. Can you tell us why we don't see any mention in the transcript where Mr Jenkins says one of the bugs was extant No, I or where Mr Jenkins told you that the earlier bug was historic and a patch had been applied, which remedied the problem? No. As I say, Mr Smith produced the transcript. I don't know why So are you saying the transcript was inaccurate or your advice was an inaccurate summary? Oh, no, my advice was an accurate summary. I don't resile from my advice one jot all.

All right. Mr Jenkins was given no warning of that

1 Q.

S

20112

- 20 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: That's it, Mr Blake.
- 21 MR BLAKE: It is, yes, sir. Thank you.

22 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, Mr Clarke, I'm very grateful to you

- 23 for your participation in this Inquiry. You have
- 24 fielded a good many questions, some of which have been
- 25 hostile, which you have dealt with with resolution, if
 - 243

- "Mr Singh suggested we get in touch".
- 2 **A.** Yeah.

1

3

8

- **Q.** You described that as a rhetorical device this morning.
- 4 Do you mean by that that it was something that wasn't
 5 true? Was it an attempt to put Mr Jenkins at his ease
 6 in that call?
- 7 A. No, it was to -- it was simply a rhetorical device so
 - that he could connect with why we were calling
- 9 because -- forgive me -- if he had been warned, as
- 10 I would have expected, it would have been by Mr Singh.
- In your advice -- I'm not going to take you to it, it's
 paragraph 30, your advice of 15 July -- you summarise
 that call and, in that summary, you say that:
- 14 "Dr Jenkins told us it was he who had informed the
- 15 Second Sight committee of the existence of two bugs
- 16 which had affected Horizon. He told us that the extant
- 17 bug affects Horizon to a limited degree and at specific
- 18 Post Office locations only. Bugs had been identified in
- 19 Horizon which call into question some of the aspects of
- 20 the way in which it operates. He said that the earlier
- bug was historic and a patch had been applied to Horizonwhich remedied the problem."
- 23 Can you help us with why in the transcript we don't
- 24 see any mention that Mr Jenkins said he personally had
- 25 told Second Sight about the two bugs --

242

1 I can put it in that way. THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir. 2 3 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: So thank you for your participation. 4 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 5 MR BLAKE: 9.45 tomorrow. 6 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: 9.45, provided my train is on time, 7 Mr Blake. MR BLAKE: Thank you, sir. 8 9 (4.56 pm) (The hearing adjourned until 9.45 am the following day) 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

INDEX

SIMON ANDREW CLARKE (affirmed)	1
Questioned by MR BLAKE	1
Questioned by MR MOLONEY	166
Questioned by MR STEIN	177
Questioned by MS WATT	189
Questioned by MS ALLAN	193
Questioned by MR HENRY	200
Questioned by MS OLIVER	219

MR BEER: [1] 165/12	' 'ball' [1] 54/15 'bug' [3] 30/2 30/16	160/19 201/15 202/3 202/3 202/11 202/12 12.00 [1] 89/8 12.10 [3] 88/18 89/6	20 years [1] 66/3 2009 [1] 123/16 2010 [13] 2/7 3/10 61/24 63/11 66/16	28th [2] 74/18 86/4 29 [3] 125/25 128/25 129/5
MR BLAKE: [39] 1/3	174/25	89/10	67/4 67/12 124/20	3
1/5 1/9 45/24 46/1 47/1 47/8 47/10 47/14	'Civil [1] 160/21 'cultural [1] 106/4	12.34 [1] 154/5	129/23 129/24 133/7	3 July [3] 45/3 49/17
47/16 60/17 60/20	'doubling [1] 123/22	12.55 [1] 121/18	138/9 208/11	222/4
60/22 88/16 89/1 89/6		13 July [1] 204/7	2012 [3] 3/14 4/9 9/16	3 September [1] 223/7
89/11 89/16 89/19	123/22	132 [1] 63/20 138 [2] 13/7 13/10	2013 [65] 3/17 3/19	3.00 [2] 165/12
121/10 121/14 121/17 121/21 121/23 136/12		14 [20] 31/17 31/17	8/10 8/14 10/11 13/1	165/12
164/23 165/4 165/16	13/23	31/23 33/7 33/9 33/20		3.15 [2] 166/11
165/18 166/12 166/16		33/24 36/9 37/4 37/9	28/6 70/13 78/2 79/9	166/15 3.2 [1] 116/15
189/17 189/21 199/13	U	40/3 49/6 59/12 76/7 76/11 170/4 171/4	80/2 80/4 89/21 91/8 92/16 98/19 104/24	30 [2] 22/13 242/12
218/25 219/3 243/21	'mention' [1] 37/24	172/25 173/1 173/4	114/4 114/14 116/7	30 minutes [1]
244/5 244/8 MR HENRY: [19]	'older' [1] 62/7 'settle' [1] 150/20	14 August [2] 103/19		218/19
199/15 200/3 200/5	'shredded' [1] 93/11	103/20	126/18 133/1 133/3	300 [1] 152/23
200/8 200/12 200/14	'unsafe' [1] 148/5	15 [4] 66/3 122/16 130/13 138/21	137/23 138/5 160/19 166/23 178/5 190/3	31 July [2] 91/8 93/3 33 [2] 68/19 217/6
202/7 202/9 202/12	'yes [1] 146/3	15 July [22] 18/11	195/1 196/19 197/14	34 [1] 11/1
202/15 204/14 204/18 207/13 207/16 207/19	-	18/15 18/15 40/12	198/9 198/13 198/22	35 [2] 69/19 221/11
212/18 213/1 218/13	difficulty [1] 23/23	70/11 73/18 81/25	199/1 200/25 201/15	36 [1] 222/23
218/15	wanted [1] 19/24	89/21 146/17 178/23	202/3 202/4 203/16	37 [2] 152/17 233/24 38 [1] 234/3
MR MOLONEY: [3]	0	180/5 181/16 181/24 183/17 185/15 204/8	204/1 204/7 204/8 204/23 207/10 207/21	
166/19 177/3 177/18 MR STEIN: [2]	00114253 [1] 202/6	219/19 227/25 229/1	208/22 211/7 211/9	4
177/24 189/16	0s [1] 202/9	235/6 239/4 242/12	211/12 211/16 213/7	4 July [3] 51/9 52/20 55/21
MS ALLAN: [2]	1	15 minutes [1] 165/14	217/25 219/19 220/25 223/7 223/21 232/18	4.00 [1] 166/1
193/4 199/12	1 April [1] 4/9	16 [3] 57/9 171/1	2014 [12] 121/24	4.22 [1] 219/8
MS OLIVER: [7] 218/18 219/7 219/13	1 August [1] 92/6	204/1	122/1 122/13 124/8	4.27 [1] 219/10
233/3 240/15 243/17	1 January [5] 61/24	16 December [1]	128/6 137/3 140/11	4.30 [1] 199/19
243/19	63/11 64/18 65/24	208/11	140/12 152/7 156/3 213/21 217/10	4.50 [1] 219/6 4.56 [1] 244/9
MS WATT: [2]	67/4 1 January 2010 [1]	16 July [3] 79/9 213/7 213/18	2015 [2] 198/11	400 [1] 67/10
189/25 193/2	66/16	17 [3] 35/24 140/23	216/5	43 [5] 45/2 45/24
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: [69] 1/4 45/22 45/25	1 July [10] 27/23	140/24	2016 [1] 2/11	45/25 68/19 222/8
47/6 47/9 47/15 60/13	28/6 30/4 43/25	18 [2] 37/14 172/21	2024 [2] 1/1 1/14	44 [3] 45/2 45/24 45/25
60/18 60/21 88/21	166/23 168/19 169/13 186/21 234/10 234/12	19 [2] 30/15 131/20	21 [1] 40/1 22 [1] 234/8	47 [3] 13/7 13/10
89/4 89/7 89/15 89/18 121/13 121/16 121/22	1 November [1]	156/3	22 January [2]	92/18
134/9 135/2 135/6	116/7	19 July [1] 138/4	122/13 137/3	5
135/16 135/19 135/22	1.54 [1] 121/20	194 [1] 198/7 1981 [1] 203/20	221 [1] 61/5 23 [4] 40/19 114/2	5 December [2]
136/1 136/4 136/10	1.55 [1] 121/15 1/2 [2] 94/2 94/2	198766 [2] 202/8	114/2 124/3	137/23 217/8
165/2 165/11 165/13 165/17 165/23 166/3	10 [3] 66/3 97/10	202/9	23 March [1] 1/14	5 July [2] 56/24
166/17 177/4 177/11	123/15	1996 [1] 193/9	24 [8] 41/5 42/23	57/13 5 September [1]
177/13 177/17 177/20	10 July [2] 70/13	1997 [2] 2/4 203/24 1999 [1] 198/11	42/24 43/4 44/13 44/14 125/6 171/15	196/19
189/19 189/23 199/25	221/21 10-minute [1] 165/18		25 years [1] 204/1	57 [2] 130/14 197/10
200/4 200/6 200/9 202/5 202/8 202/10	10.48 [1] 47/11	2	25/26 June [1] 16/9	58 [1] 131/9
202/14 204/13 204/16	10.58 [1] 47/7	2 August [1] 92/15	26 [2] 89/21 125/10	6
207/8 207/14 207/17	10/11 years [1] 235/3 11 [1] 137/18	2 Bedford [1] 203/17 2 bugs [1] 22/23	27 [1] 125/21 27 July [1] 174/19	6.00 [1] 61/6
212/9 212/21 218/14	11 December [1]	2 paragraphs [1]	27 June [9] 14/18	60 [1] 198/10
218/16 218/21 219/1 219/4 219/12 232/7	211/9	58/22	15/23 16/12 16/23	64 [1] 31/2 67 [1] 114/2
233/2 240/13 243/18	11.00 [2] 47/7 47/13	2.59 [1] 166/13	18/5 29/23 30/6 30/9	68 [7] 31/12 31/18
243/20 243/22 244/3	12 [1] 47/9	20 [3] 39/8 124/3 218/20	178/10 27th [4] 18/20 19/13	33/7 33/9 40/3 131/20
244/6	12 July [1] 78/1 12 June [1] 17/10	20 January [1]	19/17 20/4	131/22
THE WITNESS: [4] 165/20 166/2 244/2	12 months [1] 61/15	217/10	28 June [6] 18/18	68th [1] 31/21 69 [2] 1/16 132/21
244/4	12 September [6]	20 minutes [1] 218/23	86/15 178/19 204/6	
		210/23	224/10 240/16	
				(63) MP REED: 700

7 76 [2] 66/9 68/17	100/15 100/18 101/19 103/10 103/15 104/11 106/19 106/20 107/2	130/7 130/10 134/4 149/23 155/3 164/10 192/24 197/8 199/2	actually [12] 27/19 36/7 47/3 47/4 66/24 69/8 85/20 87/16	94/24 97/7 97/8 97/14 97/20 97/21 98/7 100/5 100/10 100/11
8 8 July [7] 21/5 40/11 60/25 178/4 179/1	109/6 109/9 110/3 110/9 110/16 113/2 113/21 119/4 120/18	199/10 202/4 205/25 213/19 217/18 223/14 225/4 225/13 226/11 226/14	ad [2] 7/16 68/15	101/10 101/15 101/16 101/22 103/8 104/19 106/3 107/5 108/25
180/24 181/6 8 October [1] 152/7 81 [1] 68/17	120/20 121/1 123/19 124/8 124/14 125/6 135/19 135/22 136/18 137/17 139/9 144/7	226/14 accepted [6] 4/24 91/3 209/16 216/1 216/22 238/21	ad hoc [1] 7/16 add [6] 3/5 35/19 54/2 77/11 118/14 217/21	109/6 109/17 109/19 109/19 119/24 122/2 122/5 124/23 127/15 132/16 137/17 140/10
87 [4] 230/7 230/10	146/15 149/11 155/13	access [1] 2/17	addition [4] 3/7 3/8	140/16 142/17 143/11
230/11 232/8	155/13 155/15 155/18		111/11 238/22	145/4 145/11 145/13
8th [1] 71/6	155/24 156/20 160/24		additional [3] 2/21	145/21 146/8 146/17
9	163/5 164/5 166/22	accomplished [1]	64/25 214/11	146/17 146/19 148/5
9 December [1]	167/13 169/3 170/12	80/14	address [4] 33/21	149/3 149/21 149/24
206/20	170/25 172/3 175/7	according [5] 50/21	33/22 124/7 199/24	155/10 158/21 160/18
9 inches [1] 137/12	175/13 178/8 178/11	129/24 130/2 134/24	addressed [4] 92/18	163/13 164/2 164/4
9 July [1] 140/11	178/20 179/22 179/25	203/24	113/25 145/24 221/21	164/11 168/18 171/17
9 September [9]	180/7 180/24 181/20	accordingly [11]	addresses [1] 137/18	178/24 178/24 178/25
104/24 107/4 203/16	181/25 182/12 183/5	22/1 28/12 34/23	addressing [2] 61/3	179/6 179/19 180/5
204/23 206/3 206/18	183/6 184/19 185/5	39/14 53/22 96/15	122/6	180/12 180/22 180/22
207/21 209/24 217/25 9.45 [4] 1/2 165/25 244/5 244/6	400/05 407/00 400/40	102/23 112/2 131/11 139/2 166/10	adduced [1] 123/24 adequate [1] 233/9 adjourn [3] 35/6	181/16 182/12 183/17 187/6 187/14 187/14 188/19 188/25 194/21
9.45 am [1] 244/10	195/18 195/25 197/5	49/9 139/11 139/16	167/16 171/12	195/3 195/4 197/14
93 [1] 92/19	201/8 201/25 206/2	228/10	adjourned [3] 37/25	201/15 203/13 204/7
95 [1] 92/19	206/18 206/20 207/4	accounting [8]	38/10 244/10	206/15 213/7 217/8
A [1] 115/11	207/9 207/15 207/19	138/25 156/11 156/21	Adjournment [1]	217/10 219/19 220/12
	208/17 208/19 210/25	156/22 157/13 157/23	121/19	221/17 223/2 224/1
	211/10 211/12 211/13	163/24 164/9	adjudicated [1] 177/6	224/15 226/8 227/25
abandoned [1] 235/4	212/17 213/22 215/10	accounts [6] 21/20	admissible [1] 97/18	229/1 233/23 234/8
able [8] 35/6 45/7	216/10 220/3 220/8	24/1 28/11 28/24	admitted [1] 8/5	234/9 234/12 235/6
53/11 111/12 134/23	222/2 222/14 223/18	63/16 64/4	admittedly [1] 66/9	239/4 239/15 242/11
161/14 161/19 161/20	224/18 225/5 225/22	accuracy [1] 241/22	adopted [2] 59/25	242/12 243/14 243/15
aborting [1] 39/4		accurate [7] 14/9	150/16	243/16
about [221] 3/17 7/3	226/9 226/12 227/6	73/9 105/25 109/12	advance [2] 149/7	advices [13] 5/16
9/25 9/25 10/8 10/16	227/6 227/21 228/18	111/14 161/11 243/15	176/25	77/14 119/9 121/1
12/9 12/17 14/3 14/6	228/19 229/17 229/18	accurately [4] 81/4	advanced [5] 37/16	143/12 162/25 180/9
14/25 15/14 15/23	229/21 235/3 235/4	82/7 83/23 105/20	163/18 172/23 173/2	180/18 183/5 183/22
16/9 16/10 18/9 18/20		accused [1] 238/4	192/10	201/4 201/9 213/10
20/7 20/9 20/9 20/12		achieved [4] 41/21	advantageous [1]	advise [18] 4/17 6/1
21/21 23/9 23/10	240/8 241/14 241/15	172/2 191/24 198/6	120/11	40/11 56/9 66/24
23/22 24/24 26/20	242/25	achieving [1] 159/10	adverse [11] 41/9	99/14 118/7 133/13
29/12 29/13 32/21	above [2] 172/10	acknowledged [1]	51/4 51/7 51/7 51/9	140/12 148/2 182/2
36/6 36/10 36/14 37/5 37/5 38/13 38/24 40/7 40/14 41/22 41/25	abrogated [1] 96/12 absence [8] 34/16	240/5 acknowledgement [1] 29/2	56/8 56/24 60/6 148/18 150/9 171/19 advice [167] 4/22	188/12 194/3 199/8 203/11 209/10 211/11 215/24
42/13 42/24 43/2 43/3 43/21 43/22 44/16 45/17 46/12 47/1	35/9 40/2 72/20 118/12 229/8 230/16 233/6 absolute [2] 17/4	acknowledges [1] 24/8 across [5] 4/1 4/9 12/1 74/7 105/6	4/23 7/8 7/16 7/19 9/4 9/17 9/22 9/24 9/25 10/4 12/2 12/4 18/11 18/15 27/1 41/7 52/18	advised [16] 5/25 12/15 43/8 46/7 85/8 90/3 99/3 126/22 154/22 179/8 205/24
47/19 49/3 49/17 51/7 51/21 51/25 52/5 53/25 54/21 54/22 56/21 56/24 59/19	45/13 absolutely [11] 11/5 25/7 45/21 60/20	act [3] 5/20 96/17 193/9 acted [1] 196/11	54/5 55/2 56/4 56/15 56/18 56/19 59/19 59/23 59/25 60/8	209/2 211/8 211/19 212/4 215/25 advising [10] 82/12
61/2 61/5 62/14 63/1	69/17 101/8 126/24	acting [5] 55/16 99/7	60/10 60/23 61/2	90/24 91/16 92/5
63/4 63/9 64/5 64/17	151/9 173/3 205/21	134/12 189/12 200/16	62/11 65/22 65/23	188/23 189/12 189/14
67/2 67/23 69/21 71/3	212/3	action [3] 58/15	67/19 69/10 70/9	200/15 202/15 234/22
73/12 74/15 75/1 81/21 82/12 82/18 83/5 84/20 87/12	absolved [1] 201/19 accede [1] 141/7 accept [33] 32/25	59/15 98/13 actions [3] 48/19 139/16 208/13	74/14 76/7 76/10 77/6 77/19 77/21 82/2 82/7	advocate [2] 187/2
89/19 90/11 92/10 97/21 98/22 98/23 99/23 99/24 100/1	42/1 52/25 69/7 69/11 69/12 69/15 69/22 70/2 70/8 113/12	224/5 actual [3] 6/19 77/16	82/15 82/21 87/4 89/20 89/22 90/1 91/3 92/2 92/7 92/8 92/9	166/7 184/16
	113/12 113/20 125/4	83/5	92/10 92/14 92/22	advocating [1] 98/9

(64) 76 - advocating

Δ	152/14 168/11 179/14	237/11 238/17 241/1	24/18 29/2 30/20 53/4	206/19 208/9 211/23
A	183/16 185/13 185/19		60/17 65/2 65/6 113/7	211/25 214/14 215/7
affect [1] 108/19	186/3 187/17 188/23	Allan [5] 165/5	144/23 177/6 190/19	228/5 238/8
affected [21] 22/25	189/8 189/9 191/10	189/18 189/22 193/3	227/14	answered [2] 84/24
30/20 31/17 31/20	191/11 199/4 201/8	245/12	Altman [35] 9/4 65/3	214/12
32/5 47/25 50/5 50/25	201/13 204/12 209/19		65/12 65/24 104/24	answers [4] 23/15
54/11 58/6 58/8 60/3	210/15 211/18 214/5	123/6	106/7 109/8 109/16	86/21 144/7 202/16
60/16 64/17 125/12	214/21 216/10 221/3	allegations [3] 14/6	118/19 118/22 124/22	Anthony [9] 146/12
173/25 174/2 175/6	221/5 221/8 221/9	132/2 198/3	128/17 128/18 182/17	152/11 153/18 156/3
175/14 175/19 242/16	221/24 226/2 228/15	alleged [3] 21/17	182/23 183/4 183/18	156/6 156/10 159/2
affecting [1] 124/17	229/5 231/2 231/10	67/22 224/16	183/23 184/5 184/7	164/3 164/14
affects [2] 33/11	231/17 231/23 231/25		188/19 189/10 203/18	
242/17		Allen [1] 213/7	203/20 204/25 206/4	225/12
affirmed [2] 1/7	239/23 241/13 241/16		206/14 209/2 209/8	any [99] 3/15 3/16
245/2	agreed [7] 32/24 65/3		209/15 210/11 211/19	
afraid [3] 195/9	65/16 73/4 192/8	Alliance/Tony [1]	218/9 240/5 240/9	17/5 23/1 23/6 24/1
201/25 223/20	192/8 231/24	146/8		25/1 29/14 29/18 30/6
after [38] 3/3 10/12			Altman's [5] 85/21 85/22 119/8 120/1	33/15 34/16 34/19
10/14 12/25 17/8	agreement [3] 32/20	allocate [1] 5/13	125/1	
17/21 17/22 17/23	148/20 185/22	allocated [1] 5/15		40/2 40/3 40/21 41/15 41/18 46/6 46/17
18/8 18/16 25/4 27/22	Ah [1] 186/11	allow [3] 38/11 85/17	always [11] 13/21	
33/6 45/4 57/14 60/25	ahead [3] 44/18	210/3	34/15 51/25 52/4 52/7	49/21 55/17 58/12
64/18 65/12 67/12	236/14 236/17	allowed [5] 22/12		59/2 60/1 62/1 62/3
78/2 79/24 80/1 83/1	aim [1] 198/5	142/24 147/2 147/10		62/23 66/23 67/25
89/2 89/5 110/16	alarming [1] 147/4	213/2	am [23] 1/2 10/5	71/1 72/19 74/8 74/9
124/22 129/15 132/24	albeit [1] 125/20	allowing [1] 143/7	22/16 30/2 39/10 46/1	74/14 77/17 81/21
162/15 181/24 191/25	all [125] 3/24 4/8	allows [2] 149/10	47/11 47/13 87/5 87/7	83/5 85/25 86/2 86/2
198/12 202/9 203/4	4/20 11/22 17/18 22/3		87/9 120/18 131/15	90/10 92/6 102/20
206/21 207/25 221/16	22/3 22/7 24/17 25/3	alluded [1] 181/9	132/6 135/23 145/11	104/13 105/5 109/13
afternoon [6] 51/17	26/5 28/9 30/14 35/8	almost [7] 13/23	160/5 174/21 202/22	111/8 112/3 112/7
121/21 165/1 190/1	37/10 38/22 39/25	34/11 45/10 56/23	207/16 211/1 240/24	112/13 116/1 116/17
202/16 219/13	42/12 42/22 42/23	165/12 207/2 226/19	244/10	116/22 118/1 120/13
again [32] 3/24 8/9	43/16 43/20 45/8	alone [1] 232/2	ambit [2] 67/7 78/17	124/4 125/23 130/23
31/11 32/14 42/9	46/24 47/6 50/24	along [2] 163/12	amenable [1] 120/14	131/24 132/12 148/2
42/15 51/3 52/19	53/11 59/13 61/22	168/23	amongst [1] 35/13	151/20 152/12 158/12
53/13 56/24 73/25	64/13 66/13 66/20	already [26] 2/1 33/2	amount [6] 58/25	158/12 159/12 168/14
95/6 96/22 97/7	68/18 68/20 69/20	65/22 77/12 80/5	96/12 96/22 96/24	170/17 172/8 173/13
103/24 108/18 111/25	72/13 73/23 74/24	84/24 95/10 125/24	97/2 97/16	179/10 184/3 199/20
113/19 123/5 128/8		142/2 146/21 149/14	amounted [1] 13/16	202/17 206/4 210/13
133/8 153/4 154/2	95/11 97/25 103/1	165/24 173/2 192/12	analysing [2] 229/2	211/6 211/16 211/25
159/22 166/10 171/13	105/20 107/4 109/13	202/16 207/4 208/10	229/10	217/20 218/9 220/17
172/3 181/22 207/23	112/3 112/21 115/6	211/4 214/1 216/1	analysis [4] 125/21	225/22 228/18 228/24
208/13 216/17 222/22	117/17 119/1 121/7	217/18 218/5 221/5	133/1 229/7 229/7	229/8 229/17 230/21
against [11] 22/4	121/13 129/13 133/17	228/21 238/21 239/20		232/24 234/13 234/24
51/14 111/11 142/6	135/22 136/10 136/12			241/5 242/24 243/4
142/19 143/6 147/1	136/17 144/11 149/6	8/5 14/5 15/14 15/15	87/1 97/20 97/20	anybody [9] 10/6
161/4 211/10 215/15	155/7 155/20 158/19	25/22 38/16 40/20	109/11 145/3 145/17	11/23 27/10 27/14
236/1	158/25 159/3 159/3	43/7 50/15 54/2 64/19		88/3 96/4 96/9 194/8
Agencies [1] 193/11	159/11 161/7 162/8	66/11 69/11 69/12	Andy [11] 4/4 5/5	217/21
Agency [1] 193/22	163/21 163/22 164/24		5/11 5/15 7/6 8/10	anyone [2] 18/23
agenda [1] 150/19	165/9 166/11 166/25	89/19 92/19 109/14	71/11 71/12 87/2	194/1
agent [2] 3/23 3/25	167/4 172/20 173/6	111/11 132/6 133/20	101/17 101/24	anything [18] 24/24
agents [1] 148/11	175/2 175/11 177/17	135/21 136/4 148/22	anecdotal [1] 16/6	41/22 43/2 63/16
ages [1] 158/4	178/23 178/24 184/25		anecdotally [1] 79/21	100/19 100/20 130/19
ago [3] 188/11 234/6	184/25 185/1 187/20	199/22 217/17 222/1	angle [1] 115/9	130/25 137/10 141/13
235/3	188/23 191/20 192/1	232/15 236/7 237/22	another [13] 13/5	162/3 167/5 167/14
agree [67] 6/21 14/7	192/10 192/19 192/20		27/4 31/3 78/14 78/14	182/24 188/4 196/23
43/3 44/16 51/11 55/6	196/25 197/14 197/20	alternative [9] 61/3	87/7 110/19 127/2	206/13 215/11
57/1 65/17 65/25 66/1	198/21 200/2 202/17	118/10 150/12 150/15	146/17 207/23 209/9	anyway [1] 202/4
79/13 81/11 82/14	205/2 213/12 216/21	150/25 159/6 159/9	218/22 237/15	anywhere [1] 17/2
82/20 88/2 97/8	218/17 219/25 220/10	179/2 180/22	answer [22] 3/9 65/8	apologise [1] 58/12
110/11 113/13 119/12	220/22 225/12 225/25	alternatively [2]	82/13 88/23 113/5	apology [1] 209/25
131/18 132/15 144/10	226/1 226/2 228/1	165/18 189/20	116/2 117/11 117/12	apparent [6] 32/7
149/6 149/23 150/2	228/15 231/2 231/17	alters [1] 141/5	117/16 128/23 130/11	86/3 86/14 126/1
143/0 143/23 130/2	231/24 232/9 233/2	although [13] 3/18	160/7 201/21 205/13	222/9 224/6
				(65) offect apparent

(65) affect - apparent

Α	116/2 168/21 169/19	144/2 145/25 146/6	52/19 59/9 61/8 62/12	46/25
apparently [1] 97/24	170/7 170/16 187/12	147/5 148/1 149/8	127/8 129/18 135/2	at [381]
appeal [50] 51/15	applying [2] 120/9	149/17 149/24 149/25		Atkinson [2] 231/3
52/1 52/2 52/6 52/8	170/23	150/11 150/23 151/11		231/13
52/13 52/15 53/25	appointed [3] 107/24	151/13 152/10 154/14	177/15 178/3 189/20 203/15 205/3 208/13	Atkinson's [1]
78/22 85/9 85/16	107/25 194/14	154/24 156/5 157/8 157/15 158/16 158/18		233/17
139/9 139/18 140/14	appraisals [1] 134/11	158/18 158/25 159/14		attach [1] 50/4
141/2 141/2 141/9	appreciate [4] 112/7 113/7 199/25 226/20	163/9 163/20 163/20	asked [44] 7/18 15/1	attached [4] 71/13 72/2 78/10 145/4
141/20 142/1 142/4	appreciated [2]	164/13 164/16 164/16		attaches [1] 48/25
142/6 142/8 142/21	20/13 204/18	164/24 165/3 165/8	44/22 78/17 87/3	attachment [1]
143/7 143/13 143/25	apprise [1] 199/21	166/1 169/18 170/19	89/19 100/18 114/5	211/10
144/3 144/3 144/8	approach [18] 34/22	170/24 171/4 177/8	114/7 114/21 114/23	attempt [2] 152/5
146/13 148/6 149/11 149/18 152/1 152/4	52/7 52/17 113/15	180/21 180/24 183/21	117/13 118/18 126/4	242/5
152/15 152/20 154/13	117/2 118/22 130/21	185/19 185/25 189/11	126/16 126/16 127/5	attempts [1] 130/3
157/18 158/18 159/1	139/25 150/12 150/25			attend [3] 108/5
205/16 205/22 209/19	151/14 159/9 159/22	200/10 200/24 201/21		154/14 154/16
209/21 210/2 210/4	169/15 171/2 197/13	202/8 202/10 204/11	159/20 168/21 169/4	attendance [7] 28/1
210/22 213/2 213/3	209/18 209/21	207/19 210/20 212/11		43/21 51/7 105/2
Appeal's [1] 143/10	approached [2]	212/13 212/22 213/15		107/16 107/20 170/1
appealed [2] 142/2	172/13 192/3	214/14 215/3 217/13	207/24 208/4 208/5	attended [1] 203/16
206/24	approaches [1] 140/18	218/22 224/12 228/15 233/13 234/4 243/13	211/11 214/12 238/24 239/7 240/18	attendees [2] 106/12 107/22
appeals [6] 52/1		233/13 234/4 243/13		
141/10 152/22 153/8	appropriate [18] 34/14 34/23 40/6 47/5		asking [18] 21/24 62/25 70/25 82/10	attention [7] 12/21 98/6 101/4 102/2
158/15 159/13	60/10 66/17 69/23	54/10 239/3	82/11 84/20 103/22	139/19 194/15 229/12
appear [2] 59/16	88/16 98/13 121/12	areas [2] 4/2 119/6	117/10 129/23 172/16	
180/19	153/3 153/22 154/18	aren't [4] 25/23 71/1	193/21 197/18 197/21	83/20
appearance [2]	155/9 162/23 171/3	185/5 203/4	197/21 204/11 206/2	attitude [1] 113/8
31/23 85/3	173/10 218/6	arguable [1] 15/18	206/8 211/12	attributable [1]
appeared [4] 46/18	appropriately [1]	arguably [1] 76/14	aspect [5] 68/3	239/18
81/15 91/3 128/12	149/3	argued [1] 36/11	130/16 196/14 196/14	attribute [1] 237/23
appearing [1] 28/13 appears [10] 7/21	approve [1] 210/19	argument [3] 34/12	219/23	attributed [2] 126/14
11/2 13/14 85/21	April [4] 3/14 3/17	37/4 79/1	aspects [4] 24/13	126/19
90/14 151/17 187/12	4/9 8/9	arguments [3] 37/16	68/3 191/20 242/19	audit [8] 23/3 25/10
223/6 223/15 223/23	April/May [2] 3/17	172/23 173/1	asserted [4] 80/20	63/24 64/3 64/12
appellants [2] 143/12	8/9	arise [4] 62/6 157/16		79/20 81/3 83/22
143/24		158/6 238/20	asserting [1] 135/23	audited [1] 63/12
applicant [8] 141/1	archived [1] 108/21	arisen [5] 38/17	assertion [1] 52/16	August [7] 13/1 92/6
142/5 142/15 146/25	archiving [1] 57/22 are [150] 2/2 4/14 5/2	73/22 112/14 230/3 238/25	asserts [1] 79/17 assess [1] 150/5	92/15 94/2 94/2 103/19 103/20
147/9 150/18 152/12	9/5 9/10 9/18 16/10	arises [1] 141/4	assessment [3]	Aujard [3] 11/15
157/16	16/17 16/17 17/4 22/7	arising [4] 70/1	24/14 148/23 212/16	136/17 136/20
applicant's [1] 157/9	22/11 22/12 22/12	132/24 155/17 158/15		author [2] 26/20
applicants [4] 141/5	22/25 23/2 23/3 24/5	arm's [1] 136/16	assist [25] 11/8	60/14
148/10 150/15 152/17	24/17 24/19 24/23	arm's length [1]	17/18 21/11 29/13	authorised [2]
application [33] 35/14 36/24 42/6 42/9	25/19 28/12 30/12	136/16	36/9 45/8 51/22 52/15	102/22 168/25
42/15 42/21 43/8 43/8	30/21 31/17 33/9	arose [4] 13/22 74/10		authority [5] 4/13
43/18 44/2 44/3 44/6	34/15 43/20 45/7 49/1		70/20 75/14 93/12	4/19 42/17 156/20
44/8 44/12 44/15	49/3 50/25 51/12 52/3		105/19 107/19 109/8	199/8
44/17 85/16 85/18	52/13 52/14 53/10	11/17 16/8 163/3	111/9 118/24 120/16	authors [1] 32/6
152/15 166/23 167/13	53/23 54/6 55/1 55/15		136/13 140/16 156/16	
167/16 167/16 168/2	55/17 56/24 57/4	206/5 219/19 220/12	203/1 230/13	available [9] 29/8
168/9 168/14 169/5	57/24 58/22 59/2 59/12 61/15 63/3 65/8	223/2 223/7 224/1 226/8	assistant [1] 50/9 assisted [1] 64/13	79/1 91/19 95/3 127/6 127/6 133/6 157/5
169/10 169/13 169/22	72/3 76/11 76/24 77/5		assists [2] 141/6	158/5
170/17 173/3 173/14	77/17 77/18 78/21	71/21	177/18	avoid [6] 41/20 42/2
applications [6] 34/3	78/21 82/13 86/14	arrive [2] 62/1 71/18	assumed [3] 75/10	97/1 146/2 150/9
147/3 148/19 150/15	96/18 105/1 105/9	arrived [1] 205/3	75/10 208/4	172/1
158/7 177/6	105/15 108/7 109/7	article [2] 13/17	assurance [1] 182/20	
applied [7] 42/19 78/21 120/6 132/5	110/12 112/5 113/20	123/19	assurances [1] 66/20	
169/18 242/21 243/9	119/7 120/6 121/5	as [312]	assure [1] 58/13	155/16
apply [8] 33/25 90/15	121/25 127/10 135/23		assured [1] 230/4	avoids [1] 151/14
	138/12 139/24 140/5	8/21 19/25 23/13 35/8	astonishment [1]	awaiting [1] 53/21
L	L	L	1	(66) apparently - awaiting

(66) apparently - awaiting

Α	138/15 174/21	62/19 63/9 64/3 65/19	48/14 48/18 49/22	71/17 73/8 73/13
	balancing [1] 131/5	66/15 66/20 70/6	51/25 52/7 52/18	74/20 80/2 81/25
aware [61] 3/11 3/13 8/8 8/19 10/7 11/16	banner [1] 128/1	70/25 75/20 76/3	53/22 54/1 54/22 55/2	84/20 89/23 110/15
14/2 14/5 15/22 20/4	bar [5] 2/4 2/6 3/6	76/17 80/2 81/9 93/16	55/6 58/9 58/16 59/1	113/19 113/21 118/16
22/16 24/3 25/20	215/1 215/6	93/18 94/1 95/9 97/20	59/15 62/3 62/5 62/10	122/6 123/21 134/9
29/22 32/17 33/6 49/1	bare [1] 127/22	98/3 100/8 101/17	63/10 63/11 63/12	134/13 150/24 160/7
57/24 58/16 58/17	barrister [16] 2/2	105/8 106/7 108/2	64/9 64/17 65/4 65/13	160/14 160/15 165/2
73/19 73/25 74/1	6/25 17/5 20/22 87/8	110/19 110/21 110/22	67/6 67/11 67/16	168/24 176/15 184/16
74/14 74/20 75/4 77/5	90/24 96/16 100/3	111/20 112/15 112/17	68/25 69/9 69/13	184/17 187/22 195/20
77/16 77/17 77/18	182/18 186/17 186/18	112/22 113/4 113/15	71/16 72/6 72/15	197/25 215/11 226/25
79/21 79/24 80/5	186/23 186/23 187/18	117/11 118/5 126/20	72/18 72/20 73/22	229/1 233/1
87/11 96/18 96/18	187/25 216/18	127/21 132/8 133/20	74/8 74/15 74/21	beforehand [2] 26/1
103/19 104/5 126/7	barrister-solicitor [1]	138/14 143/15 144/18		207/3
131/4 133/21 138/13	6/25	144/22 145/9 149/9	76/18 77/1 80/6 81/16	0.1
146/12 158/18 159/14	barristers [5] 5/14	151/22 155/1 156/10	82/23 83/1 84/4 85/9	begin [2] 110/3
160/2 164/2 183/19	6/24 100/1 184/15	156/13 158/6 160/5	85/13 90/1 93/6 93/8	122/20
194/1 196/2 200/22	184/16	161/6 161/8 161/13	93/10 94/4 94/24 95/7	beginning [6] 41/3
201/2 203/4 203/8	base [1] 142/4	161/18 161/18 161/19 162/8 163/3 163/5	97/15 98/23 99/23 100/13 101/5 101/6	63/25 71/7 121/25 163/13 241/25
208/10 208/14 209/2	based [13] 2/11 43/15 43/18 55/9 74/5	163/6 163/7 163/9	100/13 101/5 101/6 101/6 101/9 102/7 105/12	
211/3 211/6 214/1	43/15 43/18 55/9 74/5 74/7 96/23 112/8	163/23 164/11 168/7	105/13 106/4 106/6	beginnings [1] 207/14
214/2	153/11 153/13 173/6	168/22 168/24 175/9	106/25 107/1 107/5	begins [1] 61/3
awareness [1] 117/7	192/11 197/2	175/24 176/8 180/1	109/8 110/16 113/1	behalf [8] 68/25
away [3] 100/2 100/7	basic [2] 31/1 237/18	181/8 181/9 183/5	114/25 116/10 116/12	169/9 186/8 186/12
240/25	basically [3] 21/17	183/22 184/6 185/22	117/18 118/4 119/3	187/2 201/17 219/14
В	179/8 201/17	185/23 186/13 189/14		238/13
	basis [35] 7/16 36/24	190/7 190/10 192/2	124/5 126/14 129/2	behaviour [1] 164/7
B14 [5] 49/3 50/5 50/19 54/10 54/18	56/13 57/25 68/15	192/10 198/1 201/15	130/2 130/4 130/8	behind [8] 32/15 41/7
back [65] 4/12 13/14	74/15 79/6 87/5 108/1	202/19 205/2 206/3	138/10 138/11 139/1	42/2 65/16 139/19
16/8 42/5 51/16 57/9	115/25 126/4 129/7	206/23 208/11 212/5	140/1 141/18 142/23	139/20 171/16 236/16
61/16 62/25 65/18	136/5 138/23 141/19	213/22 217/14 218/5	142/25 143/8 143/21	being [59] 5/4 8/2
66/3 67/3 67/5 67/12	144/11 147/17 168/1	220/19 221/16 226/14	144/12 147/10 147/16	16/3 28/10 44/24 48/3
67/18 84/12 87/16	169/22 170/12 170/24	226/16 227/1 227/12	149/10 149/16 149/19	52/10 54/3 54/25 55/8
88/11 88/18 96/6	172/12 173/14 187/15	229/15 230/1 231/13	150/7 151/12 151/15	66/7 68/22 69/4 72/11
100/16 100/18 100/19	187/16 187/17 190/8	232/24 234/25 235/2	151/21 152/2 153/8	76/15 78/22 86/5 93/5
103/12 107/2 109/24	192/4 192/9 197/12	235/6 235/17 235/25	154/6 154/6 156/11	94/12 96/21 98/25
112/5 113/10 120/25	197/25 232/2 232/11	236/7 237/1 238/10	157/5 157/6 158/23	99/14 99/24 103/15
121/15 124/25 126/6	232/20 233/23	238/15 239/15 239/18		108/3 113/16 113/20
126/9 127/1 127/3	bat [1] 7/8	241/13 242/9	162/1 163/2 163/6	115/5 117/9 120/18
127/12 128/7 128/10	BDO [2] 195/14	become [7] 69/21	168/9 171/20 174/1	139/8 139/9 142/10
129/23 131/2 138/4	195/23	70/6 96/18 97/17	175/3 175/6 175/8	142/11 149/5 150/21
139/24 141/11 142/2	be [277]	181/17 208/10 239/23	175/10 175/12 175/17 177/12 183/1 183/22	151/13 153/7 153/13
144/5 149/2 151/24	bear [2] 132/11 146/6 bearing [1] 231/24	becoming [4] 64/10	185/10 186/1 187/19	154/9 157/14 161/14 161/17 163/16 164/9
153/21 156/20 164/19	bears [1] 231/24	69/14 70/3 222/15	189/2 190/10 190/13	179/25 186/22 196/23
165/21 166/4 168/18	became [12] 11/11	bed [1] 105/5	190/22 192/14 197/16	198/8 208/20 211/14
173/8 187/11 188/3	12/25 15/22 29/22	Bedford [1] 203/17	198/2 205/17 205/23	212/2 212/16 227/5
188/8 213/24 215/9	32/17 40/23 67/1 67/2		206/11 211/8 211/9	227/19 232/2 232/8
217/24 226/21 227/12	74/11 79/24 93/3	7/21 8/2 8/10 8/18	220/6 220/8 220/14	237/23 241/20
230/2 232/22 235/7 239/2	224/22	13/14 13/24 14/21	221/25 223/17 226/9	belief [4] 1/21 135/25
	because [167] 2/21	15/11 15/13 16/15	226/24 228/4 228/8	136/3 136/4
back-up [1] 112/5 background [3] 3/12	4/11 4/18 5/25 5/25	16/16 16/22 19/21	228/23 231/3 233/9	believe [11] 19/9
3/24 28/7	6/23 7/9 7/20 8/13	21/5 22/13 22/15	233/25 235/23 236/7	24/2 29/16 110/17
backwards [2]	8/25 9/12 9/21 10/12	22/17 23/4 24/12	236/25 237/8 237/10	144/24 184/5 184/6
118/16 230/22	12/2 12/7 12/17 12/21	24/18 25/2 25/9 25/10		201/16 206/9 206/11
bad [3] 153/8 153/14	14/15 14/21 16/13	25/20 26/9 26/15 27/8		241/24
154/24	16/20 17/3 17/23	27/10 29/3 29/24	242/9 242/10 242/18	believed [3] 37/1
badly [2] 115/7	19/20 21/2 26/2 26/15	30/19 31/21 31/23	242/21 243/9 243/24	53/19 138/14
115/11	26/18 27/8 28/18	32/5 32/9 33/9 35/23	before [51] 3/19	believing [1] 36/2
balance [1] 31/24	29/19 31/17 37/1	36/15 36/18 36/21	17/19 18/15 18/24	below [1] 79/2
balanced [1] 63/13	38/24 39/1 39/3 39/5	37/8 37/20 38/19	19/7 21/3 36/22 37/6	benchmark [1] 63/14
balances [6] 30/11	43/7 43/15 44/4 44/7	39/19 40/15 40/16	38/2 38/23 42/14	benefit [3] 89/11
33/13 124/11 138/11	52/2 53/23 53/25 54/6	41/10 41/13 42/6 43/12 44/7 46/4 48/12	43/12 60/13 64/9 65/5	
	55/17 62/1 62/13	40/12 44/1 40/4 48/12	67/3 67/5 69/20 70/10	
				(67) awaro - host

(67) aware - best

В	150/18 158/4 161/25	BTO [5] 196/3 196/4	77/13 79/13 80/9	240/11 240/16 241/2
	164/12 164/13 169/1	196/6 196/8 196/12	81/15 82/16 83/5 83/8	241/6 241/8 241/13
best [10] 34/25	169/3 169/4 169/4	bug [31] 22/15 31/2	86/22 87/18 88/5	241/20 241/25 242/6
52/17 52/17 62/19	169/7 171/11 171/25	31/2 31/3 31/3 31/4	88/15 88/23 95/12	242/13 242/19
62/20 67/18 78/19	173/16 193/6 202/10	31/5 31/6 31/12 31/17	95/25 96/5 98/15	called [12] 2/4 16/4
158/7 159/10 171/6	202/12 202/12 223/15	31/18 31/21 31/23	99/21 100/6 100/23	31/2 31/3 31/4 31/17
better [7] 12/18	bother [1] 170/25	33/7 33/7 33/9 33/10	101/9 101/25 102/9	49/3 112/16 162/17
14/20 53/15 56/9	bottom [18] 28/6	40/3 40/3 49/3 57/25	105/11 105/13 105/24	179/10 203/20 203/24
75/10 159/2 165/14	28/20 49/11 56/3	58/3 124/9 124/10	106/22 110/9 112/8	Callendar [10] 31/3
between [21] 4/7	70/13 79/15 86/24	124/17 130/4 215/2	113/5 113/19 115/13	31/6 124/7 124/9
6/10 6/16 55/14 73/11	120/3 131/9 137/8	215/7 242/17 242/21	115/14 116/4 117/13	125/7 125/12 125/16
91/9 128/15 140/13	137/19 138/6 144/25	243/8	117/16 118/14 118/16	125/17 125/20 125/24
162/22 165/6 178/23	1/5/1 152/9 150/17		119/2 119/6 120/1	
179/10 187/23 188/18	178/2 234/9	bugs [78] 12/20 14/13 14/17 14/19	120/18 121/3 123/13	calling [1] 242/8
196/11 198/11 201/3				calls [2] 95/20 123/11
233/6 233/11 236/1	bound [3] 62/6	14/23 15/1 15/22	124/14 124/23 125/2	
237/25	148/17 213/15	16/17 16/25 18/2	125/4 125/16 126/17	came [31] 8/9 8/14
beyond [5] 85/25	Bowyer [13] 2/13	18/21 19/18 20/4	127/7 127/9 128/2	16/14 32/13 93/12
106/9 144/1 234/4	6/13 6/23 68/13 68/17	22/13 22/17 22/23	128/20 129/20 130/8	93/15 95/11 100/16
234/24	126/14 126/19 127/23		134/24 134/25 135/21	100/17 101/19 103/12
big [1] 239/16	128/21 135/12 163/1	24/17 24/23 25/19	136/4 136/23 137/24	126/17 127/25 128/13
bill [1] 16/10	220/24 221/13	25/23 26/1 26/15	139/22 144/10 144/11	134/19 136/22 163/21
Birmingham [1]	branch [9] 17/12	29/22 30/8 30/18	145/12 147/5 149/6	163/22 168/15 179/20
20/23	50/7 50/9 54/11 57/23	30/19 31/1 31/7 31/16		182/17 182/24 207/22
bit [18] 22/10 28/1	58/6 58/8 60/16 63/12	33/7 33/8 33/9 33/15	151/19 151/24 153/17	208/20 218/9 219/20
38/24 53/2 94/12	branches [13] 22/14	33/16 35/5 36/15	154/20 155/20 156/12	225/20 226/6 230/20
100/1 112/9 113/20	22/25 31/20 49/7 50/3	39/20 43/11 47/19	159/24 160/2 160/6	230/24 233/14
	50/4 50/25 57/21	55/25 63/18 64/16	160/25 161/23 163/1	can [155] 1/3 1/4 1/9
140/4 140/4 144/8	59/12 59/20 59/20	64/25 66/9 77/1 81/10	163/5 164/14 164/25	1/16 3/5 8/9 8/23 9/13
151/5 156/8 180/8	60/2 66/9	86/9 90/6 98/22	165/24 166/4 167/9	10/3 11/8 13/6 13/8
182/2 197/4 220/23	breach [12] 36/21	124/13 171/11 173/25		13/9 15/20 15/24
235/8	76/20 82/4 96/12	174/2 175/3 175/13	168/23 170/8 170/12	17/18 19/10 19/15
black [3] 164/6	96/16 170/19 170/21	175/18 178/12 179/23		21/11 21/16 23/13
164/12 164/21	172/9 215/21 224/16	185/19 190/15 214/1	173/19 174/13 175/6	24/2 24/2 24/16 24/20
black-letter [2] 164/6	233/25 236/1	214/2 214/11 214/14	177/5 178/3 180/6	24/23 25/8 26/23
164/21	breaches [2] 96/14	215/16 216/9 224/7	180/25 181/9 183/2	27/25 29/13 31/9 33/3
BLAKE [13] 1/8	96/22	237/14 241/14 241/19		35/8 35/19 36/9 38/2
45/22 47/9 60/13 89/5	breaching [2] 170/14	242/15 242/18 242/25		
136/11 177/22 214/2	172/4	242/10 242/20	191/18 191/18 195/14	
214/11 218/18 243/20	break [13] 47/1 47/12		196/17 197/9 198/24	54/2 55/19 57/2 58/7
244/7 245/4	70/16 88/17 89/9	bullet [3] 72/1 72/3	199/17 199/21 202/4	59/16 60/23 61/4
blame [1] 117/11	121/12 160/15 165/1	145/14	205/17 209/2 209/6	62/12 62/19 62/25
blinkered [4] 113/11	165/14 166/14 218/22		210/9 210/19 211/8	64/1 68/21 69/1 69/4
113/12 113/14 113/21			213/12 214/1 214/4	69/6 70/9 70/20 71/20
blinkering [1] 112/9	219/4 219/9	bus [1] 201/12		
blinkers [1] 66/18	breaking [1] 70/20	business [4] 12/1	214/5 214/17 215/14	72/1 72/2 73/17 76/7 77/23 78/2 78/19 79/3
board [4] 182/17	breaks [2] 47/4	102/20 105/6 219/18	216/9 217/13 225/5	
182/24 183/23 200/17	165/18	but [216] 2/2 2/20	225/7 225/12 232/5	79/14 83/7 86/22
bogged [1] 83/8	Brian [14] 9/4 65/12	3/15 4/20 4/24 6/12	232/17 235/3 235/8	86/24 89/13 91/17
bombshell [5] 26/5	65/24 85/21 85/22	6/19 7/8 7/18 8/2 9/7	235/22 236/4 237/4	92/13 92/22 93/12
73/2 86/15 98/21	104/24 106/7 119/8	9/9 10/1 10/18 12/12	237/15 238/24 240/9	95/13 101/7 101/25
205/21				102/9 102/13 104/23
Bond [9] 109/23	203/18 240/5 240/9	16/16 17/24 18/14	buy [1] 38/5	105/19 107/19 109/8
110/4 151/4 151/17	brief [8] 3/18 21/16	19/1 22/12 25/8 26/12		116/6 116/14 116/25
160/20 203/17 207/19	72/3 95/24 110/8	27/4 28/19 36/25 38/8		118/24 119/24 120/16
207/20 211/13	160/14 165/9 189/21	38/11 39/5 42/22 43/3	С	121/21 122/11 122/14
bones [1] 127/22	briefly [3] 119/24	43/14 43/23 44/7		129/21 129/21 131/12
bore [1] 112/16	163/9 234/7		calculation [1] 57/23	131/20 131/23 134/6
boss [1] 7/6	bring [12] 11/5 13/9	52/25 53/8 53/16 54/4		134/7 134/9 136/13
	27/25 57/5 89/13	54/24 55/5 56/21	15/3 18/17 18/25 19/8	137/5 140/9 140/16
both [36] 2/16 13/17	90/10 98/6 106/13	58/17 58/24 62/17	19/19 19/25 20/1 21/1	143/1 143/13 143/24
35/5 40/15 41/19 43/1	112/18 114/1 194/12	62/23 64/9 64/15	21/7 24/12 33/1 66/6	144/2 144/21 145/6
58/22 59/8 75/24	194/14	64/19 65/11 65/21	93/2 93/7 95/25 104/9	146/10 151/5 151/6
80/15 80/23 83/18	bringing [1] 107/9	66/11 67/2 67/6 67/8	109/2 146/1 146/10	151/7 152/7 154/2
96/22 97/3 105/8	brought [1] 198/12	67/10 68/25 69/7	178/19 178/25 179/15	156/16 156/19 160/17
115/12 131/22 134/11	brutally [1] 166/3	73/14 76/22 77/1	212/12 224/9 224/12	163/4 165/18 169/6
				(68) host _ can

(68) best... - can

C	219/21 220/4 221/18	157/13	131/19 172/7 188/16	193/4 199/12 201/12
С	223/25 236/23 237/19		199/4 200/19 200/20	201/16 201/20 204/7
can [30] 170/3	239/19 239/24 240/2	casting [1] 152/11	201/8 221/3 227/18	204/16 205/5 205/19
171/1 177/24 178/2	case [131] 4/11 5/1	categories [1] 42/19	characterise [2]	211/8 215/14 218/23
178/4 180/18 180/23	5/2 5/15 6/2 6/3 7/2	category [3] 42/21	187/2 227/11	219/5 219/13 232/7
184/2 184/13 184/13	7/6 10/1 10/15 20/22	79/13 155/19	characterised [2]	243/22 245/2
185/12 199/25 206/19	20/23 24/19 27/21	cause [13] 23/6	68/22 69/4	Clarke's [1] 108/25
207/17 208/9 212/25	28/7 32/2 34/6 34/22	58/14 66/13 75/23	charged [1] 157/12	Clarke/Jenkins [1]
217/24 218/9 219/15	35/25 38/10 40/20	80/21 124/20 125/15	charging [1] 138/24	178/24
220/23 224/9 225/6	41/4 41/8 47/17 47/18	131/4 157/21 210/23	chase [1] 103/22	clean [2] 16/10 64/8
227/21 233/20 234/7	47/22 47/24 51/12	220/21 228/18 229/17	check [2] 235/23	clear [32] 15/13
236/4 236/18 242/23	51/15 53/25 54/3	caused [10] 8/18	241/22	19/12 30/20 31/19
243/4 244/1	56/12 56/13 56/13	20/5 31/7 58/13	children's [1] 64/12	59/4 66/10 67/1 67/2
can't [36] 16/14 17/1	65/6 67/6 68/4 68/7	120/21 143/1 143/4	choice [2] 82/20	79/10 79/12 111/16
24/22 25/14 25/22	68/10 68/12 69/14	148/24 199/2 229/8	187/23	117/16 118/12 119/9
44/4 45/12 46/6 46/23	69/17 69/19 70/3 70/7	caution [5] 52/8	choose [4] 65/9	120/7 127/15 128/25
56/21 66/6 67/8 77/7	74/5 74/9 74/10 75/25			135/22 137/20 150/21
77/11 77/20 88/20	80/5 81/6 83/3 83/11	148/5	chosen [3] 65/4 66/1	155/21 157/18 158/22
101/22 106/22 106/24	84/2 84/17 88/22	cautious [1] 51/25	101/25	170/3 180/4 207/17
114/4 115/12 116/4	91/21 96/13 111/10	CCRC [8] 78/1 78/18	Chris [2] 11/15	207/19 211/15 226/22
126/15 130/9 162/5	111/11 115/7 116/17	82/12 82/17 82/23	159/20	226/23 227/6 235/25
168/22 168/24 173/8	122/11 122/17 126/13		Christopher [2]	clearer [1] 50/10
177/12 180/7 196/21	126/16 128/17 128/10		136/17 136/20	clearly [19] 24/22
211/21 211/22 213/10	129/6 131/22 132/4	central [9] 12/10 46/8		26/24 68/9 84/3 86/3
215/9 215/12	132/11 133/15 134/7	57/19 58/1 74/11 90/3		88/10 109/18 128/3
candid [1] 183/1	134/11 135/24 137/12	151/24 217/14 224/23		136/8 138/2 158/11
candidates [2]	137/18 138/3 138/5	centrally [2] 93/5	132/11 138/22	169/18 191/14 195/23
163/15 163/15	120/24 120/7 120/0	108/21	circles [1] 176/9	217/5 217/7 226/24
cannot [8] 33/16 36/4	139/12 139/18 140/4	Centre [2] 57/20 58/2		238/15 240/8
96/11 132/7 142/25	141/15 141/21 142/1	certain [12] 4/13 8/5	188/1	clerk [3] 34/19
174/8 175/20 205/13	146/4 157/4 157/9	17/14 37/18 49/6	circumstances [16]	141/24 161/9
capable [1] 64/25	162/17 162/19 163/2	73/16 93/25 94/1	17/4 33/25 59/2 68/21	clerks [1] 161/4
card [4] 21/20 24/1	167/23 169/17 170/15		82/18 96/18 97/13	client [4] 9/13 43/22
28/11 28/13	170/15 171/2 171/17	229/2	132/12 138/22 141/4	187/9 187/15
career [1] 26/8	176/3 186/20 186/20	certainly [24] 4/16	142/7 150/20 157/19	clients [5] 3/11 5/14
careful [6] 24/24 52/4	186/20 186/22 192/4	5/3 14/8 14/12 22/16	169/16 188/13 210/14	
52/5 142/12 179/25	192/4 192/9 192/9	27/6 52/13 53/8 54/25		close [2] 16/2 61/23
238/5	192/14 192/17 197/12			closed [3] 34/6 42/20
carefully [6] 62/14	197/13 197/25 197/25		200/23 201/2 206/22	170/9
86/18 86/21 86/22	198/5 198/13 200/7	110/10 112/20 147/16	206/25 207/1 207/2	closely [2] 220/24
86/23 192/7	208/15 209/10 210/22	160/6 177/15 177/15	207/4 207/7 207/10	222/24
carried [5] 68/22	213/14 224/13 226/5	186/17 211/3	208/1 208/13 208/15	Code [5] 114/11
69/4 74/13 98/1	234/10 237/4 237/7	certificate [17] 34/1	209/3 209/7 211/3	119/5 119/20 119/22
122/12	240/17 241/4 241/9	34/13 35/1 36/13	211/5 211/6 211/10	121/3
carry [4] 5/9 164/12	cases [48] 3/22 4/14	37/17 38/4 41/7 42/2	211/16 211/20 217/16	codes [2] 96/14
184/12 233/2	5/13 6/21 16/22 30/8	168/21 170/7 170/16	claim [1] 215/5	96/23
carrying [5] 68/2 69/24 87/24 110/19	32/7 34/4 34/6 40/8	171/7 171/17 172/24	claimed [3] 124/12	coherent [2] 117/11
117/22	48/17 48/20 53/20	173/9 173/11 176/9	198/17 198/18	117/12
Cartwright [57] 2/9	56/13 63/5 67/4 67/10	cetera [7] 63/18 82/5	claiming [1] 21/25	collating [1] 112/23
2/11 2/17 3/2 3/9 3/21	67/11 69/14 71/17	111/14 170/11 171/22		collation [1] 113/17
4/4 4/7 4/7 4/14 5/6	72/19 75/1 77/22	171/23 232/10	160/21 200/23 201/2	colleague [2] 218/2
5/13 5/23 6/10 10/7	80/20 83/17 91/21	Chair [2] 76/10 233/5		219/17
11/17 71/14 74/1	111/17 111/18 113/3	chambers [5] 34/15	207/7 207/10 208/16	colleagues [2] 73/24
74/25 84/22 84/23	115/1 133/18 140/9	34/17 36/12 37/15	211/10 217/16	140/7
87/3 87/24 94/12	145/21 145/25 146/14		clarify [2] 8/9 161/3	collect [1] 112/2
100/4 101/18 105/1	157/13 158/4 158/9	chamfered [1] 209/9	clarity [1] 156/8	collectively [1]
105/15 111/16 114/15	159/23 161/1 161/7	chance [1] 241/22	Clarke [42] 1/6 1/7	192/20
114/22 117/22 118/1	162/8 170/8 189/1	change [3] 64/9	1/10 1/11 2/1 20/21	College [1] 163/17
118/6 118/13 127/16	190/8 213/22 236/22	107/23 141/8	42/22 47/17 53/3 66/1	colours [1] 106/23
127/21 128/1 159/23	237/2	changed [9] 56/5	89/19 105/9 121/24	combination [1] 4/15
191/1 194/2 194/5	cash [13] 4/4 5/5	107/25 122/23 236/12		combined [3] 129/5
196/9 201/7 209/3	5/11 5/15 7/6 8/10	236/15 236/15 236/19		135/13 151/14
209/11 211/19 219/17	23/25 101/4 101/5	237/15 238/18	177/5 177/24 178/24	come [53] 5/16 7/17
	101/17 101/25 102/14	characterisation [9]	184/10 189/16 190/1	12/9 15/3 15/19 15/20
	I	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	(60) com como

(69) can... - come

С	communications [2]	209/24 222/12 228/18		154/20 155/4
come [47] 18/12	6/9 91/18	229/9 229/15 229/15	110/23 110/25 183/12	
21/19 27/1 27/21	compelling [2] 37/10	229/17 229/21	184/8 200/6 232/23	61/19 61/22 149/8
29/19 31/9 31/11	226/14	concerned [38] 5/24	232/24 236/22 237/19	
31/13 32/14 39/25	compensation [2] 148/25 210/1	5/25 9/9 14/3 20/5	conducted [8] 22/7	considered [16]
43/11 51/16 61/6		20/9 24/20 25/16	23/25 28/9 28/12 71/17 72/24 137/11	13/20 51/17 65/15 114/8 121/2 130/17
61/21 68/15 70/10	competence [2] 222/2 222/7	39/10 41/9 43/5 43/6 43/7 43/9 51/9 52/2	195/15	131/22 132/24 146/25
71/4 88/18 121/14	competency [1]	52/14 53/25 59/13	conducting [4] 24/20	157/5 159/14 161/8
129/21 135/7 142/16	237/18	60/6 75/20 76/1	102/19 154/23 194/17	162/9 189/7 189/9
165/21 166/4 176/5	competent [4] 17/5		conduit [2] 6/16 6/18	197/25
178/1 179/14 179/17 180/2 181/3 181/12	108/8 148/2 205/11	155/24 157/8 158/18	conference [18]	considering [2]
185/1 205/7 206/2	competing [2] 51/12	159/11 171/19 178/16		120/5 232/6
209/1 216/18 220/3	52/9	194/15 198/20 210/2	93/2 93/7 95/20	considers [1] 72/10
220/10 222/1 223/24	compiled [1] 107/13	227/4 227/11 235/17	203/16 206/7 207/20	consisted [1] 188/25
225/10 225/15 226/7	complainant's [1]	236/24	207/22 207/23 207/25	
227/14 229/1 229/12	28/24 complained [1] 42/13	concerning [5] 78/5 190/20 219/20 221/13	210/9 218/10 234/13	217/9 consists [1] 150/16
230/4	complaint [3] 131/25	240/17	conferences [2]	conspiracy [1] 97/2
comes [9] 7/20 29/8	143/5 149/20	concerns [33] 14/21	111/1 124/23	constraints [1] 158/2
52/24 116/2 116/3	complaints [1]	40/14 46/12 50/7	confess [1] 184/21	construct [1] 189/6
134/9 162/21 176/13 203/5	151/25	56/24 73/5 73/12	confidence [4] 34/8	construction [1]
comfort [1] 13/3	complete [8] 16/22	81/21 82/18 83/5	41/19 43/1 171/25	211/25
comfortable [1] 87/5	56/23 106/15 158/10	86/14 87/11 88/4	confident [2] 23/2	consultancy [1] 2/19
coming [5] 47/2	172/20 218/23 219/5	90/10 98/23 105/25	55/1	consultation [6]
72/25 108/16 130/16	239/9	106/20 118/1 132/23	confines [1] 109/24	206/4 207/21 209/24
152/3	completed [4] 62/5 67/17 73/13 137/2	153/3 155/12 155/13 160/3 178/8 191/13	confirm [8] 58/20 59/14 62/14 95/13	210/7 211/14 218/2 contact [7] 6/10
comings [1] 8/5	completely [3] 38/4	194/23 195/11 197/2	95/16 95/25 134/10	16/12 19/1 27/9 27/20
commence [2] 36/1	201/19 212/15	197/5 222/20 224/18	168/12	55/13 196/18
176/16	complications [1]	236/21 237/17	confirmation [1]	contacted [3] 19/1
commenced [1] 114/10	158/6	concession [8]	23/12	32/20 100/21
commencing [2]	complied [4] 36/3 180/3 229/21 238/5	141/16 141/20 143/21 147/14 148/3 148/20	23/8 25/22 59/1 99/12	contain [3] 72/13 158/7 228/12
114/13 176/15	complies [1] 231/16	152/18 210/3	105/4	contained [8] 35/4
commending [1]	comply [7] 35/7	concise [1] 120/7	conflict [7] 67/25	97/15 149/3 150/23
159/9 comment [3] 39/8	36/25 38/6 38/13	conclude [5] 58/21	87/9 99/18 99/18	159/24 171/10 177/1
69/23 79/3	38/14 233/21 234/23	131/11 132/4 184/13	99/21 233/12 240/1	229/13
commentary [1]	comprehensive [1]	199/19	confusing [1] 105/8	contains [1] 145/5
52/25	67/13	concluded [2] 83/2 232/9	confusion [4] 31/6 31/9 31/22 58/12	contemplate [1] 36/4
commented [2]	compromise [1] 150/21	conclusion [41] 39/8	conjunction [1]	contemplated [1] 32/8
38/16 57/12	compromised [1]	93/1 128/13 130/16	34/24	contemplating [2]
commenting [3] 41/6	23/4	132/16 133/4 133/12	connect [1] 242/8	97/24 98/12
160/23 171/16 comments [1] 163/5	computer [5] 78/5	134/3 134/19 138/20	consequence [2]	content [3] 41/15
commission [2]	108/18 123/20 125/23	139/4 179/15 179/17	72/18 170/14	87/12 221/6
77/23 78/20	214/24	179/20 180/3 181/4	consequences [10]	contention [3]
commissioned [4]	concede [1] 147/7 conceded [1] 207/4	181/12 185/15 203/5 212/19 213/21 216/18	41/21 120/12 147/4	217/19 223/14 239/2 context [4] 87/6
16/3 37/20 176/4	conceded [1] 20774 concentrate [1]	217/24 218/10 219/20		141/10 141/21 155/8
227/9	214/5	219/25 220/3 220/12	172/8	continue [5] 33/13
committed [4] 10/23 64/7 102/19 147/1	concentrating [1]	223/24 225/15 225/20		116/17 161/22 162/23
committee [7] 21/2	196/15	226/7 229/2 230/20	158/5	163/8
30/18 30/22 173/24	concentration [1]	230/25 232/1 232/4	Consequently [1]	continued [5] 2/22
174/2 175/18 242/15	165/24	233/7 233/14 233/15	105/15	12/12 161/8 162/9
common [3] 35/13	concern [35] 19/18 23/6 40/2 40/7 46/19	233/25 conclusions [4]	consider [13] 5/8 42/16 71/20 99/18	207/25 continues [1] 107/11
91/17 231/7	51/21 59/19 76/4 76/4		115/24 157/17 158/13	
communicated [1]	81/14 97/19 120/16	222/2	159/1 176/14 194/8	193/10 193/16 199/1
103/5 communicating [2]	120/19 120/21 120/22		203/7 227/3 235/14	229/6 240/2
12/8 136/14	127/2 141/10 143/17	condemning [1]	considerable [3]	continuity [4] 107/16
communication [2]	143/23 144/4 149/13	73/13	125/13 148/23 182/19	
11/21 12/1	149/13 150/6 150/8 150/11 155/5 155/22	conduct [16] 4/8 10/20 68/15 72/18	consideration [5] 67/15 142/13 154/18	contract [1] 4/6 contractor [1] 80/19
	100/11 100/0 100/22			
				(70) como contractor

(70) come... - contractor

С	copying [2] 71/24	162/12 201/16	crawl [2] 210/12	cure [2] 12/16 230/2
contractual [1] 71/21	150/25	counsel [32] 3/11 4/3		curing [1] 228/22
contrary [6] 25/7	Core [3] 160/16	5/21 5/22 35/13 35/14	created [1] 90/3	curious [1] 201/14
102/21 159/3 197/13	164/25 193/4	35/16 35/17 35/21	credibility [4] 132/25	currency [2] 85/13
215/19 230/15	corporate [3] 200/15	35/22 35/23 38/19	133/3 133/5 241/17	139/2
control [1] 239/10	202/15 203/11	50/19 68/14 85/8	Crichton [14] 11/16	current [1] 56/6
convened [1] 12/15	correct [34] 2/10	96/13 102/10 167/1	86/25 101/4 102/2	currently [1] 137/1
convenient [1]	2/24 6/6 15/11 28/25	169/12 169/12 169/14		curve [1] 61/10
165/21	35/10 35/11 35/12	179/8 182/21 182/21	103/16 104/24 105/8	cut [1] 184/10
convergence [1]	47/20 47/21 48/16	182/22 203/21 205/4	109/3 136/17 136/21	cutting [1] 226/19
131/24	66/19 85/5 95/24	205/6 205/8 205/11	210/7	cynical [3] 69/21
conversation [41]	134/16 134/17 137/3	205/13 232/25	criminal [56] 2/6 5/12	70/6 140/4
14/10 17/19 18/2	164/7 164/8 178/14	counsel's [2] 50/15	10/22 29/10 32/20	D
18/23 18/24 19/3 19/7	185/3 185/4 185/6	184/8	39/13 39/16 39/24	
20/12 21/13 25/4	187/22 188/4 202/7	counter [2] 22/7	40/4 50/18 60/5 70/18	
25/18 26/1 26/4 26/9	203/18 207/13 215/2	28/10	71/15 71/17 72/8	damage [4] 8/17 228/22 228/23 235/17
26/20 27/4 27/22	216/5 218/7 218/8	counterparts [1] 194/24	77/22 84/16 84/17	damaged [5] 41/17
28/16 29/14 30/24	225/17 225/19		87/8 91/21 111/5	152/21 153/7 171/24
30/25 31/10 32/23	corrected [2] 182/14 186/6	country [1] 4/1	111/16 111/19 120/23 120/24 140/1 140/20	206/5
33/18 39/23 54/20		couple [10] 11/13		damaging [2] 43/13
73/1 73/7 73/23 74/18	correcting [1] 235/19	23/14 45/4 98/15 100/24 108/23 109/9	142/23 143/2 145/20 146/4 146/23 147/1	239/24
74/20 86/4 86/15 91/6	corrections [1] 138/16	100/24 106/23 109/9	148/17 148/19 149/5	data [13] 22/4 23/24
91/9 94/5 105/21	correctly [2] 134/10	course [23] 27/1 74/5		28/14 28/17 28/23
122/1 129/12 184/5	202/6	74/9 74/11 97/3 97/9	152/12 152/17 152/23	31/25 32/9 40/21
204/6	correspondence [4]	112/8 114/7 134/20	155/6 157/24 159/22	57/19 57/22 58/1 62/3
conversations [4]	17/14 59/13 89/12	173/5 173/12 176/17	161/3 184/15 190/8	125/8
45/14 74/8 91/1 104/1	136/25	191/23 193/1 196/25	191/1 191/4 193/8	date [30] 21/5 22/21
conveyed [7] 84/9	corrupt [1] 124/6	198/24 199/23 201/3	203/25 207/24 208/16	61/12 61/16 61/18
91/23 93/11 93/13	cost [1] 13/20	202/2 203/23 220/9	217/17 231/8	61/20 61/23 61/24
93/25 94/18 104/8	Costcutter [2] 50/7	222/13 235/22	cringed [1] 28/18	62/2 63/6 63/9 63/15
convicted [26] 53/22	50/18	court [57] 4/3 4/4	criteria [1] 78/21	63/17 64/1 64/3 65/3
54/1 76/25 77/4 140/1	costs [1] 14/3	20/23 34/19 35/15	criterion [1] 79/5	65/9 65/11 65/15
141/24 142/23 143/2	couched [1] 120/7	36/2 48/5 48/9 48/12	critical [2] 90/11	65/17 65/23 66/1
143/4 143/8 144/2 144/13 144/18 149/5	could [85] 7/1 31/20	52/1 52/2 52/6 54/16	216/13	66/11 66/17 66/25
151/15 151/21 152/3	35/20 36/1 36/11	73/16 75/15 75/24	criticised [1] 123/14	122/13 124/20 132/10
153/5 154/24 155/5	36/16 37/5 38/5 38/6	76/5 80/25 83/6 83/19	criticising [1] 236/2	202/10 202/12
157/9 157/23 209/25	38/12 43/15 43/16	97/13 139/9 139/17	criticism [4] 67/21	dated [4] 1/14 178/4
210/17 235/18 238/20	47/25 48/21 49/7	141/2 143/6 143/10	110/4 113/20 131/11	179/1 221/21
convicting [1] 149/16	50/16 51/15 52/18	144/3 144/8 146/13	cross [1] 126/1	dates [1] 61/15
conviction [17] 9/2	53/2 55/19 57/9 57/15		cross-examination	day [38] 8/1 8/24
79/8 132/8 141/19	59/9 60/22 63/17	154/13 158/18 159/1	[1] 126/1	14/17 15/2 16/1 27/24
141/22 142/6 143/6	64/24 71/10 76/11	178/9 179/23 179/24	Crown [20] 4/3 20/23	29/17 30/9 37/1 39/5
147/17 148/4 157/7	78/8 83/9 85/6 87/6	184/17 184/18 184/21		46/6 48/22 52/5 53/2 57/14 73/8 75/6 81/25
158/19 203/6 204/21	88/18 90/10 90/24	187/23 187/25 188/1	119/5 119/20 119/22	91/15 93/16 100/16
204/23 212/7 214/6	96/10 98/8 100/5	188/2 188/3 188/8 188/9 188/9 188/10	121/3 184/17 190/4	122/24 122/25 123/16
217/16	100/6 112/18 114/1 116/1 120/2 121/14	213/3 216/10 216/14	191/6 192/22 194/25 196/9 196/18 196/20	123/20 130/18 134/5
conviction' [1]	123/25 130/13 131/4	229/16 229/20 230/13		
152/16	134/21 136/23 137/15		crude [1] 225/6	139/15 139/23 154/3
convictions [5] 9/6	138/5 140/23 141/8	court's [1] 39/4	cruel [1] 77/12	156/22 169/13 174/19
48/18 52/3 140/9	141/18 142/8 142/20	courts [9] 140/18	crystallised [1]	195/20 244/10
152/23	144/25 145/1 150/3	179/16 183/1 184/16	135/10	day one [1] 134/5
convinced [6] 20/13	152/25 154/7 154/24	184/17 185/17 185/25		days [5] 27/22 38/23
67/5 113/13 184/7	156/2 156/11 157/6	188/22 237/13	135/14	45/4 52/21 61/9
236/12 236/24	157/11 159/17 165/20		culpability [2] 156/13	deal [17] 4/2 6/11
cool [1] 28/3	168/21 172/20 173/22		238/15	14/16 38/5 62/13
copied [4] 49/20	174/5 181/7 189/9	193/8	culpable [1] 139/10	62/17 72/16 73/9 76/6
49/23 50/1 136/24	194/12 196/23 210/1	covering [2] 57/7	cultural [11] 105/12	98/13 101/1 104/22
copies [2] 85/11 121/3	212/4 212/9 212/19	101/3	105/19 106/1 106/6	112/12 143/16 163/4
copy [7] 78/12 114/5	213/20 214/11 216/17	CPS [8] 54/9 54/10	106/8 106/9 106/17	188/24 240/11
114/7 114/8 114/15	218/19 242/8	54/13 54/16 55/4 55/4		
115/2 160/20	couldn't [6] 15/11	55/13 187/2	109/25	51/13 55/17 63/19
	37/1 93/21 112/19	crafted [1] 127/13	culturally [1] 106/14	dealings [1] 53/14
L	1		·	71) contractual - dealings

(71) contractual - dealings

D	defending [1] 35/14	determine [5] 68/4	220/17 222/20 222/21	disagree [15] 6/21
deals [2] 139/12	defensive [3] 11/11	72/19 85/15 157/21	225/18 226/15 227/25	6/23 43/3 81/23
224/15	44/7 222/15	191/21	228/2 228/3 228/3	118/25 131/15 133/8
dealt [9] 107/7	defer [1] 6/6	determined [1] 125/8	228/7 228/12 228/12	172/7 204/12 204/17
109/13 109/21 125/13	deference [1] 199/16	determining [1] 197/25	228/18 230/17 231/20 232/18 232/19 234/17	204/18 211/18 217/9 227/18 231/1
132/9 133/1 155/25	deficient [1] 123/5 deficit [2] 8/23	deterring [2] 217/16	232/18/232/19/234/17	disagreed [1] 44/23
187/13 243/25	140/19	217/17	didn't [72] 3/15 4/21	disagreement [1]
deceived [1] 135/15	definitive [3] 104/3	devalued [1] 148/12	8/15 10/13 14/14	217/9
December [19] 126/13 126/17 127/11	104/4 181/4	developed [3] 96/19	26/19 27/19 29/17	disappointed [1]
127/15 134/14 137/15	degree [8] 33/11	214/20 224/18	44/25 48/5 66/15 68/6	121/9
137/16 137/23 156/3	39/12 40/25 69/13	development [2]	69/7 73/14 74/17	disclosable [11]
206/20 208/11 208/22	150/10 179/9 235/1 242/17	35/25 235/11	75/18 76/2 77/20	47/18 56/14 95/2 97/22 134/5 139/1
209/1 211/9 216/19	delay [2] 107/7 199/3	device [3] 21/13 242/3 242/7	77/21 80/2 88/5 88/10 99/20 100/8 103/1	167/23 175/23 176/7
216/25 217/2 217/3	deliberately [5] 96/21		108/1 111/21 114/15	176/21 176/23
217/8	134/21 135/4 135/24	devised [1] 162/17	115/2 117/10 117/12	disclose [17] 34/1
decided [2] 34/24 235/7	237/25	devolved [1] 194/24	117/20 119/11 124/13	35/2 50/20 54/13 55/4
decision [28] 56/12	deliver [1] 10/13	Dickinson [8] 109/23	126/20 129/18 139/21	55/11 76/24 137/10
63/9 64/16 65/19 66/2	delivered [2] 10/6	110/4 151/4 151/17	159/16 161/20 164/4	171/8 194/20 195/3
96/23 96/25 97/4 97/4	128/5	203/17 207/19 207/20	170/16 173/5 177/15	206/16 213/15 215/16
101/24 116/16 116/20	demonstrate [2] 79/19 161/19	211/14 Dickinson's [1]	180/2 187/20 189/3 191/4 192/2 202/17	238/2 238/3 239/1 disclosed [19] 30/21
117/4 117/8 117/25	demonstrated [1]	160/21	204/25 208/18 211/15	
118/4 118/4 118/14	24/18	dictate [1] 69/20	212/7 215/14 218/5	76/19 77/1 81/10
120/8 120/13 120/14 120/15 132/19 132/20	demonstrates [3]	did [143] 2/8 2/17	220/19 225/23 226/12	126/2 129/7 133/16
146/3 155/4 197/12	81/6 84/2 238/13	2/19 3/18 3/21 4/11	226/12 228/7 229/12	139/3 167/20 176/17
198/16	department [5] 74/6	4/14 4/22 5/8 5/20	229/17 230/23 232/23	189/2 195/6 205/25
decision-makers [1]	107/23 116/23 194/2	6/11 6/13 6/13 9/9	235/1 235/14 235/24	238/22 239/17
120/14	221/18 departments [1]	18/11 19/7 23/6 23/17 26/13 27/4 31/9 35/16	238/3 238/11 239/20 240/8 240/9	disclosing [5] 49/7 112/23 129/15 189/1
decisions [3] 4/13	108/15		died [1] 166/10	195/4
4/18 117/17	departure [1] 93/17	45/23 46/4 46/11	difference [7] 53/20	disclosure [92] 8/25
declaration [6] 75/18 228/13 231/7 231/12	dependent [1] 198/4	46/17 46/21 46/24	64/1 73/11 233/3	9/2 9/11 9/14 10/8
231/19 231/20	depth [1] 109/14	62/17 64/21 64/23	233/5 233/11 237/25	13/16 13/21 15/17
declared [3] 22/24	Derby [1] 74/7	65/1 65/15 66/13	different [21] 5/16	33/21 35/7 36/25
23/5 157/14	derived [4] 30/15 79/20 113/17 119/4	66/23 67/6 67/12	9/3 74/2 82/9 97/14	37/23 38/4 38/6 38/14
defect [3] 81/1 83/20	describe [3] 198/7	72/13 74/14 75/17 77/14 77/20 77/21	108/15 109/2 111/17 113/4 113/22 128/13	48/19 50/15 50/16 54/15 55/5 56/4 56/5
230/2	217/22 225/6	88/3 92/2 96/2 98/14	141/12 150/19 160/3	56/7 77/3 91/12 91/16
defects [3] 47/19	described [8] 6/19	98/15 99/6 99/17	161/17 187/13 188/5	91/19 92/5 92/7 92/11
90/6 215/17 defence [34] 3/10	52/9 69/2 73/2 115/4	100/10 100/13 100/15		92/14 95/3 97/1 97/12
8/25 9/10 25/13 34/2	123/22 204/20 242/3	100/16 103/3 104/11	239/3	108/25 109/6 109/17
34/16 35/2 35/17	describes [1] 139/22	107/1 107/4 110/21	differentiation [1]	111/3 111/5 111/17
35/21 35/22 35/22	describing [2] 92/24 145/10	117/7 118/1 124/13 124/20 124/22 125/3	140/12 difficult [4] 63/24	112/12 126/6 126/8 126/22 127/14 127/18
37/12 37/20 48/10	description [2] 7/1	125/8 126/18 128/19	100/3 100/8 150/5	128/14 128/19 129/19
50/20 55/8 55/9 55/10	84/21	134/15 134/24 145/13		130/4 130/6 130/17
60/13 122/18 122/21 122/24 123/9 130/18	designed [1] 117/3	150/4 151/19 159/1	39/14 138/18	130/22 131/12 131/13
130/25 138/7 167/1	despite [3] 123/10	168/12 168/20 169/11	digital [1] 134/19	132/3 132/6 133/15
171/8 174/7 175/20	154/4 190/25	176/1 176/16 176/19	dim [1] 67/2	133/18 137/21 140/1
175/23 177/7 203/25	destroyed [1] 93/10	180/2 180/2 182/2	direct [9] 53/16 77/9	143/15 143/18 148/23
206/25	destruction [2] 106/2 106/20	182/23 183/3 183/5 183/10 183/11 184/3	95/8 116/23 118/15 135/3 136/19 164/12	152/21 153/7 160/6 176/14 193/7 193/10
defend [1] 9/13	detail [4] 36/6 125/14		212/24	193/16 193/23 203/3
defendant [13] 34/16	146/19 167/19	189/10 189/13 190/14		203/7 203/11 204/9
35/9 53/21 54/8 72/20	detailed [2] 71/18		112/22 112/23 128/14	206/6 212/13 212/17
79/1 79/17 80/20 83/10 83/17 85/15	114/10	191/8 191/17 194/20	164/11	215/25 216/19 222/3
111/9 158/21	details [5] 19/1 55/24	195/3 195/13 202/24	direction [1] 40/12	222/10 224/19 226/10
defendants [6] 62/7	123/8 131/23 167/18	203/2 203/22 204/22	directly [12] 6/12	231/16 234/1 234/23
76/19 76/25 77/2	detected [1] 12/20 detection [2] 81/1	204/25 209/18 211/15 212/1 212/5 214/13	7/22 28/22 30/15 31/14 145/24 173/16	235/16 236/3 236/25 238/19
79/23 238/20	83/21	212/1212/3214/13	174/5 174/14 175/16	disclosures [1]
defended [1] 85/10	deter [1] 208/15	217/19 218/7 220/3	176/6 176/21	153/13

(72) deals - disclosures

D	67/17 67/20 67/23	178/2 178/4 194/21	189/9 191/10 191/11	156/2 159/20 159/23
discontinued [1]	68/21 69/1 69/3 69/16		193/19 194/6 194/19	171/21
198/1		documents [23] 7/21	195/7 195/13 196/7	drafted [9] 78/13
discouraged [1]	73/14 76/6 80/3 81/12 82/5 82/6 82/15 82/21	7/24 7/25 40/25 49/5 57/5 78/10 78/13	197/8 199/4 199/10 201/8 201/13 202/20	85/2 110/13 115/17 116/6 116/8 116/12
13/22	83/11 84/9 84/12	106/2 106/21 127/20	205/11 205/16 206/17	117/9 121/2
discovered [4] 39/20	84/20 84/22 86/4	128/10 135/8 135/13	206/19 209/5 209/6	drafting [3] 81/7
175/8 182/4 188/6	87/16 88/9 89/4 95/19	155/11 180/10 203/3	209/20 210/15 210/19	114/10 121/2
discrepancies [1]	96/12 96/22 97/5 97/8	215/9 228/9 229/11	213/8 213/9 216/7	drawer [2] 98/14
64/4	100/6 100/6 102/24	229/13 229/16 229/20		100/24
discrepancy [1] 58/25	109/12 110/2 110/7	does [26] 42/23	221/9 225/4 226/20	dreamed [1] 195/4
discretion [7] 119/2	110/18 113/1 115/15	49/21 51/8 60/4 60/15		drip [1] 208/24
119/2 119/6 120/9	118/11 124/8 124/13	60/16 60/17 60/17	241/5 241/10 241/13	due [14] 21/3 27/1
120/11 120/14 120/21	126/4 129/9 129/11	81/18 81/19 81/19	241/24 242/23 243/4	36/17 39/1 39/4 54/12
discuss [4] 87/6	131/7 132/15 133/6	81/24 84/5 93/23	243/12 243/15	59/2 61/6 114/7
106/13 152/2 195/17	133/8 133/19 139/2 141/3 142/7 142/18	104/10 105/20 105/24 113/7 132/7 133/4	22/18 39/6 39/6 52/7	119/13 176/16 197/2 197/5 202/2
discussed [8] 71/13	143/2 144/5 144/6	172/12 180/9 185/16	64/3 64/15 66/4 72/14	I I
91/17 106/21 108/14	149/2 149/23 150/8	200/6 223/20 232/17	75/11 80/12 80/23	Duncan [1] 231/3
219/25 221/12 223/6	150/24 153/3 153/20	doesn't [13] 43/2	82/24 82/24 83/18	duplicate [2] 28/9
225/14	153/21 154/3 154/18	59/6 59/16 81/20	92/10 126/3 139/13	28/25
discussing [3] 29/24 91/12 117/25	155/11 155/17 158/12		140/5 149/17 177/7	during [21] 8/13 20/1
discussion [16]	160/11 160/13 160/23	106/2 112/21 160/1	179/18 183/7 184/25	50/14 74/4 74/9 74/10
74/12 87/15 99/1	161/11 161/13 161/20	180/23 206/4	185/18 188/4 196/24	85/13 88/12 91/25
108/12 109/5 182/23	162/1 164/4 164/8	doing [18] 8/13 10/17		
183/3 183/6 189/10	164/19 164/24 165/2 166/3 167/12 169/21	11/20 16/15 21/23 37/2 38/14 40/10 52/8	225/8 225/8 225/9 228/22 228/23 235/17	134/20 139/1 160/5 193/6 196/1 207/22
189/13 206/5 206/8	176/15 176/19 178/3	52/24 69/22 80/11	235/19 235/20 235/20	209/23 220/9 223/2
206/11 206/12 224/23	179/14 180/2 180/6	104/10 128/11 153/19		
226/6	180/7 180/16 180/19	189/11 207/20 228/25		9/11 9/12 10/8 10/9
discussions [6] 54/23 151/20 151/24	181/2 184/19 184/19	domain [5] 41/13	double [1] 21/18	17/3 35/7 36/3 36/25
220/11 225/1 225/5	184/22 185/8 186/2	51/2 95/1 132/13	doubt [5] 66/3 132/8	38/7 38/14 56/6 92/12
disgraceful [1] 213/5	186/4 186/11 187/11	171/22	135/7 152/18 203/6	105/14 111/3 112/12
dishonest [2] 152/4		don't [143] 7/23 7/25		130/22 176/15 179/18
183/14	189/19 190/4 190/6	8/22 9/22 10/1 11/4	13/2 21/15 24/4 28/4	180/3 186/25 187/1
dishonesty [2]	192/8 195/19 196/13 197/18 197/21 197/21	11/5 12/24 16/1 17/24 18/14 18/16 19/2 19/9		187/3 187/4 193/19 193/21 219/22 220/8
164/13 218/11	200/3 202/19 203/1	20/11 20/11 21/3 27/7		222/10 224/16 226/9
disingenuous [1]	205/10 207/1 208/7	29/16 32/11 44/10	60/22 61/2 70/3 78/2	226/13 226/24 227/22
192/21	208/8 211/18 211/18	46/4 48/8 54/23 62/23		228/19 229/18 230/17
dismiss [1] 230/21 dispute [1] 150/20	213/7 215/11 216/25	65/17 65/18 67/14	84/14 85/7 88/8 88/9	231/15 231/22 232/2
disseminated [2]	217/18 218/11 218/19	67/24 76/22 77/7 80/7		232/16 232/20 233/22
90/18 93/5	218/20 219/22 221/24	80/8 82/10 82/14	103/24 105/11 111/25	234/1 236/9
dissuade [6] 152/11	222/18 222/19 223/7	82/20 85/22 85/25		duty [32] 50/15 50/16
153/18 155/1 155/3	224/23 226/2 227/20 228/15 229/5 229/5	86/1 88/2 88/22 89/1 92/19 96/4 99/17	121/9 122/14 122/17 123/25 125/6 137/19	50/21 54/6 54/16 55/3 60/5 76/20 82/4 92/14
196/24 198/25	229/23 231/2 231/9	100/2 100/7 100/8	145/1 146/5 146/23	96/11 96/16 96/20
distil [1] 121/7	231/10 231/25 233/3	102/14 103/3 103/3	147/23 148/8 150/5	108/25 109/18 111/8
distillation [1] 170/5	233/4 233/11 233/12	105/23 106/14 106/22		111/17 111/23 188/3
distilled [2] 33/5 204/7	233/14 239/23 240/4	107/14 111/20 113/12		193/16 203/4 203/10
distilling [1] 233/5	240/23 241/16 242/4	117/11 125/2 128/20	157/2 158/3 159/7	215/22 226/10 229/22
distinct [3] 106/10	document [43] 26/19	137/9 140/6 146/15	161/1 175/1 175/4	231/13 231/15 234/2
117/13 118/17	57/15 62/25 77/17	151/2 155/10 155/23	203/20 239/15	234/23 235/16 236/3
distinctly [1] 115/9	78/14 78/16 89/25	163/25 164/1 164/2	dozen [1] 25/5	238/5
divine [1] 131/24	90/14 91/7 97/15 97/17 98/7 102/17	165/20 167/6 167/12 168/20 169/6 169/8	Dr [3] 76/22 213/14 242/14	Dyfan [3] 50/6 51/12 57/3
do [187] 2/22 6/21	113/14 113/15 115/8	172/18 180/1 182/1	Dr Jenkins [2]	dynamite [1] 205/21
7/12 7/18 9/22 10/3	115/11 126/12 126/13	182/6 182/7 182/8	213/14 242/14	<u> </u>
12/23 15/15 21/20	126/19 126/24 127/1	182/11 182/13 182/16		E
27/14 32/12 36/2 38/2 39/17 41/25 42/4 42/5	127/3 127/11 128/2	183/2 183/9 184/2	55/22 57/3 57/6 57/12	each [9] 11/18 12/8
46/15 49/3 52/5 56/19	128/4 128/7 128/21	184/2 184/5 184/6	57/14 58/9 71/21	12/16 12/22 50/24
58/9 59/23 60/5 60/9	130/10 137/1 137/16	184/10 184/22 184/24		107/23 169/7 197/12
60/13 62/9 62/16	151/7 166/24 172/11	185/3 185/4 185/6	87/16 87/20 88/24	197/13
	176/12 176/14 177/25	187/17 188/23 189/8	118/19 119/8 120/1	earlier [22] 20/3 24/6
				(73) discontinued - earlier

(73) discontinued - earlier

E	element [1] 26/3	enter [3] 41/12	74/9 132/12 141/4	180/19 226/7
	eliminate [1] 24/20	147/10 171/22	158/13 173/13 234/13	
earlier [20] 57/11	else [7] 3/23 9/19	entertained [1] 149/5	235/10	126/1
59/19 92/10 99/13 110/15 113/10 125/5	27/14 31/4 65/19 92/8	entire [6] 43/14 52/21	events [8] 125/15	examine [1] 125/8
135/9 138/3 144/9	96/9	56/10 127/5 128/11	125/17 125/19 132/24	example [23] 6/1
145/8 159/20 178/15	elsewhere [2] 44/18	200/17	133/1 178/7 178/10	11/19 36/10 56/19
181/19 208/5 216/21	162/1	entirely [5] 16/22	178/18	68/7 86/1 90/6 102/7
220/20 238/6 242/20	email [32] 48/23	85/24 188/5 199/9	eventually [4] 163/21	104/2 111/19 115/18
243/8	48/24 49/12 56/2 57/7	219/1	176/22 198/15 216/3	133/22 141/7 143/21
early [12] 14/2 15/20		entitled [4] 77/2	ever [13] 4/25 29/16 46/3 73/22 88/3 98/1	149/9 153/6 154/7 154/12 173/5 192/12
16/22 16/23 30/4	71/22 78/8 88/5 91/23 91/25 103/19 137/5	110/24 159/3 160/21 entries [2] 28/13	138/10 182/14 189/10	198/4 221/20 231/15
41/13 45/10 53/14	137/8 145/2 145/8	28/14	189/11 189/13 219/21	examples [2] 139/24
80/7 106/11 114/17			220/10	140/5
155/11	152/8 154/2 154/4	envelope [1] 48/14	every [9] 56/12 63/12	
earth [3] 187/18	154/5 159/18 208/12	environment [1]	67/6 68/4 76/8 84/17	exemplifies [1] 31/22
213/20 215/24 ease [1] 242/5	208/17 208/19 217/11		108/5 157/4 186/21	exercise [7] 106/16
easier [1] 242/3 easier [1] 165/19	217/12 221/21	equal [1] 164/14	everybody [3] 11/24	148/24 152/21 153/7
easiest [1] 53/21	emailed [1] 93/8	equitable [1] 159/11	100/12 100/14	158/11 158/17 158/17
echelons [1] 107/8		equity [1] 101/13	everyone [2] 107/17	exercising [1] 152/11
echoing [1] 51/6	91/14 91/17 93/9	er [1] 23/1	107/20	exhausted [1] 140/14
Eden [6] 139/7	136/23 152/6	erm [8] 22/16 22/24	everything [13] 6/11	exist [1] 25/22
139/12 139/22 156/17	emerged [1] 79/7	22/25 23/2 24/15 25/11 25/12 25/13	6/13 6/13 38/2 50/2 63/13 86/21 99/22	existed [1] 99/19 existence [20] 30/8
156/20 156/23	emerges [1] 157/18 emerging [1] 80/10	erred [1] 147/8	136/22 193/24 197/20	30/8 30/17 35/5 39/20
edges [1] 115/10	employed [1] 2/6	erroneously [1]	215/1 215/6	41/11 43/10 43/10
effect [13] 31/23	employee [3] 5/23	126/14	evidence [83] 6/22	54/10 54/18 74/17
35/25 75/22 75/23	97/14 181/9	error [14] 24/2 24/21	10/4 15/13 16/21	77/1 86/9 171/11
76/15 94/4 100/20	employees [1]	32/7 57/21 57/22 64/6		171/21 208/19 215/16
136/2 137/25 148/4 148/22 220/21 236/10	1/8/11	131/18 133/20 141/18		216/9 237/14 242/15
effective [1] 116/7	employer [2] 76/15	143/22 147/16 184/19		
effectively [21] 3/10	182/3	206/1 216/2	72/8 72/11 72/13	existing [2] 156/12
5/2 5/21 6/18 7/4 8/15	employers [1] 230/14		72/17 75/4 78/25	191/13
23/13 28/15 36/22	enabled [1] 48/2	123/22 139/21 161/6	79/11 80/15 80/19	expand [3] 67/7 156/19 209/21
39/3 52/23 94/13	encapsulate [1] 145/15	161/18 184/25 186/6 215/16	80/25 83/1 83/16 83/19 98/24 102/15	
101/11 103/12 104/7	encapsulates [1]	escaped [1] 12/20	117/20 118/15 122/2	expansion [1] 147/20 expect [4] 69/18
128/7 154/24 164/3	144/11	essential [2] 212/6	123/24 124/1 124/2	100/10 241/8 241/10
165/7 200/17 234/3	encountering [1]	214/6	124/4 124/6 125/23	expectation [1]
effectiveness [1] 47/24	13/1	essentially [6] 21/23	128/6 128/12 129/2	177/13
	encourage [1] 41/14	127/24 156/23 172/5	130/1 134/15 137/13	expected [9] 9/6 9/10
effects [1] 148/14 efficacy [2] 34/11	end [13] 51/6 52/6	194/12 200/6	157/5 158/19 158/20	46/17 46/25 74/25
213/15	55/14 63/24 64/12	establish [2] 32/21	158/22 160/9 164/3	77/15 104/20 104/20
effort [2] 155/7	67/9 84/15 145/14	168/4	177/18 178/8 178/15	242/10
190/25	159/7 168/20 176/22	estimate [2] 218/17	178/20 179/22 179/25	
efforts [3] 152/10	191/23 231/5 endorsed [1] 102/22	218/18 et [7] 63/18 82/5	183/2 185/17 185/18 186/1 193/6 197/2	158/10 expensive [1] 163/23
153/17 153/19	ends [1] 157/2			
eg [1] 108/18	engaged [2] 198/24	171/23 232/10	219/23 221/2 222/16	182/19 204/2 212/5
eg turn [1] 108/18	224/5	et cetera [5] 63/18	224/24 225/14 226/15	
eight [5] 37/25 38/8 38/9 38/10 61/9	engendering [1]	82/5 111/14 171/22	227/9 228/9 229/5	experienced [1]
either [13] 16/13	159/11	171/23	229/10 229/14 230/8	216/17
59/16 67/10 68/13	England [8] 4/9	etc [2] 91/18 108/21	231/2 232/13 233/15	expert [97] 9/12 9/14
93/4 122/25 177/8	190/22 193/8 196/15	ethical [3] 187/13	233/17 237/2	10/9 11/10 16/20
203/10 206/5 206/7	197/22 198/18 198/23		evidenced [2] 28/12	19/10 19/25 20/1 30/7
223/16 226/5 231/7	199/7 enough [4] 125/3	ethics [1] 164/17 evade [1] 205/11	28/19 evidential [4] 10/1	36/15 36/16 70/22 72/7 72/8 72/11 75/18
elaborate [2] 15/24	139/18 182/17 231/10		79/20 161/13 161/24	80/15 80/17 80/19
64/1	enquiry [3] 103/11	74/4 74/17 77/15	evolution [1] 235/11	80/24 81/3 81/16
elapsed [1] 162/22	232/23 232/24	77/16 99/1 122/9	exact [3] 93/21	82/23 83/1 83/14
electronic [2] 2/18	ensure [5] 63/13	139/14 172/9 192/14	150/23 168/23	83/15 83/16 83/18
135/3 electronically [1]	100/13 117/3 189/3	199/8 231/18 237/2	exactly [9] 22/25	83/23 83/25 124/12
177/9	231/14	evening [1] 61/7	29/23 48/12 63/22	132/25 161/20 163/4
	entail [1] 231/15	event [9] 12/25 55/17	70/5 119/5 126/5	163/10 163/14 175/17
1	•			

(74) earlier... - expert

E	41/14 201/4 201/9	false [16] 30/11	105/2 111/25 131/9	194/25 196/10 198/14
oxport [60] 176/4	201/11	31/25 33/12 124/11	140/24 147/13 159/5	198/25 199/10
expert [60] 176/4	eyes [1] 182/3	138/24 139/11 151/23	184/11 240/10	Fiscal's [2] 191/12
176/5 176/20 176/23		156/11 156/20 156/22		195/17
177/1 179/2 179/6	F	157/12 157/23 159/12		fit [1] 132/10
179/10 179/18 180/4	face [40] 0/14 120/7			
180/23 181/14 182/13	face [10] 9/14 139/7	163/24 164/9 174/21	Finance [2] 57/20	five [2] 166/7 219/4
182/25 191/7 191/13	150/17 150/17 234/13	falsification [1]	58/2	fixed [2] 125/9 225/9
191/14 191/15 191/19	234/13 234/17 234/17	139/15	financial [4] 31/24	flagged [2] 68/11
	235/5 235/5	familiar [1] 233/24	31/25 43/14 116/23	68/12
191/20 194/22 197/16	faced [1] 236/13	family [2] 68/9	find [17] 12/5 14/25	flagging [2] 40/10
213/16 214/24 219/22	facility [1] 200/18	192/13	19/19 62/17 78/10	40/23
220/8 222/16 223/5				
224/16 225/15 226/10	fact [49] 31/12 35/2	far [17] 23/24 25/15	99/16 100/21 145/4	Flemington [11]
227/2 227/5 227/22	43/18 49/17 50/25	42/7 44/4 52/2 55/3	149/11 163/3 163/10	29/10 29/14 29/16
	53/20 54/19 57/5 59/9	56/9 88/13 141/1	163/13 178/16 182/6	29/18 46/2 49/21
228/12 228/16 228/19	67/15 81/20 86/8	144/17 150/2 150/4	211/24 216/1 241/14	49/22 55/22 101/5
229/13 229/18 230/18	88/23 90/20 90/21	150/4 150/5 154/15	finding [1] 57/25	102/3 102/9
231/4 231/7 231/11	93/22 93/23 103/15	178/21 227/4		
231/12 231/14 231/15	113/25 120/12 124/17		findings' [1] 150/19	floated [1] 145/20
231/15 231/19 231/20			fine [21] 4/20 11/5	flouted [1] 96/21
231/22 232/2 232/14	126/15 129/5 147/6	fast [4] 119/3 119/7	45/1 47/6 60/21 62/4	focus [3] 112/10
	147/9 149/23 150/6	119/10 119/15	67/16 89/4 89/6 89/23	113/8 133/17
232/16 233/9 233/22	151/12 153/15 154/5	fatally [6] 122/3	89/23 121/16 177/17	focusing [1] 57/17
234/1 235/16 236/3	154/19 154/21 158/8	129/2 141/18 147/19		follow [9] 4/21 21/20
237/5 237/10	162/11 162/12 171/9			
experts [1] 61/3	176/20 192/8 198/8	152/21 204/20	191/8 215/1 215/6	54/15 100/13 155/10
explain [5] 46/11		fateful [3] 139/15	218/21 241/9	157/10 181/2 181/3
105/16 139/11 176/14	199/23 201/14 211/18		finger [1] 73/15	221/6
	217/1 217/3 226/5	fault [7] 28/25 59/6	finish [3] 127/24	followed [3] 46/8
185/11	230/12 230/23 230/23	79/18 123/6 156/12	160/15 206/19	66/16 169/17
explained [22] 26/21	233/13	157/20 158/24	finished [1] 166/9	
27/12 38/21 46/12				following [16] 15/2
50/14 51/20 81/9	factor [2] 63/10	faults [1] 181/8	firewall [1] 55/14	30/9 30/12 54/7 84/1
98/16 99/10 123/18	216/13	favour [5] 61/22	firm [23] 2/13 2/20	93/1 93/5 136/13
	factors [4] 149/25	146/14 146/15 146/16	2/23 2/25 3/8 68/23	155/2 174/19 174/22
137/23 173/18 191/18	225/13 231/25 238/17	152/12	68/25 69/5 84/16 87/7	179/4 208/24 210/7
211/5 218/5 225/6	facts [2] 141/13	fear [1] 199/18	96/15 110/9 114/25	222/3 244/10
228/21 230/1 232/6	157/13			
232/25 234/6 239/21		features [1] 226/2	115/2 150/6 158/16	follows [13] 29/4
explains [1] 192/7	factual [1] 132/11	fed [1] 208/24	163/13 196/3 200/16	50/23 53/18 54/5
explanation [9] 38/18	failed [10] 75/23	Federation [1] 190/2		120/4 125/25 145/17
	204/5 215/16 233/21	feel [7] 26/13 148/12	211/19	147/12 148/15 157/3
39/11 39/15 129/20	234/22 235/15 237/4	148/17 152/4 185/4	first [67] 3/5 10/17	159/19 161/2 206/10
129/21 216/23 217/13	237/10 237/12 238/2	202/17 218/5	11/10 13/16 15/7	footing [1] 189/14
218/9 239/16	failings [5] 15/14		15/22 18/5 19/24	
explore [3] 212/18		feelings [1] 73/10		footnote [1] 116/25
213/6 220/22	123/19 220/4 223/25	feels [2] 87/4 87/8	21/25 26/8 26/12	footnote 8 [1] 116/25
	239/18	feet [1] 181/2	29/22 35/8 42/12	Forget [1] 211/25
express [2] 169/25	failure [12] 76/13	fell [4] 42/16 79/11	45/19 53/8 55/22	forgive [20] 9/20
199/16	76/15 76/18 76/24	79/13 209/11	57/14 57/18 59/10	19/16 33/19 43/5
expressed [6] 73/4	96/23 130/17 163/10	felt [7] 13/22 44/5	60/14 65/9 66/5 68/3	65/23 69/11 82/10
120/19 149/14 209/24	222/9 234/4 237/6			
216/8 216/18		58/17 118/25 119/1	76/3 78/15 78/21	98/5 118/14 135/17
expresses [1] 120/18	237/16 240/6	143/7 152/4	91/25 103/1 105/20	151/7 160/7 194/5
	failures [1] 130/24	few [9] 5/16 27/22	107/22 109/13 111/6	195/2 201/23 204/11
expressing [1] 56/24	fair [11] 24/14 56/15	38/23 52/21 106/6	111/15 118/25 122/21	226/18 237/9 241/5
expressly [1] 224/15	80/9 84/21 87/25	115/1 157/1 164/25	122/25 123/1 123/16	242/9
extant [5] 26/2 33/10	160/9 181/22 181/23	177/24		forgotten [1] 177/20
33/10 242/16 243/6	182/17 185/12 237/21			
extended [1] 67/3			127/11 132/18 136/16	
extends [1] 54/6	fairly [5] 64/14 68/21	fierce [1] 145/21	143/5 144/13 144/15	126/18 135/4 145/15
	69/1 69/4 78/19	figure [2] 67/10 68/6	160/17 166/16 166/25	166/5 212/24 232/19
extent [18] 5/8 5/20	fairness [1] 199/19	figured [1] 68/5	182/21 182/23 195/2	formal [5] 27/1 70/11
6/23 10/18 16/18 43/3	faith [2] 13/17 33/14	file [12] 10/3 127/5	195/7 200/2 201/21	98/7 114/6 120/2
56/18 56/18 86/10	Falkirk [5] 31/4 31/5	128/8 134/16 134/19	201/21 202/6 203/21	
93/4 109/5 110/7				formalise [1] 7/2
124/12 127/19 197/24	130/4 215/2 215/7	134/25 134/25 135/3	208/17 208/20 211/24	
226/13 237/22 241/16	fall [3] 79/5 139/3	135/18 136/1 136/15	213/13 218/17 231/2	80/8 80/9 129/1 129/6
	201/6	208/24	232/9	135/9 137/24 181/5
external [2] 68/14	fallen [1] 64/6	files [1] 80/6	Firstly [2] 22/17	181/6 208/15
184/4	fallibility [2] 123/17	final [17] 50/12 52/3	236/21	former [3] 142/9
extra [1] 89/5	132/1			
extremely [5] 7/14		57/8 57/13 58/9 59/6	Fiscal [9] 190/4	146/13 159/1
	fallible [1] 24/19	59/16 60/14 89/1	191/3 191/6 194/16	formulated [1]
			l	(75) oxportformulatod

(75) expert... - formulated

F	72/10 106/19 137/2	238/22 239/22	237/1 237/2 237/17	188/18 189/20 195/10
formulated [1]	140/13 145/13 158/21	• • •	239/22 241/1 241/5	200/11 202/1 203/15
144/10	239/16	gave [19] 6/22 10/15	241/22	206/13 212/3 212/23
formulation [1] 120/5	fully [7] 35/7 51/17 80/8 209/3 210/21	31/1 31/2 38/9 60/8	gives [3] 84/3 147/24 165/14	213/11 213/13 215/9
forum [1] 106/16	211/2 211/20	77/8 82/22 96/5 97/21 101/22 119/24 145/14	giving [12] 7/15 9/22	219/14 222/22 226/19 227/2 233/22 233/23
forward [22] 6/14	function [16] 4/16	151/22 168/18 215/15		234/17 235/2 235/2
34/25 53/10 63/16	4/16 24/9 55/5 96/20	217/13 221/2 239/4	62/10 83/6 120/21	240/11 242/11
66/18 71/19 74/21 77/9 112/11 112/12	98/6 99/14 112/11	Gelsthorpe [2]	143/12 224/23 229/11	gone [16] 19/11
112/15 112/18 112/25	132/1 183/11 183/12	101/13 101/15	gloating [2] 43/21	53/15 77/15 100/25
113/7 113/13 113/18	184/8 187/25 188/8	general [22] 3/10	43/23	101/1 113/19 113/21
116/11 124/5 171/6	188/12 189/4		gloss [2] 84/23	118/16 124/25 183/17
227/13 230/2 234/25	functioning [1] 24/10			202/18 226/18 226/22
forwarded [7] 48/25	functions [1] 5/13	92/11 102/10 113/6	go [50] 17/2 21/3	233/1 236/14 236/17
51/18 53/6 53/8 53/12	fundamental [4] 9/3 15/4 149/4 149/14	113/8 116/15 119/18 119/19 120/22 132/2	22/10 33/2 33/20 33/21 35/20 41/2 41/3	good [10] 1/3 6/1 63/14 100/7 121/21
94/16 154/7	fundamentally [5]	135/21 144/17 149/1	42/7 44/4 47/2 56/2	132/4 140/5 190/1
forwards [1] 235/7	12/23 11/10 15/5	180/22	57/2 57/9 62/25 65/17	219/13 243/24
found [13] 14/8 14/12	28/16 142/22	generalised [2]		goodbyes [1] 101/12
25/9 31/21 72/2 73/17 98/22 125/22 142/8	further [23] 28/22	130/20 131/1	85/6 87/7 91/5 100/15	
142/20 143/13 143/24	33/15 65/18 71/3	generality [1] 120/8	101/23 104/13 104/21	
161/6	104/14 104/16 124/25		108/3 108/4 108/11	22/4 22/11 24/6 24/24
foundation [1]	142/4 146/5 148/13	67/24 106/18	109/23 120/25 123/24	
217/15	152/21 152/22 153/7	generate [2] 59/21	137/5 144/25 149/18	67/10 73/25 77/7
foundational [1]	153/7 155/7 156/14 157/15 158/6 182/2	153/1 generated [3] 41/10	150/4 171/1 174/12 176/8 178/2 188/3	89/23 94/11 95/12 95/15 99/15 106/10
217/15	220/23 232/23 232/24		188/8 191/2 197/9	117/13 127/9 136/22
founded [2] 147/18	238/24	generically [2] 5/11	206/22 217/24 234/20	140/4 174/6 180/7
156/11	futility [1] 158/17	112/14	238/6	182/25 185/14 186/20
four [2] 68/14 149/2	future [8] 97/1 112/2	get [20] 4/11 6/3	god [1] 182/14	187/21 202/5
frame [1] 150/19 frank [2] 106/19	112/7 143/12 181/8	18/13 51/1 69/19	goes [11] 55/3 69/8	grant [7] 35/1 36/13
135/10	189/3 197/15 227/3	76/22 83/7 101/9	83/14 113/20 132/22	37/17 44/2 171/6
frankly [8] 26/16	G	117/10 117/12 146/7	144/1 149/15 151/24	172/23 213/7
26/25 127/8 152/4	gains [1] 57/23	148/14 168/19 181/16 184/11 212/11 215/25		granted [6] 44/5 120/9 120/14 170/18
185/3 208/23 209/15	Gareth [92] 14/10	216/19 227/1 242/1	13/9 16/10 16/17	173/8 173/11
238/12	15/2 15/10 17/14	gets [2] 100/2 100/8	16/25 17/5 17/6 18/13	
fraud [1] 157/12 free [3] 30/2 30/16	17/20 18/17 19/13		20/15 21/22 23/2 24/5	Grapevine [1] 163/22
174/25	19/16 19/19 20/2	181/10 181/10 191/7	27/1 27/21 28/1 33/1	grateful [2] 233/5
fresh [2] 69/17 94/4	20/19 20/21 21/14	Gibraltar [1] 100/17	35/22 40/11 42/14	243/22
Friday [1] 108/14	23/8 26/16 26/16	gist [2] 202/21	47/3 48/17 53/10	gratitude [1] 199/17
frightened [1] 104/12	29/11 29/13 30/24 32/12 32/20 33/17	202/22	54/19 55/20 57/2 61/14 66/18 69/10	gravity [1] 199/21
frolic [3] 98/4 99/12	40/8 46/13 54/21	give [19] 1/9 1/15 7/8 7/19 16/10 16/21 21/1	70/7 70/13 76/8 77/22	great [5] 41/18 109/14 166/21 172/5
103/13	54/21 58/3 61/4 64/19		81/23 87/17 88/13	199/16
front [3] 1/11 130/3	65/7 66/6 69/10 70/9	100/4 101/20 127/22	89/25 91/5 93/16	greater [1] 40/2
187/25 frowning [1] 95/9	70/17 71/3 71/5 71/16		102/11 104/13 104/16	
frustrating [1] 12/2	72/6 72/10 72/13 73/1	210/1201/0	105/22 106/19 106/23	
Fujitsu [31] 26/15	73/15 73/19 74/15	given [56] 6/4 10/3	108/6 108/11 109/22	grounds [5] 85/9
29/11 30/17 30/22	75/13 76/13 76/17	23/13 56/22 64/22	110/10 110/13 112/12	
31/1 33/5 33/9 33/13	80/13 81/22 82/12 86/4 86/8 98/21 122/1	65/4 65/10 65/22 65/23 60/12 83/1 87/4	112/15 113/7 113/10	143/24
40/3 58/4 61/3 70/17	124/1 124/2 129/1	65/23 69/12 83/1 87/4 93/9 94/24 96/5 97/8	113/22 121/11 121/24 127/2 138/3 138/4	3/15 3/25 61/17 80/16
70/21 71/15 71/21	129/13 129/25 132/23		140/8 140/24 143/23	84/18 131/13 142/14
71/22 72/6 72/10	133/2 133/23 134/3	117/16 130/1 134/15	145/9 146/7 147/12	145/10 145/19 146/1
76/14 80/17 179/2 179/3 180/22 181/1	143/18 173/16 173/21		152/6 156/20 157/1	146/3 190/25
181/9 181/14 181/24	175/16 178/21 181/5	154/15 174/14 175/10		guidance [2] 6/5
182/3 182/9 182/12	181/6 183/13 190/13	175/12 175/22 178/15		110/23
183/14	194/21 195/12 195/18		165/9 166/1 166/6	guilt [1] 158/23
Fujitsu's [1] 181/2	195/25 204/6 213/23 215/6 218/6 220/6	198/4 202/16 205/15	166/16 166/22 166/24	
fulfilled [1] 179/17	221/22 225/7 226/22	205/22 209/1 212/5 212/17 215/19 216/7	167/8 168/19 172/5 173/23 175/1 175/1	138/23 139/14 140/13 146/25 158/20 164/9
fulfilling [1] 159/21	226/23 232/12 234/14		175/4 176/8 178/3	164/9 185/6
full [9] 1/9 20/13	235/5 237/1 237/12	229/10 236/7 236/8	179/13 181/11 184/3	gut [1] 138/1
				(76) formulated gut

(76) formulated ... - gut

Н	76/10 76/15 79/7	125/2 125/8 125/14	173/17 244/10	36/12 45/9 45/11
	80/16 80/19 80/20	126/2 126/3 126/10	hearings [3] 3/18	45/12 45/14 46/3 46/5
had [363]	80/23 80/25 82/23	129/2 129/7 130/1	7/10 34/15	46/5 46/21 53/13
hadn't [15] 12/6 25/19 29/3 72/24	82/24 83/1 83/1 83/2	142/3 142/7 142/8	heavily [1] 32/9	68/19 71/1 75/2 75/6
100/20 160/7 173/17	83/13 83/16 83/17	145/17 145/17 146/5	held [2] 34/15 111/1	95/25 97/23 101/9
173/19 175/12 181/3	83/18 83/20 83/25	146/5 146/15 164/7	Helen [19] 17/7 18/5	111/11 117/11 159/20
217/8 220/14 236/7	84/15 85/8 86/25	173/24 174/2 174/8	30/23 54/24 66/10	176/6 182/20 182/24
237/2 239/7	91/12 93/6 95/10	175/17 175/20 179/7	86/1 86/12 89/19	183/6 189/11 203/22
hairs [1] 205/19	96/19 101/23 106/14	179/18 179/22 180/2	98/25 122/5 132/22	203/22 212/23 218/12
half [4] 13/10 25/5	109/11 126/14 141/1	180/2 180/3 181/8	133/14 133/19 134/2	219/5 221/7 227/2
55/23 125/21	141/22 141/25 142/1	181/9 182/23 183/5	139/1 143/19 216/4	232/14 236/2 236/2
halfway [5] 125/6	142/5 142/24 147/9	183/5 185/16 185/18	216/15 238/23	238/14 241/6 241/18
125/10 156/7 156/7	149/10 149/19 154/1	188/9 204/21 204/22	help [14] 2/21 8/21	243/3
158/3	156/25 157/5 157/5	204/25 205/2 209/16	56/6 99/16 140/17	himself [4] 6/19 7/19
halt [1] 199/3	157/16 162/22 163/2	209/24 210/2 210/11	160/25 169/19 179/13	70/23 94/13
hand [12] 23/23	165/10 168/25 175/7	212/18 212/21 212/21		hindsight [2] 77/11
52/10 52/12 57/10	179/5 179/8 181/24	215/19 215/21 218/7	187/23 208/13 242/23	77/13
57/11 57/12 57/16	183/17 187/19 187/22	219/20 219/25 220/14		his [85] 5/12 7/8 8/5
57/17 58/7 58/24 59/9	189/21 199/23 229/3	220/24 221/2 221/6	160/21	8/19 11/15 16/21 25/3
59/11	231/3 237/25 238/1	223/19 224/3 225/8	helpline [2] 123/10	25/5 25/6 26/23 37/15
handed [1] 216/5	hasn't [2] 21/25 76/5	225/15 226/11 226/12		46/19 46/19 46/24
handing [1] 86/20	hasten [1] 118/14	228/4 228/4 228/9	helps [1] 41/1	53/22 54/22 56/18 71/5 75/1 75/8 75/13
hands [3] 132/14	hate [2] 28/18 43/23	228/22 229/3 229/10 229/11 229/16 229/19	Henry [9] 165/8 199/13 199/14 200/13	75/14 75/24 76/15
185/11 205/11	have [402] haven't [4] 44/11	229/11 229/16 229/19 229/21 230/17 231/21		81/3 83/22 83/25
handwritten [2]	54/1 149/17 175/8	232/15 234/22 235/19		85/15 98/5 99/12
94/15 223/9	having [20] 28/24	235/20 236/7 237/2	her [15] 22/4 102/17	103/13 111/10 118/25
happen [13] 51/3	32/5 46/3 54/22 56/10	237/14 238/2 238/3	122/23 123/5 123/16	122/2 125/21 132/25
90/22 90/25 91/2	64/25 73/11 73/22	238/5 238/11 238/11	123/21 123/23 130/19	133/5 142/6 152/11
125/3 151/18 153/16	80/5 103/4 103/16	240/9 240/9 240/23	130/24 138/7 157/17	157/17 164/14 172/21
154/19 154/21 155/10	116/23 131/22 135/7	241/4 241/5 241/9	200/7 205/23 206/13	174/7 175/19 178/8
170/16 189/3 234/18	137/24 165/13 175/6	241/11 241/18 241/22		179/17 179/23 179/23
happened [18] 6/2	177/5 216/18 231/24	242/8 242/9 242/14	here [43] 11/7 15/7	180/1 180/3 183/1
48/17 88/24 123/22	he [209] 4/6 6/5 6/16	242/16 242/20 242/24		185/17 209/9 209/18
125/4 125/4 126/15	6/18 6/19 6/22 7/13	243/3	40/10 43/17 43/19	209/21 212/22 213/16
128/5 128/20 129/6	7/14 8/21 8/23 8/24	he'd [8] 75/21 76/2	46/20 52/8 78/18	219/22 219/23 220/8
129/14 130/10 181/24 182/8 207/23 209/13	8/25 16/13 16/16	177/20 179/17 220/8	82/14 87/9 97/8 97/19	220/18 226/9 226/10
216/3 234/16	18/25 19/2 20/9 20/20	235/17 235/23 241/7	108/4 109/16 117/25	226/13 226/24 227/4
happening [2] 126/5	20/25 21/5 21/21 22/5	he's [5] 25/2 25/7	120/8 124/17 128/12	227/9 228/19 229/17
155/8	22/9 22/16 22/21	178/9 182/22 182/25	130/14 139/8 143/17	229/18 229/22 231/22
happens [1] 115/7	22/23 23/10 23/16	head [13] 3/16 5/12	144/10 150/11 151/3	232/1 232/3 232/13
happy [4] 43/22 45/1	24/3 24/7 24/9 24/22	23/19 29/9 29/10	154/4 156/24 162/1	232/20 232/21 233/22
87/7 219/6	25/6 25/8 25/17 25/22	32/19 39/23 39/24	162/7 162/18 167/8	235/16 236/2 236/8
hard [5] 119/3 119/7	25/22 25/25 26/2	49/25 94/16 102/9	171/1 175/13 176/9	238/5 238/15 240/19
119/10 119/15 146/7	26/22 27/9 27/20	191/1 205/21	179/5 179/13 180/22	242/5
hardened [3] 69/14	32/24 35/23 38/7 38/9		189/11 194/13 235/2	historic [3] 40/8
70/4 140/4	38/24 38/25 46/3	39/12 39/16	herself [1] 22/1	242/21 243/9
hardly [1] 27/9	46/18 48/25 49/13	health [1] 16/11	Hewlett [1] 30/14	historically [1] 122/6
hardware [1] 138/19	49/23 49/24 49/25 50/1 50/6 56/15 65/14	hear [9] 1/3 1/6 47/14 88/20 121/21 147/14	24/9	history [1] 122/17
Harry [10] 6/13 6/23	65/15 65/16 65/20	163/20 163/20 166/16		hm [1] 58/23 hoc [2] 7/16 68/15
68/13 68/16 126/14	65/25 66/2 66/6 66/6	heard [21] 2/16 6/4	hide [1] 156/21	hold [6] 40/16 51/15
126/19 127/23 128/21	70/14 71/5 73/22	10/16 16/1 16/2 21/2	high [2] 71/14 203/25	114/15 115/2 144/5
135/12 163/1	74/11 74/20 75/4	21/4 21/21 29/12	higher [3] 46/6 107/8	197/15
has [91] 1/23 18/20	75/14 75/18 75/23	29/13 44/17 88/11	187/3	holding [2] 89/16
22/15 22/17 23/4	75/24 76/4 76/5 80/23	100/19 100/20 126/12		150/17
24/18 25/9 25/10	80/25 81/9 82/24 83/3	163/21 188/10 219/17		hole [1] 181/1
25/22 26/9 28/6 28/22	83/6 83/18 83/20 84/5	220/23 231/3 238/6	149/25	holiday [4] 93/16
31/23 33/9 42/13		hearing [20] 11/16	highly [3] 27/10 29/5	101/24 103/12 103/21
53/22 54/11 56/4	92/12 93/21 94/12	14/16 27/22 28/2 28/4		home [1] 100/17
57/22 58/9 58/25	95/7 97/23 98/9	35/8 35/18 37/24	him [51] 7/14 8/1	honest [4] 62/17
59/12 59/15 62/6 62/21 68/4 71/15	100/20 100/20 100/21		8/21 26/23 27/9 27/11	148/11 167/6 183/13
71/16 72/18 72/20	101/17 101/25 117/12	154/13 155/16 155/19		Honour [2] 37/15
	117/12 119/10 119/12	157/8 157/17 170/1	29/17 31/13 32/15	172/22
L				(77) had - Honour

(77) had - Honour

	214/12 214/14 214/17	Ladviced [2] 12/15	Loomo [1] 70/10	140/6 146/15 151/2
H	214/12 214/14 214/17 214/18 214/20 242/16		I come [1] 70/10 I completed [1] 73/13	155/23 164/2 165/20
Hooper [8] 145/23		l agree [23] 14/7 43/3		167/6 168/20 169/6
146/8 146/13 152/11 153/18 156/3 156/6	Horizon's [2] 152/20	44/16 51/11 55/6 57/1	132/4	169/8 172/18 180/1
159/21	153/6	65/25 66/1 79/13	I consider [2] 42/16	182/1 182/6 182/7
Hooper's [2] 159/2	Horizon-based [1]	81/11 82/14 113/13	99/18	182/16 183/9 184/2
164/3	197/2 Harizan/baginning	131/18 144/10 149/6 150/2 168/11 185/13	I could [9] 35/20 38/6 38/12 90/24 100/5	184/2 184/5 184/6 184/10 184/24 187/17
hope [7] 100/5 100/6	Horizon/beginning [1] 63/25	204/12 231/17 231/23		188/23 189/8 191/10
112/20 132/3 151/23	horrified [1] 151/19	232/5 236/24	218/19	193/19 194/19 195/7
159/12 199/20 hoped [2] 121/8		l also [1] 3/5	I couldn't [1] 37/1	195/13 196/7 197/8
191/15	hostile [2] 154/16	I always [2] 52/7	I cringed [1] 28/18	199/4 199/10 201/8
hoping [1] 191/14	243/25	127/20	I deal [2] 62/13 101/1	201/13 202/20 206/17
Horizon [165] 12/17	hour [1] 165/15	l am [16] 10/5 22/16	I dealt [1] 155/25	209/5 209/6 209/20
12/20 13/19 14/6	house [2] 3/16 5/13 how [41] 4/13 6/19	30/2 39/10 87/5 87/7 87/9 120/18 132/6	I delivered [1] 10/6 I derived [1] 119/4	210/15 213/8 216/7 221/8 225/4 228/2
14/15 14/20 15/8 16/4	9/13 10/25 17/2 24/16		I described [1] 73/2	234/19 236/14 241/5
17/15 17/23 17/24	45/8 61/3 64/12 70/16	174/21 202/22 207/16		241/10 241/13 241/24
19/18 21/18 22/4 22/8 22/18 22/18 22/22	74/20 75/1 76/6 77/7	240/24	3/18 4/11 6/11 6/13	243/12 243/15
23/25 24/2 24/9 24/12		l and [2] 32/19 39/14	35/16 38/3 39/21	I drafted [1] 121/2
24/18 25/14 25/15		I appreciate [3]	40/11 46/4 46/17	I eventually [1]
28/10 28/14 28/17	120/22 120/24 127/25		46/24 62/17 100/15	163/21
28/23 29/1 29/23 30/2	131/4 140/21 142/25 143/14 145/14 165/3	I approached [1] 172/13	100/16 103/3 110/21 124/22 126/18 145/13	l expect [2] 69/18 241/10
30/11 30/15 30/16		l are [1] 150/11	151/19 169/11 176/16	
32/7 32/10 32/22 33/7 33/11 33/14 33/16	188/24 208/19 212/18		183/11 190/14 190/16	
35/5 40/21 41/12	213/20 215/24 216/17	l ask [6] 23/13 62/12		I explain [1] 176/14
43/11 47/19 47/22	218/9 225/9 241/18	167/4 208/13 216/17	211/15 212/1 217/19	I explained [1] 26/21
47/25 55/9 61/17	however [7] 34/6	219/14	228/2	I express [1] 199/16
61/23 62/3 63/15	58/16 71/5 90/11 174/21 209/18 227/11	l asked [9] 15/1 18/25 25/4 38/3 38/8	I didn't [24] 3/15 8/15 10/13 27/19 69/7	I feit [3] 13/22 119/1
63/25 63/25 64/10	hub [10] 12/10 12/15	100/18 114/21 114/23		152/4
64/17 64/24 65/1	46/8 90/3 90/7 92/11	126/16	100/8 111/21 117/10	
66/10 66/12 66/14 67/3 67/7 68/5 68/6		l assumed [1] 208/4	119/11 126/20 159/16	I finish [1] 160/15
68/10 68/12 72/16		l attach [1] 50/4	170/16 208/18 220/19	
73/9 78/5 79/18 79/20		I became [1] 79/24	225/23 232/23 235/1	29/22 45/19
80/18 80/21 80/23		l beg [1] 204/15	235/24 239/20 240/8	
81/4 83/23 90/5 90/11	29/14 29/16 29/18 46/1 49/20 49/21	I believe [3] 110/17 144/24 206/9		I followed [1] 169/17 I formed [1] 80/8
90/11 98/22 105/6	55/21 101/4 102/3	I believed [1] 37/1		I formulated [1]
111/13 111/24 112/3 112/8 112/10 112/10	102/9	I came [6] 8/9 8/14	I disagreed [1] 44/23	144/10
112/13 112/14 112/17	human [4] 69/19	100/16 100/17 128/13		I forwarded [1] 53/12
112/17 112/19 112/21	141/18 143/22 147/16		I do [17] 9/22 42/4	I gave [5] 10/15 77/8
112/22 112/24 113/9		I can [22] 1/4 8/9	52/5 67/20 82/15	101/22 145/14 168/18
113/17 123/6 123/17	175/5 175/14 Hutchings [2] 138/5	8/23 46/24 69/6 78/19 86/22 95/13 101/25	160/11 160/13 166/3 186/4 190/6 208/8	I get [1] 76/22 I give [1] 21/16
123/19 124/10 124/14	139/21	102/9 129/21 129/21	217/18 222/19 227/20	
124/18 130/18 130/20 130/25 131/1 131/4	Hutchings' [1] 138/7	131/23 134/6 163/4	231/9 233/4 233/12	I got [5] 89/23 94/11
130/25 131/1 131/4	hypotheses [1] 124/5			106/10 117/13 136/22
136/9 138/9 138/10		220/23 224/9 236/4	9/22 10/1 11/5 12/24	I had [50] 5/25 8/12
141/17 147/15 147/18	l abandoned [1]	244/1	16/1 17/24 18/14	10/16 14/21 18/3
156/12 157/21 158/24	235/4	I can't [22] 16/14 45/12 46/6 46/23	18/16 19/2 19/9 20/11 20/11 21/3 27/7 29/16	18/15 18/16 20/3 26/21 27/8 29/18
161/7 161/15 162/12	l accept [19] 32/25	56/21 67/8 77/7 77/11	32/11 46/4 48/8 54/23	29/19 30/6 42/8 42/16
171/11 173/25 174/2	52/25 69/7 69/15 70/2	77/20 101/22 106/22	62/23 65/17 65/18	63/8 73/12 75/10
174/8 174/9 174/20 174/24 175/19 175/20	70/8 113/12 113/20	106/24 115/12 116/4	67/14 67/24 76/22	77/15 80/2 94/5 95/24
175/21 178/13 190/8	125/4 130/7 130/10	126/15 130/9 173/8	77/7 80/7 80/8 82/10	103/18 121/2 124/24
190/15 191/8 191/15	134/4 155/3 164/10	177/12 196/21 211/21	82/14 82/20 85/22	134/17 136/19 136/19
191/21 192/11 197/2	213/19 223/14 225/4 226/11 226/14	215/9 215/12	88/2 88/22 89/1 92/19	136/20 137/11 144/4 160/8 175/24 180/2
198/4 198/11 212/6	l achieved [1] 198/6	I cannot [2] 142/25 205/13	96/4 99/17 100/7 100/8 102/14 103/3	181/5 188/2 188/3
213/15 213/22 213/24		I certainly [3] 27/6	105/23 106/14 106/22	188/4 188/6 188/14
213/25 214/3 214/4 214/6 214/8 214/11	I advanced [1]	160/6 177/15	107/14 111/20 113/12	193/19 195/20 196/12
217/0214/0214/11	163/18	I claimed [1] 198/18	117/11 125/2 128/20	199/7 207/1 207/1
L				(78) Hooper - I had

(78) Hooper - I had

1	I missed [1] 197/4	29/17 44/22 46/5 75/6	86/17 88/16 88/19	l used [1] 220/20
	I must [1] 213/6	91/25 98/6 99/13	91/25 94/14 94/17	I very [1] 143/7
I had [4] 207/6	I need [2] 114/20	100/3 119/8 144/18	95/5 95/21 97/20	I want [5] 13/11 57/7
208/17 235/6 239/21	232/22	201/9 216/12 223/9	97/22 99/11 100/15	62/14 200/14 240/24
I hadn't [2] 72/24	I needed [1] 26/17	223/12 226/25	100/17 100/21 100/23	
181/3	I never [7] 5/22	I say [5] 22/6 22/16	101/1 101/13 101/15	119/18 176/8 176/9
I hardly [1] 27/9	124/12 135/1 172/14	120/17 236/18 243/11	101/18 103/1 103/16	176/13 196/18 227/12
I hasten [1] 118/14	174/16 198/17 238/4	I see [6] 58/10 59/18	104/9 104/12 105/22	235/7
I hate [2] 28/18 43/23 I have [31] 1/13 1/17	I now [3] 13/14 77/13	59/18 101/22 151/7	105/23 105/24 106/17	I was [93] 3/11 3/13
21/5 22/11 29/16 30/5	205/25	233/12	107/23 107/24 108/8	4/25 5/23 5/25 8/16
39/14 44/17 46/3	I objected [1] 175/9	I sent [1] 77/8	108/9 108/10 109/11	8/23 11/16 13/1 18/8
61/21 62/13 66/3	I occasionally [1]	I separate [1] 113/18	109/21 110/4 112/16	30/9 38/4 43/9 52/24
71/19 87/3 95/15	5/24	I set [2] 2/25 103/11	113/6 114/3 116/13	69/3 73/16 74/4 74/5
118/15 118/17 120/19	I only [1] 38/11	I should [1] 168/17	117/12 118/18 118/21	75/6 75/22 75/22 76/1
130/17 163/5 165/24	I paraphrase [4] 9/7	I signed [1] 28/5	121/5 122/3 124/10	82/11 84/20 87/17
177/24 183/6 189/5	139/9 168/24 206/16	I simply [2] 48/9	124/11 124/22 125/2	88/13 93/16 96/7
199/17 199/22 214/22	I picked [1] 11/22	226/15	126/18 128/16 130/8	99/17 100/15 101/11
216/22 226/14 239/20	I please [1] 33/20	I smile [1] 38/23	133/24 134/6 135/10	105/22 118/15 121/8
240/10	I posed [1] 24/5	I sought [3] 121/7	136/17 136/19 137/17	127/7 128/5 131/17
I haven't [1] 44/11	I postponed [1]	155/3 192/4	139/17 140/3 140/5	135/15 139/17 142/22
I hope [1] 199/20	93/17	I speak [1] 44/16	140/17 140/19 144/1	144/16 145/11 151/18
I hoped [1] 121/8	I presume [2] 92/9	I speculate [1] 88/8	144/9 145/8 145/12	160/5 164/6 168/15
I identified [1] 163/15	92/12	I spoke [3] 11/14	145/14 146/20 146/22	168/20 169/9 170/23
I imagine [2] 18/25	I probably [1] 163/25	20/1 169/3	149/13 150/2 150/8 154/1 154/4 155/19	174/19 175/22 181/4 186/15 186/17 186/18
205/1	I produced [1] 128/22	I stand [2] 62/21 65/19	160/9 161/25 162/25	186/19 186/22 186/23
I include [1] 136/25	I put [3] 13/1 182/7	I still [1] 210/19	163/17 164/6 164/7	188/7 189/14 196/15
I inferred [1] 243/3	207/5	I stopped [1] 186/21	164/8 164/11 164/14	197/18 197/20 197/21
I joined [1] 3/9	I raise [2] 199/15	I suggest [5] 43/17	164/22 166/6 168/22	198/20 199/5 199/6
l just [16] 3/5 7/23	199/20	152/10 179/3 204/4	172/15 180/4 192/13	208/21 210/10 211/2
10/11 13/8 27/19 35/8	I raised [1] 124/22	216/3	193/17 195/15 195/20	211/4 211/6 211/13
35/19 38/2 44/1 101/7	I rather [6] 12/17	I suggested [2] 140/3		213/22 214/4 215/11
134/10 144/14 165/20	12/19 66/15 98/11	144/9	210/16 213/4 216/1	217/20 220/20 225/4
184/10 220/22 230/8	118/9 119/9	I summarised [1]	218/19 218/20 220/19	225/9 226/17 226/19
I knew [9] 7/13 27/18 52/24 81/13 124/10	I read [1] 88/5	78/18	221/5 222/8 228/21	227/4 227/11 229/10
146/15 189/14 208/20	I realised [1] 20/1	I suppose [4] 44/21	230/1 232/7 232/22	229/19 230/2 232/5
240/7	I recall [2] 9/22	97/25 150/10 160/2	233/18 234/6 235/4	234/17 234/25 235/17
I know [18] 4/10 7/9	117/10	I suspect [7] 41/2	236/4 236/15 237/21	237/11 238/5
12/18 13/12 17/23	I received [2] 96/1	45/10 96/6 127/21	237/24 238/21 239/2	l wasn't [15] 8/13
88/11 91/16 92/5	115/10	127/25 192/15 235/4	240/3	10/12 75/20 101/24
98/14 162/25 196/17	I recommended [2]	I take [1] 177/25	I thought [20] 26/14	127/6 186/13 205/6
205/17 205/24 209/15	163/15 163/18	I then [1] 186/21	42/20 84/8 84/25 85/4	205/8 205/13 207/6
210/8 219/16 219/24	I refer [4] 18/11	I think [194] 2/17	104/9 110/21 110/22	225/7 226/21 230/1
219/24	18/13 18/14 198/21		110/22 117/15 119/20	
I learned [2] 14/13	I reiterate [1] 170/17		144/15 144/15 144/19	
134/18	l remember [2] 93/15		153/20 154/21 155/9 163/12 207/9 236/5	135/11 135/12 135/12
I looked [2] 4/12 69/2	115/8 L ropost [1] 90/13	15/12 15/18 16/5 16/12 16/14 19/20	163/12 207/9 236/5 I to [1] 131/15	I went [2] 100/17 101/23
I made [3] 43/7 65/19	I repeat [1] 90/13		I told [5] 36/14 36/16	
216/22	I repeatedly [1] 163/19	31/2 38/7 38/8 40/10	36/23 73/12 100/15	209/8 209/23
I make [4] 9/23 44/7	I represent [2] 190/1	40/12 43/23 44/1	l took [13] 34/22 82/3	
180/4 236/18	193/4	44/16 45/6 45/18	91/7 93/19 99/11	166/9 230/4
I may [5] 9/25 49/25	l require [1] 234/13	45/21 46/8 46/10	102/17 150/24 171/2	I won't [2] 89/12
163/1 182/6 240/12	I required [2] 90/23	46/23 47/2 47/3 47/4	176/25 192/15 209/6	201/23
I mean [17] 22/3 22/6	90/25	47/8 49/2 49/23 52/16		I would [38] 6/11
24/22 36/9 49/20	I returned [1] 103/11	52/19 52/24 53/7 54/2		8/21 14/20 18/8 27/11
54/17 65/20 69/24	I right [1] 46/1	56/7 63/8 63/19 65/9	I turn [2] 11/4 227/21	27/12 42/7 42/8 42/14
73/1 81/20 81/25	I said [16] 26/23	66/2 66/19 67/9 67/14		44/4 44/12 45/9 45/11
103/24 110/3 118/12 131/1 160/1 167/8	26/25 37/3 62/15	67/20 68/11 69/22	87/10 93/2 98/14	48/8 52/19 53/15 61/8
I meant [1] 106/17	68/16 114/22 151/5	71/4 71/7 72/24 73/4	185/24 207/11 229/5	69/11 69/12 77/11
I mention [1] 31/12	199/5 199/5 202/20	73/11 74/6 75/10	230/13 232/10 233/14	94/2 95/9 103/22
I might [4] 95/13	202/22 202/23 202/25		I understood [5] 3/25	
95/15 218/20 222/23	203/2 207/6 238/4	81/18 81/23 83/7 83/8		116/10 116/10 127/22
	I saw [17] 4/16 8/7	84/24 85/20 86/10	135/20	157/4 167/15 182/5
L	1			(79) Lbad - Lwould

(79) I had... - I would

	211/12 211/15 242/4	60/14 60/00 64/0	16/02 101/10	inedequate FAT 444/0
1	211/13 211/15 212/1	60/14 60/22 61/2	16/23 101/10	inadequate [4] 114/9
I would [6] 186/7	212/3 212/8 212/18	61/11 64/9 66/2 66/5	immediately [12]	115/4 115/5 122/7
209/16 217/20 217/22	213/11 213/12 214/24	66/17 68/6 68/10	20/4 86/14 149/17	inadvertently [3]
240/24 242/10	215/4 219/14 222/22	68/12 68/16 69/2	175/23 176/6 177/25	53/7 141/12 238/2
	223/7 223/20 230/6	70/24 71/10 76/10	184/22 185/4 185/6	inappropriate [3]
I wouldn't [6] 45/12	232/7 232/17 233/5	76/11 77/16 78/2 79/3	186/6 187/20 217/22	37/13 60/10 60/11
74/7 87/18 183/7	233/22 233/23 236/12	79/15 81/19 83/9	immune [1] 70/3	incarceration [1]
195/4 222/7	236/24 240/10 242/11	84/14 85/6 85/6 85/22		148/25
I write [1] 86/22	243/22	87/4 87/8 91/18 91/19		inches [1] 137/12
I wrong [1] 211/1		95/4 97/21 99/17	42/19 48/2 48/15	
I wrote [15] 56/21	l've [57] 7/10 7/20			incident [2] 58/18
62/21 76/9 77/14 90/8	10/13 10/23 21/21	102/15 102/17 103/15		58/21
90/14 100/16 101/22	24/6 37/8 49/5 51/17	103/24 105/2 105/11	166/23 168/10 169/5	include [6] 23/25
119/9 121/1 127/11	51/25 56/22 59/18	108/11 109/12 109/23		31/25 61/20 136/25
128/10 129/18 201/9	65/10 67/9 77/12 82/6	111/24 114/19 116/2	impact [6] 23/1 40/7	147/5 153/5
235/6	85/4 88/11 95/12	116/3 116/12 116/25	52/12 113/2 140/15	included [5] 17/14
	99/10 117/20 126/11	119/22 120/2 122/13	236/10	230/12 231/5 231/19
I'd [23] 38/23 39/19	127/2 129/14 129/17	122/16 123/25 128/2	impacted [2] 59/12	232/3
57/5 60/12 63/2 80/7	135/14 149/14 155/12	129/25 137/15 138/5	238/18	including [7] 32/7
80/8 84/24 88/10	155/22 173/2 182/24	138/20 139/7 139/10	impacting [1] 66/9	65/5 70/17 107/7
92/10 104/9 107/6	191/18 192/11 192/19	139/14 140/23 141/7	Imperial [1] 163/17	114/12 123/9 152/23
121/3 122/19 127/5	198/4 202/5 206/3	141/22 142/10 145/1	impertinence [1]	inclusions [3] 228/16
156/8 173/18 177/20				
179/17 181/6 188/25	207/3 211/4 211/4	145/16 146/23 147/23		229/8 229/13
192/15 209/12	216/1 217/1 217/18	148/8 149/9 149/9	implement [1] 97/4	incoherent [1]
I'II [10] 22/10 28/8	221/25 225/6 226/2	149/15 149/23 152/16		130/20
49/1 78/14 102/18	228/15 228/21 230/1	152/20 153/11 153/13		income [1] 149/1
126/24 135/10 190/2	230/25 232/6 232/25	153/15 154/2 154/11	implications [1]	incompetence [1]
201/21 212/12	233/16 234/6 238/6	154/11 155/10 156/25	157/16	218/11
l'm [139] 10/2 10/24	238/17 238/21	159/7 161/1 162/5	implicit [2] 28/23	incomplete [1]
13/5 13/9 18/13 18/13	idea [6] 107/23	162/16 162/17 162/22	55/10	162/20
	145/12 145/20 160/8	164/2 165/13 165/19	imply [1] 93/23	inconceivable [2]
19/10 20/12 20/15	214/22 240/18	165/20 167/4 168/7	import [3] 20/13 43/4	204/4 204/8
20/21 21/10 23/12	ideal [1] 159/24	169/6 170/16 170/17	77/21	inconsiderable [1]
23/20 23/22 24/3	identification [2]	170/23 172/9 172/20	importance [3] 204/9	
31/16 33/1 37/8 40/10	111/2 157/20	173/10 173/21 174/5	208/14 210/21	inconsistent [1]
40/11 40/12 44/8	identified [25] 14/23	177/18 178/3 184/3	important [20] 16/20	141/14
44/18 45/1 45/18 47/1	17/12 22/13 22/15	184/18 185/3 185/6	25/25 26/3 26/14	incorrect [2] 31/24
47/1 47/9 48/17 52/2	24/12 24/17 30/19	185/11 186/5 187/23	42/11 44/2 58/17 63/9	
52/4 52/5 52/8 61/9				
61/14 62/17 67/5	32/4 36/15 57/20 66/8		73/14 78/25 79/6	increased [1] 123/11
69/10 70/5 70/6 72/24	71/15 96/4 108/24	194/8 195/13 196/23	79/11 108/17 111/4	indeed [5] 20/20
73/25 76/7 77/22	109/10 125/14 149/21	198/21 200/9 200/9	119/17 168/4 199/24	156/14 194/2 196/14
81/23 89/25 91/5	157/6 163/15 175/3	205/4 205/10 206/8	235/14 235/22 237/7	210/1
93/25 94/1 94/22 95/9	175/6 188/14 188/25	206/19 206/23 209/5	importantly [2] 23/9	independence [2]
95/9 100/1 106/23	197/17 242/18	209/8 209/12 209/16	125/14	67/22 67/22
108/3 108/6 108/11	identify [6] 54/8 54/9		impossible [1] 212/4	independent [13] 3/6
110/13 113/13 113/22	84/17 111/8 163/14	213/11 218/22 220/23	impressed [1] 36/18	68/23 69/5 69/9 84/16
	191/15	221/25 222/23 224/9	impression [10] 6/4	116/22 117/5 163/16
121/11 128/11 135/22	ie [1] 50/17	225/6 231/18 231/25	6/6 94/11 101/21	181/13 181/14 182/13
138/3 140/8 140/23	ie that [1] 50/17	233/13 234/7 236/7	104/8 104/13 106/10	197/16 222/2
144/8 144/21 147/12	if [213] 1/15 6/9 7/1	237/4 237/16 238/24	117/13 118/17 182/11	
151/16 151/18 152/6	7/2 7/6 8/9 11/4 12/1	239/23 240/11 242/9	imprisonment [4]	55/16 69/3
153/12 155/1 156/23	13/6 13/18 15/8 16/20	243/25	62/4 67/16 122/16	index [1] 162/22
157/1 159/5 160/14	18/13 18/14 18/15	ignore [1] 93/20	122/16	indicate [6] 49/21
162/3 162/18 165/23				
166/6 166/20 166/22	21/3 21/15 23/11 24/4		improper [8] 44/3	60/15 221/12 222/24
166/24 167/8 167/15	25/12 26/15 27/9 28/4		44/8 44/12 44/25	230/11 233/7
172/16 178/3 179/25	28/5 28/18 28/20	ii [6] 94/15 116/22	143/14 144/20 170/18	
180/1 180/25 184/7	28/24 29/18 30/13	123/9 142/5 148/7	212/15	30/1 207/12 219/18
185/21 185/22 185/23	35/13 35/24 37/25	174/24	improperly [2]	221/5
192/19 193/21 195/9	39/21 40/18 42/7 42/9		191/21 237/9	indicates [1] 147/6
195/10 196/4 197/9	43/9 44/21 45/5 47/3	147/13 148/9 148/23	impugned' [1] 13/24	indicating [2] 23/20
201/23 201/25 201/25	48/21 48/23 49/11	ill [1] 60/11	inability [4] 130/19	139/13
		illustrious [1] 203/21	130/25 163/3 163/6	indication [2] 31/25
202/1 202/23 203/15	53/18 54/15 54/23	imagine [3] 18/25	inaccurate [3] 43/16	33/15
205/9 206/2 206/14	55/8 55/11 55/19 56/2	129/22 205/1	243/13 243/14	indications [2] 80/10
209/22 210/18 210/20	57/9 57/15 59/8 59/9		inadequacy [1] 47/24	
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
				80) I would indications
			,	

(80) I would... - indications

1	infringe [1] 167/25	intent [1] 62/23	investigation [8]	105/12 105/20 106/1
	initial [4] 61/17 61/23		11/22 11/23 50/11	106/6 106/8 106/9
indicative [1] 139/24	72/12 126/18	101/20 110/8	115/25 117/6 183/12	106/17 106/25 107/4
indictment [2]			184/9 218/4	107/12 108/12 108/17
130/20 131/1	initially [1] 53/19	interest [38] 33/22		
individual [8] 5/10	initiative [1] 239/4		investigation/prosec	108/22 109/1 109/20
60/2 107/16 107/20	inkling [1] 124/24	42/19 48/2 48/15	ution [1] 50/11	109/25 112/13 112/19
	input [1] 56/22	48/22 61/1 78/6 113/1	investigations [2]	123/17 124/16 125/20
140/19 182/22 197/13	inputted [1] 56/16	113/11 113/12 116/23	162/16 193/9	131/5 132/5 136/8
236/22	inquiry [9] 122/14	154/15 155/15 161/10		138/18 140/19 154/3
individuals [8] 71/25	135/8 164/16 167/15	161/22 161/23 162/2	96/19	155/16 168/8 190/19
105/14 105/18 108/24				
109/2 109/10 109/17	208/11 221/11 231/4	162/4 162/5 162/10	investigator [1]	194/3 195/18 236/9
136/24	235/21 243/23	162/21 163/8 166/22	97/13	238/22 238/24
	Inquiry's [1] 1/25	167/15 168/9 169/5	involved [18] 4/11	issues' [1] 106/4
inescapable [1]	inside [1] 205/20	169/15 169/23 169/24	8/14 10/12 47/22 50/8	issuing [1] 59/13
205/20	Insight [1] 21/2	170/9 170/10 209/6		
inestimable [1]	insisting [1] 39/15	226/17 228/21	79/22 101/9 149/16	it'll [1] 178/1
148/21				
inevitable [6] 41/10	insofar [2] 24/19	interested [11] 8/17	150/7 179/7 187/21	it's [154] 9/3 9/7 9/20
45/11 45/18 69/19	43/18	75/22 164/17 202/22	188/7 195/16 227/1	9/20 9/21 9/23 10/5
154/16 205/22	inspected [1] 63/17	202/23 220/20 225/7	involvement [10]	11/7 12/24 13/6 13/10
	instance [6] 10/4	225/9 226/17 229/19	3/20 6/20 10/11 52/1	13/10 15/8 16/1 17/24
inevitably [3] 70/7	121/4 131/24 141/17	232/25	52/21 79/24 80/1	18/6 20/21 21/13
148/5 171/20	147/15 241/7	interests [3] 51/13	114/18 196/1 226/25	22/20 22/22 24/9
inferred [2] 141/3		52/9 172/10		26/12 26/12 27/10
243/3	instead [1] 123/5		involves [1] 41/1	
influenced [1] 139/17	instinct [1] 138/1	interferes [1] 88/21	involving [5] 34/4	27/14 28/4 28/5 29/19
inform [5] 50/24	instinctive [1] 14/24	interim [20] 15/24	65/6 66/9 170/8	31/1 33/19 35/11
54/10 193/24 202/18	institution [3] 34/8	55/23 66/8 79/4 79/10	198/11	42/18 44/7 45/10
	34/9 170/11	81/5 82/25 84/2 85/11	Ireland [1] 196/14	45/18 46/7 47/8 47/17
231/21	instruct [3] 75/2	85/22 131/23 132/7	irregularities [2]	47/24 48/24 48/25
informally [1] 35/15	191/14 237/5	133/13 138/25 161/6	80/21 83/17	49/8 49/20 50/1 53/5
informant [1] 19/24				
informants [1] 34/5	instructed [33] 4/25	167/22 216/4 216/8	irrelevant [2] 215/2	53/6 53/6 53/8 53/9
information [71] 29/7	5/5 5/9 5/11 6/1 7/3	216/12 216/14	215/7	53/12 53/15 54/3 55/3
	9/16 30/2 30/10 31/16	internal [2] 48/24	irresistible [1]	56/21 58/24 61/6
29/8 29/18 30/14	32/6 65/13 68/14 74/4	159/18	205/16	61/10 63/24 66/10
31/24 32/11 32/13	74/16 75/21 75/22	internally [2] 7/5	is [459]	69/19 78/1 78/2 80/9
33/5 37/22 38/18	76/2 81/16 84/15	162/2	ish [1] 116/13	85/24 86/13 86/17
41/12 42/8 44/10				
46/22 47/19 48/2	91/13 110/18 174/20	interpretation [1]	isn't [12] 24/14 36/6	89/16 89/21 91/7
49/24 52/22 54/18	186/19 196/3 219/22	141/13	41/22 82/9 82/19	91/19 92/10 94/22
54/25 56/8 72/21 73/7	223/17 226/24 231/4	interpreting [1] 120/9	91/20 126/5 172/16	95/1 95/1 95/3 95/3
	235/23 237/9 237/10	interrupting [2]	201/12 202/21 216/6	95/4 97/21 97/22
78/7 79/6 81/4 81/15	237/11	69/11 98/5	230/20	100/6 102/2 102/11
83/2 83/6 83/24 86/2	instructing [5] 4/3	intervene [1] 185/9	isolated [1] 125/15	103/24 105/7 106/22
86/3 86/5 86/7 87/23				
88/1 88/14 93/6 93/18	7/4 7/5 191/19 240/6	intervening [1]	issue [50] 27/2 29/22	110/24 114/2 115/6
96/1 110/5 110/15	instruction [15] 10/9	235/10	36/15 36/19 37/10	119/9 128/2 128/3
111/9 111/12 112/3	73/19 93/9 94/3 96/6	intervention [1] 89/5	49/4 49/7 49/9 50/17	129/19 129/20 132/18
	98/4 106/10 118/5	interview [1] 138/8	58/15 59/14 63/18	132/18 133/11 138/3
126/6 133/21 133/25	196/6 220/18 223/5	into [39] 16/4 18/14	67/25 68/12 71/14	138/4 139/22 143/11
134/1 134/12 143/23	225/16 227/7 231/11	24/2 24/12 36/2 41/11		143/20 143/22 144/25
146/21 149/10 158/5	233/9	46/18 46/24 49/23	91/6 97/12 99/6 107/7	151/11 152/8 153/17
167/21 168/15 171/22				
173/16 173/21 174/14	instructions [13]	50/1 52/21 56/16	109/13 109/24 110/23	153/19 154/3 154/8
174/24 175/7 175/10	3/15 94/7 95/11 95/17	56/22 59/6 61/9 64/6	113/18 122/2 122/5	154/19 154/19 154/20
175/12 175/15 175/16	95/25 118/13 174/23	75/12 81/5 83/7 83/24	124/7 125/12 130/4	155/3 156/25 160/9
	176/10 209/9 228/3	91/17 99/16 121/7	131/25 148/14 148/16	161/18 161/25 162/23
175/22 176/2 176/13	236/8 236/8 239/21	142/24 143/8 147/2	152/13 153/1 161/13	163/6 163/7 165/12
218/1 238/1	insufficient [2] 231/6	147/6 147/10 152/12	161/23 161/24 162/2	171/16 172/5 172/11
informed [23] 19/21				
26/2 30/12 35/15	231/21	155/19 171/4 182/14	162/4 164/3 173/6	172/11 172/16 172/18
35/17 35/23 58/3	intact [1] 25/16	183/12 184/9 208/20	222/15 223/16 224/7	175/19 180/6 183/11
62/10 86/9 173/24	integrity [12] 17/16	212/11 218/6 228/10	225/2 227/4 237/7	184/19 187/8 187/23
	17/25 25/10 25/16	242/19	239/14	190/10 195/23 199/13
174/22 175/17 190/10	32/22 33/14 66/12	introduce [1] 24/7	issues [53] 9/14 9/14	200/8 205/19 209/12
209/3 211/20 220/8	79/19 80/23 81/21	intrusion [1] 155/18	11/10 17/12 17/16	212/23 219/1 222/23
226/9 230/15 232/12				
232/15 232/22 240/5	147/18 161/19	investigate [2] 32/6	42/16 49/15 52/7	226/22 226/23 227/6
242/14	intend [1] 166/7	183/3	66/12 66/12 66/14	227/6 230/9 230/23
informing [1] 85/10	intended [3] 9/21	investigated [2]	67/3 72/16 73/9 85/10	231/10 233/12 234/8
	114/10 143/16	183/11 184/1	91/12 99/1 105/6	234/9 234/25 242/11

(81) indicative - it's

	122/1 124/2 124/2	judge's [5] 34/17	130/24 134/10 136/13	knew [49] 7/13 10/17
	124/16 125/7 125/14	39/10 127/4 127/12	137/11 140/24 143/18	14/1 15/11 23/10
item [1] 153/15	125/22 126/2 129/13	127/12	144/14 144/22 154/6	25/25 26/14 27/9
its [8] 32/18 58/18			1	
91/18 91/19 102/19	129/25 133/23 134/3	judged [1] 60/11	156/7 157/1 159/10	27/18 27/20 36/14
166/24 215/22 239/10	143/18 173/16 173/21	judgement [1] 63/5	165/20 167/8 170/3	52/24 64/3 64/5 64/19
	175/16 178/8 178/21	judice [1] 51/23	170/3 172/16 172/20	64/24 81/7 81/13 84/5
itself [7] 33/12 44/14	178/24 178/24 179/5	July [68] 13/1 15/20	173/22 173/23 174/17	84/9 106/13 124/10
92/22 97/17 119/21				
122/9 231/20	179/15 180/25 181/5	18/11 18/15 18/15	177/4 179/13 181/8	124/14 136/8 146/15
iv [5] 95/18 147/23	181/7 181/12 181/20	21/5 27/23 28/6 30/4	182/2 182/8 184/10	183/5 189/14 190/12
	181/25 182/3 182/15	40/11 40/12 43/25	190/13 196/18 197/1	190/15 190/17 190/22
148/24 154/12 175/2	183/13 183/19 185/15	45/3 49/17 51/9 52/20	197/23 200/9 203/1	193/24 205/5 207/4
	186/2 187/7 187/14	55/21 56/24 57/13	203/20 204/14 205/3	208/1 208/20 210/11
J			1	
jaded [1] 70/7	187/22 188/21 190/13		207/17 208/17 208/18	212/6 215/14 215/14
jail [1] 202/18	195/12 195/18 195/25	73/18 78/1 79/9 80/4	208/18 208/23 211/25	215/19 215/21 217/14
	204/6 204/19 206/6	81/25 89/21 91/8 93/3	214/5 215/4 216/8	226/9 232/1 239/16
January [20] 3/10	213/14 213/23 215/6	138/4 140/11 146/17	216/21 217/24 220/22	240/7 240/8 241/18
61/24 63/11 64/18	218/6 219/14 219/20	166/23 168/19 169/13	1	
65/24 66/16 67/4 67/7			1	Knock [1] 148/22
67/12 121/24 122/13	219/22 220/6 221/22	174/19 178/4 178/23	228/15 230/8 234/6	Knock-on [1] 148/22
124/8 128/6 134/14	223/17 224/1 224/7	179/1 180/5 180/24	234/7 235/11 240/11	know [110] 2/2 4/10
	224/13 224/22 225/7	181/6 181/16 181/24	241/6	7/9 9/11 10/12 11/19
137/3 206/15 213/21	226/8 226/23 226/23	183/17 185/15 186/21		12/6 12/18 12/24
215/25 216/20 217/10				
January 2010 [2]	230/17 232/1 232/12	195/1 197/14 200/25	51/21 97/3 111/5	13/12 14/8 16/1 17/23
3/10 67/12	232/19 233/21 234/14	201/3 204/7 204/8	111/19 145/22 146/7	19/2 19/24 21/3 22/14
January 2014 [1]	234/21 235/5 235/15	213/7 213/18 219/19	187/4	22/25 26/19 27/19
	237/1 237/12 237/23	221/16 221/21 222/4	Justice for [1]	32/12 43/22 45/14
213/21	220/1 220/7 220/10	224/15 227/25 229/1	145/22	46/4 49/8 49/20 50/15
Jarnail [58] 6/14 7/13				
7/13 7/15 7/15 7/22	238/13 238/22 239/17		justification [1]	50/17 54/23 55/8
11/14 11/20 16/13	239/22 240/6 240/17	239/4 242/12	129/20	56/23 62/16 65/3
	241/1 241/12 241/20	juncture [2] 186/11	justifying [2] 87/24	66/14 74/17 76/22
19/1 20/22 21/1 21/6	241/25 242/5 242/14	187/1	151/3	77/8 77/13 80/2 84/25
21/11 27/6 27/10				
27/17 27/19 29/10	242/24 243/5 243/8	June [22] 8/15 13/1	K	85/22 88/11 88/23
29/12 29/20 31/13	Jenkins' [13] 40/8	14/18 15/20 15/23		91/16 92/5 98/14
32/14 32/20 32/24	72/11 76/17 129/1	16/9 16/12 16/23	KC [3] 104/24 231/3	102/14 106/8 107/1
	132/23 133/2 181/2	17/10 18/5 18/18	231/13	111/21 115/6 124/8
34/24 36/19 39/25	194/21 227/24 228/19			139/21 146/15 159/16
45/7 45/15 77/9 77/9				
91/9 91/14 94/17 95/5	230/12 231/18 241/16		keenly [1] 204/18	162/25 164/2 169/6
95/7 95/13 95/16	Jenkins/Fujitsu [1]	178/19 204/6 224/10	keep [4] 57/17	172/18 180/1 182/1
	58/4	240/16	123/25 152/5 167/8	182/7 182/8 182/11
95/22 100/21 102/7	jigsaw [1] 133/22	June/early [1] 15/20	keeping [2] 144/19	182/13 183/2 184/2
104/1 104/5 104/8			166/8	
104/11 104/25 114/7	job [2] 149/17 164/20			184/24 185/4 193/19
135/11 136/16 136/22	John [18] 91/6 91/6	198/19 199/7	kept [4] 90/7 90/16	194/6 194/19 195/7
152/8 155/25 168/16	91/12 94/6 94/8 94/18	jurisdictions [1]	209/3 211/20	195/13 196/7 196/17
	96/5 96/7 98/4 99/12	194/24	kind [3] 75/9 86/2	198/10 200/21 202/25
169/1 171/5 191/1	103/13 104/10 104/10		116/8	204/22 205/2 205/15
241/8			1	
Jarnail's [2] 7/18	104/22 106/9 109/11	7/23 10/11 10/13	King [56] 2/9 2/11	205/17 205/19 205/20
21/7	109/21 117/14	10/23 11/18 13/8	2/17 3/2 3/9 4/4 4/7	205/24 206/17 206/19
Jenkins [148] 14/10	joined [2] 2/9 3/9	14/12 15/4 15/13	4/8 4/15 5/6 5/13 5/23	208/19 209/5 209/6
	jointly [2] 169/9	15/24 21/6 23/5 25/1	6/11 10/7 11/17 71/14	209/15 210/8 211/16
15/2 15/10 17/15	221/22	25/7 25/18 26/18	74/1 74/25 84/22	216/7 219/16 219/24
17/20 18/18 19/13	1-4 FAT 040/40		84/23 87/3 87/24	
19/17 19/19 20/2 20/7	jot [1] 243/16	27/17 27/19 29/23		219/24 223/4 223/7
20/10 20/19 21/14	journalistic [2] 34/10	35/8 35/19 35/20 37/9		226/12 226/12 234/19
23/8 24/15 26/16	37/5	37/9 38/2 39/3 39/19	105/1 105/15 111/16	238/3 238/11 239/20
	judge [38] 34/1 35/1	43/5 43/6 43/13 44/1	114/15 114/22 117/22	240/23 241/5 241/10
26/16 28/15 29/11	35/20 36/6 36/12	44/25 45/23 47/1	118/1 118/6 118/13	243/12
29/13 30/24 32/12			127/21 128/1 159/23	
32/21 33/17 46/13	36/14 36/17 36/23	49/17 53/17 53/24	1	knowing [4] 64/13
54/21 54/22 58/4 61/4	37/3 37/7 37/15 37/15		191/1 194/3 194/5	129/12 129/13 241/7
64/19 65/7 66/6 69/10	38/3 38/7 38/16 38/21	61/8 62/8 63/2 74/24	194/6 196/9 201/7	knowingly [1] 225/21
	40/13 44/2 44/5 44/5	82/6 85/4 87/15 91/8	209/3 209/11 211/19	knowledge [35] 1/20
70/9 70/17 71/4 71/5	44/8 44/10 123/23	93/19 94/14 95/15	219/17 219/21 220/5	8/6 8/12 8/16 8/20
71/16 72/6 72/13 73/2			1	
73/15 73/20 74/15	130/3 130/5 131/18	99/10 100/1 100/15	221/18 223/25 236/23	8/24 52/6 54/21 63/4
75/13 76/14 80/13	142/9 142/10 146/13	101/7 108/11 113/10	237/19 239/19 239/24	63/8 74/14 75/8 75/9
81/8 81/22 82/13	159/1 170/7 170/18	115/16 120/19 120/22	240/2	77/9 92/24 97/5 104/5
	172/21 172/22 173/8		King's [2] 3/21	104/6 132/23 140/20
82/19 86/4 86/8 98/21	173/10 180/1 185/10	122/25 125/21 128/9	127/16	158/22 179/23 193/10
		122/20 120/21 120/9		100/22 110/20 100/10
1	1			

(82) item - knowledge

inoviedge[12] 184/4 187/21 190/25 207/9 21/5 (21/1) 102/25 1503 (16/11 (16/11) 206/22 207/2 207/2 208/12 227/9 237/13 239/19 21/4 (5 1503 (16/11 (16/11)) 159/21 166/24 (17/03) 229/1 281/4 241/19 apars [1] 181/10 59/16 60/96 (0/14) 144/9 150/5 164/12 1159/21 120/25 185/10 187/7 188/17 239/1 281/4 241/19 apars [1] 181/10 59/16 60/96 (0/14) 144/9 150/5 164/12 1156/21 120/26 192/9 230/1 221/12/16 73/7 51/1 334/14 11/20 148/5 apars [1] 181/10 181/18 80/52 51/26 188/17 116/14 14/17 1159/21 120/2 120/17 13/18 135/8 182/22 204/12 239/12 back [6] 10/16 10/1/17 78/18 81/12 51/57 14/14 116/24 23/16 120/17 13/18 135/8 116/14 23/12 30/17 13/18 135/8 113/2 13/11 11/13/12 learling [1] 13/24 1/14/11 113/13 13/16 11/16/11 13/14 23/12 30/16 223/17 123/16 223/17 12/37 11/14 113/14 23/12 30/16 23/17 123/16 223/17 123/16 223/17 12/37 11/14 123/16 223/17 12/37 11/14 13/14 23/12 30/16 23/17 13/14 23/12 30/16 23/17 13/14 23/12 30/16 23/17 13/14 23/12 30/16 23/17 13/14 23/12 30/16 23/17 13/14 23/12 30/16 23/17 13/14 23/12 30/16 23/17 13/14 13/16 11/16/17 13/14 23/12 23/17 13/14 23/	К	55/17 85/15 159/3	174/17 186/25 200/10	Limited's [2] 40/3	139/7 142/17 149/23
20672 2072 2072 2071 20714 20712 20712 20712 20712 20712 20712 20714 20714 20714 20714 20714 20714 20714 20714 20714 20714 20714 20714 20714 20714 20714 20714 20714 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
22176 2228/12.327/12.227/14/17 22018 22016 22017 </td <td></td> <td>207/24 208/1 222/15</td> <td>214/5</td> <td>limiting [1] 51/9</td> <td>159/21 166/24 170/3</td>		207/24 208/1 222/15	214/5	limiting [1] 51/9	159/21 166/24 170/3
229/18 230/16 236/2 1ay [1] 220/1 230/15 2/16 200 120/15 126/201 129/25 1as/16 120/16 200 Known [11] 31/25 39/16 6/07 480/17 80/17 1as/17 78/17 80/17 1as/17 20/17 20/17		227/9 237/13 239/19	letter [33] 50/6 51/15		172/20 173/22 174/17
22.80 12.80 10.200 12.201 <td></td> <td>lay [1] 20/2</td> <td>57/3 57/6 57/8 58/19</td> <td>128/15 128/20 129/25</td> <td>185/10 187/7 188/17</td>		lay [1] 20/2	57/3 57/6 57/8 58/19	128/15 128/20 129/25	185/10 187/7 188/17
August 1, 1472 iayman* [1] 71/2 iayman* [1] 71/2 <td></td> <td></td> <td>59/16 60/9 60/14</td> <td>144/9 150/5 164/12</td> <td>191/20 192/6 192/9</td>			59/16 60/9 60/14	144/9 150/5 164/12	191/20 192/6 192/9
Alight 11, 13, 12, 23, 77 Ising 14, 12, 14, 12, 14, 12, 14, 12, 14, 12, 14, 12, 14, 12, 14, 12, 14, 12, 14, 12, 14, 12, 14, 12, 14, 12, 14, 12, 14, 12, 12, 14, 12, 12, 14, 12, 14, 12, 14, 12, 14, 12, 14, 12, 12, 14, 14, 12, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14			77/24 78/1 78/11	linear [1] 164/12	195/13 205/9 212/5
Base 1, 191, 193, 193, 193, 193, 193, 193, 1			78/13 81/8 81/12		227/12 235/7
Biol. 22/21 22/16 B9/2 10/13 10/32 Link 64/2 15/3 10/37 <		133/4 141/20 148/5	81/18 86/25 87/2 88/4		looked [12] 4/12 7/10
L leading [1] 138/4 158/5 158/5 178/2 188/7 203/2 178/2 188/7 203/2 227/2 188/7 203/2 227/2 188/7 203/2 227/2 188/7 203/2 227/2 188/7 203/2 227/2 188/7 203/2 227/2 188/7 203/2 227/2 188/7 203/2 178/2 <		221/6	89/1 89/2 101/3 103/2	links [4] 4/5 4/6	
lack [0] Grazz 113/1 100/24 123/19 134/18 160/21 listed [3] 27/24 237/5 113/2 113/11 131/2 141/9 164/21 123/16 22016 164/21 123/16 22016 164/21 123/16 22016 164/21 123/16 22016 164/21 123/16 22016 164/21 23/16 22016 164/21 23/16 22016 164/21 23/16 22016 164/21 23/16 22016 164/21 23/16 22016 164/12 23/16 22016 164/12 23/16 22016 164/12 23/16 22016 173/16 13/16 11/16 11/12/25 173/16 13/16 11/16 11/12/25 173/16 13/16 11/16 11/12/25 173/16 13/16 11/16 11/12/25 173/16 13/16 11/16 11/12/25 173/16 13/16 13/16 13/16 13/16 173/16 13/	102/22 204/21 239/23	leading [1] 138/24	103/18 103/25 156/3	171/4 238/9	129/17 133/18 135/8
Late 19 0.022 10.022<	L	learned [5] 14/13	156/5 158/25 159/21	list [2] 34/5 170/9	188/17 206/3 227/24
113/2 113/2 113/1 113/2 123/16 224/17 113/12 123/16 224/18 113/12 123/16 224/18 113/12 123/16 224/18 113/12 123/16 223/16 23/17 23/16 23/17 23/16 23/17 23/16 23/17 23/16 23/17 23/16 23/17 23/16 23/17 23/16 23/17 23/16 23/17 23/16 23/17 23/16 23/17 23/16 23/17 <td>lack [8] 67/22 113/1</td> <td>100/24 123/19 134/18</td> <td>160/4 164/6 164/12</td> <td>listed [3] 27/24</td> <td>231/5</td>	lack [8] 67/22 113/1	100/24 123/19 134/18	160/4 164/6 164/12	listed [3] 27/24	231/5
Hardscape [4] Listers [9] 49/2 549/2 Listers [1] 13/14 23/12 <th23 12<="" th=""> <t< td=""><td></td><td>241/19</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<></th23>		241/19			
Landscape [4] 236/12 237/1 236/12 237/1 Bisting [1] 123/1 44/13 53/12 84/12 236/19 237/16 236/11 237/16 237/17 139/12					
236/19 237/16<					
Lane (4) 22/14 32/1 175/5 175/14 175/5 175/14 175/15 175/5 175/5 175/5 171					
1756/174 least [24] 13/25 119/22 140/15 203/26 119/22 140/15 203/26 113/31 31/31 13/31/31 13/31/31/31/31 13/31 13/31 13/31/31/31/31/31 13/31/31/31/31					
Harg and the form of the second se					
65/25 76/19 78/20 35/21 51/4 62/1 76/17 (levels [2] 104/21 39/12 39/16 39/24 143/20 144/3 138/21 51/4 62/1 76/17 (levels [2] 104/21 39/12 39/16 39/24 143/20 144/3 138/21 51/4 62/1 76/17 (levels [2] 104/21 20/4 20/97 211/3 137/22 149/21 133/21 153/21 138/21 51/4 62/1 76/17 (levels [2] 101/2 114/11 119/21 132/8 11ability (1] 157/22 211/20 21/32 1164/19 17/38 174/15 137/1 66/1 57/97/3 221/16 223/16 223/16 11aison [1] 196/11 19/31/9 196/13 209/15 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/1 132/1 156/6 11/3 56/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/2 230/12 230/2 230/11 120/1 106/6 18/2 11/2 10/0 /8 11/2 11/2 11/2 11/2 11/2 11/2 11/2 11/2 11/2 11/2 10/2 1 10/0 /8 120/1 10/2 1 10/2 10/2 1 10/2 10/2 1 10/2 10/2 1 10/2 10/2 1 10/2 10/2 1 10/2 10/2 1 10/2 10/2 1 10/2 10/2 1 10/2 10/2 1 10/2 10/2 1 10/2 1 10/2 1 10/2 1					
large [4] 97.39/12 79/21 96/7 106/7 165/24 209/4 209/7 211/3 147/22 149/21 53/21 largel [6] 2/11 161/16 147/7 179/91 192/21 liable [1] 211/5 211/7 211/17 161/14 180/21 183/23 213/25 largel [6] 2/11/2 231/2 liable [1] 201/5 211/7 211/5 211/7 211/17 160/21 183/23 213/25 last [9] 38/20 81/24 241/12 liable [1] 11/24 193/19 196/13 209/15 230/2 230/2 230/22 230/2 230/2 230/2 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>					
136/21 161/16 114/11 119/21 13/28 liability [1] 15//2 211/5 211/211/7 164/19 17/38 17/415 1argely [6] 2/19 12/7 37/1 66/15 79/23 221/16 223/16 223/18 liaising [1] 224/5 211/12 211/12 118/19 13/38 17/415 154/16 221/16 223/16 223/18 liaising [1] 224/5 liaising [1] 224/5 119/14 13/28 214/2 226/21 227/12 154/16 221/12 23/23 liaising [1] 124/5 liaising [1] 166/1 119/14 13/28 230/22 230/22 230/22 230/22 230/22 230/22 230/22 230/22 230/22 230/22 230/22 230/22 230/22 230/22 230/22 230/23 230/22 230/23 230/22 230/23 230/22 230/23 230/22 230/22 230/22 230/23 230/22 230/23 230/22 230/23 230/22 230/23 230/22 230/23 230/22 230/23 230/22 230/23 230/21 230/34 100/14 230/14 230/14 230/14 230/14 230/14 230/14 230/14 230/14 100/14	large [4] 9/7 39/12				
134 gir) 101 121/16 223/16 223/16 223/12 23/11 23					
37/1 66/15 79/23 221/16 223/16 223/16 liabsing [1] 224/5 1193/14 150/6 214/14 220/21 221/2 154/16 227/1 235/25 236/7 liabsing [1] 124/5 193/17 100/16 127/3 230/2 14/14 1ate [1] 916 15/20 130/16 147/3 lieg [1] 14/6/2 lief [3] 65/5 75/9 lief [3] 65/6 1/1 lives [1] 64/12 lioks [9] 54/3 56/2 125/4 128/17 134/23 later [1] 14/6/2 left [1] 47/17 57/10 light [4] 54/5 71/20 locating [2] 33/12 locating [2] 33/12 154/4 154/5 219/18 left [1] 47/17 57/16 log2/5 73/5 60/12 60/18 logical [1] 65/11 locating [1] 158/10 loss [4] 158/11 loss [4] 158/11 loss [4] 57/23 loss [4] 57/23 loss [4] 57/23 loss [4] 57/23 loss [4] 58/11 loss [largely [6] 2/19 12/7				
1341 [9] 38/20 81/24 241/12 lie [3] 4/1/4 29/1 84/3 220/23 232/22 234/25 237/8 234/11 leave [7] 85/16 87/5 lies [1] 126/9 live [1] 185/17 237/11 239/2 239/3 234/11 late [9] 9/16 15/20 30/17 100/16 147/3 lies [1] 158/9 live [1] 185/17 207/24 208/4 live [1] 185/17 237/11 239/2 239/3 235/25 38/20 122/24 leaves [1] 123/2 100/8 lifed [2] 85/25 lise [1] 144/24 lios(1] 100/8 lises [1] 100/18 lises [1] 100/11 lises [1] 100/11 lises [1] 100/11 lises [1] 100/11 lises [1] 100/12 lises [1] 100/11 lises [1] 100/11 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>					
Bar 19 Solid 201 Bar 17 Bar 17 <thbar 17<="" th=""> <thbar 17<="" th=""> Bar 17</thbar></thbar>	154/16				
145/19 188/15 197/4 93/17 100/16 147/13 lies [1] 158/15 197/4 234/11 lioks [9] 54/3 56/25 58/6 58/12 100/8 lioks [1] 11/24 100/8 lioks [1] 11/24 100/8 100/18 100/8 100/18 100/8 100/18 100/8 100/8 100/8 100/8 100/8 100/8 100/8 100/8 100/8 100/18 100/8 100/18 100/8 100/18 100/8 100/18 100/8 100/18 100/8 100/18 100/8 100/18 100/18 100/18 100/18 100/18 <td>last [9] 38/20 81/24</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	last [9] 38/20 81/24				
143.01 100.13 137.14 207/24 208/41 life [3] 64/11 100/2 living [1] 11/24 59/25 58/6 68/12 126/4 126/4 126/3 128/21 100/8 100/13 130/14 105/11 108/12 110/11 100/13 120/12 105/11 108/12 105/11 108/12 100/14 120/12 105/11 108/12 105/11 108/12 105/11 108/12 105/11 108/12 105/11 108/12 105/11 108/12 105/11 108/12 105/11 108/12 105/11 108/12 110/11 126/14 105/11 108/12 110/14 126/14 105/11 105/11 108/12 111/14/11 111/15 105/14 106/14 126/14					
234/11 102/12 102/12 100/8 Ioaning [2] 68/9 105/11 108/12 110/10 35/25 38/20 122/24 leaving [1] 146/2 lifted [2] 85/12 120/1 146/2 140/1 140/1 140/1 120/1 120/1 120/1 120/1 120/1 120/1 120/1 120/1 120/1 120/1 120/1 120/1 120/1 120/1 120/1 120/1 120/1 120/1 120					
late [1] 13/12 14/12 14/12 14/12 12/12 12/14 13/12 13/12 14/12 14/12 14/12/4 19/12 10/18 13/12 13/12 14/12 14/12/4 10/18 11/15 11/15 13/12 12/14 12/14 14/14/4 10/14 12/14 10/14 11/15 13/12 12/14 12/14 14/14/14 10/14 12/14 10/14 11/15 10/14 11/15 10/14 11/15 10/14 11/15 10/14 11/15 10/14 11/15 10/14 11/15 10/14 11/15 10/14 11/15 10/14 10/14 11/15 10/14 11/15 10/14 11/15 10/14 11/15 10/14 11/15 10/14 11/15 10/14 11/15 10/14 10/14 11/14 10/14 11/14 10/14 11/14 10/14 10/14 11/14 10/14 10/14 10/14 10/14 10/14 10/14 10/14 10/14 10/14 10/14 10/14 10/14 10/14 10/14					
126/4 126/6 129/9 130/18 Iocal [1] 49/8 Iocal [1] 49/8 Iocal [1] 126/24 Iocal [1] 26/24 Iocal [1] 42/15 Iocal [1] 42/16 Iocal [1] 42/16 Iocal [1] 42/17 Ioc	late [9] 9/16 15/20				
120/18 178/18 light [4] 54/5 71/20 located [1] 26/24 loser [1] 117/5 130/18 left [11] 47/17 57/10 20/5 233/16 located [1] 26/24 loser [1] 147/5 125/4 128/17 134/23 156/14 156/75 19/9 julke [3] 21/16 6/9 71/2 242/18 located [1] 26/24 loser [1] 147/5 125/4 128/17 134/23 156/14 156/75 19/9 julke [3] 21/16 6/9 71/1 logistics [1] 142/1 lofe/14 156/21 157/22 123/4 124/14 144/25 148/17 63/2 67/9 78/6 88/10 logistics [1] 142/1 loses [4] 57/23 124/1 1200/19 200/20 57/12 57/16 58/7 59/9 108/12 114/19 120/1 logistics [1] 142/1 loses [1] 78/11 39/12 124/1 12/01 112/16 144/9 151/19 156/8 logistics [1] 142/2 loses [1] 57/23 loses [1] 57/23 132/1 12/17 112/19 112/21 legal [11] 8/19 49/25 122/19 129/25 138/10 lone [1] 94/8 lose [1] 142/2 launched [2] 141/10 124/11 83/14 214/8 likely [29] 9/23 17/14 los/16 13/6 los/16 13/6 los/16 13/6 159/12 law [2] 8/21 29/10 logistics [1] 18/19 49/25 los/2 17/24 158/21 los/17 16/276/7 los/[1] 9/12 los/[1] 9/12 159/12 law [2] 8/21 29/10 legal [11] 8/19					
Instr 10 Instr 11 Instr 12 Instr 13					
http://i.i.gov 57/12 57/16 58/7 59/9 like [33] 2/16 6/9 7/1 242/18 148/25 148/25 149/1 125/4 128/17 134/23 166/9 182/11 199/14 7/7 12/1 16/7 24/25 logical [1] 65/11 156/14 156/21 157/22 234/21 left-hand [5] 57/10 54/3 57/56 60/12 60/18 logical [1] 65/11 156/14 156/21 157/22 latest [1] 14/9 left-hand [5] 57/10 56/32 67/9 78/6 88/10 logical [1] 65/11 logical [1] 65/11 latest [5] 110/21 66/14 112/10 112/16 124/18 13/4 21/49 log/21 13/2 12/470 los [1] 142/2 los [1] 142/2 launch [1] 85/16 112/17 112/91 12/21 167/14 182/25 184/24 los [7] 8/11 19/7 los [5] 66/7 67/11 launch [2] 141/10 124/18 13/14 21/48 192/17 213/11 22/47 long [7] 8/11 10/1 66/2/22 los [6] 68/33 los [7] 8/3/3 163/7 launch [2] 157/18 lse [1] 8/19 49/25 21/13 27/11 27/14 lse [2] 9/23 17/18 s8/14 161/10 162/10 low [1] 68/12 launch [2] 157/18 leggi [1] 18/19 49/25 21/13 27/11 27/14 lse [2] 9/22 s8/14 161/10 162/10 low [1] 68/12 launch [2] 157/18 lse [4] 38/161/16 lsg/14 18/16 lsg/14 18/16 lsg/17 36/26 lsg/18 3/14 lsg/16 13/2 <tr< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr<>					
125/4 128/17 154/4 154/5 154/4 154/4 154/5 154/4 154/4 154/5 154/4 155/7 166/9 182/11 199/12 166/9 166/14 155/7/10 163/2 166/9 166/14 155/7/10 165/16 166/14 155/7/10 109/2 121/2 123/7 123/					
12/14/1 12/15/14					
234/21 isf-hand [5] 57/10 63/2 67/9 78/6 88/10 logistics [1] 158/10 losses [4] 57/23 latest [1] 14/9 57/12 57/16 58/7 59/9 108/12 114/19 120/1 logs [1] 125/8 logs [1] 125/8 logs [1] 125/8 losses [4] 57/23 142/11 200/19 200/20 66/14 112/10 112/16 144/9 151/19 156/8 long [7] 8/11 19/7 lots [5] 64/7 67/11 loss [7] 142/2 loss [7]				logical [1] 65/11	
23/121 57/12 57/16 58/7 59/9 108/12 114/19 120/1 logs [1] 125/8 123/7 123/11 139/12 latter [5] 110/21 66/14 112/10 112/16 142/19 129/25 139/10 long [7] 8/11 19/7 long [7] 8/11 19/7 236/4 112/17 112/19 112/21 162/16 162/22 166/11 189/2 128/23 162/22 long [7] 8/11 19/7 lots [5] 49/23 49/23 13/3 launch [1] 8/5/16 launch [2] 141/10 12/17 112/19 112/21 lots [7] 3/16 13/6 lots [5] 49/23 49/23 lots [6] 6/7 11 lots [6] 12/10 lots [6] 12/11 lots [6] 12/10 lots [6					
Legacy [15] 14/9 :1 Legacy [15] 63/25 122/19 129/19 139/10 Ione [1] 94/8 Ions [1] 14/2 142/11 200/20 66/14 112/12 113 111 163/1 163/1 163/1 163/1 163/1 163/1 163/1 165/1 164/17 163/1 163/1 163/1 164/1 16/1 16/1<					
142(1) 2010/19 200/20 66/14 112/10 112/16 144/9 151/19 156/8 long [7] 8/11 19/7 lot [5] 66/7 67/11 236/4 112/17 112/19 112/21 162/16 162/22 166/11 89/2 128/23 162/22 lot [5] 66/7 67/11 83/13 124/18 131/4 214/8 12/2/2 113/2 124/10 167/14 182/25 184/24 163/3 163/7 lots [5] 49/23 49/23 83/13 124/18 131/4 214/8 192/17 213/11 224/9 look [78] 8/16 13/6 low [1] 68/14 16/17 169/14 94/2 152/22 157/18 log2/10 157/24 158/21 45/8 45/9 46/10 51/14 18/12 18/17 46/23 low [1] 23/17 33/13 launching [2] 157/18 102/10 157/24 158/21 45/8 45/9 46/10 51/14 18/12 18/17 46/23 low [1] 20/17 33/13 lawer [1] 164/17 169/14 194/1 53/12 53/15 105/22 48/20 48/21 49/11 lunck [1] 201/16 lude rous [1] 97/21 law g2 2 8/21 29/10 166/8 214/20 lom [1] 17/12 18/3 145/25 148/14 151/2 66/5 66/23 67/13 lunck [2] 121/12 122/6 9/17 39/24 70/18 less [4] 38/8 112/5 20/11 37/6 33/6 33/11 89/13 91/17 92/22 37/18 42/6 43/7 43/8 153/16 154/8 158/15 67/17 67/18 70/10 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
112/17 112/17					
112/22 113/2 124/10 167/14 182/25 184/24 163/3 163/7 Iots [5] 49/23 49/23 124/18 131/4 214/8 124/18 131/4 214/8 192/17 213/11 224/9 Iooger [5] 36/16 83/3 167/9 182/20 237/2 124/18 131/4 214/8 192/17 213/11 224/9 Iikely [29] 9/23 17/18 190/14 161/10 162/10 Iook [78] 8/16 13/6 Iook [78] 8/16 13/6 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>108/17 174/13 175/10</td>					108/17 174/13 175/10
11.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1		112/22 113/2 124/10	167/14 182/25 184/24	163/3 163/7	lots [5] 49/23 49/23
Jaunch [1] 85/16 214/9 214/18 likely [29] 9/23 17/18 89/14 161/10 162/10 low [1] 68/12 Jaunched [2] 141/10 141/10 152/22 141/10 157/78 81/10 152/22 157/78 16/17 16/17 16/17 13/12 13/12 11/12 16/17 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 11/12 16/17 16/17 13/12 13/13 10/17 13/13 10/17 13/13 10/17 13/13 10/17 13/13 10/17 13/13 10/17 13/13 10/17 13/13 10/17 13/13 10/17 13/13 10/17 13/13 10/17 13/13 10/17 10/12 13/13 10/17 10/12 13/13 10/17 10/12 13/13 10/17 10/12 13/13 10/17 10/12 10/11 10/12 12/16 10/11 10/11 10/11 10/11 10/11 12/12 10/11 10/12 12/12 12/16 10/11 12/12 12/14 12/12 12/12 12/11 12/11 12/12 12/11 12/11 12/11 12/11 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>167/9 182/20 237/2</td></td<>					167/9 182/20 237/2
Iaunched [2] 141/10 legal [11] 8/19 49/25 27/13 27/13 27/14 look [78] 8/16 13/6 lower [1] 238/16 152/22 Iaunching [2] 157/18 75/5 79/19 97/16 29/19 33/8 11/14 45/6 14/11 15/7 16/4 Ltd [2] 30/17 33/13 luck [1] 20/19 33/8 14/14 45/6 14/11 15/7 16/4 Ltd [2] 30/17 33/13 luck [1] 20/19 33/8 15/7 16/4 14/11 15/7 16/7 16/7 16/7 16/7 16/7 16/7 16/7 10/				89/14 161/10 162/10	
152/22 75/5 79/1 97/16 29/19 33/8 41/14 45/6 14/11 15/19 16/4 Ltd [2] 30/17 33/13 Iaunching [2] 157/18 102/10 157/24 158/21 45/8 45/9 46/10 51/14 18/12 18/17 46/23 Iuck [1] 201/16 159/12 164/17 169/14 194/1 53/12 53/15 105/22 48/20 48/21 49/11 Iuck [1] 201/16 Iuck [1] 201/16 12/20 33/21 39/13 Leicester [1] 74/7 106/22 109/5 116/8 50/12 53/2 57/2 57/8 Iuck [2] 121/12 Iuck [2] 121/12 39/17 39/24 70/18 Lepton [3] 17/12 18/3 145/25 148/14 151/2 66/5 66/23 67/13 67/17 67/18 70/10 122/6 Iumch [2] 121/12 Iuck [1] 20/1/16 Iuck [1] 20/1					
Launching [2] 157/18 102/10 157/24 158/21 45/8 45/9 46/10 51/14 18/12 18/12 18/17 46/23 48/20 48/20 48/21 49/11 1uck [1] 201/16 1udicrous [1] 97/21 32/20 33/21 39/13 164/17 169/14 194/1 106/22 109/5 116/8 50/12 53/2 57/15 60/14 60/24 122/6 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>					
159/12 164/17 169/14 194/1 53/12 53/15 105/22 48/20 48/21 49/11 Iudicrous [1] 9//21 1aw [22] 8/21 29/10 32/20 33/21 39/13 106/22 109/5 116/8 50/12 53/2 57/2 57/8 Iunch [2] 121/12 39/17 39/24 70/18 113/10 118/12 132/13 57/15 60/14 60/24 122/6 122/6 96/22 158/8 164/6 164/17 169/14 194/1 145/25 148/14 151/2 66/5 66/23 67/13 19/12 122/6 96/22 158/8 164/6 168/2 14/20 153/16 154/8 158/15 67/17 67/18 70/10 71/10 72/1 76/2 76/7 106/8 214/20 199/22 164/11 192/23 166/8 214/20 166/8 214/20 10mited [24] 29/8 29/9 79/14 83/9 83/10 maddening [1] 99/22 103/12 194/4 194/8 207/2 231/8 165/2 105/3 206/22 38/8 48/4 52/22 71/18 104/23 105/2 106/2 37/18 42/6 43/7 43/8 116/21 148/2 224/3 205/5 205/3 206/22 38/8 48/4 52/22 71/18 104/23 105/2 106/2 37/18 42/6 43/7 43/8 116/21 148/2 224/3 147/2 47/7 57/16 60/18 112/10 116/18 116/22 122/17 122/18 122/19 55/13 59/6 64/6 64/16 123/14 237/6 237/8 139/10 165/2 170/25 147/5 158/5 193/14 128/2 128/16 129/11 123/6 127/14 127/18 139/10 165/2 170/25 147/5					
Iaw [22] 8/21 29/10 Leicester [1] 74/7 106/22 109/5 116/8 50/12 53/2 57/2 57/8 Iunch [2] 121/12 32/20 33/21 39/13 139/13 139/13 145/25 148/14 151/2 66/5 66/23 67/13 122/6 122/6 39/17 39/24 70/18 16/8 214/20 145/25 148/14 151/2 66/5 66/23 67/13 67/17 67/18 70/10 122/6 122/6 96/22 158/8 164/6 165/8 214/20 153/16 154/8 158/15 67/17 67/18 70/10 71/10 72/1 76/2 76/7 120/1 122/6 122/6 122/6 193/12 194/4 194/8 194/20 166/8 214/20 11mited [24] 29/8 29/9 79/14 83/9 83/10 maddening [1] 99/22 123/18 35/14 37/5 10xy rg [7] 110/5 166/8 214/20 11mited [24] 29/8 29/9 79/14 83/9 83/10 128/2 106/2 37/18 42/6 43/7 43/8 116/21 148/2 224/3 202/5 205/3 206/22 38/8 48/4 52/22 71/18 104/23 105/2 106/2 37/18 42/6 43/7 43/8 37/18 42/6 43/7 43/8 116/21 148/2 224/3 147/5 158/5 193/14 102/22 102/23 111/7 116/10 119/24 122/11 126/11 48/10 48/20 55/13 59/6 64/6 64/16 65/19 66/7 118/13 123/6 127/14 127/18 123/6 127/14 127/18 123/6 127/14 127/18 123/6 127/14 127/18 123/					
32/20 3/21 39/13 18/10 118/10 118/10 13/21/3 57/15 60/14 60/24 12/26 39/17 39/24 70/18 145/25 148/14 151/2 66/5 66/23 67/13 66/5 66/23 67/13 13/10 13/11 13/11 13/11 13/11 13/11 13/11 13/11 13/11 13/11 13/11 13/11 13/11 13/11 13/11 13/11 13/11 13/11 13/11 13/11 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>					
39/17 39/24 70/18 Image: Constraint of the system of					
Inits 67/8 90/12 96/22 158/8 164/6 164/21 191/1 192/23 193/12 194/4 194/8 207/2 231/8 lawful [1] 102/20 lawyer [7] 110/5 116/21 148/2 224/3 237/4 237/6 237/8 lawyers [13] 9/10 12/2 13/2 194/4 194/8 207/2 231/8 100/20 12/20 13/2 194/4 194/8 207/2 231/8 13/2 194/4 194/8 207/2 231/8 14/21 102/20 12/20 13/2 11/2 116/21 148/2 224/3 237/4 237/6 237/8 13/9/10 165/2 170/25 147/5 158/5 193/14 139/10 165/2 170/25 230/15 242/17 139/10 165/2 170/25 140/23 108/2 122/17 122/18 128/16 129/11 134/7 138/3 138/6 139/10 165/2 170/25 147/5 158/5 193/14	39/17 39/24 70/18				Iying [1] 216/13
96/22 158/8 164/6 1655 [4] 30/0 112/3 20/1 76/10 77/23 78/8 164/21 191/1 192/23 166/8 214/20 limb [1] 79/11 76/10 77/23 78/8 193/12 194/4 194/8 166/8 214/20 limb [1] 79/11 76/10 77/23 78/8 207/2 231/8 lesser [1] 164/10 limited [24] 29/8 29/9 79/14 83/9 83/10 102/20 lesser [1] 164/10 limited [24] 29/8 29/9 89/13 91/17 92/22 made [43] 15/1 21/18 202/5 205/3 206/22 202/5 205/3 206/22 38/8 48/4 52/22 71/18 104/23 105/2 106/2 37/18 42/6 43/7 43/8 116/21 148/2 224/3 214/25 76/14 87/23 102/19 108/6 110/13 116/6 44/11 48/10 48/20 116/21 148/2 224/3 147/5 77/16 60/18 112/10 116/18 116/22 122/17 122/18 122/19 55/13 59/6 64/6 64/16 123/14 237/6 237/8 72/5 83/9 117/22 147/5 158/5 193/14 128/2 128/16 129/11 123/6 127/14 127/18 139/10 165/2 170/25 230/15 242/17 134/7 138/3 138/6 131/12 133/6 148/20	71/15 87/8 96/12				М
104/21 191/1 192/23 lesser [1] 164/10 limited [24] 29/8 29/9 79/14 83/9 83/10 made [43] 15/1 21/18 207/2 231/8 let [6] 62/16 135/2 29/11 33/6 33/6 33/11 89/13 91/17 92/22 28/24 31/8 35/14 37/5 lawful [1] 102/20 202/5 205/3 206/22 38/8 48/4 52/22 71/18 104/23 105/2 106/2 37/18 42/6 43/7 43/8 lawyer [7] 110/5 116/21 148/2 224/3 214/25 76/14 87/23 102/19 108/6 110/13 116/6 44/11 48/10 48/20 237/4 237/6 237/8 let's [19] 15/19 18/17 102/22 102/23 111/7 116/10 119/24 122/11 55/13 59/6 64/6 64/16 awyers [13] 9/10 72/5 83/9 117/22 147/5 158/5 193/14 128/2 128/16 129/11 123/6 127/14 127/18 139/10 165/2 170/25 230/15 242/17 134/7 138/3 138/6 131/12 133/6 148/20					
193/12 194/4 194/6 194/4 194/6 207/2 231/8 1et [6] 62/16 135/2 29/11 33/6 33/6 33/11 89/13 91/17 92/22 28/24 31/8 35/14 37/5 1awful [1] 102/20 202/5 205/3 206/22 28/8 48/4 52/22 71/18 104/23 105/2 106/2 37/18 42/6 43/7 43/8 1awyer [7] 110/5 116/21 148/2 224/3 214/25 76/14 87/23 102/19 108/6 110/13 116/6 44/11 48/10 48/20 237/4 237/6 237/8 147/2 47/7 57/16 60/18 112/10 116/18 116/22 122/17 122/18 122/19 55/13 59/6 64/6 64/16 1awyers [13] 9/10 72/5 83/9 117/22 147/5 158/5 193/14 128/2 128/16 129/11 123/6 127/14 127/18 139/10 165/2 170/25 230/15 242/17 134/7 138/3 138/6 131/12 133/6 148/20					
201/2 231/8 202/5 205/3 206/22 38/8 48/4 52/22 71/18 104/23 105/2 106/2 37/18 42/6 43/7 43/8 lawyer [7] 110/5 110/5 76/14 87/23 102/19 108/6 110/13 116/6 44/11 48/10 48/20 116/21 148/2 224/3 115/19 18/17 102/22 102/23 111/7 116/10 119/24 122/11 55/13 59/6 64/6 64/16 237/4 237/6 237/8 12/5 83/9 117/22 147/5 158/5 193/14 128/2 128/16 129/11 123/6 127/14 127/18 139/10 165/2 170/25 230/15 242/17 134/7 138/3 138/6 131/12 133/6 148/20					
Iawful [1] 102/20 Iawyer [7] 110/5 116/21 14/25 116/21 14/25 237/4 237/6 237/4 237/6 237/4 237/6 214/25 76/14 87/2 102/22 102/22 102/23 116/21 14/25 116/21 14/25 147/2 47/7 57/16 60/18 112/10 116/18 112/10 116/18 112/10 116/18 122/17 122/17 128/2 128/16 128/2 128/16 128/2 128/16 128/2 128/16 128/2 128/16 128/2 128/16 128/3 138/6 131/12 133/6 148/20					
lawyer [7] 110/5 116/21 148/2 224/3 237/4 237/6 237/8 lawyers [13] 9/10	lawful [1] 102/20				
116/21 148/2 224/3 47/2 47/7 57/16 60/18 112/10 116/18 116/22 122/17 122/18 122/19 65/19 66/7 118/13 237/4 237/6 237/8 47/2 47/7 57/16 60/18 112/10 116/18 116/22 122/17 122/18 122/19 123/6 127/14 127/18 lawyers [13] 9/10 165/2 170/25 230/15 242/17 134/7 138/3 138/6 131/12 133/6 148/20	lawyer [7] 110/5				
237/4 237/6 237/8 72/5 83/9 117/22 147/5 158/5 193/14 128/2 128/16 129/11 123/6 127/14 127/18 Iawyers [13] 9/10 165/2 170/25 230/15 242/17 134/7 138/3 138/6 131/12 133/6 148/20					
Tawyers [13] 9/10 139/10 165/2 170/25 230/15 242/17 134/7 138/3 138/6 131/12 133/6 148/20					
	lawyers [13] 9/10				
					(00) Im and a days

(83) knowledge... - made

М	213/10 243/24	49/25 52/6 52/14 55/9	232/18 232/22 237/9	members [4] 68/9
	March [1] 1/14	58/12 58/15 59/10	240/9 241/5 242/9	123/4 192/13 203/17
made [17] 150/21 152/10 153/13 153/18	marked [1] 102/2	64/11 65/2 80/2 96/16		memory [3] 95/12
	marks [1] 93/23	96/17 97/2 105/6	22/6 24/22 36/9 39/17	95/23 177/4
154/9 155/21 177/5	marshal [1] 41/1	108/19 109/8 111/3	49/20 54/17 65/20	mention [15] 3/18
184/21 184/25 185/2	Martin [68] 6/9 6/14	112/4 113/1 118/2	69/16 69/24 73/1	17/15 31/12 42/23
186/5 203/11 205/5	7/3 7/8 7/17 7/19 7/21	119/25 120/12 120/25	81/20 81/25 88/9	60/1 85/25 86/2
212/21 216/22 236/25 240/16	8/10 10/3 14/22 15/24	125/12 132/3 141/3	103/24 110/3 115/15	112/21 169/25 170/20
	16/12 18/2 18/8 18/25	141/14 141/17 142/3	118/11 118/12 118/24	170/22 171/13 173/4
magazine [1] 123/20	20/13 24/6 24/7 25/4	142/6 143/21 144/24	131/1 135/20 160/1	242/24 243/4
Magistrates' [2] 4/3 184/17	26/22 27/20 31/14	146/9 147/8 147/15	167/8 172/12 184/10	mentioned [7] 40/13
	32/19 34/23 39/14	147/25 148/11 151/23	189/19 227/10 242/4	86/12 89/20 89/21
Mail [8] 3/4 3/13 3/15 3/25 61/17 80/15	44/22 49/12 49/14	151/23 156/13 157/9	meaningful [1]	123/13 125/24 193/7
84/18 131/13	51/18 53/8 53/10	157/16 158/20 158/23	131/11	merited [1] 119/2
main [5] 6/16 6/18	53/13 53/16 56/2	163/1 167/4 170/9	means [2] 121/13	Merthyr [3] 50/6
42/17 108/14 200/4	70/15 75/4 77/8 93/15	174/9 174/21 175/21	213/12	51/12 57/3
mainly [1] 163/1	93/18 93/21 93/24	177/4 182/6 182/6	meant [7] 11/8 70/20	message [6] 107/17
	94/5 100/18 101/12	199/15 210/19 223/4	105/19 106/17 107/19	
maintain [2] 6/24 55/14	101/14 101/23 103/22	233/21 240/12	137/11 156/16	108/4 148/9
	107/2 107/8 108/6	May 2024 [1] 1/1	measured [2] 86/17	messages [1] 16/8
maintenance [1] 80/18	108/8 114/5 114/6	maybe [5] 53/7	86/18	met [6] 45/9 45/11
major [1] 155/22	114/23 117/10 127/19	129/20 136/20 180/25	mechanism [2] 17/1	45/12 45/19 46/1 46/3
majority [1] 132/9	127/23 135/12 145/2	208/9	48/7	method [1] 159/10
make [37] 4/13 9/23		McLachlan [2] 126/3	media [2] 78/4	mid [5] 47/1 88/17
12/16 42/9 42/14	195/15 196/11 219/18	130/21	154/15	114/4 114/14 165/1
42/21 44/1 44/6 44/7	221/22 240/8 240/22	me [132] 1/3 1/15	mediate [8] 143/1	mid-2013 [2] 114/4
44/15 58/17 63/5 63/8	Martin's [3] 6/25 8/16	5/15 5/24 8/21 9/9	146/4 147/2 149/15	114/14
63/25 69/23 86/19	103/19	9/10 9/20 10/3 10/4	150/14 152/25 155/5	mid-afternoon [1]
98/8 125/3 132/4	massive [1] 187/8	16/2 16/14 16/16	210/13	165/1
166/4 166/4 168/9	mast [1] 106/23		mediated [1] 157/22	mid-morning [1]
169/4 169/10 169/13	master [1] 77/13		mediating [11] 140/9	88/17
169/21 170/3 180/4	material [42] 9/5 34/1	30/21 31/5 31/8 33/19		might [51] 9/5 15/15
180/9 184/18 197/12	34/2 48/10 76/18 77/3	36/18 37/2 37/11 38/7		
202/5 211/15 216/21	85/12 85/14 86/20	38/9 41/3 43/5 46/4	146/14 147/24 148/19	
219/5 230/9 236/18	92/15 93/4 96/11	46/18 47/14 51/1	159/22	50/8 50/17 59/21
maker [3] 117/8	96/24 99/13 111/2	53/16 61/10 62/12	mediation [21] 140/8	
118/4 120/8	112/24 113/17 126/2	62/25 65/23 68/13	140/21 141/11 142/13	
makers [1] 120/14	126/23 129/7 129/15		142/18 142/19 142/24	
makes [2] 45/13	132/3 133/5 142/3	77/24 78/17 79/13	143/8 144/17 146/24	111/9 111/10 112/3
185/3	142/7 142/20 143/13	82/10 82/10 82/11	148/9 149/6 151/15	117/21 121/12 133/3
making [7] 70/6	159/24 167/20 176/11	87/4 88/6 88/12 88/15		133/5 137/9 141/20
111/16 138/13 167/15	176/17 189/1 190/20	91/3 92/1 93/6 93/11	155/6 158/16 160/12	142/3 154/6 157/22
198/15 224/9 224/12	203/5 203/7 205/5	94/1 95/10 98/5	207/14 210/3	162/1 169/15 169/19
malfunction [1]	205/10 205/20 205/24	101/14 101/16 103/22		171/3 192/13 198/5
125/23	213/1 213/16 228/8	104/8 105/22 107/2	114/11 133/14 190/3	203/6 218/20 222/23
malicious [2] 201/6	materialised [1]	111/22 114/19 117/16		234/22 236/9 236/21
201/18	191/17	117/20 118/15 121/21		237/15 237/16 238/16
man [3] 73/13 74/17	materials [1] 85/20	126/16 127/2 127/8	46/14 49/22 104/23	238/17 238/18 238/25
183/25	matrix [1] 107/15	134/21 135/2 135/17	105/21 105/24 106/5	240/4
manifest [2] 148/1	matter [12] 40/5	151/7 153/4 159/20	106/19 106/21 107/16	
158/9	58/12 58/16 132/22	160/7 163/14 168/18	108/1 108/1 108/7	238/18
manifested [1]	166/22 169/23 169/24	169/7 169/8 169/19	109/6 109/13 110/2	migrated [1] 138/9
125/17	176/17 194/15 199/9	175/10 175/12 177/1	136/20 145/9 145/19	migration [2] 61/18
manifests [1] 33/12	222/12 235/21	177/5 178/4 183/16	146/10 150/17 190/12	
manner [2] 102/20	matters [11] 4/2	184/4 184/24 185/22	191/24 192/7 195/15	mildly [1] 165/25
235/23	97/11 132/9 156/14	193/17 194/5 195/2	195/20 196/13 196/19	
manufacturer [1]	174/6 181/20 189/7	195/10 201/22 201/23		million [1] 125/21
80/18	199/22 199/24 221/12	202/5 204/11 204/11	meetings [18] 11/14	mind [23] 5/3 11/4
manuscript [1] 223/4	239/17	205/3 206/8 207/4	12/9 12/15 90/10	46/24 65/2 94/4
many [13] 2/1 6/5	may [74] 1/1 3/17	208/18 208/23 209/12		111/20 133/25 146/6
56/13 69/14 80/15	6/18 8/2 8/9 9/25	211/12 212/1 213/4	105/5 105/17 106/11	165/20 181/17 198/2
80/20 83/13 83/16	10/11 23/14 28/11	215/3 217/21 219/2	107/3 107/10 107/22	220/19 225/23 225/24
152/17 157/13 165/3	30/2 30/11 33/5 34/7 34/12 34/18 46/3	226/17 226/18 226/23 230/21 232/12 232/15		
	34/12 34/10 40/3	230/21 232/12 232/15	130/21 190/0	230/16 230/24 230/24
				(84) made _ mind

(84) made ... - mind

Μ	misrepresentations	move [16] 48/17	224/13 224/22 225/1	125/7 125/14 125/22
	[1] 158/8	55/19 60/12 69/10	225/2 225/14 225/18	126/2 178/8 179/15
mind [3] 231/25	miss [1] 70/8	77/22 80/13 89/25	226/6 226/6 226/7	180/25 181/12 181/25
233/6 239/14	missed [2] 197/4	91/14 92/13 113/22	226/8 227/24 228/19	182/3 185/15 186/2
minded [1] 69/3	199/2	121/11 121/24 151/5	230/12 230/17 231/13	187/7 187/14 206/6
minds [1] 198/2	misses [1] 156/15	189/22 212/25 214/25	231/18 232/1 232/7	219/14 219/20 219/22
mine [2] 21/8 28/5	missing [3] 13/19	moved [1] 106/7	232/19 233/17 233/21	223/17 224/1 224/7
minimal [1] 142/10	15/8 15/8	moving [4] 60/23	234/21 235/15 237/23	224/13 224/22 226/8
minimisation [1]	missing' [1] 13/19	63/16 70/9 140/11	238/4 238/7 238/10	230/17 232/1 232/19
110/10	mistake [7] 59/2	MPs [2] 21/3 36/17	238/13 239/15 239/17	233/21 234/21 235/15
minimise [1] 86/23	170/10 101/10 101/01	Mr [225] 1/6 1/8 1/11	240/6 240/16 240/17	237/23 238/4 238/7
minimised [3] 109/14	185/3 212/22 216/22	2/1 2/13 2/14 2/16 6/4	240/18 241/1 241/11	238/10 238/13 239/17
109/15 110/3	mistaken [2] 162/18	6/4 8/5 9/17 18/20	241/12 241/16 241/20	240/6 240/17 241/1
minister [1] 187/4	170/24	19/7 19/15 20/7 20/9	241/25 242/1 242/5	241/12 241/20 241/25
minute [6] 47/8 89/5 95/19 110/2 165/18	mistakes [3] 64/7	20/10 24/15 28/15	242/10 242/24 243/5	242/5 242/24 243/5
219/4	138/13 216/21	42/22 44/20 44/22	243/8 243/11 243/20	243/8
minuted [2] 95/1 95/4	mitigated [1] 142/12	44/25 45/22 47/9	243/22 244/7 245/4	Mr Jenkins' [6] 181/2
minutes [16] 47/9	Mm [1] 58/23	47/17 49/6 60/13 65/3	245/6 245/8 245/14	227/24 228/19 230/12
90/16 90/18 91/13	Mm-hm [1] 58/23	66/1 71/2 77/24 81/8	Mr 'Jennings' [1]	231/18 241/16
93/7 93/10 94/15 99/2	mobile [1] 26/23	82/19 89/5 89/19 91/7	179/5	Mr Moloney [7] 44/20
109/23 165/14 166/8	mock [1] 17/24	91/9 91/15 92/2 94/6	Mr Altman [23] 65/3	44/22 44/25 165/8
218/19 218/23 240/10	Moloney [7] 44/20	94/21 94/23 95/6 95/7	109/8 109/16 118/19	166/16 166/18 245/6
240/13 240/13	44/22 44/25 165/8	95/8 95/11 95/12	118/22 182/17 182/23	Mr Parsons [4] 49/6
mirrors [1] 117/2	166/16 166/18 245/6	101/4 101/5 102/14	183/4 183/18 183/23	95/6 150/24 151/13
misconceived [2]	moment [8] 1/15	109/8 109/16 118/19	184/7 188/19 189/10	Mr Singh [6] 92/2
157/25 159/12	26/6 88/17 126/25	118/22 120/1 121/24	203/20 204/25 206/4	94/6 154/1 208/12
misconduct [3]	165/1 178/2 185/9	124/16 125/1 125/7	206/14 209/2 209/8	242/1 242/10
185/7 236/22 238/4	234/6	125/14 125/22 126/2	209/15 210/11 211/19	
misconducted [1]	Monday [3] 20/22	136/11 145/17 150/24		2/16 6/4 6/4 8/5 9/17
70/23	30/4 71/19	151/1 151/13 154/1	Mr Altman's [2]	18/20 19/7 20/9 71/2
mislead [2] 36/2	money [7] 13/19 15/8	165/8 165/8 165/8	120/1 125/1	77/24 91/7 91/9 91/15
188/1	21/19 22/1 68/8	165/23 166/16 166/18		94/21 94/23 95/7 95/8
misleading [1]	138/12 192/13	166/19 166/20 166/21	231/13	95/11 95/12 145/17
216/13	month [1] 116/11	167/9 170/25 172/14	Mr Atkinson's [1]	166/19 177/18 180/8
misled [12] 73/16	months [1] 61/15	177/5 177/18 177/22	233/17	188/19 210/6 218/2
135/15 135/23 136/5	months' [1] 122/16	177/23 177/24 178/8	MR BLAKE [13] 1/8	220/13 220/24 221/14
178/9 179/16 184/18	more [52] 7/17 8/17	179/5 179/15 180/8	45/22 47/9 60/13 89/5	223/6 223/10 223/15
188/2 188/7 188/9	12/25 23/9 24/23	180/25 181/2 181/12	136/11 177/22 214/2	223/23 224/12 225/1
188/11 216/10	25/23 31/1 31/8 33/15	181/20 181/25 182/3	214/11 218/18 243/20	
Misra [47] 75/25	38/24 51/17 53/20	182/17 182/23 183/4	244/7 245/4	239/15 240/16 240/18
122/12 122/23 123/3	54/18 54/25 55/6	183/18 183/23 184/7	Mr Bowyer [3] 2/13	241/11 243/11
123/17 126/12 126/16	60/15 69/18 69/21	184/10 185/15 186/2 187/7 187/14 188/19	220/24 221/13	Mr Smith's [1] 19/15
127/5 127/18 128/17	71/1 71/18 78/6 86/17		Mr Brian [1] 203/18	Mr Stein [4] 165/8
129/6 129/16 132/14	86/18 89/17 113/5 113/6 118/21 119/23	188/19 189/10 189/16 190/1 193/4 199/12	101/5 102/14	202/16 216/21 218/5 Mr Williams [4]
134/11 135/18 135/24	119/25 120/2 120/14	199/13 199/14 200/13		223/16 225/2 225/18
136/15 137/2 137/10	130/19 130/25 133/20			226/6
137/21 200/4 200/5	133/24 141/10 142/17		66/1 89/19 121/24	Mrs [27] 122/23
203/2 203/12 204/10	146/19 149/13 150/8	203/20 204/6 204/16	165/23 166/20 166/21	123/3 123/17 127/18
204/22 204/23 205/4	165/10 167/18 167/19		167/9 170/25 177/5	131/22 132/12 132/14
205/6 205/13 205/23	181/17 181/19 182/18		177/24 184/10 189/16	132/25 133/16 138/7
206/6 206/24 208/6	200/1 212/23 218/11	207/15 208/12 209/2	190/1 193/4 199/12	200/5 203/2 203/12
208/12 208/24 209/19	220/20 221/7 231/6	209/8 209/15 210/6	201/12 201/16 201/20	204/10 204/22 204/23
209/21 210/2 210/13	morning [12] 1/3 1/5	210/11 211/8 211/19	204/16 205/5 205/19	205/6 205/13 205/23
212/13 213/2 213/21	17/1 17/1 88/17 03/3	212/9 214/2 214/11	211/8 215/14 218/23	206/6 206/24 210/13
213/24 215/12 215/15	110/25 140/3 221/20	215/14 216/21 218/2	219/5 219/13 232/7	212/7 213/2 213/21
217/16	222/14 224/22 242/3	218/5 218/9 218/14	243/22	213/24 214/6
Misra's [15] 65/5	most [16] 6/12 25/24	218/18 218/23 219/5	Mr Gareth [1] 204/6	Mrs Hutchings' [1]
130/17 131/22 132/12	26/3 31/11 31/12 31/3		Mr Henry [7] 165/8	138/7
132/25 133/16 137/18	41/15 45/6 63/9 65/11	219/22 220/13 220/24	199/13 199/14 202/6	Mrs Misra [20]
208/15 209/10 210/21	106/11 132/13 141/15	220/24 221/13 221/14	207/15 212/9 218/14	122/23 123/3 123/17
210/22 212/7 214/6	163/16 170/7 192/23	223/6 223/10 223/15	Mr Jenkins [53] 20/7	127/18 132/14 200/5
215/1 215/5 Mierze [1] 210/12	motive [2] 212/15	223/16 223/17 223/23		203/2 203/12 204/10
Misras [1] 210/12	212/15	224/1 224/7 224/12	81/8 82/19 124/16	204/22 204/23 205/6
				(95) mind Mro Mioro

(85) mind... - Mrs Misra

Μ	82/15 84/3 84/25 85/1	50/24 72/18 98/8	72/24 73/21 74/17	noise [2] 3/12 3/24
Mrs Misra [8]	87/20 89/5 90/8 93/16	105/14 110/20 110/21	74/22 75/20 76/4 76/9	non [6] 37/23 108/24
205/13 205/23 206/6	93/17 94/4 95/23 98/3		77/20 83/3 84/6 85/4	109/10 109/17 126/8
206/24 210/13 213/2	98/6 98/11 99/13	229/13	86/13 86/22 87/14	142/10
213/21 213/24	100/3 101/1 101/12	necessity [1] 167/25	88/2 91/25 92/4 96/15	
Mrs Misra's [6]	105/24 106/5 106/23	need [24] 11/5 14/25	96/15 96/15 99/8	37/23 126/8
131/22 132/12 132/25	109/19 109/21 111/20 114/17 114/18 118/16	19/9 35/2 41/3 48/5 56/11 88/22 89/4	99/19 102/5 102/16 103/3 104/8 106/1	non-existent [1] 142/10
133/16 212/7 214/6	120/24 127/20 128/2	92/19 108/19 114/20	106/16 109/7 109/15	non-identified [2]
Ms [26] 65/5 130/17	128/3 128/3 128/3	129/15 137/9 146/9	109/22 112/11 112/16	108/24 109/10
139/21 165/4 165/5	120/9 120/16 122/4	163/25 171/8 174/12	112/22 115/23 115/23	non-individuals [1]
165/10 189/17 189/18	133/25 134/2 135/5	180/25 191/8 200/21	115/25 116/3 117/20	109/17
189/21 189/22 189/24 193/3 196/17 199/14	135/14 135/25 136/3	227/3 232/22 235/5	118/9 118/15 124/4	none [8] 10/12 60/7
199/17 199/19 199/23	140/6 140/6 142/24	needed [4] 26/17	124/5 124/14 125/22	141/3 157/19 161/6
200/4 208/11 212/13	144/7 144/11 145/11	106/8 110/23 182/13	126/8 128/8 128/8	193/15 229/7 229/12
218/17 219/11 219/12	149/4 149/13 149/13	needs [4] 108/15	128/9 130/6 131/11	nor [3] 133/14 138/12
245/10 245/12 245/16	149/19 151/24 153/19			
Ms Allan [2] 165/5	155/5 155/7 155/10	neither [6] 96/17 133/13 133/15 175/13	135/7 136/19 138/12	normally [1] 184/19
189/18	162/3 163/12 164/10 164/24 165/24 168/18		139/5 141/1 141/24 146/25 149/11 149/13	northern [1] 196/14
Ms Hutchings [1]	171/17 171/18 176/14		149/13 150/8 150/21	not [359] not' [1] 95/4
139/21	177/4 177/5 180/5	neutralised [1] 33/10		note [28] 28/2 28/4
Ms Misra [2] 200/4	182/14 183/5 183/11	neutrally [1] 183/21	152/18 153/10 153/15	
212/13	183/12 187/25 188/8	never [24] 5/22 13/3	153/23 153/25 154/1	102/24 105/25 106/5
Ms Misra's [2] 65/5 130/17	188/12 189/4 189/5	24/23 38/17 46/1	156/14 156/14 160/8	109/12 145/13 160/21
Ms Oliver [7] 165/10	189/14 193/17 194/11	117/16 124/12 127/8	160/8 161/9 162/3	160/23 160/24 170/1
199/14 199/17 199/19	194/17 195/3 195/4	135/1 145/24 148/10	162/9 162/14 164/1	191/24 192/6 195/14
199/23 218/17 219/12	198/2 198/5 199/16	172/14 174/16 182/24		210/5 210/6 210/8
Ms Talbot [1] 208/11	203/13 203/14 206/15			210/18 223/4 223/9
Ms Watt [4] 165/4	206/19 208/23 212/22		170/20 170/22 171/13	227/25 228/3 228/7
189/17 189/21 196/17	216/2 217/9 218/18 220/19 225/12 225/23	226/9 234/16 234/18 238/4	173/3 173/20 174/12 182/10 182/16 186/10	228/12 241/22
much [33] 1/5 1/23	226/16 226/25 227/18		187/5 188/1 188/3	notes [7] 107/25
11/21 20/12 36/14	228/21 229/15 229/15		188/23 189/14 189/21	145/5 145/7 206/3
39/13 42/24 47/10		new [17] 22/18 46/21	190/10 190/19 191/10	
51/6 57/9 57/16 59/25	232/10 235/8 236/5	63/11 78/25 79/11	193/1 193/16 193/17	notetaker [1] 108/9
61/10 69/18 74/11 86/19 88/14 90/24	243/15 243/16 243/17	81/15 98/16 115/17	195/3 197/6 197/8	nothing [16] 13/18
99/21 120/7 121/14	244/6	121/11 141/4 153/13	197/18 199/4 199/8	14/19 15/4 15/7 16/9
124/24 160/10 166/5	myself [6] 5/22 44/19	191/14 191/14 191/19		
166/9 166/12 167/20	95/14 129/18 129/22	191/20 209/12 214/4	207/2 207/6 209/6	157/5 170/12 172/3
182/18 202/14 233/19	129/23	news [3] 38/22 70/17	209/6 211/5 213/4	176/19 202/19 207/1 210/8
238/16 238/16 239/6	myth [1] 91/17	70/21 next [10] 21/3 22/10	213/10 214/22 215/4 215/10 216/16 216/17	notice [6] 18/1 35/9
must [18] 13/23	N	58/24 97/10 177/22	218/4 218/12 218/21	62/7 71/22 167/2
16/12 28/25 54/2	nail [1] 106/23	189/17 199/13 202/8	219/1 220/2 220/16	228/24
78/25 79/12 107/17	name [5] 1/9 28/6	202/9 225/12	221/4 221/8 221/8	notified [1] 205/23
107/20 108/5 111/11 114/22 130/8 203/7	31/2 54/8 128/2	nexus [1] 235/25	222/8 225/21 226/4	notifying [2] 50/18
203/11 206/10 209/5	named [4] 31/18	NFSP [1] 165/4	226/11 226/16 226/25	59/20
213/6 240/3	91/22 145/25 184/4	nine [2] 61/9 218/20	227/3 227/17 228/6	Nottingham [3] 74/5
mustn't [1] 79/12	names [2] 31/2 77/17		228/11 228/14 228/23	
mute [1] 88/19	naming [1] 31/7	6/7 7/16 8/9 8/12 8/24		
my [156] 3/8 3/19	narrative [3] 128/3 232/12 232/15	10/6 10/21 10/22	229/19 229/24 230/1	76/13 77/3 158/23
4/10 4/16 4/25 5/3	narrow [1] 139/25	10/23 10/24 11/7 11/25 12/4 17/21 19/3	230/21 231/1 232/23 237/8 239/8 239/9	November [2] 116/7 116/12
7/10 7/20 10/11 12/4	national [6] 34/4	19/4 19/6 19/16 23/14		now [98] 12/18 13/14
14/24 16/18 18/4 18/6	41/16 169/23 169/24	23/18 24/23 27/9	241/3 241/4 241/9	13/25 15/4 15/14 25/2
18/11 18/14 19/9	170/8 190/1		241/18 241/21 241/22	27/21 30/23 32/11
19/18 19/24 26/21 36/25 38/6 38/14 41/7	nature [3] 27/13	33/15 34/18 35/11	242/7 243/7 243/11	41/22 42/8 47/4 51/20
41/8 52/21 53/14	69/19 92/3	35/13 36/8 36/16	243/15	57/2 59/19 60/12
56/21 62/12 62/21	naught [2] 163/21	39/14 39/25 41/24	no' [1] 146/3	60/25 62/5 62/22 66/5
62/22 65/8 66/2 69/6	163/22 necessarily [3] 14/14	45/18 46/3 47/3 49/23		67/16 69/10 69/12
72/24 73/13 73/16	87/18 157/11	50/10 58/3 62/25 63/15 64/4 64/5 66/2	183/25 194/6 nodding [2] 185/21	72/3 76/25 77/3 77/13 79/21 83/3 84/25 85/1
76/4 77/9 77/12 79/24	necessary [11] 26/13		185/22	87/15 88/11 88/23
				(86) Mrs Misra - now

(86) Mrs Misra... - now

N	217/12	107/14 115/6 155/25	112/14 112/24 113/9	other [64] 3/5 6/15
now [64] 89/5	occasionally [7] 5/24	168/11 177/15 182/14	113/18 124/14 138/9	8/1 8/24 9/9 10/13
89/25 93/12 98/25	6/11 6/15 7/16 7/17	183/20 188/9 189/23	138/10 213/22 213/24	11/18 12/8 12/17
99/24 100/9 101/16	115/7 136/19	193/24 205/7 208/2	213/25 214/17 214/20	12/22 17/2 24/11
105/7 105/13 106/4	occasions [2] 130/5	220/7 233/18 239/25	only [36] 3/2 4/25	25/15 29/17 30/7
106/25 108/6 110/13	134/18	240/3 243/1 243/15	19/25 27/18 28/10	30/24 31/20 33/10
111/15 112/7 121/24	occur [3] 34/3 117/20		38/11 38/23 39/19	33/15 34/18 34/18
123/7 124/17 126/5	189/13	22/11 22/23 24/4	47/8 52/20 59/12 61/9	39/2 40/4 40/21 46/5
130/7 130/8 130/9	occurred [7] 18/4	24/16 49/10 92/21	62/8 64/18 86/7 101/5	50/25 52/12 54/23
132/13 133/5 133/10	18/5 114/19 127/8	127/1 166/2 167/7	102/3 102/9 110/16	55/18 59/20 60/2 66/7
134/4 135/5 135/6	133/7 140/9 188/21	167/11 169/24 178/5 178/18 178/21 179/1	126/4 127/4 127/9 129/9 129/19 129/21	66/23 71/25 75/6 77/17 85/12 85/20
137/8 137/24 139/3	occurrence [1] 58/25 occurring [2] 139/21	179/12 180/21 182/8	142/12 158/18 165/13	86/2 103/3 116/23
140/8 140/11 144/5	142/11	182/17 183/16 184/10		119/16 125/23 133/17
144/7 144/24 160/5	occurs [1] 170/8	185/14 185/24 186/14		138/3 138/18 138/19
165/11 167/20 169/24	October [4] 116/13	186/25 187/18 188/15		149/24 172/4 174/6
173/15 178/23 179/1	123/18 133/7 152/7	195/22 196/1 199/12	onto [4] 11/6 13/9	174/9 175/21 176/20
183/22 183/23 184/15	odd [1] 87/4	214/11 219/15 221/23		183/9 184/13 185/18
185/14 186/5 186/8	off [22] 7/8 15/20	old [7] 22/18 63/19	onwards [6] 8/15	186/21 187/3 187/21
187/11 190/12 198/10 199/20 205/3 205/25	23/19 23/20 47/17	65/1 100/1 214/3	124/3 131/21 140/24	188/19 196/13 207/2
206/2 208/18 209/8	51/15 75/13 95/10	214/12 214/17	198/9 198/22	210/12 231/18
218/16 219/24 226/14	108/18 127/1 127/3	old-fashioned [1]	Ooh [1] 27/6	others [8] 61/18 94/9
227/15 230/20 233/15	127/11 127/24 128/7	100/1	open [14] 21/13 48/5	104/6 105/1 121/7
NSPCC [1] 121/5	128/10 139/15 139/23		48/8 48/12 51/13	149/11 157/10 165/21
nuanced [1] 237/22	141/11 142/1 156/21	199/14 199/17 199/19		otherwise [6] 9/13
number [38] 3/25	184/10 226/19	199/23 218/17 219/11 219/12 245/16	102/20 106/15 120/13 147/3 154/13 212/11	52/4 69/6 106/16
7/20 21/24 29/9 30/10	offence [9] 10/23 122/15 139/14 141/25			141/13 238/16 ought [47] 12/6 26/22
30/19 30/20 31/19	143/2 147/1 156/10	once [9] 32/17 51/17	opening [1] 181/1 operate [1] 169/16	39/6 69/9 75/24 76/5
32/7 42/12 45/22	162/22 164/10	54/14 56/9 62/6 71/19		77/14 82/24 85/12
57/21 58/6 58/8 61/15	offences [7] 64/7	157/16 165/25 166/9	74/1 224/20	99/15 99/19 100/25
65/571/2574/276/25	140/2 142/23 149/5	one [74] 3/5 3/18 4/5	operates [2] 24/13	102/11 115/24 118/8
77/13 80/6 93/8	151/22 155/6 164/13	5/12 12/14 12/19	242/20	119/1 119/2 120/25
129/14 134/17 147/4 149/24 153/6 153/15	offend [1] 212/1	22/14 32/2 32/4 32/8	operating [2] 143/15	124/24 127/14 133/5
153/21 158/6 161/3	offender [1] 156/13	33/9 37/9 43/4 49/17	187/1	142/23 153/20 155/6
174/20 175/3 179/6	Offenders [1] 146/24	52/10 53/20 53/21	operation [1] 80/22	163/7 179/9 183/10
195/14 199/17 199/23	offensive [2] 210/16	55/23 57/4 57/6 57/9	operations [1]	188/13 188/13 189/1
229/2	211/24	58/6 60/15 65/14	138/13	192/2 192/3 192/5
number 2 [3] 153/6	offer [4] 130/19	68/10 71/4 75/12	opinion [6] 41/8 81/3	198/1 203/2 205/24
153/15 153/21	130/25 148/13 218/9 offered [2] 150/22	78/13 98/12 99/14	83/23 84/9 171/18 176/25	206/16 225/8 225/8 235/20 235/20 236/14
numbers [1] 69/13	216/23		opportunity [1] 199/2	
0	office [296]	115/23 121/1 121/6	opposed [6] 142/22	238/21 240/9
	Office's [13] 45/3	124/17 124/23 134/5	144/16 157/12 164/21	our [32] 4/16 4/21
objected [1] 175/9 objective [7] 41/20	92/11 114/6 114/15	136/20 138/1 138/3	196/20 212/16	4/23 35/7 36/3 36/16
41/21 44/14 44/15	159/22 175/17 176/5	147/9 148/10 149/14	opposite [1] 230/25	41/20 50/14 50/16
172/1 172/2 191/24	194/1 196/20 196/20	154/5 154/7 155/2	opposition [2]	54/6 54/16 56/4 56/6
obligation [3] 202/17	208/1 222/2 224/18	155/20 157/9 163/1	144/12 149/4	56/15 58/14 64/15
231/11 238/19	officer [4] 34/19	164/10 165/13 169/8	or [253]	71/14 88/17 112/4
obligations [3] 97/2	97/14 192/22 192/23	175/5 177/11 178/25	oral [4] 80/25 83/19	121/12 124/23 138/13
193/11 224/19	officer/employee [1]	179/9 183/9 186/19	193/6 232/13	146/25 148/10 148/16
obliquely [1] 172/10	97/14	189/21 200/1 209/9	orally [3] 27/7 75/25	149/17 157/25 163/3
observe [1] 120/6	officers [1] 34/5	213/5 215/2 215/6 217/12 218/16 230/25	182/5 ordor [10] 32/21	163/5 165/1 172/1 184/15
observed [1] 107/15	offices [9] 22/13 30/10 30/20 31/18	243/5 243/16	37/23 38/11 86/23	ourselves [1] 201/12
obtain [5] 4/6 114/5	32/4 45/3 50/25 74/2	ones [1] 217/17	97/1 128/19 139/11	out [78] 5/9 12/5
114/23 141/2 210/3	174/20	ongoing [6] 48/18	157/21 176/15 189/2	13/22 14/8 14/12
obtained [2] 32/10	often [3] 7/19 34/3	48/19 114/17 131/13	orders [1] 37/18	14/25 19/19 21/19
121/3	170/8	185/25 197/15	organisation [3] 16/4	22/1 25/14 33/16
obvious [5] 33/19 70/25 78/4 235/22	oh [34] 16/24 16/24	online [25] 22/22	16/7 163/16	43/11 44/14 61/6
240/1	20/21 31/11 40/16	61/18 61/23 63/11	original [4] 62/3 79/7	63/12 66/7 68/2 68/22
obviously [5] 170/5	40/16 45/1 47/8 59/18		141/19 147/17	69/5 69/24 71/14
183/21 206/12 214/17	63/21 64/3 90/2 91/10		originally [1] 141/15	74/13 81/12 83/9
	101/22 104/20 106/6	112/4 112/8 112/10	origins [1] 168/4	83/25 85/17 85/18
L				(

(87) now... - out

0	33/20 34/21 38/1	38/25 39/8 40/1 40/19	paragraph 24 [7]	132/19 156/17 156/23
	40/18 48/21 49/8	41/5 42/23 42/24 43/4		
out [51] 87/25 98/2	49/11 50/12 50/22	43/19 44/13 44/14	44/13 44/14 171/15	Parliament [14] 30/3
98/22 100/21 108/3 108/4 110/19 111/4	55/20 56/2 56/3 57/9	45/22 50/12 57/18	paragraph 26 [2]	32/19 35/3 36/22 38/5
112/14 112/24 113/19	57/10 61/11 76/7	58/24 59/10 60/15	89/21 125/10	38/13 42/11 42/13
114/11 115/5 115/20	76/11 84/14 85/6 85/6	61/5 62/13 62/16	paragraph 29 [2]	42/14 43/12 168/19
116/2 116/3 116/15	86/24 92/22 96/10	63/20 76/8 79/16	128/25 129/5	168/25 171/10 176/12
117/22 122/12 124/2	105/3 108/11 114/2	81/24 82/6 83/7 83/12		Parliamentary [25]
127/25 128/1 130/14	114/2 116/14 120/3	84/4 89/21 92/18	28/20	36/20 36/21 37/2
138/7 138/15 138/17	120/3 123/12 124/1	92/23 96/10 97/10	paragraph 30 [1]	41/22 42/10 42/23
145/8 146/19 146/21	125/10 130/13 131/9 131/10 131/20 137/18	97/10 97/12 102/18 105/2 107/11 109/25	242/12	43/6 43/19 168/1 168/8 168/13 168/17
148/17 149/11 150/12	137/19 138/6 138/6	110/7 111/6 111/25	paragraph 33 [1] 217/6	169/22 169/25 170/12
151/16 157/4 158/15	138/17 138/20 138/21	112/1 114/2 122/19	paragraph 34 [1]	170/14 170/21 170/24
163/9 169/18 170/6	140/23 144/25 145/1	122/19 122/21 123/8	11/1	171/13 172/3 172/4
174/8 174/23 175/21	150/3 158/1 158/2	123/15 124/3 124/3	paragraph 35 [1]	172/9 173/4 173/6
178/16 185/2 210/12 210/15 212/11 228/3	159/6 159/8 159/18	125/10 125/11 128/25		173/13
228/7 233/25 241/14	170/4 173/23 234/9	129/5 129/17 130/14	paragraph 36 [1]	parroting [1] 156/17
243/18	page 1 [5] 49/8 56/2	131/9 131/20 132/19	222/23	Parsons [14] 7/22
outcome [5] 47/25	120/3 120/3 159/18	132/21 140/23 150/13		48/23 49/6 71/11
148/3 151/23 159/11	page 11 [1] 137/18	151/8 151/16 151/17	233/24	
205/17	page 138 [1] 13/7	156/25 157/2 158/1 158/3 158/14 159/5	paragraph 38 [1]	109/11 145/3 145/17
outcomes [1] 58/20	page 14 [2] 76/7 76/11	158/3 158/14 159/5	234/3 paragraph 4 [2] 29/7	150/24 151/1 151/13 Parsons' [1] 97/20
outside [5] 104/5	nage 15 [2] 120/12	170/4 171/1 171/4	156/25	part [40] 19/3 23/1
117/18 117/21 148/16	138/21	172/25 173/1 173/4	paragraph 43 [1]	42/1 55/24 60/5 69/7
157/24	page 16 [1] 57/9	173/22 174/13 174/17	222/8	96/7 97/3 114/12
outweigh [1] 158/12 over [31] 5/17 10/23	page 19 [1] 131/20	175/1 179/2 197/10	paragraph 47 [2]	114/17 132/18 132/20
15/19 21/10 22/7	page 2 [6] 55/20	198/7 217/6 221/11	13/7 92/18	140/6 153/17 153/19
23/11 23/25 28/10	84/14 92/22 108/11	222/8 222/23 230/7	paragraph 5 [1]	155/7 164/20 169/21
30/13 33/20 34/21	138/6 138/6	230/11 232/8 233/24	92/23	184/11 195/2 195/2
37/25 40/18 55/4 59/8	page 23 [2] 114/2	234/2 234/3 234/8	paragraph 57 [1]	195/7 195/9 200/16
67/1 85/6 86/20	114/2	242/12	197/10	203/10 207/6 209/6
108/11 123/12 125/10	page 3 [4] 61/11 85/6 86/24 158/2	179/2	paragraph 6 [3] 174/13 174/17 175/1	211/5 213/1 215/10 216/2 218/1 220/4
138/17 153/12 158/1	page 4 [1] 150/3	paragraph 10 [2]	paragraph 67 [1]	222/20 229/23 230/17
165/20 172/10 184/14	page 47 [1] 13/10	97/10 123/15	114/2	236/4 237/6 239/16
204/1 208/24 216/5	page 5 [5] 48/21	paragraph 132 [1]	paragraph 68 [1]	240/6
221/17 overall [4] 37/10	96/10 138/20 140/23	63/20	131/20	partial [3] 56/5 56/7
55/15 56/4 56/15	159/8	paragraph 14 [10]	Paragraph 69 [1]	56/8
overcome [5] 105/13	page 6 [3] 33/20	33/20 33/24 36/9 37/4		partially [1] 123/3
106/4 107/1 107/1	116/14 170/4	37/9 170/4 171/4	paragraph 7 [4]	Participant [1] 193/4
107/5	page 69 [1] 1/16	172/25 173/1 173/4	122/19 150/13 151/16	
overheard [1] 101/14	page 8 [2] 124/1 234/9	paragraph 16 [1] 171/1	173/22 paragraph 8 [5] 33/3	90/10 160/16 164/25 participation [2]
overinfluenced [1]	pages [1] 59/8	paragraph 17 [2]	122/19 122/21 151/8	243/23 244/3
131/17	painted [1] 137/20	35/24 140/23	151/17	particular [20] 5/14
overly [3] 139/17	palatable [1] 100/4	paragraph 18 [2]	paragraph 87 [3]	8/22 10/1 11/25 12/17
139/25 155/18 oversight [3] 172/18	pandemonium [1]	37/14 172/21	230/7 230/11 232/8	32/2 57/25 62/23
194/9 229/23	210/23	Paragraph 19 [1]	paragraph 9 [3] 9/15	72/15 72/20 80/25
own [21] 2/13 3/7 3/8	pandering [2] 150/11	38/15	96/10 123/8	83/20 115/5 116/17
4/2 7/8 8/5 11/24 13/3	155/23	paragraph 194 [1]	paragraphs [8] 45/2	120/20 135/17 151/7
69/6 95/22 98/5 99/13	panic [1] 13/23	198/7	58/22 61/14 62/24	161/9 163/16 180/21
103/13 127/20 134/25	paper [2] 134/13 135/4	paragraph 2 [1] 28/8 paragraph 20 [2]	71/8 120/3 140/24 157/2	particularly [11] 15/16 39/10 51/9
134/25 220/17 222/1	papers [5] 128/9	39/8 124/3	paragraphs 43 [1]	82/17 87/6 93/15
224/18 236/9 239/4	134/25 158/6 195/23	Paragraph 21 [1]	45/2	119/4 148/19 152/13
owners [1] 108/21	205/2	40/1	paragraphs 5 [1]	157/11 184/15
Р	paragraph [120] 9/15	paragraph 22 [1]	120/3	parties [1] 59/13
pack [1] 218/1	9/21 9/24 11/1 13/7	234/8	parameters [1]	partly [2] 96/25 97/6
Packard [1] 30/14	13/10 28/8 28/20 29/7		239/10	partner [3] 2/23
page [61] 1/16 13/7	31/7 32/16 33/3 33/20		paraphrase [4] 9/7 139/9 168/24 206/16	101/14 219/18
13/10 23/11 30/13	33/24 35/24 36/9 37/4 37/9 37/14 38/15	paragraph 23 [2] 40/19 124/3	paraphrasing [3]	partners [1] 4/5 parts [2] 65/8 135/7
			Parapinasing [0]	
				(99) out porte

Р	157/8	plain [2] 78/19	158/9 179/14 179/20	POL00139866 [1]
party [4] 74/8 96/16	person [5] 16/16	232/17	181/3 181/6 187/20	108/7
101/24 220/10	27/18 34/18 209/25	plainly [3] 8/18 39/5	200/24 201/21 201/22	
pass [2] 52/25 53/13	215/15	157/25	206/14 207/8 211/4	18/18
passage [1] 13/5	personally [5] 69/3 99/3 129/12 198/8	plan [1] 165/2 played [2] 204/21	213/25 226/21 229/6 pointed [1] 206/15	POL00145145 [1] 48/20
passages [1] 20/15	242/24	204/22	pointing [1] 40/12	POL00145201 [1]
past [7] 35/5 76/3	persons [2] 93/8	playing [1] 177/4	points [6] 33/2 72/1	55/19
166/1 171/11 188/21	151/22	plea [6] 138/23	72/3 129/13 145/14	POL00148710 [1]
236/10 237/19 patch [2] 242/21	perspective [1]	138/23 140/13 158/20	154/9	144/23
243/9	70/18	164/8 164/9	POL [19] 83/13 83/18	
patent [1] 139/20	persuade [2] 192/5	pleaded [1] 29/3	109/1 109/20 109/21	146/18
path [3] 97/23 153/16	192/22	pleas [2] 139/19	116/6 147/14 171/24	POL00150390 [1]
155/2	persuaded [3] 36/12	139/20	171/25 171/25 179/6	156/2
Paul [1] 195/24	37/16 172/22	please [95] 1/9 13/7 15/21 19/10 20/17	179/9 179/11 193/12 195/13 198/9 198/22	POL00150493 [1] 159/17
Paula [1] 78/1	persuading [1] 197/11	21/15 23/11 26/24	201/18 222/9	POL00172804 [3]
paused [1] 190/23	pervert [1] 97/2	27/25 28/20 30/13	POL's [1] 150/19	27/25 166/25 234/8
pausing [9] 21/6 23/5	PF [2] 190/10 194/16	33/3 33/20 34/21	POL00002213 [1]	POL00191966 [1]
25/1 53/24 54/17 57/24 62/8 130/24	PF's [9] 192/5 192/8	40/18 48/20 48/21	57/8	71/10
132/15	193/24 195/21 195/24		POL00006357 [2]	POL00191967 [1]
paying [1] 139/18	195/24 196/12 197/18		73/18 194/23	72/2
payment [2] 148/20	197/19	57/16 59/8 60/22	POL00006365 [2]	POL00192214 [1]
210/1	phases [1] 131/14 phew [5] 137/8 137/9	60/23 61/11 62/12 62/16 63/1 70/9 71/10	60/24 178/1	86/24 POL00198595 [2]
pedantic [1] 207/8	137/13 217/10 217/12		104/23 109/24	137/16 217/6
pending [3] 162/16	phone [8] 7/14 14/9	73/18 76/12 77/23	POL00006797 [1]	POL00198766 [1]
211/6 211/16 penultimate [2]	14/21 18/17 33/1 66/5	78/8 78/10 79/14	102/13	202/3
102/18 158/1	104/9 240/19	84/14 85/6 85/7 86/24		POL00297182 [2]
people [32] 2/1 6/15	phoning [1] 32/24	92/23 96/10 102/13	92/13	53/2 53/6
11/12 11/18 12/7	photocopied [2]	104/23 109/24 110/14		POL00297607 [1]
12/16 13/2 21/19	115/8 115/11 phrase [5] 85/20	116/6 116/14 120/2 121/15 122/11 122/17	116/7 POI 00030003 [1]	70/10 POL00298236 [1]
32/15 42/13 65/4 69/6	113/11 210/15 220/20			101/3
100/25 102/11 107/9	232/2	137/5 137/15 138/6	POL00039994 [1]	POL00349361 [1]
108/5 108/15 109/3 112/18 128/20 139/11	phrased [2] 143/11	138/17 138/20 140/10		152/7
139/13 140/1 142/19	151/11		POL00039995 [1]	POL00349378 [1]
143/7 152/2 152/5	picked [1] 11/22	145/16 146/6 150/3	79/14	154/1
155/25 162/5 164/8	picking [2] 105/5	151/8 152/8 154/11	POL00039998 [1]	police [7] 34/4 34/19
167/9 184/13	107/12 picture [1] 137/20	156/2 156/7 158/1 159/17 160/17 170/4	78/8 POL00040190 [1]	50/8 50/18 238/8 238/10 238/14
people's [1] 12/21	piece [4] 82/2 98/1	170/25 172/21 173/22		police/Costcutter [1]
per [3] 18/3 55/10	101/21 110/19	174/6 174/17 203/15	POL00060715 [1]	50/18
145/21	piecemeal [2] 126/3	206/22 212/10 218/17		policy [33] 98/4 98/9
perfectly [4] 17/25 24/10 53/1 205/15	129/7	227/22 227/23 234/7	POL00066850 [1]	102/22 103/14 112/21
perhaps [25] 30/4	pieces [2] 5/10	236/20	134/8	113/23 114/6 114/9
43/20 44/18 53/9	143/22 DU [49] 24/15 25/1	pleased [1] 191/23	POL00066853 [1]	114/10 114/16 114/20
53/20 61/24 67/2	PII [18] 34/15 35/1 35/14 35/17 36/13	pm [9] 89/8 89/10 121/18 121/20 166/13	137/5 POI 00108223 [1]	115/13 115/14 115/17 116/5 116/9 117/9
69/20 83/9 85/1 88/17	38/3 40/13 41/7 44/15	166/15 219/8 219/10	122/11	118/19 118/25 119/1
102/17 106/3 107/25	48/7 155/19 171/6	244/9	POL00114253 [2]	119/8 119/18 119/19
114/1 121/14 122/25 147/19 151/6 164/25	171/17 172/23 173/3	point [58] 2/18 3/5	160/18 202/2	119/19 120/1 120/5
194/9 199/1 236/16	176/8 176/9 177/6	4/25 6/10 8/23 9/9	POL00125210 [1]	120/7 120/25 121/2
237/22 240/8	PIN [1] 21/24	17/23 20/14 24/7	119/25	121/4 121/8 122/7
period [5] 8/13 38/11	place [18] 14/16 18/24 35/9 39/1 48/7	24/11 27/4 27/8 27/15 37/9 37/10 44/1 44/7	POL00125222 [1] 140/10	122/9 polite [1] 120/18
48/4 89/2 162/20	62/7 67/8 76/3 93/2	46/14 47/2 63/3 64/8	POL00128993 [1]	politics [2] 12/24
permission [2] 141/2	98/10 99/2 143/5	70/5 71/5 73/14 75/12		13/2
152/15	143/5 144/13 192/5	75/17 75/20 81/7	POL00129740 [1]	poor [1] 23/22
permit [4] 41/12 150/18 157/22 171/21	199/5 206/20 217/21	84/20 90/23 93/1	57/2	port [1] 19/25
permitted [2] 37/21	placed [3] 130/22	99/11 103/15 106/16	POL00139745 [1]	portal [1] 28/11
154/14	205/10 217/20	114/4 114/19 129/11	91/7 POL 00139746 [1]	posed [1] 24/5
permitting [2] 152/12	placing [3] 76/19 82/4 141/12	129/24 147/20 148/17 156/15 157/4 158/2	91/14	position [28] 4/10 4/12 19/15 26/18
	~=/ 1 1 1/1/2			

(89) party - position

Ρ	3/24	25/5 25/6 93/7 97/11	220/9 238/6	proportionality [1]
position [24] 39/13	pre-trial [1] 131/13	98/24	process [34] 10/16	61/20
39/17 39/22 51/17	preamble [2] 111/4	previously [2] 25/19	17/1 41/1 52/22 61/10	
52/23 73/16 100/22	111/18	147/22	61/12 67/1 90/13	propose [2] 50/4
102/25 129/24 131/2	precedent [4] 147/11	primary [1] 198/19	105/15 114/17 130/9	159/8
141/5 151/3 169/9	148/7 157/10 208/15	principles [8] 9/4 9/8 116/15 120/6 120/10	130/17 131/12 134/18	proposed [3] 150/16 157/1 158/25
180/1 183/18 188/16	preceding [1] 84/4 precisely [4] 81/24	169/14 169/18 170/6	141/6 143/15 147/24	proposing [1] 197/19
194/7 194/11 201/10	132/5 184/22 238/13	prior [19] 10/11 18/4	150/16 150/16 157/25	proposition [17]
205/10 212/6 217/1	predecessor [1]	30/3 30/6 62/2 63/13	158/3 159/6 160/6	35/19 43/9 51/14 55/9
219/24 226/15	11/15	63/18 66/20 73/22	162/19 166/7 179/7	110/11 139/12 142/22
positive [5] 111/8 148/10 203/10 233/7	prefer [1] 146/2	74/8 74/13 84/18	179/11 193/7 194/18	143/3 144/1 149/7
233/14	pregnant [1] 202/19	117/8 122/25 142/14	235/12 240/2	151/20 192/10 204/12
possessed [1] 85/14	prejudiced [1] 72/20	151/13 173/17 241/4	processes [5] 57/22	211/24 221/9 226/11
possibility [6] 24/20	prelude [1] 101/10	241/9	81/4 83/23 235/2	237/11
69/15 85/8 147/25	premises [1] 157/14	priority [1] 236/5	235/9	propositions [2]
207/12 225/24	preparation [2] 39/15		processing [3]	44/23 233/16
possible [12] 30/8	137/6	private [3] 187/9	180/25 181/4 181/11	propriety [2] 44/17
33/15 33/25 36/10	prepared [6] 72/11 78/10 138/8 147/7	187/15 194/12 privilege [25] 36/20	Procurator [11] 190/4 191/3 191/6	184/9 prosecute [11] 5/1
36/20 85/24 157/15	218/23 240/21	36/21 37/2 41/23	190/4 191/3 191/0	111/13 116/3 116/3
158/12 170/7 185/9	preparing [3] 71/3	42/10 42/24 43/2 43/6		116/16 117/4 117/25
199/18 203/12	72/25 111/9	43/19 97/17 168/1	198/25 199/10	118/5 162/5 162/24
possibly [5] 27/6	preposterous [1]	168/8 168/14 169/22	produce [1] 134/23	186/19
32/15 91/20 113/6 185/12	193/1	169/25 170/15 170/21	produced [12] 30/11	prosecuted [13] 3/12
post [292]	prescriptive [1]	170/24 171/14 172/3	36/22 91/19 95/3	54/3 62/2 62/3 64/9
post-conviction [1]	118/21	172/4 172/9 173/4	113/15 124/11 126/13	64/14 65/4 67/6 84/17
9/2	presence [3] 81/1	173/7 173/14	128/21 128/22 140/16	
post-date [1] 132/10	83/20 177/7	privileged [5] 168/17	174/21 243/11	186/22
post-hearing [1]	present [3] 34/18	168/22 170/13 195/5	producing [1] 33/12	prosecuting [17] 4/2
170/1	35/5 171/12	195/5	production [1] 36/23	4/19 8/11 20/22 34/20 35/15 50/14 50/19
Post-separation [1]	presented [5] 35/3 43/12 44/11 158/19	probably [17] 15/12 41/16 43/23 51/25	professional [2] 97/16 185/7	54/9 68/25 80/11
4/4	171/9	66/19 67/20 69/8	professionally [2]	114/25 186/8 186/12
post-trial [1] 132/6	presenting [1]	116/10 134/6 136/18	198/8 239/24	186/17 186/18 186/23
postmaster [1] 144/2	111/10	137/12 140/3 163/25	Professor [2] 126/3	prosecution [64]
postmasters [3] 148/11 153/5 235/19	preserve [1] 52/23	164/22 201/16 234/25	130/21	8/25 9/11 9/11 9/17
postmistress [2]	press [8] 41/16 42/12		Professor	10/22 23/3 30/7 32/8
21/17 192/12	154/14 154/16 154/25		McLachlan [2] 126/3	
postponed [2] 93/17	155/13 155/16 155/18		130/21	50/8 50/11 54/4 68/5
123/23	pressure [8] 16/6	20/2 20/14 22/11 25/2		68/6 71/17 79/18 81/2
potential [18] 14/18	201/23 201/24 209/17 217/14 217/20 217/21	25/9 25/13 27/13 34/23 55/15 70/18	163/17	83/22 85/13 111/11
18/20 37/4 40/7 41/9	217/14 217/20 217/21	108/14 125/7 125/9	profound [1] 76/15 prohibitive [1] 13/21	113/23 114/13 114/16 114/20 115/13 115/14
52/1 52/12 133/2	pressures [2] 201/20	125/16 125/24 143/16		115/25 116/5 116/17
	201/22	149/12 162/19 171/3	prompted [2] 35/21	116/24 117/3 117/23
148/13 148/18 152/2	presumably [4] 14/1	174/8 175/20 182/15	230/21	118/8 119/1 120/23
157/18 171/19 200/23 201/2	80/5 103/20 217/25	185/10 187/8 187/8	promptly [1] 213/2	120/24 122/7 128/8
power [2] 94/13	presume [2] 92/9	188/24 242/22 243/10	proper [23] 42/5	131/14 132/1 134/16
199/8	92/12	problematic [2]	42/20 44/6 44/15	134/25 139/2 141/19
powerful [1] 77/5	presupposes [1]	132/17 132/18	59/14 104/12 108/16	147/17 150/7 161/7
practice [6] 3/6 35/13	240/7	problems [8] 25/15	121/8 142/8 142/20	161/9 162/8 162/9
96/19 96/25 117/2	pretend [1] 152/1	27/12 63/15 66/7 174/9 175/21 183/19	143/5 143/24 149/7 150/1 154/20 154/22	176/3 179/11 187/4 187/15 192/17 194/12
204/1	pretty [9] 19/10 36/14 74/11 79/10 98/16	188/20	155/4 200/19 200/20	194/17 200/17 201/6
practised [1] 2/6	124/23 221/1 239/6	procedure [3] 140/20		201/18 221/7
pre [7] 3/24 67/7	240/24	193/8 231/8	239/2	prosecutions [50]
67/11 131/13 156/12	prevent [3] 37/2	procedures [1] 9/17	properly [18] 9/13	4/8 8/15 40/5 48/18
213/24 213/25	155/8 191/3	proceed [1] 118/8	63/14 75/2 75/11	72/9 76/16 79/22
pre-1 January [1] 67/7	prevented [1] 38/4	proceedings [14]	75/21 76/3 141/3	81/16 83/2 98/17
pre-Horizon [2]	prevention [3] 34/7	50/18 74/23 88/12	143/4 143/9 149/10	98/24 112/7 114/6
213/24 213/25	34/10 170/10	92/1 97/18 103/4	149/18 162/6 191/22	117/8 117/22 160/17
Pre-separation [1]	preview [1] 32/18			161/4 161/16 161/22
	previous [6] 25/3	157/19 160/6 203/5	237/5 237/10	162/14 176/5 179/6

(90) position... - prosecutions

Р	51/2 61/1 95/1 119/19		quo [1] 196/24	realised [4] 20/1
prosecutions [28]	119/19 132/13 155/15	QC [3] 108/23 109/2	quote [4] 213/11	123/21 186/2 206/23
186/24 188/7 190/22	161/10 161/22 161/23	240/5	213/13 232/10 234/1	reality [3] 4/20 79/22
191/4 191/8 191/25	162/2 162/4 162/4	qualified [6] 116/21	quotes [1] 109/25	118/9
192/11 192/24 196/25	162/10 162/21 163/8	187/19 194/3 194/5	quoting [2] 210/18	really [14] 3/19 11/23
197/15 197/20 197/24	166/22 167/15 168/9	194/6 194/9	215/3	16/18 36/24 63/2
198/3 198/9 198/10	169/5 169/15 170/9	qualitative [1] 237/24	R	102/11 117/10 122/9
198/17 198/22 199/3	170/11 171/22 171/25	quality [1] 182/20		149/7 168/7 180/24
199/6 199/9 221/13	197/2 197/5	quarter [2] 165/15	raise [10] 81/21 83/5	187/8 188/18 239/8
221/18 224/20 235/18	publication [11] 30/4	201/3	88/3 99/6 130/18	reason [26] 16/19
236/11 236/13 236/16	32/18 38/12 78/3	question [48] 3/9	130/24 199/15 199/20	19/19 24/1 31/20 39/2
237/20	142/14 161/5 170/20	24/12 65/8 70/25	222/20 236/9	44/16 45/12 76/17
prosecutor [13] 10/8	175/24 176/1 176/11	75/18 82/9 82/9 82/11	raised [13] 11/10	76/24 94/1 99/10
17/4 36/3 54/6 76/20	234/14	82/13 84/24 88/23	37/6 37/8 42/16 66/12	119/16 139/20 158/4
82/5 111/7 130/23	publicity [17] 41/9	97/25 99/17 99/24	97/12 107/5 123/17	161/16 163/22 175/9
193/20 203/7 215/22	41/25 41/25 42/3 51/7	113/5 128/23 129/23	124/22 143/17 145/25	185/16 192/9 226/25
228/8 231/14	56/8 56/25 59/21 60/6	130/11 135/3 160/8	160/4 222/15	229/19 232/23 237/12
prosecutor's [2] 60/5	62/5 148/15 148/18	175/9 181/3 183/10	raises [1] 97/25	237/15 239/14 240/4
231/11	149/9 150/10 153/1	184/3 189/21 195/2	range [1] 221/12	reasonable [3] 42/22
prosecutorial [1]	155/15 171/19	195/3 195/8 204/11	ranging [2] 223/24	52/16 52/16
96/20	publish [2] 14/24	204/16 205/14 205/18	237/17	reasonably [1] 9/5
prosecutors [10]	168/24	208/6 211/25 212/24	rap [1] 201/18 rather [26] 12/17	reasoning [6] 41/6
111/22 114/12 119/5	published [7] 1/24	215/4 218/12 223/18		42/1 130/8 153/17
119/20 119/22 121/3	36/17 51/5 54/20 61/6	225/10 225/12 230/5	12/19 47/6 66/15 67/2 88/12 98/11 100/25	171/16 236/16
121/5 121/6 189/12	62/6 83/1	233/6 233/8 233/20		reasons [14] 12/14
237/18	publishing [1] 37/11	238/7 238/9 238/24	102/7 118/9 119/9 122/24 128/1 150/14	12/19 31/18 40/22
protecting [1] 44/20	punchy [2] 87/19	242/19	150/20 165/21 166/3	43/16 65/10 78/4
protection [1] 34/12	87/22	questioned [15] 1/8	166/21 169/7 188/20	137/23 139/19 145/23
protestations [1]	pure [1] 164/6	129/18 166/18 177/23	198/24 220/21 230/13	174/13 228/22 234/4
136/6	purported [3] 102/23	189/24 193/3 200/13	235/7 235/10 243/2	234/22
protocol [14] 53/17	103/25 104/2	219/11 245/4 245/6	rationale [1] 65/16	recall [28] 9/22 9/22 10/2 19/15 25/3 31/9
90/8 90/14 90/21	purpose [14] 58/19 78/16 97/6 105/16	245/8 245/10 245/12	rationalisation [1]	46/15 49/4 59/23 61/9
90/23 91/4 105/16	111/1 113/5 113/16	245/14 245/16	216/23	85/23 105/23 106/22
108/20 110/13 110/14	113/16 144/23 145/6	questioner [1]	Re [4] 42/18 42/18	114/4 116/4 117/10
110/15 110/25 111/20	146/18 168/5 196/22	218/16	132/19 132/20	120/25 145/6 150/24
111/21	241/13	questioners [1]	reached [5] 183/17	151/2 154/3 160/23
proud [2] 198/8	purposes [4] 10/15	165/3	185/15 212/19 213/20	
199/5	49/24 111/18 227/25	questioning [1]	220/13	183/9 195/19 222/18
prove [4] 111/12	pursue [1] 235/1	88/22	reaction [7] 14/24	recalling [2] 101/10
161/14 162/5 162/12	numiou [0] 1/0/17	questions [22] 8/21	16/18 18/4 19/9 25/1	128/12
	151/25	23/14 24/5 64/5	46/15 46/16	recap [1] 121/25
provide [7] 9/16 25/5	push [1] 65/18	145/24 145/25 160/15	read [23] 13/8 20/15	receive [3] 3/15
38/18 39/8 56/7	pushback [1] 145/21	164/24 164/25 166/5	28/8 33/2 61/14 66/11	77/21 142/3
120/12 142/19	pushed [1] 146/7	167/10 177/24 189/5	72/5 78/4 81/24 83/7	received [17] 66/20
provided [21] 9/25	put [44] 8/1 12/23	189/20 199/18 200/1	88/5 101/7 102/18	67/6 73/8 77/18 78/12
30/3 72/13 80/17	13/1 17/25 21/24	219/14 228/4 238/6	108/11 123/20 140/24	85/12 86/25 87/2 94/3
80/19 83/3 83/16 86/6	44/21 44/24 46/6	238/12 243/17 243/24		96/1 107/6 115/10
87/23 111/13 114/8	60/18 62/22 66/18	quick [2] 134/7 190/2	205/2 217/5 217/7	142/7 145/21 173/15
160/20 174/1 179/6	68/10 71/22 74/21	quickly [5] 65/12	217/25	173/21 175/7
179/22 179/25 213/23	79/23 98/9 105/14	134/7 199/15 219/15	readily [1] 96/24	receiving [2] 67/4
228/8 229/3 232/14	124/5 127/16 139/15	240/11	reading [2] 75/17	93/18
244/6	139/22 165/25 182/7	quiet [2] 144/19	232/17	recent [2] 29/7 78/4
provides [1] 119/6	185/10 192/15 192/19	152/5	ready [1] 23/17	recently [3] 49/3 49/5
providing [8] 13/20	197/15 197/19 199/22	quite [29] 5/16 7/19	real [17] 46/12 56/22	62/9
46/21 71/16 72/7	202/1 207/5 209/8	8/11 12/2 14/1 26/5	67/25 81/14 81/21	receptive [1] 125/2
85/11 88/14 187/6	209/23 212/24 213/4	38/25 44/1 44/23 49/2	82/18 99/17 106/20	recipient [1] 91/22
187/14	213/12 215/21 217/14	52/22 68/11 72/3	156/14 164/4 164/7	recipients [2] 102/4
provision [1] 72/11	223/9 226/11 232/8	73/13 93/21 101/25	164/15 164/20 168/1	102/7
public [42] 33/22 34/2 34/7 34/8 34/12	233/16 242/5 244/1	106/12 118/10 128/23 128/23 134/6 164/25	101/1 102/14 107/0	recognise [6] 7/24
34/2 34/7 34/8 34/12 34/13 36/10 41/12	putting [8] 26/5	128/23 134/6 164/25	real-world [2] 164/7	7/25 29/17 46/5 103/3
41/18 42/19 42/25	84/22 155/20 156/21	185/8 187/19 230/15	164/15	204/5
48/2 48/3 48/14 48/22	183/21 199/3 215/4	234/20	realisation [1]	recognised [3] 121/5
	226/17		227/15	121/6 204/9
L				

(91) prosecutions... - recognised

cogniss [1] 88/16 68/16 68/11 68/16 68/17 68/16 68/17 68/16 68/17 68/16 68/17	R	reflected [2] 83/11	213/14	79/10 81/6 82/25 84/2	132/12
217/12 "Emercical ection [5] Terrecollection [5] 142/16 164/19 2011 46/3 95/15 2011 46/3 9		86/16	relies [1] 40/21	85/11 85/19 86/1 86/8	resile [2] 155/23
recontaction [6] reflection [4] 73/8 122/5 73/12/3 resistant [3] 4/23 100/23 177/5 reflections [1] 52/2 52/8 53/14 13/2/1 53/14 13/2/1					
131/15 131/15<	recollection [5]				
100/32 07/75 reflections [1] 63/2 37/8 106/12 133/2 133/14 133/14 14/5 201/23 163/16 recommended [2] 133/2 133/14 134/16 133/19 133/9 resolution [2] 56/18 263/25 163/15 153/16 retuse [1] 56/2 retuse [1] 56/2 retuse [1] 56/16 resolve [1] 56/17					
163/18 reflective [1] 62/21 refly [3] 50/6 [111/2] 130/5 [35/15] 135/19 [resolution [2] 50/7 163/15 [153/18 recornell [1] 132/2 23/32 133/14 [34/2] 133/2 resolve [1] 63/15 resolve [1] 71/12 resolve [1] 71/12 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>					
recommended [2] fields 153/15 (133/14) fields 153/15 (133/14) fields 153/15 (133/14) record [1] 20/17 regard [1] 52/17 regard [2] 52/17 regard [1] 52/17 regard [2] 52					
163/16 113/14 resurve [1] 13/14 resurve [1] 13/14 <td>recommended [2]</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	recommended [2]				
record [16] [1] [1] [2] <th< td=""><td>163/15 163/18</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>	163/15 163/18				
regarded [1] 94/12 94/4 99/11 96/17 94/4 99/11 96/17 94/4 99/11 96/17 94/2 20/21 65/24 111/8 123/8 180/10 133/22 187/14 194/21 112/0 regardless [1] 112/0 regardless [1] 139/14 112/0 123/12 20/25 139/14 123/12 123/12 139/14 123/12 123/12 139/14 123/12 123/12 139/14 123/12 123					
94/4 96/11 96/17 regarding [9 //2] remained [3] 161/10 170/20 171/9 171/10 regardles [1] 570 91/20 96/24 102/22 2187/4 149/21 152/10 152/17 176/12 173/6 175/25 8/4 4/10 110/5 13/4/22 202/1 202/5 regardless [1] 152/17 176/12 173/6 175/25 172/2 173/16 175/25 172/2 173/16 175/25 172/2 173/16 175/25 172/2 173/16 175/25 172/2 173/16 175/25 172/2 173/16 175/25 172/2 173/16 175/25 172/2 173/16 175/25 172/2 173/16 175/25 172/2 173/16 175/25 172/2 173/17 176/17 16/22 172/2 173/17 16/17 16/22 172/2 173/17 16/17 16/22 172/2 173/17 16/17 16/22 172/2 173/17 16/17 16/17 16/22 172/2 173/17 16/17 16/22 172/2 173/17 16/17 16/25 172/2 173/17 16/17 16/25 172/17 16/17 16/25 172/17 16/17 16/17 16/22 172/17 16/17 16/17 16/17 172/17 16/17 16/17 172/17 16/17 16/17 172/17 16/17 16/17 172/17 16/17 16/17 172/17 16/17 16/17 172/17 16/17 16/17 172/17 16/17 16/17 172/17 16/17 16/17 172/17 16/17 16/17 172/17 16/17 16/17 172/17 16/17 16/17 172/17 16/17 16/17 172/17 16/17 16/17 172/17 16/17 16/17 172/17 16/17 16/17 172/17 16/17 16/17 172/17 16/17 16/17 172/17 16/17 16/17 172/17 16/17 16/17		regarded [1] 94/12	151/18		resourcing [1] 61/20
99/20 80/24 (103/24 11/18 (123) 80/24 (103/24) 211/20 remaining [2] 58/20 173/22 174/15 (175/25) 88/4 94/10 (10/5) 11/18 (123) 80/10 regardless [1] 139/14 regardless [1] 139/14 regardless [1] 139/14 regardless [1] 139/14 regardless [1] 132/17 regardless [1] 139/14 regardless [1] 132/17 regardless [1] 130/17 regardless [1] 130/17 regardless [1] 130/17 regardless [1] 130/17 regardless [1] 130/17 regardless [2] 130/17 regardless [2] 130/17 regardless [2] 24/15 regardless [2] 24/16 regardless [2] 24/15 regardless [2] 24/16 regardless [2] 24/16 regardless [2] 24/16 regardless [2] 24/16 regardless [2] 24/16 regardless [3] 24/16 regardless [3] 24/16 regardless [4] 24/17 regardl					
1116 1236 16/07 regardless [1] 139/14 regardless [1] 139/14 139/12 202/12 2025 regardless [1] 139/14 regardless [1] 139/14 139/12 2022 139/14 regardless [1] 139/14 regardless [1] 139/14 26/10 26/22 99/4 regardless [1] 129/17 17/14 17/14 129/17 129/					I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
139/12 20/12 20/19 139/14 139/14 139/14 139/14 139/14 139/14 139/14 139/14 139/14 139/14 139/14 129/17 139/17					
26/10_26/22_99/4 regular [1] 25/13 17/16 17/16 17/16 16/17 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>					
175/13 177/16 177/17					I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
17/10 17/17 15/24 23/9					
240/16 24/1/20 regulation [1] 193/11 remedis [3] 90/6 reports [1] 32/12 respond [4] 50/23 111/2 recordis [3] 26/25 reinforces [1] 208/23 remedis [3] 90/6 reports [1] 30/17 respond [4] 50/23 81/4 83/23 reiterate [1] 200/8 11/14 52/20 73/2 13/8 10/72 155/16 53/3 118/9 132/2 rectification [2] 81/2 reiterate [1] 200/8 11/14 52/20 73/2 reports [5] 26/32 76/11 78/14 82/17 rectified [2] 215/2 relate [3] 90/5 162/14 168/23 190/5 162/14 168/23 190/5 84/1 107/6 238/23 76/11 78/14 82/17 reduced [1] 166/13 relates [3] 143/12 216/72 reports [5] 26/3 20/1 76/11 78/14 82/17 78/17 86/18 86/18 refuelce [1] 166/13 refer [9] 16/11 18/3 reports [1] 101/16 102/25 149/14 18/32 103/10 109/20 109/21 103/10 109/20 109/21 18/14 45/23 148/22 respons [2] remove [1] 60/17 reparating [1] 13/32 reports [1] 12/16 respons [2] reports [2] respons [2] 105/17 108/21 refuence [1] 18/17 relations [2] 97/3 reparting [1] 8/17 reparting [
reference [1] 120/2 reinforces [1] 208/23 reported [7] 33/8 107/2 155/16 81/4 83/23 reiterate [1] 170/17 remedy [1] 9/15 33/8 107/2 155/16 responde [1] 103/6 81/4 83/21 reiterate [1] 170/17 remember [19] 4/24 responde [1] 103/6 rectified [2] 215/7 responde [1] 103/6 responde [1] 103/6 rectified [2] 215/7 relate [4] 103/6 76/7 79/3/15 33/11 87/25 89/16 102/14 redicting [2] 112/12 208/7 21/3/2 208/7 11/32/2 103/76 238/33 103/14 87/12 87/16 86/18					
records [3] 26/25 81/4 83/23 retification [2] 81/2 83/21 retification [2] 81/2 retification [2] 81/2 retification [2] 105/6 71/7 93/15 93/21 18/14 52/20 73/25 retification [2] 105/6 71/7 93/15 93/21 18/14 52/20 73/25 reporting [3] 105/7 retification [3] 90/5 retification [4] 105/6 retification [4] 105/6 retification [4] 105/6 retification [4] 105/6 retification [4] 102/5 100/7 reporting [4] 103/6 100/7 reporting [4] 100/7 reporting [4] 100/			152/2 152/3	reported [7] 30/17	
1/14 63/23 reiterated [1] 230/8 18/14 52/20 73/25 reporting [3] 107/9 response [20] 50/22 83/21 reiterated [1] 230/8 18/14 52/20 73/25 reporting [3] 107/9 response [20] 50/22 83/21 reiterated [1] 230/8 18/14 52/20 73/25 reporting [3] 107/9 response [20] 50/22 78/11 78/14 82/17 reiterated [1] 230/8 18/14 52/20 73/25 reporting [3] 107/9 response [20] 50/22 78/11 78/14 82/17 reiterated [1] 230/8 18/14 52/21 73/25 reporting [3] 107/9 response [20] 50/22 78/11 78/14 82/17 related [3] 90/5 162/14 168/23 190/5 reporting [3] 107/9 reporting [3] 103/1 reporesponse [20] 100/1 reporting [3]	records [3] 26/25				
Partial (a) Print (a)					
rectified [2] 215/2 215/7 215/7 215/7 215/7 112/19 133/21 112/19 133/21 113/21 13/23 113/21 13/23					
215/7 12/19 13/21 16/21/4 <					I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
redaction [2] 143/2 relates [3] 143/12 216/25 219/23 represent [7] 28/14 103/10 109/20 109/21 144/24 178/7 188/6 reminded [1] 195/10 102/25 149/4 165/7 120/2 125/1 167/6 reduced [1] 156/13 32/2 remove [1] 60/17 represent [7] 28/14 103/10 109/20 120/2 125/16 136/8 136/76 refore [9] 15/14 36/8 130/12 190/1 130/12 120/2 125/16 136/8 143/12 136/76 responsibilities [2] 113/2 120/2 125/16 136/8 136/76 responsibilities [2] 105/17 108/17 106/17 represent [1] 107/25 133/16 105/17 108/17 responsibilities [2] 105/17 108/17 105/17 108/17 responsibilities [2] 105/17 108/17 105/17 108/17 109/18 101/14 101/14 101/14 101/14 102/2 105/17 108/17					I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
reduction [2] 178/7 189/6 remind [1] 195/10 102/25 120/2 122/1 167/4 redrafting [1] 113/23 reduct [1] 160/17 remove [1] 190/1 193/4 102/25 189/4 167/6 refer [9] 18/11 18/3 18/14 45/23 148/24 178/7 18/6 190/1 193/4 193/14 167/6 representative [6] responses [2] 119/25 142/13 119/25 120/2 125/16 159/6 163/6 199/24 190/1 190/1 190/1 190/1 190/1 190/1 190/1 190/1 190/1 190/1 190/1 190/1 190/1 180/14 160/17 representative [6] 160/17 representative [6] 160/17 160/17 160/17 160/17 160/17 160/17 160/17 160/17 160/17 160/17 160/17 160/17 160/17 160/17 160/17 160/17 160/17 160/14 160/17 160/14 160/17 160/14 160/17 160/14 160/17 160/14 160/14 160/17 160/14 160/	rectify [1] 188/20				
redrafting [1] 113/23 reduced [1] 156/13 reduced [1] 156/13 refer [9] 14/11 18/13 18/14 45/23 148/22 159/6 196/22 198/21 224/9 reininded [1] 101/16 59/1 130/22 181/20 relation [13] 3/22 relation [2] 197/3 relation [2] 197/3 relation [2] 197/3 relatively [1] 165/5 repeated [1] 136/6 repeated [1] 147/2 replace [1] 213/10 relatively [1] 165/12 relatively [1] 165/12 relatively [1] 165/12 relatively [1] 165/12 relatively [1] 165/12 relativel [2] 36/23 relativel [3] 168/14 relativel [3] 136/8 relativel [3] 168/14 relativel [3] 137/8 relativel [3] 168/14 relativel [3] 137/8 relativel [3] 137/8 r					I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
reduced [1] 15/16 6/3 39/1 130/22 16/20 removed [1] 60/1 108/2 representative [6] responsibilities [2] 18/14 45/23 148/22 15/16 63/6 99/2 133/6 60/1 108/2 92/2 19/5/16 195/25 reponsibilities [2] 19/25 142/13 18/14 45/23 148/22 15/16 63/6 99/2 133/6 60/1 108/2 render [2] 9/6 157/6 repsentatives [2] 105/17 108/21 224/9 174/23 18/1/11 182/8 render [2] 9/6 157/6 repsentatives [2] 105/17 108/21 responsibilities [2] 18/14 452/3 18/23 174/23 18/1/1 182/8 repaint [1] 126/17 repsentatives [2] 105/17 108/21 responsibilities [2] 105/17 108/21 224/9 relations [2] 197/3 repaint [2] 6/25 repaint [2] 123/10 represents [1] 165/5 represents [1] 165/5 responsible [4] 4/17 references [2] 35/4 relavel [2] 93/6 repaice [1] 124/20 repaice [1] 155/12 repaice [1] 155/12 repaice [1] 155/12 repaice [1] 155/12 repaired [3] 5/18 141/18 143/12 restrictive [2] 144/6 19/11 102/24 103/24 relevant [6] 29/5 rifk 17/10 18/4 18/6 repaired [3] 5/18 92/21 145/5 71/19 58/1 135/13 10/5 62/19 70/5 92/12 10/5 62/19 70/5 92/12 repaired					
refer 19 18/14 15/16 63/6 99/2 133/6 60/1 108/2 representatives [2] 15/17 105/17 108/17 105/17 108/17 105/17 108/17 105/17 108/17 105/17 108/17 105/17 108/17 105/17 108/17 105/17 108/17 105/17 108/17 105/17 108/17 105/17 108/17 108/17 105/17 108/17 108/18 105/17 108/18 105/17 108/18 105/17 108/18 105/17 108/18 105/17 108/18 105/17 108/18 105/17 108/18 105/17 108/18 107/25 133/16 105/17 105/17 108/18 106/17 108/18 107/25 108/18 107/25 103/18 107/25 103/18 108/17 108/12 1	reduced [1] 156/13				
16/14/3/22 174/23 181/11 182/8 render [2] 9/6 157/6 representatives [2] 105/71 108/21 159/6 196/12/22 182/18 187/4 187/14 187/14 187/14 187/14 187/14 187/14 182/18 187/14 <td< td=""><td>refer [9] 18/11 18/13</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	refer [9] 18/11 18/13				
130:100122 182/18 187/4 187/7 renew [1] 126/17 renew [1] 126/17 107/25 133/16 responsibility [6] reference [19] 5/4 9/24 30/6 30/23 40/2 187/11 220/6 repairing [1] 8/17 represented [2] 148/3 196/8 201/19 209/10 85/19 92/10 105/7 106/1 109/15 111/19 relations [2] 197/3 186/16 repeated [1] 136/6 represents [1] 165/5 reputation [8] 41/17 responsibility [6] 11/24 126/12 135/17 relatively [1] 165/9 relatively [2] 93/6 repeated [1] 136/6 repeated [1] 155/12 203/21 rest [3] 134/6 155/20 11/24 126/12 135/17 relased [2] 36/23 repletition [1] 155/12 203/21 restrictive [2] 144/6 12/17/11 reference [3] 168/14 replx [117] 14/11 replace [1] 61/4 replx [117] 14/11 result [10] 16/5 48/5 139/8 208/18 referring [16] 10/2 referring [16] 10/2 106/1 20/7 193/10 194/2 30/1 30/3 30/5 30/23 92/2 145/5 141/18 141/18 143/22 109/18 102/41 109/17 relevant [6] 29/5 relaval [6] 20/2 30/1 30/3 30/5 30/23 90/25 119/15 resultid [3] 100/19 10/5 62/19 70/5 92/12 referring [16] 10/2 referring [17] 14/14 16/2/2 27/2 resulting [1]					
reference [19] 5/4 9/24 30/6 30/23 40/2 85/19 92/10 105/7 106/1 109/15 111/19 111/24 126/12 135/17 137/13 138/23 172/8 195/14 239/9 relaved [2] 35/4 195/14 239/9 relaved [2] 36/25 references [2] 35/4 17/11 102/24 103/24 139/8 208/18 reference [7] 7/4 90/1 reference [6] 10/2 10/5 62/19 70/5 92/12 109/18 162/18 166/4 references [5] 50/6 106/3 197/5 result [6] 29/5 17/8 17/10 18/4 18/25 repated [1] 161/4 report [117] 14/11 report [117] 14/11 report [117] 14/11 report [117] 14/11 report [117] 14/11 report [117] 14/11 report [117] 14/12 10/5 62/19 70/5 92/12 109/18 162/18 196/4 references [5] 50/6 106/3 108/24 109/17 relavel [1] 13/18 references [5] 50/6 106/3 108/24 109/17 relavel [1] 13/18 references [1] 13/18 reference [1] 13/18 references [2] 35/4 references [2] 36/23 report [117] 14/11 report [117] 14/12 report [117] 14/12 report [117] 14/12 report [117] 14/12 report [117] 14/14 report [117] 14/1		182/18 187/4 187/7	renew [1] 126/17	107/25 133/16	
9/24 30/6 30/23 40/2 197/5 197/7	reference [19] 5/4				
85/19 92/10 105/7 relationship [2] 6/25 repeated [1] 136/6 reputation [8] 41/17 55/10 194/16 198/15 11/24 126/12 135/17 ratively [1] 165/9 relationship [2] 93/6 repeated [2] 123/10 42/25 61/21 148/25 resti [3] 134/6 155/20 137/13 138/23 172/8 relayed [2] 93/6 relayed [2] 93/6 repeated [1] 155/12 203/21 restrictive [2] 144/6 171/11 relaxed [2] 36/23 replace [1] 61/4 replace [1] 61/4 reguest [7] 88/1 92/7 restrictive [2] 144/6 97/11 102/24 103/24 176/12 relevance [3] 168/14 replace [1] 71/14 132/3 141/5 141/8 result [10] 16/5 48/5 139/8 208/18 relevant [6] 29/5 34/19 50/17 64/6 18/6 19/21 21/2 22/12 require [1] 234/13 require [1] 234/13 109/7 200/24 209/20 34/19 50/17 64/6 18/6 19/21 21/2 22/12 required [6] 90/9 90/23 90/25 119/15 resulted [3] 100/19 222/22 223/8 reliability [11] 14/6 32/18 35/3 35/4 36/17 152/22 158/10 resulted [3] 100/19 20/2 4 105/20 113/8 161/14 162/12 194/21 34/10 43/12 54/11 requirements [4] 10/17 5/5 119/11 resulted [2] 2/19 98/24 99/23 124/16 36/3 8/12 41/11 39/11 90/13 requirement					
111/24 126/12 135/17 137/13 138/23 172/8 195/14 239/9 112/16 relatively [1] 165/9 relayed [2] 93/6 repeatediy [2] 123/10 42/25 61/21 148/25 rest [3] 154/6 155/20 195/14 239/9 rejaved [2] 93/6 repattediy [2] 121/20 152/20 153/6 171/24 230/4 references [2] 35/4 refeased [2] 36/23 repiace [1] 214/20 request [7] 88/1 92/7 restrictive [2] 144/6 71/11 refeared [7] 7/4 90/1 94/25 replace [1] 214/20 request [7] 88/1 92/7 restrictive [2] 144/6 97/11 102/24 103/24 103/24 176/12 replace [1] 214/20 request [7] 88/1 92/7 reduite [3] 16/5 48/5 70/5 82/19 70/5 92/12 relevance [3] 168/14 repott [117] 14/11 request [3] 5/18 141/8 141/18 143/22 105/5 62/19 70/5 92/12 relevant [6] 29/5 17/8 17/10 18/4 18/6 require [1] 234/13 resulte [3] 100/19 20/24 209/20 20/12 199/12 00/24 209/20 30/1 30/3 30/5 30/23 90/23 90/25 119/15 resulting [1] 224/7 108/23 109/9 109/16 refiable [3] 13/18 13/16 55/23 55/24 56/5 56/7 requirements [4] 108/25 109/18 111/8 102/24 105/20 113/8 13/14 140/8 80/16 81/8 57/14 61/5 66/8 66/10 requiring [1] 234/20 retained [2] 2/19					
137/13 138/23 172/8 195/14 239/9 relatively [1] 165/9 relayed [2] 93/6 163/19 152/20 153/6 17/1/24 230/4 195/14 239/9 relayed [2] 93/6 repetition [1] 155/12 repute [1] 214/20 restrictive [2] 144/6 171/11 released [2] 36/23 replace [1] 214/20 repute [1] 214/12 resuit [10] 16/5 48/5 761/2 replace [1] 21/2 repute [1] 79/15 159/21 196/20 resuit [10] 16/5 48/5 77/17 102/12 relevance [3] 168/14 repot [117] 14/11 repute [1] 234/13 require [1] 234/13 141/8 141/18 143/22 10/5 62/19 70/5 92/12 relevant [6] 29/5 17/8 17/10 18/4 18/6 require [6] 90/9 resulted [3] 100/19 109/18 162/18 196/4 refers [5] 50/6 106/3 161/14 162/12 194/21 36/22 37/12 37/20 requirement [2] requirement [2] results [1] 147/25 70/22 2222 reliable [3] 13/18 13/18 54/13 54/13 54/12 requirements [4] 10/1 75/5 119/11 108/25 109/18 111/8 108/23 109/9 109/16 reliable [3] 13/18 54/13 54/15 56/7 requiring [1] 234/20 retain [2] 2/19 93/5 119/18 164/4 164/20					
195/14/239/9 94/25 replace [1] 214/20 request [7] 88/1 92/7 144/11 references [2] 35/4 176/12 replace [1] 214/20 request [7] 88/1 92/7 144/11 referred [7] 7/4 90/1 176/12 replace [1] 214/20 request [7] 88/1 92/7 144/11 139/8 208/18 referring [16] 10/2 176/12 report [117] 14/11 159/21 196/20 57/19 58/1 135/13 10/5 62/19 70/5 92/12 relevance [3] 168/14 204/5 225/10 17/8 17/10 18/4 18/6 required [6] 90/9 141/8 141/18 143/22 10/5 62/19 70/5 92/12 34/19 50/17 64/6 18/6 19/21 21/2 22/12 required [6] 90/9 206/12 240/1 108/3 108/24 109/17 193/10 194/2 30/1 30/3 30/5 30/23 90/23 90/25 119/15 resulted [3] 100/19 202/2 222/22 223/8 refers [5] 50/6 106/3 161/14 162/12 194/21 38/6 38/12 41/11 39/11 90/13 requirements [4] 102/24 105/20 113/8 19/91 11/14 162/12 194/21 41/15 42/10 42/11 requirements [4] 108/25 109/18 111/8 102/24 105/20 113/8 111/14 147/18 55/23 55/24 56/5 56/7 requirements [4] 108/25 109/18 111/8 102/24 105/20 113/8 112/2 retained [1] 23/4/20					
released [2] 36/23 replaced [1] 61/4 132/3 141/5 141/8 result [10] 16/5 48/5 771/11 7/4 90/1 176/12 replaced [1] 79/1 159/21 196/20 57/19 58/1 135/13 141/8 141/8 143/22 57/19 58/1 135/13 141/8 141/8 143/22 141/8 141/8 143/22 141/8 141/8 143/22 141/8 141/8 143/22 141/8 141/8 143/22 141/8 141/8 143/22 141/8 141/8 143/22 141/8 141/8 141/2 141/8 143/22 141/8 141/8 143/22 141/8 141/8 141/2 141/8 141/2 141/8 141/2 161/14 161/2 141/8 141/2 161/2 141/8 141/2 161/2 141/8 141/2 161/2 141/8 141/2 132/3 141/8 141/8 141/2 141/8 141/2 161/2 141/18 161/2 141/18 161/14 161/2 141/18 161/14 161/2 161/14 161/2 16					
referred [7] 7/4 90/1 97/11 102/24 103/24 139/8 208/18 referring [16] 10/2 10/5 62/19 70/5 92/12 10/5 62/19 70/5 92/12 10/5 62/19 70/5 92/12 109/8 168/14 109/8 168/14 10/5 62/19 70/5 92/12 10/5 62/19 70/5 92/12 109/8 162/18 109/8 162/18 109/18 162/18 109/18 162/18 109/18 162/18 109/18 162/18 109/18 162/18 109/18 162/18 109/18 162/18 109/18 162/18 109/18 162/18 109/17 111 109/12 30/1 109/18 162/18 109/19 193/10 109/12 10/1 109/12 10/1 109/12 10/1 109/12 10/1 108/23 109/10/1 108/23		released [2] 36/23			
97/11 102/24 103/24 139/8 208/18 relevance [3] 168/14 report [117] 14/11 204/5 225/10 requested [3] 5/18 14/24 15/24 16/25 14/18 14/18 14/18 14/3/22 14/26 15/25 10/5 62/19 70/5 92/12 108/3 108/24 109/17 109/18 162/18 196/4 14/24 15/24 16/25 13/10 194/2 92/2 145/5 require [1] 234/13 required [6] 90/9 109/18 162/18 196/4 199/7 200/24 209/20 222/22 223/8 14/18 14/18 14/18 14/18 14/18 14/24 15/24 16/25 92/2 145/5 resulted [3] 100/19 109/18 162/18 196/4 199/7 200/24 209/20 222/22 223/8 19 30/1 30/3 30/5 30/23 90/23 90/25 119/15 resulted [3] 147/25 161/14 162/12 194/21 36/22 37/12 37/20 requirement [2] results [1] 147/25 98/24 99/23 124/16 38/6 38/12 41/11 39/11 90/13 96/17 96/21 96/24 161/14 162/12 194/21 41/15 42/10 42/11 requirements [4] 108/25 109/18 111/8 108/23 109/9 109/16 reliable [3] 13/18 54/13 54/19 54/24 231/7 requiring [1] 234/20 119/18 164/4 164/20 34/11 40/8 80/16 81/8 57/14 61/5 66/8 66/10 researche [1] 74/13 researche [1] 74/13 retention [4] 89/25 110/5 111/2 113/17 72/10 73/13 78/3 79/4 resemblance [1] 110/5 111/2 113/17		176/12	reply [1] 79/15		57/19 58/1 135/13
T39/8 208/18 relevant [6] 29/5 17/8 17/10 18/4 18/6 require [1] 234/13 resulted [3] 100/19 10/5 62/19 70/5 92/12 34/19 50/17 64/6 18/6 19/21 21/2 22/12 require [1] 234/13 require [6] 90/9 206/12 240/1 108/3 108/24 109/17 193/10 194/2 30/1 30/3 30/5 30/23 90/23 90/25 119/15 resulted [3] 100/19 109/18 162/18 196/4 199/7 200/24 209/20 20/7 54/22 82/19 36/22 37/12 37/20 90/23 90/25 119/15 results [1] 147/25 222/22 223/8 refers [5] 50/6 106/3 161/14 162/12 194/21 38/6 38/12 41/11 39/11 90/13 96/17 96/21 96/24 108/23 109/9 109/16 161/14 162/12 194/21 41/15 42/10 42/11 requirements [4] 10/1 75/5 119/11 108/25 109/18 111/8 102/24 105/20 113/8 111/14 147/18 54/13 54/19 54/24 231/7 requiring [1] 234/20 retained [2] 2/19 34/11 40/8 80/16 81/8 57/14 61/5 66/8 66/10 57/14 61/5 66/8 66/10 researched [1] 125/7 retaining [1] 112/23 203/15 2/23 83/13 149/25 57/14 61/5 66/8 66/10 researched [1] 125/7 retation [4] 89/25	97/11 102/24 103/24				
referring [16] 10/2 34/19 50/17 64/6 18/6 19/21 21/2 22/12 required [6] 90/9 206/12 240/1 10/5 62/19 70/5 92/12 193/10 194/2 30/1 30/3 30/5 30/23 90/23 90/25 119/15 required [6] 90/9 206/12 240/1 108/3 108/24 109/17 193/10 194/2 30/1 30/3 30/5 30/23 90/23 90/25 119/15 resulting [1] 224/7 109/18 162/18 196/4 199/7 200/24 209/20 20/7 54/22 82/19 36/22 37/12 37/20 requirement [2] 39/11 90/13 222/22 223/8 refers [5] 50/6 106/3 161/14 162/12 194/21 41/15 42/10 42/11 requirements [4] 108/25 109/18 111/8 108/23 109/9 109/16 161/14 162/12 194/21 41/15 42/10 42/11 requirements [4] 108/25 109/18 111/8 102/24 105/20 113/8 111/14 147/18 55/23 55/24 56/5 56/7 requiring [1] 234/20 retained [2] 2/19 34/11 40/8 80/16 81/8 57/14 61/5 66/8 66/10 58/13 78/3 79/4 researched [1] 125/7 retaining [1] 112/23 203/15 34/11 40/8 80/16 81/8 57/14 61/5 66/8 66/10 researched [1] 125/7 retaining [1] 112/23					
10/5 02/19 70/5 92/12 108/3 108/24 109/17 109/18 162/18 196/4 199/7 200/24 209/20 222/22 223/8 193/10 194/2 30/1 30/3 30/5 30/23 32/18 35/3 35/4 36/17 36/22 37/12 37/20 98/24 99/23 124/16 90/23 90/25 119/15 152/22 158/10 resulting [1] 224/7 reguirement [2] 39/11 90/13 20/7 54/22 82/19 98/24 99/23 124/16 38/6 38/12 41/11 161/14 162/12 194/21 38/6 38/12 41/11 41/15 42/10 42/11 90/23 90/25 119/15 152/22 158/10 resulting [1] 224/7 reguirement [2] 39/11 90/13 108/23 109/9 109/16 reflect [8] 102/21 102/24 105/20 113/8 119/18 164/4 164/20 203/15 161/14 162/12 194/21 101/1 75/5 119/11 43/10 43/12 54/11 55/23 55/24 56/5 56/7 56/10 56/11 56/23 requirements [4] 10/1 75/5 119/11 108/25 109/18 111/8 112/2 119/18 164/4 164/20 203/15 relied [10] 6/5 32/9 34/11 40/8 80/16 81/8 82/23 83/13 149/25 57/14 61/5 66/8 66/10 72/10 73/13 78/3 79/4 researched [1] 125/7 resemblance [1] retention [4] 89/25 110/5 111/2 113/17				required [6] 90/9	
109/18 162/18 196/4 reliability [11] 14/6 32/18 35/3 35/4 36/17 152/22 158/10 results [1] 14//25 199/7 200/24 209/20 20/7 54/22 82/19 36/22 37/12 37/20 requirement [2] 39/11 90/13 retain [9] 92/15 96/11 222/22 223/8 161/14 162/12 194/21 38/6 38/12 41/11 39/11 90/13 96/17 96/21 96/24 108/23 109/9 109/16 161/14 162/12 194/21 41/15 42/10 42/11 requirements [4] 10/1 75/5 119/11 108/25 109/18 111/8 108/23 109/9 109/16 reliable [3] 13/18 54/13 54/19 54/24 231/7 retained [2] 2/19 93/5 102/24 105/20 113/8 111/14 147/18 55/23 55/24 56/5 56/7 requiring [1] 234/20 retained [2] 2/19 93/5 119/18 164/4 164/20 34/11 40/8 80/16 81/8 57/14 61/5 66/8 66/10 researched [1] 125/7 retaining [1] 112/23 203/15 2/23 83/13 149/25 72/10 73/13 78/3 79/4 resemblance [1] 10/5 111/2 113/17			30/1 30/3 30/5 30/23	90/23 90/25 119/15	
199/7 200/24 209/20 98/24 99/23 124/16 38/6 38/12 41/11 39/11 90/13 96/17 96/21 96/24 222/22 223/8 161/14 162/12 194/21 41/15 42/10 42/11 39/11 90/13 96/17 96/21 96/24 108/23 109/9 109/16 161/14 162/12 194/21 41/15 42/10 42/11 10/1 75/5 119/11 10/1 75/5 119/11 108/23 109/9 109/16 reliable [3] 13/18 54/13 54/19 54/24 231/7 retained [2] 2/19 102/24 105/20 113/8 111/14 147/18 55/23 55/24 56/5 56/7 requiring [1] 234/20 retained [2] 2/19 119/18 164/4 164/20 34/11 40/8 80/16 81/8 57/14 61/5 66/8 66/10 researched [1] 74/13 retention [4] 89/25 203/15 2/23 83/13 149/25 72/10 73/13 78/3 79/4 resemblance [1] 110/5 111/2 113/17					
122/22/22/23/8 161/14 162/12 194/21 41/15 42/10 42/11 requirements [4] 108/25 109/18 111/8 108/23 109/9 109/16 195/12 43/10 43/12 54/11 10/1 75/5 119/11 112/2 reflect [8] 102/21 102/24 105/20 113/8 111/14 147/18 54/13 54/19 54/24 231/7 retained [2] 2/19 109/18 164/4 164/20 203/15 relied [10] 6/5 32/9 56/10 56/11 56/23 research [1] 74/13 retaining [1] 112/23 203/15 2/23 83/13 149/25 57/14 61/5 66/8 66/10 72/10 73/13 78/3 79/4 resemblance [1] 110/5 111/2 113/17					
108/23 109/9 109/16 195/12 43/10 43/12 54/11 10/17/5/5 11/11 11/12 reliable [3] 13/18 13/18 13/18 11/14 147/18 55/23 55/24 56/5 56/7 requiring [1] 231/7 retained [2] 2/19 93/5 102/24 105/20 113/18 111/14 147/18 55/23 55/24 56/5 56/7 requiring [1] 234/20 retained [2] 2/19 93/5 119/18 164/4 164/20 34/11 40/8 80/16 81/8 57/14 61/5 66/8 66/10 researched [1] 74/13 retaining [1] 112/23 203/15 34/11 40/8 80/16 81/8 57/14 61/5 66/8 66/10 researched [1] 125/7 retaining [4] 89/25 110/5 110/5 111/2 113/17					
reflect [8] 102/21 refliable [3] 13/18 54/13 54/14 231/7 retained [2] 2/19 102/24 105/20 113/18 111/14 147/18 55/23 55/24 56/5 56/7 requiring [1] 234/20 93/5 119/18 164/4 164/20 34/11 40/8 80/16 81/8 57/14 61/5 66/8 66/10 researched [1] 125/7 retaining [1] 11/2/23 203/15 34/11 40/8 80/16 81/8 57/14 61/5 66/8 66/10 researched [1] 125/7 retaining [1] 11/2/23 203/15 32/23 83/13 149/25 72/10 73/13 78/3 79/4 resemblance [1] 110/5 111/2 113/17					
102/24 105/20 113/8 relied [10] 6/5 32/9 56/10 56/11 56/23 research [1] 74/13 retaining [1] 112/23 119/18 164/4 164/20 34/11 40/8 80/16 81/8 57/14 61/5 66/8 66/10 research [1] 125/7 retention [4] 89/25 203/15 203/15 72/10 73/13 78/3 79/4 resemblance [1] 110/5 111/2 113/17	reflect [8] 102/21				
119/18/164/20 34/11/40/8/80/16/81/8 57/14/61/5/66/8/66/10 researched [1]/125/7 retention [4]/89/25 203/15 32/23/83/13/149/25 72/10/73/13/78/3/79/4 resemblance [1]/110/5/111/2/113/17					
82/23 83/13 149/25 72/10 73/13 78/3 79/4 resemblance [1] 110/5 111/2 113/17		34/11 40/8 80/16 81/8	57/14 61/5 66/8 66/10	researched [1] 125/7	retention [4] 89/25
		82/23 83/13 149/25	72/10 73/13 78/3 79/4	resemblance [1]	110/5 111/2 113/17
(02) recognized retention					

(92) recognises - retention

R	214/17 214/20 214/23	route [4] 6/9 54/15	same [31] 9/5 9/8	122/21 123/2 123/15
	216/8 217/24 218/13	66/16 190/11	21/4 30/21 39/13	125/25 127/23 127/24
rethink [2] 66/24	218/16 219/25 220/10		39/17 39/20 39/22	133/24 136/4 138/21
124/20	220/22 221/19 222/6	Royal [8] 3/4 3/12	40/22 42/7 42/8 48/22	140/25 143/18 147/23
retiring [1] 34/18	225/13 226/17 227/21	3/14 3/25 61/17 80/15	53/2 58/22 68/25	148/15 148/15 150/3
returned [3] 40/5	233/2 233/18 235/12	84/18 131/12	91/15 94/13 104/7	152/8 156/4 156/9
103/11 103/20	236/4 239/12 240/3	RSPCA [1] 121/4	108/5 108/7 119/22	159/7 160/1 160/9
revealed [1] 236/21	241/1 243/4	rude [1] 82/10	120/16 131/2 154/3	161/1 162/7 164/5
revelation [3] 41/10	right-hand [4] 57/11	rude [1] 02/10 rudeness [1] 167/9	154/3 169/13 184/7	165/20 166/6 169/7
171/20 224/6	57/17 58/24 59/11	ruined [2] 64/11	192/16 220/12 226/7	173/5 173/8 173/13
review [38] 40/20	rightly [3] 41/8 79/17	64/12	229/19	177/12 179/8 180/23
40/24 49/1 58/20	171/18	rule [6] 25/14 51/22	Samra [18] 6/2 6/3	183/25 184/2 185/1
61/12 67/4 67/8 67/21	rights [1] 140/14	51/23 66/6 174/8	10/15 20/23 27/21	185/10 185/11 186/11
68/1 68/2 68/22 69/4	rise [6] 56/8 147/24	175/21	47/17 55/11 74/5 74/8	187/20 188/6 189/5
69/17 72/19 72/24	205/15 205/22 210/1	ruled [2] 33/16 130/5	74/10 167/23 186/20	189/11 189/19 196/21
77/22 85/22 87/3	203/15/203/22/210/1		224/9 224/13 234/10	197/10 201/11 202/24
120/13 120/15 122/12		rules [3] 119/3		
122/13 124/21 126/16	risk [9] 51/4 140/15	119/15 231/8	240/11 240/17 241/9	206/11 209/5 209/11
126/17 126/18 126/22		ruling [2] 34/25 171/6		209/20 211/21 215/1
137/2 137/12 138/3	142/9 142/10 147/14	run [4] 4/14 51/3 55/8		215/5 215/9 215/12
143/20 162/15 197/11	149/21	226/3	satisfy [3] 50/16	217/4 217/4 222/8
202/2 234/5 234/24	risks [1] 147/25	running [3] 163/9	231/6 231/10	226/19 227/21 230/7
236/23 240/2	RMG [1] 83/13	165/20 221/17	save [2] 90/20 141/3	232/11 233/21 234/3
reviewed [7] 37/23	robust [6] 13/17	S	saw [33] 4/16 5/22	234/12 234/17 236/18
65/24 67/9 67/10	17/24 87/17 87/18		5/24 8/7 17/7 18/5	241/25 242/13 243/11
68/13 68/17 152/24	146/9 214/21	Sadly [1] 191/18	28/18 29/17 32/11	saying [29] 25/2 25/6
reviewing [7] 52/7	robustness [2] 81/2	safe [4] 52/3 158/20	42/11 44/22 46/5 57/7	36/12 42/13 45/18
65/22 68/19 69/14	83/21	232/3 233/15	59/19 71/7 75/6 91/23	46/1 56/3 101/12
189/1 228/20 237/5	Rod [1] 108/17	safety [2] 132/8 203/6	91/25 98/6 98/11	111/22 135/23 141/13
reviews [7] 55/18	Rodric [36] 6/12 6/15	saga [1] 188/2	99/13 100/3 102/15	145/11 149/17 151/18
57/19 58/1 68/15	11/14 11/19 11/21 16/13 27/8 45/7 45/17		109/23 119/8 135/1	153/4 159/8 171/5
200/7 212/12 212/14		10/13 16/16 19/2	144/18 174/12 201/9	180/22 182/24 185/23
rewind [1] 139/10	45/19 46/11 49/12 53/4 53/9 53/9 53/14	19/12 21/11 25/7	216/12 223/9 223/12 226/25	201/17 205/9 206/12 208/7 208/12 210/11
rhetorical [3] 21/13		26/17 26/21 26/23		208/1/208/12/210/11
242/3 242/7	53/16 53/19 70/14 71/11 71/24 77/10	26/25 27/11 37/3 37/4	say [176] 3/2 7/18 9/15 10/19 11/1 12/3	
right [111] 3/2 15/12	104/25 105/4 117/15	44/8 48/6 48/8 51/6	12/4 13/4 13/13 14/12	says [78] 13/19 15/8 20/20 20/25 21/5
20/25 22/16 22/23	135/11 136/16 136/22		15/22 16/14 16/17	21/21 22/5 22/9 22/16
24/22 39/21 43/24	155/25 163/19 168/16		17/2 17/5 17/7 20/18	22/21 22/23 23/16
45/21 46/1 46/10	169/1 182/5 222/24	66/2 66/6 68/16 77/12	20/21 21/1 21/15	24/3 24/9 24/15 24/22
46/19 47/6 47/18	223/6 225/5	83/25 84/4 93/21 94/6	21/23 22/3 22/6 22/6	25/8 25/17 28/8 37/14
52/19 54/2 54/17 55/2	role [14] 3/22 10/8	94/17 94/18 95/5 95/6		40/19 41/5 45/5 49/13
55/3 57/11 57/17	75/14 78/18 78/20	95/21 98/22 100/20	22/22 23/12 23/24	50/13 53/18 56/15
57/24 58/24 59/11	84/21 98/11 100/3	101/23 103/1 103/10	24/4 24/11 24/16	57/18 58/5 58/11
67/14 79/12 84/25	183/14 204/21 204/22	105/12 106/6 108/8	24/23 24/24 25/12	61/14 70/14 76/12
89/4 89/7 89/15 95/22	207/6 230/13 232/10	108/20 114/22 115/13		78/9 80/13 83/15 84/3
103/2 118/3 127/19	rolos [2] 105/17	116/4 118/21 119/12	29/21 30/12 31/15	85/7 87/1 91/15 92/5
127/23 130/12 135/16	108/20	125/14 128/18 138/8	33/4 33/24 34/21	102/18 103/17 106/25
135/22 136/10 138/1	rolled [1] 63/11	139/18 141/14 142/16		
142/18 163/13 164/14	rollout [1] 63/13	151/5 156/17 157/6	40/1 42/7 43/2 45/2	109/2 109/3 109/9
165/11 165/13 165/23	room [3] 2/1 34/18	163/2 163/11 163/14	45/6 45/14 46/23	109/16 112/1 116/12
166/11 166/17 167/18	46/4	163/19 165/24 167/1	46/24 47/7 47/7 47/18	
	root [2] 58/14 125/15	167/4 167/12 167/15	48/5 52/6 55/7 56/21	125/11 131/10 137/4
175/11 177/10 177/20	157/21	167/25 174/16 175/10		137/8 145/17 145/18
178/7 178/23 179/24	Rose [19] 17/7 18/6	177/20 180/8 182/5	73/15 75/6 77/5 77/11	146/5 146/5 147/12
180/14 182/2 184/18	30/23 54/24 66/10	187/22 190/19 199/5	77/20 78/3 79/15 80/1	147/13 150/13 154/12
185/9 185/14 185/19	86/1 86/12 89/19	199/5 202/20 202/21	80/9 81/18 82/14	156/23 157/3 159/19
185/22 186/1 186/5	98/25 122/5 132/22	202/22 202/23 202/25	83/11 83/14 84/5 88/9	172/25 179/1 179/5
186/8 186/11 186/25	133/14 133/19 134/2	203/1 203/2 206/15	92/23 92/25 101/22	195/23 210/5 212/21
187/6 187/11 187/12	139/1 143/19 216/4	207/6 208/5 210/6	105/22 106/22 106/24	243/5
189/23 195/7 202/15	216/15 238/23	214/1 214/2 215/12	108/20 111/6 113/19	SC [2] 105/7 105/9
203/20 204/4 206/10 206/14 207/17 209/5	rough [1] 55/22	216/12 216/20 224/22	114/2 115/17 116/1	scam [1] 21/22
209/8 209/14 211/18	roughly [1] 39/20	231/13 238/4 240/24	116/15 116/19 117/14	scathing [1] 38/24
211/22 212/16 212/21	round [3] 144/16	241/11 242/20 242/24	117/15 117/21 117/22	
	149/24 176/8	243/3	120/4 120/4 120/17	scheduled [1] 36/1
L				(93) rethink - scheduled

(93) rethink - scheduled

S	55/23 56/11 56/23	233/7	62/4 67/15 82/5 84/1	151/16 157/9 189/2
	57/14 58/4 61/5 62/6	Seema [25] 75/25	112/1 131/10 143/6	settle [1] 37/9
scheme [15] 140/21 141/11 142/2 142/18	66/8 78/3 78/24 79/4	122/12 126/12 126/16	147/13 156/8 234/11	settlement [2]
142/24 143/8 144/17	79/4 79/10 79/11 81/5	127/4 128/16 129/6	sentenced [3] 53/23	157/23 158/16
147/2 147/6 147/10	81/10 82/25 84/1	129/16 134/11 135/18		seven [1] 164/12
149/6 152/13 153/5	85/11 85/19 85/25	135/24 136/15 137/10	sentencing [1]	several [2] 129/17
155/7 210/3	86/7 86/9 88/17 122/4	137/18 137/21 205/4	149/16	132/10
	122/23 131/23 132/7	208/15 209/10 210/21	separate [4] 67/21	shall [2] 13/3 40/20
scope [5] 78/17 79/5 234/4 234/24 238/19	132/20 133/13 133/19	210/22 215/1 215/5	113/18 130/3 155/19	share [1] 194/23
Scotland [13] 190/3	134/1 138/25 143/19	215/12 215/15 217/16	separated [1] 3/14	shared [4] 8/2 77/6
191/3 191/25 193/22	144/16 146/17 146/18	seemed [2] 65/10	separately [3] 7/23	195/11 224/3
194/13 194/25 196/10	152/19 153/1 157/2	98/9	163/4 169/8	she [17] 21/23 21/23
196/23 197/1 198/11	161/5 167/22 171/9	seemingly [1] 123/13		28/22 86/25 103/16
198/16 198/18 198/24	171/21 173/15 173/19		3/24 4/4 61/16 84/18	122/15 123/10 123/18
Scotland's [1]	173/24 174/1 174/15	25/18 32/23 38/21	179/10	123/18 123/20 138/8
192/23	175/18 175/24 176/2	44/13 49/16 51/1	September [28]	138/8 138/17 215/24
Scots [3] 193/12	176/19 176/22 177/2	53/24 72/12 72/15	104/24 107/4 116/13	216/19 216/20 217/15
194/3 194/8	178/11 179/7 190/17	78/12 79/9 105/7	160/19 190/3 196/19	shock [1] 46/17
Scott [16] 91/6 91/6	195/9 201/15 201/22	125/19 151/2 151/12	198/13 199/1 201/3	Shoosmiths [1]
91/12 94/8 94/18 96/5	211/24 212/9 216/4	162/11 182/25 183/7	201/15 202/3 202/3	207/12
96/7 98/4 99/12	216/8 216/14 234/14	183/18 183/25 225/2	202/11 202/12 203/16	
103/13 104/10 104/10	238/23 241/14 241/15		204/23 206/3 206/18	47/12 51/16 89/9
104/22 109/11 109/21	241/18 242/15 242/25		207/9 207/21 209/24	121/19 126/13 126/18
117/14	Second Sight [1]	12/4 12/6 12/7 13/23	211/7 211/12 211/16	130/11 145/15 160/7
Scott's [2] 94/6 106/9	131/23	17/19 18/8 30/5 30/6	217/25 223/7 223/21	165/5 166/14 218/22
Scottish [9] 165/7	seconanana [2]	42/12 49/2 49/5 51/18		219/9
190/8 192/14 193/4	94/19 94/22	55/16 56/10 69/20	September 2013 [1]	shortage [3] 141/17
193/20 196/3 196/14	section [2] 146/23	76/7 77/24 94/8	211/16	143/21 147/15
199/3 199/8	228/1		September/October-i	
scrapped [1] 91/13	Section 9 [1] 228/1	103/4 103/16 103/18	sh [1] 116/13	8/19
scratchy [3] 95/12	security [4] 11/20 34/4 94/16 170/8	126/11 135/14 137/6 155/11 160/7 173/19	sequence [2] 178/7 178/10	shorter [1] 166/5
95/15 95/23	see [73] 1/3 4/12	176/12 182/24 183/5	series [2] 180/18	shortfalls [1] 80/22 shorthand [6] 10/24
screen [13] 11/6 13/9	4/14 5/4 8/16 13/14	203/13 221/20 223/4	236/13	95/10 109/7 145/10
15/21 27/25 46/5 57/5	17/6 22/12 35/20 36/9	205/13 22 1/20 225/4	serious [9] 73/5	177/8 185/23
89/13 114/1 134/9	46/17 46/24 47/14	selected [1] 102/3	73/11 93/19 96/13	shorthand-writer [1]
137/2 178/1 179/1	48/24 49/20 55/21	selection [1] 61/19	106/3 125/20 180/6	10/24
213/12	58/7 58/9 58/10 59/17		223/18 223/24	shortly [3] 1/25 6/3
script [1] 23/17	59/18 59/18 60/6 61/4		seriously [4] 18/7	221/16
scroll [40] 21/15	63/17 69/6 71/13 76/2		41/17 44/23 171/23	should [55] 1/11
23/11 24/4 28/4 28/20	77/20 78/2 79/2 79/3	selling [2] 151/14	served [2] 40/4	13/21 38/16 46/8
30/13 33/3 35/24	92/8 95/14 101/22	162/3	122/24	50/20 55/6 55/13 61/4
37/25 40/18 48/24	101/25 103/1 107/14	send [5] 12/2 101/25	service [10] 54/4	65/17 65/24 66/3
53/18 59/8 61/2 70/24 76/11 78/2 79/3 79/15	111/24 114/20 115/6	114/7 127/25 154/7	57/20 58/2 117/3	69/25 71/18 72/14
84/14 85/7 102/17	116/25 121/21 122/14	sender [1] 102/1	190/4 191/6 194/25	76/18 77/1 80/11
103/15 103/24 105/11	134/16 136/23 137/1	sending [2] 50/4	196/10 198/15 200/18	93/10 94/16 99/3 99/7
111/25 116/25 122/14	146/17 151/5 151/6	55/22	Services [7] 29/11	112/4 119/11 119/21
122/16 138/20 145/1	151/7 154/1 154/3	sends [2] 49/6 56/2	30/17 33/6 33/13 40/3	
145/16 146/23 147/23	154/9 155/11 164/8	senior [10] 2/23 4/5	76/14 80/17	128/18 130/10 133/15
148/8 154/2 154/11	166/9 170/4 171/1	5/5 101/13 101/17	serving [1] 80/14	137/20 147/2 149/18
156/25 159/7 161/1	171/15 172/21 172/25		set [28] 2/13 2/20	151/18 151/20 153/4
scrolling [2] 123/25	180/18 183/11 196/23		2/25 18/25 19/10	153/18 157/19 168/17
137/19	200/10 201/25 203/18		44/14 59/1 81/12	177/12 179/18 181/7
second [103] 12/20	233/3 233/11 233/12	45/13 66/8 66/18	103/11 111/4 114/11	182/3 183/2 185/18
13/10 13/20 13/25	242/24 243/4	104/15 113/6 134/12	115/20 116/14 119/19	188/24 189/7 197/15
14/11 14/23 14/25	seeing [3] 59/23	135/6 169/20 180/9	119/21 124/2 138/7	197/24 208/5 212/17
15/23 16/4 16/10	107/8 154/6	sensible [1] 116/1	145/8 146/9 146/19	215/24 216/19 216/20
16/16 18/3 19/20	seek [5] 34/25 41/7	sent [19] 26/19 53/7 56/20 57/4 57/7 57/13	146/21 150/12 170/6 174/23 228/3 228/7	236/18 shouldors [1] 130/22
19/21 21/24 22/24	152/18 171/6 171/17	77/8 88/24 89/2 92/1	233/25 240/18	shoulders [1] 130/22
23/6 23/9 26/2 26/15	seeking [4] 42/2 139/22 155/1 198/25	101/3 101/17 101/20	sets [5] 71/13 91/8	shouldn't [4] 44/19 67/17 140/4 210/13
30/1 30/18 30/21	seem [10] 46/21 51/8	128/1 148/9 208/21	138/17 147/10 169/17	show [4] 25/8 25/9
32/18 33/8 35/3 41/11	59/6 65/2 86/19 99/21	210/6 211/8 211/9	setting [7] 83/25	180/19 191/7
51/4 54/13 54/19	104/11 185/16 206/4	sentence [11] 58/7	92/11 130/14 148/7	showing [1] 154/5

(94) scheme - showing

S	55/24 63/5 82/2	166/16 177/3 177/18	241/11 243/11	242/7 243/13 244/3
	101/21 158/7 237/24	189/17 189/25 199/13		sold [1] 162/1
shred [1] 96/6	significantly [1]	199/15 199/16 199/21		solely [1] 132/23
shredded [1] 93/13	166/1	202/2 202/7 207/13	so [197] 3/19 6/11	solicitor [11] 5/5 6/25
shredding [14] 90/1	silk [1] 182/19	207/16 212/19 218/15		7/2 7/4 7/6 9/1 10/19
92/7 92/9 99/2 99/10	silly [1] 53/17	218/18 219/7 219/13	9/23 10/17 12/3 14/20	34/20 96/15 116/1
99/25 106/2 106/9	silos [2] 11/3 11/9	243/19 243/21 244/2	16/5 16/20 17/4 18/8	184/16
107/7 109/19 109/19	similar [10] 31/18	244/8	18/20 19/9 22/23	solicitors [13] 4/1
109/22 110/16 122/5	33/17 59/13 125/15	Sir Anthony [8]	23/13 24/23 25/12	38/19 71/15 84/16
shut [1] 239/15	133/18 152/18 154/9	146/12 152/11 153/18	25/18 26/18 27/9 29/2	85/10 96/13 96/15
sic [6] 51/21 167/16 194/5 195/14 195/24	157/13 194/14 225/20	156/3 156/6 156/10	31/6 31/17 31/19 32/2	122/23 196/3 196/6
206/20	similarity [1] 131/25	159/2 164/3	32/23 35/17 35/22	200/16 202/18 207/11
side [19] 57/6 57/6	Similarly [1] 147/9	sit [1] 218/23	36/2 37/2 37/2 38/5	some [76] 2/18 3/5
57/10 57/11 57/12	SIMON [16] 1/7 1/10	sits [1] 154/13	38/12 38/21 40/7	4/5 7/11 8/1 9/16
57/16 57/17 57/17	20/21 49/14 53/3	sitting [2] 163/2	40/23 41/25 42/7 44/3	16/12 20/15 24/12
57/18 58/7 58/24 59/9	70/15 71/3 78/10	163/6	44/4 45/3 45/10 48/12	
59/11 68/10 148/14	91/16 92/5 105/8	situation [11] 38/16	49/16 49/20 50/1	33/25 39/2 48/19
151/6 151/6 155/20	108/14 108/24 109/1	38/24 42/8 56/6 99/15		51/21 56/22 65/2 65/5
165/7	145/4 245/2	99/22 184/25 185/14	53/14 53/24 55/4	66/14 67/11 70/16
sides [1] 115/12	Simon's [1] 102/24	185/25 188/5 188/5	55/14 55/15 57/4	72/6 76/11 78/25 93/1
sift [6] 10/16 10/17	simple [2] 12/22	situations [1] 187/24	57/11 57/13 59/4 60/8	95/19 96/2 96/4 100/6
60/23 67/1 80/7	128/23	six [1] 188/10	60/25 60/25 61/10	100/7 103/5 105/12
124/21	simply [12] 5/20 48/9		63/12 63/14 63/16	110/3 110/4 111/15 114/4 114/19 116/15
sifted [1] 68/4	81/14 120/22 134/13 139/15 143/20 199/18	sketch [1] 21/17	65/2 67/12 69/14 72/19 74/7 76/2 78/12	117/14 117/15 119/7
sifting [1] 80/6	199/21 226/15 231/12		80/23 83/18 85/19	119/9 119/10 119/12
sifts [3] 68/17 68/17	242/7	slight [1] 115/9	89/23 90/24 92/23	119/13 119/16 120/11
69/25	simultaneous [1]	slightest [1] 209/25	94/3 96/12 96/22 97/5	
sight [85] 12/20	10/19	slightly [12] 9/20	97/17 98/7 99/21	132/24 140/17 141/4
14/11 14/23 14/25	since [6] 79/7 127/3	14/12 15/25 44/6	101/3 101/20 102/10	141/5 145/14 145/22
15/23 16/4 16/10	129/17 136/7 138/10	69/21 70/6 105/8	103/15 103/20 105/25	148/20 151/14 152/23
16/17 18/3 19/20	161/5	139/10 145/2 145/11	107/10 108/2 108/10	155/11 157/20 158/4
19/21 22/24 23/6 23/9 26/2 26/15 30/1 30/18		156/19 165/10	109/23 110/7 110/14	158/9 159/24 163/5
30/22 32/18 33/9 35/3	193/5	slip [1] 24/2	112/20 113/18 114/22	163/11 180/24 187/19
41/11 51/5 54/13		small [4] 57/21 58/6	115/8 115/9 116/7	198/12 201/4 206/14
54/19 55/23 56/11	7/14 7/15 7/15 7/22	58/8 143/22	116/11 119/23 120/8	210/3 236/18 242/19
56/23 57/14 58/4 61/5	11/15 11/20 16/13	smile [1] 38/23	121/11 125/19 126/3	243/24
62/6 66/8 78/3 79/4	19/1 27/6 27/10 27/17	Smith [90] 2/14 2/16		somebody [12] 12/3
79/10 81/5 81/10	27/19 29/11 29/12	6/4 6/4 6/9 8/5 8/10	129/9 130/11 130/18	27/5 27/7 31/5 62/21
82/25 84/1 85/11	29/20 31/13 32/14	9/17 14/22 15/24 18/2		65/19 101/20 143/1
85/19 86/1 86/7 86/9	32/24 34/24 36/19 39/25 45/7 45/15	18/9 18/20 19/7 20/9 20/13 24/6 24/7 26/22	135/22 136/25 140/11	145/10 149/10 149/15 195/24
122/4 131/23 132/7	77/10 91/9 91/14 92/2		143/22 145/13 146/8	somehow [2] 51/1
133/13 133/19 134/1	01/6 01/19 05/6 05/9	34/24 39/14 44/22	146/10 146/12 146/21	
135/17 138/25 143/19	95/13 95/16 100/21	49/13 51/19 53/8	146/22 150/4 150/18	someone [7] 94/9
152/19 153/1 161/5	102/8 104/1 104/8		161/20 165/11 165/17	117/4 181/14 182/19
167/22 171/9 171/21	104/11 104/25 114/7	77/24 91/7 91/9 91/15		187/3 216/9 221/6
	135/11 136/16 136/22	93/15 93/18 93/21	167/8 168/4 168/12	something [39] 3/23
174/1 174/15 175/18	152/9 154/1 156/1	93/24 94/5 94/21	170/3 171/13 174/1	5/24 9/18 12/25 18/7
175/25 176/2 176/19 176/22 177/2 178/12	168/16 169/1 171/5	94/23 95/7 95/8 95/11		22/17 29/5 31/4 36/18
179/7 190/17 216/4	191/1 208/12 241/8	95/12 108/8 114/5	178/18 178/21 180/21	37/6 40/13 43/20
216/8 216/14 234/14	242/1 242/10	114/6 114/23 117/10	181/10 182/8 184/13	43/21 48/6 67/9 85/3
238/23 241/14 241/15	Singh's [3] 32/20	127/19 127/23 135/12		89/17 92/8 109/4
241/19 242/15 242/25	95/22 104/5	145/2 145/17 166/19	185/19 185/25 186/22	119/14 120/20 127/22
sighted [4] 210/21	single [5] 5/1 37/10	177/18 178/11 178/19		179/3 180/6 180/7
211/2 223/16 225/2	80/17 83/14 115/11	180/8 183/19 184/4	195/20 199/10 200/20	
sign [2] 126/20	sir [45] 1/3 47/3	188/19 195/16 196/11		199/15 212/23 223/5
127/20	47/10 47/14 88/16	210/6 218/2 219/18	205/1 206/10 207/17	225/22 227/15 227/21
signal [1] 23/23	88/19 88/20 89/6 89/11 89/13 121/11	220/13 220/24 221/14 221/22 223/6 223/10	209/5 209/10 210/19 214/14 216/13 217/5	230/7 230/9 232/5 238/2 242/4
signature [1] 1/18	121/21 1/6/12 152/11	223/15 223/23 224/12		sometimes [4] 5/17
signed [3] 28/5 75/13	153/18 156/3 156/6	225/15 225/23 224/12	219/4 223/15 223/23 227/3 228/23 230/23	115/6 127/21 164/11
127/20	156/10 159/2 164/3	226/7 239/15 240/8	231/18 231/24 232/17	
significant [7] 42/1	164/14 164/24 166/12		235/10 235/24 241/24	
				(95) shred - somewhat

(95) shred - somewhat

1858 203/12 205/23 Spirtling [1] 205/19 11/22 12/22/12/22 197/5 succeeds [1] 15/20 211/0 23/20 24/6 spoke [9] 11/1/2 13/8/8 13/5/15 15/470 197/5 succeeds [1] 15/20 82/00 88/21 96/91 11/4/20/12/71/4 14/97 199/710 13/75 succeeds [1] 15/20 13/75 128/24 136/11 138/7 169/71 169/21 169/3 12/24 12/22 2277/2 13/75 succeeds [1] 15/20 13/75 128/24 136/11 138/7 159/71 169/12 169/3 12/27 12/22 2277/2 13/75 <t< th=""><th>S</th><th>171/23 235/1 235/8</th><th>62/20 62/21 62/22</th><th>198/9 198/17 198/18</th><th>substantively [4]</th></t<>	S	171/23 235/1 235/8	62/20 62/21 62/22	198/9 198/17 198/18	substantively [4]
134/16 Spect [1] 32/15	somewhere [1]				I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
Storn [3] 1776 34712 splitting [1] 12054 12072 storn [2] 19773 21072 Storn [2] 1075 storce [2] 1976 storce [2] 1976 storce [2] 1976 Storn [2] 1071 1047					
18/16 200/12 200/23 Spike [1] 58/16 200/12 122/24 123/9 131/7 197/6 successful [1] 52/20 21/10 23/20 24/6 Spike [1] 11/4 201 27/14 156/20 197/9 197/10 136/8 153/15 154/19 successful [1] 52/20 successful [1] 52/20 101/7 104/15 107/14 169/2 169/2 198/7 198/2 122/11 146/8 200/25 straight-line [1] 137/6 34/6 34/2 35/6 128/24 136/11 148/11 29/16 21/7 169/2 169/2 230/7 230/11 23/12 118/6 11/14 40/20/25 128/22 13/15 113/16 straight-line [1] 34/6 34/4 67/15 34/6 34/22 35/6 34/6 34/22 35/6 129/2 22/11 13/31 116/12 Spite [1] 12/21 23/72 23/72 23/7 13/22 16/7 25/24 34/6 34/26 7/15 34/6 34/26 7/15 129/2 22/11 13/31 13/25 16/7 25/24 13/22 16/7 25/24 13/2 13/21 14/14 14/20 13/16 14/14/12/14 13/25 16/7 25/24 13/2 13/21 14/14 14/20 13/16 14/24/17 13/16 14/14/12/14 13/25 16/7 25/24 13/22 14/21 14/21 14/21 13/16 14/14/24/17 13/16 14/14/24/17 13/16 14/14/24/17 13/16 14/14/24/17 13/16 14/14/24/17 13/16 14/14/24/17 13/17 14/17/14/17/14/17 13/16 14	soon [5] 17/8 54/12				
Sorty [34] Wi24 Spoke [9] 11/12 1388 153/15 154/19 story [1] 11/12 successful [1] 8/21 08/21 09/9 10/7 104/15 129/14 16/7 169/21 169/13 136/7 109/21 221/11 14/9 240/25 137/7 109/21 221/12 136/7 109/21 221/12 136/7 109/21 221/12 136/7 109/21 221/12 34/6 34/9 34/22 35/6 41/3 34/6 14/9 24/25 34/6 34/9 34/22 35/6 41/3 34/7 14/8 24/16 34/6 34/9 34/22 35/6 41/3 34/7 14/8 14/18 41/8 33					
21/10 23/10 23/10 23/10 23/10 23/10 23/11 13/11 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td> </td></td<>					
101/7 104/15 107/14 167/1 169/2 129/3 199/1 198/21 22111 144/9 240/25 34/6 34/9 34/22 25/6 128/24 136/1 138/7 199/4 2241/15 220/8 2222 2277.2 stard [6] 13/16 34/6 34/9 34/22 25/6 169/19 1772 1485/11 291/6 230/9 2320 233/8 130/2 13/22 13/25 53/5 64/2 67/15 197/4 202/9 207/8 Square [10] 31/3 55/6 64/2 67/15 13/20 13/22 13/25 13/20 13/22 13/25 21/9 224/11 229/11 126/7 124/7 124/ 126/7 126/12 126/7 126/12 13/26 22/24 401/2 21/15 126/7 126/12 126/7 126/12 13/26 13/22 13/25 13/26 22/24 401/2 21/1 126/7 126/12 126/7 126/12 13/26 13/26 13/26 22/24 401/2 21/2 120/11 14/14 14/16 126/17 13/26 13/27 13/26 22/24 40/25 11/2 113/7 126/71 13/26 13/27 13/27 22/24 40/12 21/2 120/11 13/26 13/27 13/27 13/27 300/12 11/2 113/27 13/27 13/27 13/27 13/27 13/27 13/27 13/27					
128/24 136/11 138/7 159/4 24/115 22/8 22/22 21/22 straight-line [1] 34/6 34/2 34/22 35/6 142/25 153/12 159/8 sported [1] 50/12 23/7 230/11 231/12 strain [8] 13/16 34/16 34/16 41/20 158/21 193/13 195/10 sported [1] 50/12 37/7 20/29 232/22 23/25 strain [8] 13/16 32/7 230/12 23/25 strain [8] 13/16 32/7 4 230/12 23/25 strain [8] 13/16 13/12 14/12 14/12 14/12 14/12 14/12 14/12 14/12 14/12 14/12 14/12 14/12 14/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 14/12 14/12 14/12 14/12 14/12 14/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 14/12 14/12 14/12 14/12 14/12 14/12 14/12 14/12 14/12 13/13 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12 13/13/12 13/12 13/12 13/12		167/1 169/2 169/3		144/9 240/25	such [46] 9/6 34/3
144/25 153/12 118/6 <					
100/19/10/19/10 100/19/10					
180/2 190/1 20078 spurred [1] 152/16 statements [2] 25/5 13/25 15/7 25/24 96/20 96/24 96/25 209/22 211/15 212/0 31/6 124/7 124/9 25/6 28/14 40/04 7216 13/42 97/4 97/16 99/14 212/9 224/11 229/11 125/7 125/12 125/16 75/17 75/14 75/12 strands [2] 13/15 120/11 141/8 144/8 212/9 224/11 62/12 strands [2] 13/15 strands [2] 13/15 14/20 147/1 147/9 14/20 147/1 147/9 22/24 20/12 51/21 strands [2] 13/15 strands [2] 13/15 14/20 147/1 147/9 14/20 147/1 147/9 22/24 20/12 51/21 strands [2] 13/15 strands [2] 13/15 14/20 147/2 147/9 22/24 20/12 51/21 strands [2] 13/15 strands [2] 13/15 14/20 147/2 147/9 20/14 20/15 strands [2] 13/15 strands [2] 13/15 14/20 147/2 147/9 20/15 strands [2] 13/15 strands [2] 15/16 12/21 20/16 21/12 13/16 12/21 13/16 12/21 13/16 12/21 13/16 12/21 20/17 21/72 strands [2] 3/19 strands [2] 3/19 strands [2] 13/17 14/14 20/17 21/72 strands [2] 3/19 strands [2] 3/19 strands [2]	166/19 177/21 185/11				I I
Square [10] 31/3 Square [10] 31/3<		sputted [1] 09/23			I I
209/22 21/15 2/17 3/iF 124/7 72/12 72/17 75/14 strands [2] 13/15 120/11 141/8 141/8 23/27 232/17 237/9 125/18 125/20 125/24 80/24 83/19 102/24 strands [2] 13/15 141/20 147/2 147/9 22/24 24/012 51/21 squarely [2] 42/17 103/25 104/3 129/9 strength [3] 73/10 148/2 148/5 148/9 22/24 40/12 51/21 squarely [2] 42/17 103/25 104/3 129/9 strength [3] 73/10 148/2 148/5 148/9 22/24 40/12 51/21 system [3] 73/10 148/2 148/5 148/9 strength [3] 15/11 149/19 156/12 158/10 20/16 217/22 system [3] 73/10 148/11 129/23 23/23 23/21 153/17 172/1 176/11 192/24 300/16 217/22 162/19 148/11 141/141/8 14/16 166/6 158/25 23/20 29/17 141/1 141/25 142/6 148/11 141/14 148/11 139/12 149/17 148/11 149/19 14/17 149/19 14/17 149/19 14/17 149/19 14/17 149/19 14/17 149/19 14/17 149/19 14/17 149/19 14/17 149/19 14/17 149/19 14/17 149/19 14/17 149/19 14/17 149/19 14/17 149/19 14/17 149/19 14/17 149/19 14/17					I I
12.12 12.12 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>I I</td></td<>					I I
sort [13] 21/2 125/18 125/20		125/7 125/12 125/16			141/20 147/2 147/9
22/24 d/0/2 51/21 square (j) 14/21 // 11 103/25 10/26 // 12 103/25 10/26 // 12 103/25 10/26 // 12 117/14 117/14 117/15 126/11 St [1] 79/11 213/23 227/24 228/1 153/17 172/1 176/12 172/1 176/12 209/16 217/22 162/19 162/19 232/3 227/24 228/1 153/17 172/1 176/12 203/12 136/17 172/1 176/12 203/12 136/17 172/1 176/12 203/12 136/17 172/1 176/12 203/12 136/17 172/1 176/12 203/12 136/17 172/1 176/12 203/12 136/17 172/1 176/12 203/12 136/17 172/1 176/12 203/12 136/17 172/1 176/12 203/12 136/17 172/1 176/12 203/12 136/17 176/12 203/12 136/17 176/12 203/12 136/17 176/12 203/12 136/17 176/12 203/12 136/17 176/12 203/17 176/12 203/17 176/12 203/17 176/12 203/17 176/12 203/17 176/12 203/17 176/12 203/17 176/12 203/17 176/12 203/17 176/12 203/17 176/12 203/17 176/12 176/12 176/12 176/12 176/12					I I
1111 11111 111111 11111111 1111111 1111111<					I I I
151/27 169/6 127/22 107/42 193/12 </td <td>117/14 117/15 126/11</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	117/14 117/15 126/11				
20910 21/12 182/19 182/19 230/12 231/5 231/19 148/16 16/68/8 203/7 206/8 212/19 sought [8] 121/7 148/11 148/16 128/17 starting [2] 33/19 232/3 232/13 232/21 strong [7] 76/21 sufficient [1] 33/17 14/11 41/21 14/21 41/14 11 18/16 16/8 203/7 206/8 212/19 sufficient [1] 33/17 21/12 231/2 231/2 332/21 18/16 16/8 18/16 16/8 18/16 16/8 203/7 206/8 212/19 21/12 231/2 231/2 331/9 18/16 16/8 18/16 16/8 strong [7] 76/21 sufficient [5] 63/4 21/16 18/17 14/16 14/21 18/17 14/16 14/21 sufficient [5] 63/4 sufficient [6] 62/17 21/16 18/17 14/16 12/15 18/16 23/18 struggle [1] 21/20/16 sufficient [5] 63/4 300/12 230/9 23/16 23/17 struggle [1] 21/20/16 sufficient [5] 63/4 300/12 230/9 23/17 struggle [1] 21/20/17 struggle [1] 21/20/17 sufficient [5] 63/4 301/12 207/16 struggle [1] 20/17 struggle [1] 21/20/17 sufficient [5] 63/4 301/12 20/16 11/17/16 struggle [1] 21/20/17 sufficient [1] 20/20/17					I I
Sorder [1] 138/15 staff [3] 98/12 123/17 staff [3] 98/12 123/17 staff [3] 98/12 123/17 staff [3] 98/12 123/17 148/11 122/17 138/17 staff [3] 98/17 137/17					I I
Study [16] 12/1 14/1 14/12 14/2					
1553 192/4 192/4 192/21 192/22 192/22 192/22 192/22 192/22 192/22 146/13 146/14		148/11	statements/evidence		
217/21 62/10 60/23 81/1/1 stating [2] 33/19 strongy [6] 143/1 sufficient [5] 63/4 sound [2] 17/25 168/6 112/9 115/18 124/8 125/3 129/1 stating [2] 32/22 160/1 sufficient [5] 63/4 source [1] 81/9 160/25 181/1/13 193/7 238/15 230/15 strugg [1] 26/17 sufficient [3] 24/22 44/6 52/13 160/25 181/1/13 193/7 238/15 238/15 238/15 160/21 strugg [1] 163/12 44/12 44/25 56/15 speak [3] 12/16 51/9 84/12 139/4 staye [2] 59/9 197/20 stuff [3] 11/22 77/5 66/17 65/23 39/9 96/17 65/23 39/9 standard [1] 15/16 standard [1] 18/14 staye [2] 108/19 subject [6] 34/2 179/3 204/4 212/1 169/21 174/7 175/20 63/12 107/10 140/6 160/10 230/9 standards [1] 114/11 strol [2] 101/13 standards [1] 114/11 177/23 202/16 216/21 111/3 183/7 232/18 specialis [1] 208/14 standing [2] 5/21 5/22 15/17 167/24 strol [2] 101/13 strol [2] 101/13 123/9 37/11 42/18 44/18 suggested [25] 21/1 23/14 28/22 111/12/18 24/2 111/2/18 24/2 111/2 18/2 12/2/2 12/2 12/2/2 12/2 12/2/2 12/2 12/2/2 12/2/					
Sourine [2] 17/12 124/8 125/3 129/1/6 status [9] 32/22 160/1 sufficiently [1] 62/10 source [1] 134/15 138/12 146/12 50/10 77/4 107/2 struggling [1] 162/1 sufficiently [1] 62/10 source [1] 19/76 238/15 213/16 235/18 struggling [1] 62/17 44/12 50/10 77/4 107/20 struggling [1] 62/17 24/12 44/12 50/10 77/4 107/20 struggling [1] 62/17 44/12 50/10 77/4 107/20 struggling [1] 62/17 44/12 50/10 50/1					
19/1/6 134/15 138/12 146/12 50/10 7/4 107/3 struggle [1] 218/12 25/13 44/6 44/6 52/13 33/15 138/12 146/12 50/10 7/4 100/25 181/13 196/24 200/14 206/17 25/13 43/17 44/4 50urces [1] 29/9 50/15 struggle [1] 62/12 50/13 43/17 44/4 24/12 56/15 66/17 65/12 66/17 65/12 66/17 65/12 66/17 65/12 66/17 65/12 66/17 65/12 66/17 65/15 11/14 1	sound [2] 17/25				
Sounds [3] 42/22 160/25 181/13 193/7 196/24 200/14 206/5 struggling [1] 62/17 25/13 43/17 44/4 source [1] 81/9 238/15 238/15 213/16 235/18 struggling [1] 62/17 65/19 84/12 24/25 56/15 space [1] 191/18 stamc [1] 15/16 stay [2] 59/9 197/20 stuff [3] 11/22 77/5 67/17 95/23 96/9 97/14 112/3 124/6 space [1] 191/18 stance [1] 15/16 stay [2] 59/9 197/20 stuff [3] 11/22 77/5 15/210 15/65/156/10 16/17 95/23 96/9 97/14 112/3 124/6 15/210 15/65 156/10 16/17 95/23 96/9 97/14 112/3 124/6 15/210 15/65 156/10 16/17 95/23 96/9 97/14 112/3 124/6 16/17 95/23 96/9 97/14 112/3 12/32 21/23 21/23 16/17 95/23 96/9 97/14 11/3 16/12 11/1 11/3 183/7 subject [6] 3/2/2 3/2/18 24/58 subject [6] 3/2/2 3/11 42/16 44/18 3/2/12 37/14 42/18 44/18 3/2/14 21/1 21/6 21/12 20/2 3/11 42/18 44/18 13/10 126/22 12/17 5/16/156 65/17 65/23 16/17 65/25 16/17 65/25 16/17 65/25 16/17 65/25 16/17					
44/6 32/13 238/15 213/16 235/18 strung [1] 163/12 44/12 44/25 56/15 sources [1] 29/9 stance [1] 15/16 stance [1] 15/16 stance [1] 162/15 stuff [3] 11/22 77/5 66/17 95/23 96/9 speak [8] 12/16 65/19 84/12 139/4 stealing [1] 123/14 stealing [1] 123/14 stuff [3] 11/22 77/5 166/17 95/23 96/9 14/14 19/9 44/16 65/19 84/12 139/4 stealing [1] 123/14 stee [2] 108/19 sub[2] 51/21 51/23 169/21 174/77 175/20 14/12 19/9 44/16 65/19 84/12 139/4 stee [2] 108/19 sub[2] 51/21 51/23 169/21 174/77 175/20 63/12 107/10 140/6 160/10 230/9 203/22 sub[2] 51/21 51/23 169/21 174/77 175/20 7/15 10/14 10/19 standard [1] 18/13 Stein [6] 165/8 sub[2] 51/21 51/13 111/3 183/7 23/21 9/10 13/22 19/41 standig [2] 52/21 Stein [6] 165/8 subpostmaster [9] 70/16 94/14 101/15 13/21 13/22 19/41 55/20 61/12 61/15 Stepphen [2] 101/13 111/12 12/12 12/12 12/12 21/22 13/11 13/212 2146/2 55/20 61/12 61/15 Step [3] 58/21 98/8 subpostmaster [9] 70/16 94/14 101/15 13/21 13/22 19/14 51/22 15/27/1 165/25 168/12					
Sources [1] 29/9 stamp [1] 154/4 stay [2] 59/9 197/20 stuff [3] 11/22 77/5 66/17 95/23 96/9 space [1] 191/18 stance [1] 15/16 stayed [1] 162/15 181/5 97/14 11/23 124/6 space [8] 12/16 stand [7] 44/4 62/21 stealig [1] 160/10 230/9 203/22 sub [2] 51/21 51/23 152/10 156/51 56/10 63/12 107/10 140/6 160/10 230/9 standard [1] 187/13 Stein [6] 165/8 42/10 42/17 61/11 21/23 212/23 216/3 speaking [9] 7/13 standard [1] 187/13 stenographer [1] 23/21 submitted [2] 81/5 suggested [25] 21/1 21/8 245/8 subparagraph [1] 37/11 42/17 48 4/18 42/10 42/17 61/11 21/2 28/22 32/18 subparagraph [1] 37/11 42/14 41/14 13/10 126/22 127/13 16/16 66/7 66/25 16/17 66/25 16/17 66/25 16/17 66/25 16/17 66/25 16/17 66/25 13/11 42/17 41/21 41/24 14/12 14/21 41/24 14/12 14/21 41/24 14/12 14/21 41/24 14/12 14/21 41/24 14/12 14/22 14/14 14/13 14/14 10/15 13/11 42/16/2					I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
space [1] 191/18 stand [7] 191/14 123/4 151/5 17/14 123/4 speak [8] 12/16 65/19 84/12 139/4 132/10 152/10					
speak [8] 12/16 stand [7] 44/4 62/21 stealing [1] 12/3/4 style [2] 50/21 12/3/2 15/2/10 17/2/2 <th1 2="" 2<="" th=""> 17/2/2 <th1 2="" 2<="" t<="" td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I</td></th1></th1>					I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
14/14 19/9 44/16 05/19 64/12 139/4 159/2 11/14/1715/20 63/12 107/10 140/6 160/10 230/9 203/22 subject [6] 34/21 179/3 204/4 21/1 148/23 standard [1] 187/13 standing [2] 5/21 Stein [6] 165/8 42/10 42/17 61/11 212/3 212/23 216/3 21/10 105/22 145/5 standing [2] 5/21 Stein [6] 165/8 subject [6] 34/2 179/3 204/4 21/1 21/10 105/22 145/5 standing [2] 5/21 Stein [6] 165/8 subject [6] 34/2 21/6 21/12 8/2 3/10 37/5 41/15 standing [2] 5/21 Stein [6] 165/8 subject [6] 34/2 21/6 21/12 28/22 standing [2] 5/21 standing [2] 15/19 39/4 Stein [6] 165/8 subject [6] 34/2 21/6 21/12 28/22 stand [2] 81/5 standing [2] 15/1 31/1 11/15 subparagraph [1] 37/11 42/18 44/18 55/20 61/12 61/7 66/25 starts [3] 58/17 65/3 steps [3] 58/21 98/8 66/16 66/17 66/25 168/7 14/25 161/9 14/25 161/9 10/22 12/14 39/23 59/1 113/16 19/17 15/173 168/12 14/25 161/9 120/20 210/20 212/14 120/20 210/20 212/14 120/20 210/20 212/14 120/20 210/20 212/14 120/20 210/20 212/14 120/20 210/20 212/14 120/20 210/20 212/				style [2] 56/21 128/3	I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
Standard [1] 187/13 Stein [6] 165/8 42/10 42/17 61/11 212/3 21/13 21/14	14/14 19/9 44/16				I I I
speaking [9] 7/13 standards [1] 114/11 177/23 202/16 216/21 111/3 183/7 232/18 7/15 10/14 10/19 21/10 105/22 145/6 145/6 145/6 145/13 subgaragraph [1] 33/24 subgaragraph [1] 21/16 21/12 28/27 11/12 28/27 11/12 28/27 11/12 28/27 11/12 21/14 21/14 21/12 21/12 21/12 21/12 21/12 21/14 21/12 21/12 21/12 21/12 21/12 21/14 21/14 21/14 21/14 21/12 21/12 21/14 21/14 21/14 21/14 21/14 21/14 21/14 21/14 21/14 21/14 21/14 21/14 21/14 21/14 21/14 21/14 21/11 2					
Speaking [9] Standing [2] 5/21 218/5 245/8 submitted [2] 81/5 suggested [25] 21/1 21/10 105/22 145/5 5/22 23/21 23/21 Submitted [2] 81/5 21/6 21/6 21/2 28/5 33/24 21/6 21/6 21/12 28/5 33/24 21/6 21/6 21/6 21/12 28/5 21/6 21/6 21/12 28/5 21/6 21/12 28/5 21/6 21/12 28/5 21/6 21/12 28/5 21/6 21/12 28/5 21/6 21/12 28/5 21/6 21/12 28/5 21/6 21/12 28/5 21/6 21/12 28/5 21/11 23/21 21/11 23/21 21/14 21/12 21/14 21/15 21/11					I I I
21/10 105/22 145/5 145/6 145/13 5/22 start [25] 15/19 39/4 stenographer [1] 23/21 832/24 subparagraph [1] 23/21 21/6 21/12 28/22 37/11 42/18 44/18 special [1] 208/14 special [1] 87/7 61/19 63/6 63/9 64/8 65/15 65/17 65/23 51/5 65/17 65/23 66/1 66/17 66/25 5tephen [2] 101/13 32/9 55/1 61/15 69/24 special [1] 208/14 61/19 63/6 63/9 64/8 101/15 subpostmaster [9] 70/16 94/14 101/15 special [1] 30/21 39/11 61/1 66/17 66/25 168/12 141/22 141/24 142/3 140/3 144/9 150/14 193/11 193/22 194/14 70/13 93/17 105/12 168/12 168/12 141/22 141/24 142/3 140/3 144/9 150/14 113/16 119/15 183/6 166/1 616/10 166/21 85/25 99/7 108/19 159/5 subpostmaster's [1] 150/25 172/14 216/27 23/8 242/17 started [5] 3/20 181/4 210/19 15/17 16/7 49/1 49/6 192/20 210/20 212/11 177/12 200/22 started [5] 3/20 181/4 210/19 15/17 160/22 161/4 192/20 210/20 12/21 speculating [2] 88/15 107/22 starte [1] 160/19 stop [9] 17/5 109/19 150/7 160/22 161/4 28/23 43/11 44/3 102/9 starte [1] 160/19 stop [9] 17/5 109/19 170/23 193/1 213/4 125/2 137/9 157/20					suggested [25] 21/1
145/6 145/13 start [25] 15/19 39/4 23/21 subparagraph [1] 3/1/11 42/18 44/18 special [1] 208/14 55/20 61/12 61/15 Stephen [2] 101/13 123/9 55/1 61/19 69/24 specialist [4] 84/16 61/19 63/6 63/9 64/8 101/15 subpostmaster [9] 70/16 94/14 101/15 specialist [4] 84/16 66/1 66/17 65/23 66/1 66/17 65/25 168/12 141/22 141/24 142/3 140/3 144/9 150/14 193/11 193/22 194/14 70/13 93/17 105/12 168/12 141/25 161/9 150/25 172/14 216/21 39/23 59/1 113/16 166/6 166/10 166/21 22/15 55/1 61/9 61/10 subpostmaster's [1] 230/25 238/17 242/1 38/8 242/17 startig [5] 3/20 startel [5] 3/20 144/5 156/22 180/25 subpostmasters [11] 192/20 210/20 21/20 21/20 21/20 5/18 6/1 67/24 110/18 107/22 startig [2] 165/25 stolen [1] 138/12 51/2 145/22 146/8 suggestion [13] 21/7 102/9 startig [2] 16/25 106/12 stood [2] 115/5 190/2 44/11 59/4 102/21 speculating [2] 88/r 178/12 196/24 17/7 18/19 192/17 197/19 subsequent [1] 125/2 137/9 157/20 102/9 startig [2] 8/16 92/24 178/12 96/24 179/13 193/19 19					I I
special [1] 208/14 55/20 61/12 61/15 Stephen [2] 101/13 123/9 55/161/15 69/24 specialises [1] 87/7 61/19 63/6 63/9 64/8 101/15 subpostmaster [9] 70/16 94/14 101/15 specialist [4] 84/16 65/1 66/17 66/25 168/12 141/22 141/22 141/24 142/3 140/3 144/9 150/14 specific [9] 33/11 13/16 166/6 166/10 166/21 168/12 141/22 141/24 142/3 140/3 144/9 150/14 39/23 59/1 113/16 166/6 166/10 166/21 22/15 55/1 61/9 61/10 subpostmaster's [1] 150/25 172/14 216/21 38/8 242/17 started [5] 3/20 55/1 61/15 156/22 subpostmaster's [1] 190/20 210/20 212/11 specifics [1] 105/23 starting [2] 165/25 107/22 starting [2] 165/25 subpostmasters [1] 192/20 210/20 212/11 speculate [2] 88/8 107/22 starting [2] 165/25 169/12 stolen [1] 138/12 51/2 145/22 146/8 suggestion [13] 21/7 102/9 starting [2] 160/19 starte [1] 160/19 subsequent [1] 125/2 137/9 157/20 170/23 193/1 213/4 145/12 starte [1] 160/19 subsequent [1] 125/2 137/9 157/20 170/23 193/1 213/4 28/25 137/9 157/20 170/23 193/1 213/4 145/					I I
specialises [1] 87/7 specialises [1] 84/16 193/11 193/22 193/11 193/22 193/23 59/1 39/23 59/1 113/16 124/20 113/16 124/20 113/16 124/20 113/16 124/20 113/16 166/6 166/6 166/10 238/8 242/17 specifically [7] 5/9 started [5] 3/20 64/18 67/4 105/22 165/25 107/22 starting [2] 102/9 starting [2] 105/12 169/12 102/9 state [2] 8/10 17/712 102/9 state [2] speculation [17] state [2] 34/10 37/5 34/10 37/5 1/20 1/23 1/20 1/23 1/20 1/23 1/20 1/24 1/20 1/24 1/20 1/23	special [1] 208/14				I I
specialist [4] 64/16 66/166/1766/25 168/12 141/22141/24142/3 140/3144/9150/14 193/11 193/22194/14 59/31113/16 124/20152/7165/25 168/12 141/22141/24142/3 140/3144/9150/14 39/2359/1113/16 124/20152/7165/25 124/20152/7165/25 122/1555/161/961/10 subpostmaster's [1] 120/20210/2021/2021/2021/2021/2021/2021	specialises [1] 87/7				
1193/22 194/14 70/13 93/17 105/12 still [14] 2/23 14/15 142/5 161/9 150/25 172/14 216/21 39/23 59/1 113/16 124/20 152/7 165/25 22/15 55/1 61/9 61/10 subpostmaster's [1] 230/25 238/17 242/1 113/16 119/15 183/6 166/6 166/10 166/21 85/25 99/7 108/19 59/5 suggesting [5] 88/7 238/8 242/17 started [5] 3/20 144/5 156/22 180/25 subpostmasters [11] 192/20 210/20 212/14 5/18 6/1 67/24 110/18 5/18 6/1 67/24 110/18 64/18 67/4 105/5 stolen [1] 138/12 51/2 145/22 146/8 suggesting [3] 21/7 5/18 6/1 67/24 110/18 107/22 starting [2] 165/25 stolen [1] 138/12 51/2 145/22 146/8 suggestion [13] 21/7 102/9 starting [2] 165/25 169/12 stood [2] 115/5 190/2 subsequent [1] 125/2 137/9 157/20 125/2 137/9 157/20 state [4] 81/3 83/22 197/23 198/3 199/8 subsequent [1] 170/25 236/18 suggestions [2] 34/10 37/5 41/15 1/20 1/23 1/24 5/4 64/10 161/6 161/8 141/16 142/12 147/14 suitable [1] 71/22 su					
39/23 59/1 113/16 124/20 152/7 165/25 22/15 55/1 61/9 61/10 Subpostmaster's [1] 230/25 238/17 242/1 113/16 119/15 183/6 166/6 166/10 166/21 85/25 99/7 108/19 59/5 subpostmaster's [1] 19/20 210/20 212/11 238/8 242/17 started [5] 3/20 144/5 156/22 180/25 subpostmaster's [1] 19/2/20 210/20 212/11 5/18 6/1 67/24 110/18 64/18 67/4 105/5 181/4 210/19 51/2 145/22 146/8 suggestion [13] 21/7 5/18 6/1 67/24 110/18 107/22 starting [2] 165/25 169/12 stone [1] 217/15 150/7 160/22 161/4 28/23 43/11 44/3 102/9 starting [2] 88/8 107/22 stood [2] 115/5 190/2 subsequent [1] 125/2 137/9 157/20 102/9 starts [1] 160/19 state [2] 8/16 92/24 stop [9] 17/5 109/19 179/19 170/23 193/1 213/4 145/12 state [2] 8/16 92/24 153/19 192/17 197/19 subsequent [1] 125/2 137/9 157/20 178/12 196/24 178/12 196/24 212/9 substantial [6] suggestions [2] 170/25 236/18 34/10 37/5 41/15 1/20 1/23 1/24 5/4 9/15 11/2 13/6 15/14 161/17 161/17 162/8 148/3 158/2 199/17 suits [1] 219/2 43/15					150/25 172/14 216/21
113/16 119/15 183/6 166/6 166/10 161/10 151/10 151/10 16/10 161/10 161/10 161/10 161/10 161/10 161/10 161/10 161/10 161/10 161/10 161/10 161/10 161/10 161/10 161/10 161/10 161/10		124/20 152/7 165/25		subpostmaster's [1]	230/25 238/17 242/1
238/8 242/17 200/9 144/5 156/22 180/25 subpostmasters [11] 192/20 210/20 212/11 specifically [7] 5/9 5/18 6/1 67/24 110/18 54/18 67/4 105/5 181/4 210/19 51/2 145/22 146/8 212/13 177/12 200/22 starting [2] 165/25 169/12 stone [1] 217/15 150/7 160/22 161/4 28/23 43/11 44/3 102/9 speculating [2] 88/8 106/12 storts [1] 160/19 storte [2] 81/6 92/24 stop [9] 17/5 109/19 179/19 170/23 193/1 213/4 speculation [17] stated [4] 81/3 83/22 197/23 198/3 199/8 197/23 198/3 199/8 subsequently [1] subsequently [1] suggestions [2] 34/10 37/5 41/15 1/20 1/23 1/24 5/4 9/15 11/2 13/6 15/14 161/17 161/17 162/8 substantial [6] suitable [1] 71/22 56/9 56/25 96/9 110/0 9/15 11/2 13/6 15/14 162/15 162/15 163/7 148/3 158/2 199/17 suitable [1] 219/2					
specifically [7] 5/9 5/18 6/1 67/24 110/18 5/17 16/7 49/1 49/6 212/13 5/18 6/1 67/24 110/18 64/18 67/4 105/5 stolen [1] 138/12 51/2 145/22 146/8 suggestion [13] 21/7 177/12 200/22 starting [2] 165/25 stolen [1] 217/15 150/7 160/22 161/4 28/23 43/11 44/3 specifics [1] 105/23 starting [2] 165/25 stood [2] 115/5 190/2 44/11 59/4 102/21 speculate [2] 88/8 102/9 statte [2] 8/16 92/24 stop [9] 17/5 109/19 179/19 170/23 193/1 213/4 speculation [17] state [2] 8/16 92/24 state [2] 8/16 92/24 153/19 192/17 197/19 subsequent [1] 170/25 236/18 syseculation [17] stated [4] 81/3 83/22 197/23 198/3 199/8 substance [1] 77/18 suggestions [2] 34/10 37/5 41/15 1/20 1/23 1/24 5/4 212/9 substantial [6] 82/25 169/7 41/16 42/2 43/13 9/15 11/2 13/6 15/14 161/17 161/17 162/8 148/3 158/2 199/17 suitable [1] 71/22 56/9 56/25 96/9 110/9 17/7 26/21 45/2 45/6 162/15 162/15 163/7 substantive [2] 89/17 suitable [3] 58/19					
3/18 6/167/24 (10/18) 107/22 stope (1) 217/15 150/7 160/22 161/4 28/23 43/11 44/3 177/12 200/22 starting [2] 165/25 stope (1) 217/15 190/2 44/11 59/4 102/21 specifics [1] 105/23 starting [2] 165/25 169/12 stood [2] 115/5 190/2 44/11 59/4 102/21 speculate [2] 88/8 102/9 starts [1] 160/19 state [2] 8/16 92/24 stop [9] 17/5 109/19 179/19 170/23 193/1 213/4 speculation [17] stated [4] 81/3 83/22 197/23 198/3 199/8 58/13 subsequently [1] suggestions [2] 170/25 236/18 34/10 37/5 41/15 1/20 1/23 1/24 5/4 54/10 64/10 161/6 161/8 141/16 142/12 147/14 suitable [1] 71/22 43/15 51/4 51/8 51/10 56/9 56/25 96/9 110/9 17/7 26/21 45/2 45/6 162/15 162/15 163/7 substantive [2] 89/17 suitable [1] 21/2	specifically [7] 5/9				
17/712 200/22 specifics [1] 105/23 speculate [2] 88/8 102/9 speculating [2] 88/15 145/12 speculation [17] 34/10 37/5 41/15 41/16 42/2 43/13 43/15 51/4 51/8 51/10 56/9 56/25 96/9 110/9 state [1] 105/23 state [2] 8/16 145/12 speculation [17] 34/10 37/5 41/15 1/20 1/23 1/24 5/4 9/15 11/2 13/6 15/14 17/7 26/21 45/2 45/6 56/9 56/25 96/9 110/9 substantial [6] substantial [6] substantial [6] substantial [6] substantial [6] substantial [6] 12/21 45/2 45/4 9/15 11/2 13/6 15/14 162/15 162/15 163/7 162/15 162/15 163/7 substantive [2] 89/17					
specifics [1] 105/23 speculate [2] 88/8 102/9 starts [1] 160/19 speculating [2] 88/15 145/12 stated [4] 81/3 83/22 speculation [17] 34/10 37/5 41/15 41/16 42/2 43/15 51/4 51/2 9/15 11/2 12/2 12/2 102/9 state [2] 8/16 92/24 state [2] 8/16 92/24 stop [9] 17/5 109/19 170/23 193/1 213/4 subsequent [1] 170/25 23/19 192/17 197/19 170/25 170/25 103/1 170/25 236/18 170/25 236/18 170/25 236/18 170/25 236/18 170/25 236/18 170/25 236/18 170/25 236/18 170/25 236/18 170/25 236/18 170/25 236/18 170/25 236/18 170/25 236/18 170/25 236/18 170/25 236/18 170/25 170/25 170/25 170/25 170/25 236/18 170/25 170/					
speculate [2] 88/8 102/9 starts [1] 160/19 speculating [2] 88/15 145/12 state [2] 8/16 92/24 speculation [17] state [4] 81/3 83/22 34/10 37/5 41/15 1/20 1/23 1/24 5/4 41/16 42/2 43/15 51/4 51/2 1/20 1/23 1/24 5/4 64/10 161/17 161/17 162/15 163/7 substantial [6] suitable [1] 71/22 suitable [1] 71/22 56/9 56/25 96/9 110/9 162/15 162/15 163/7 substantive [2] 89/17 summarise [3] 58/19					I I
speculating [2] 88/15 state [2] 8/16 92/24 153/19 192/17 197/19 subsequently [1] suggestions [2] 145/12 stated [4] 81/3 83/22 197/23 198/3 199/8 58/13 170/25 236/18 speculation [17] 178/12 196/24 212/9 substance [1] 77/18 suggests [3] 38/25 34/10 37/5 41/15 1/20 1/23 1/24 5/4 64/10 161/6 161/8 141/16 142/12 147/14 suitable [1] 71/22 43/15 51/4 51/8 51/10 9/15 11/2 13/6 15/14 161/17 161/17 162/8 148/3 158/2 199/17 suits [1] 219/2 56/9 56/25 96/9 110/9 17/7 26/21 45/2 45/6 162/15 162/15 163/7 substantive [2] 89/17 summarise [3] 58/19				179/19	
145/12 stated [4] 61/3 63/22 197/23 196/3 199/6 36/13 176/23 236/16 speculation [17] 178/12 196/24 212/9 substance [1] 77/18 suggests [3] 38/25 34/10 37/5 41/15 statement [53] 1/12 stopped [18] 8/14 substantial [6] 141/16 142/12 147/14 43/15 51/4 51/8 51/10 9/15 11/2 13/6 15/14 161/17 161/17 162/8 148/3 158/2 199/17 suitable [1] 71/22 56/9 56/25 96/9 110/9 17/7 26/21 45/2 45/6 162/15 162/15 163/7 substantive [2] 89/17 summarise [3] 58/19					
speculation [17] statement [53] 1/12 stopped [18] 8/14 substantial [6] 82/25 169/7 34/10 37/5 41/15 1/20 1/24 5/4 64/10 161/6 161/8 141/16 142/12 147/14 suitable [1] 71/22 43/15 51/4 51/8 51/10 9/15 11/2 13/6 15/14 161/17 162/15 163/7 substantial [6] suitable [1] 71/22 56/9 56/25 96/9 110/9 17/7 26/21 45/2 45/6 162/15 163/7 substantive [2] 89/17 summarise [3] 58/19		Sialeu [4] 01/3 03/22			I I
34/10 37/3 41/15 1/20 1/23 1/24 5/4 64/10 161/6 161/8 141/16 142/12 147/14 suitable [1] 71/22 41/16 42/2 43/13 9/15 11/2 13/6 15/14 161/17 161/17 162/8 148/3 158/2 199/17 suits [1] 219/2 56/9 56/25 96/9 110/9 17/7 26/21 45/6 162/15 162/15 163/7 substantive [2] 89/17 summarise [3] 58/19	speculation [17]				
4/1/10 42/2 43/13 43/15 51/4 51/8 51/10 56/9 56/25 96/9 110/9 17/7 26/21 45/2 45/6 162/15 162/15 163/7 substantive [2] 89/17 summarise [3] 58/19					
43/15 51/4 51/6 51/10 17/7 26/21 45/2 45/6 162/15 162/15 163/7 substantive [2] 89/17 summarise [3] 58/19					
51/20 59/4 62/12 186/21 186/23 111/6 233/23 242/12		17/7 26/21 45/2 45/6	162/15 162/15 163/7	substantive [2] 89/17	summarise [3] 58/19
		51/20 59/4 62/12	186/21 186/21 186/23	111/6	233/23 242/12

(96) somewhere - summarise

S	suspense [1] 49/8	46/18 58/21 68/8	183/9 193/23 195/9	15/18 18/18 18/18
summarised [1]	suspicion [1] 23/7	85/23 88/5 97/3 99/2	207/24 222/3 234/20	20/23 24/13 25/2 28/3
78/18	suspicions [2]	101/6 144/21 153/6	239/9	28/15 32/2 35/12
summarising [2]	220/17 225/22	192/19	territory [2] 143/9 144/8	35/16 37/3 38/7 39/1 39/19 41/2 41/2 43/25
25/18 92/24	suspicious [1] 241/12	Talbot [1] 208/11 talk [4] 7/3 12/9	test [10] 114/12	45/5 45/18 45/19
summary [6] 33/1	system [45] 14/13	29/12 29/13	115/18 115/20 115/23	45/21 46/10 47/6
91/11 124/1 242/13	17/1 18/3 22/18 22/19		115/24 132/5 133/14	48/16 49/17 52/8
243/14 243/15 summer [3] 98/19	24/23 25/16 25/23	222/14	146/10 162/21 241/16	52/16 52/19 52/24
140/11 232/18	29/23 30/11 31/24	talking [17] 10/23	text [1] 156/5	53/17 63/20 63/22
summing [10] 127/4	34/9 37/6 43/14 57/21	11/18 11/23 12/21	than [48] 7/17 10/13	66/4 68/9 68/22 69/15
127/7 127/9 127/12	63/11 63/19 64/17 64/24 78/6 79/19	109/9 135/19 137/17 153/12 190/13 194/13	17/2 31/1 34/19 38/25 41/3 46/6 47/6 53/16	69/22 70/5 70/5 71/4 71/24 72/22 73/18
127/13 134/14 134/22	80/23 81/5 83/24	206/18 207/9 207/15	54/18 54/25 60/15	76/1 76/3 82/9 83/7
208/22 216/24 217/4	90/12 99/24 111/5	211/13 211/13 213/22		84/20 87/5 88/15
summing-up [10] 127/4 127/7 127/9	111/13 111/19 112/13		103/4 112/5 118/22	88/16 89/23 91/7
127/12 127/13 134/14	112/15 123/6 124/6	talks [2] 139/9	125/23 128/1 130/20	92/12 92/15 100/23
134/22 208/22 216/24	157/21 161/7 161/15	211/10	131/1 135/9 143/18	100/23 101/18 103/11
217/4	161/19 162/13 162/17		150/14 150/20 159/2	103/22 106/17 109/18
sums [1] 23/25	162/17 174/21 178/13 185/19 190/15 214/21		164/10 165/21 167/19 172/5 176/20 188/20	114/3 116/6 120/22 126/19 126/24 127/24
supervise [3] 65/13	systemic [1] 190/19	Teams [1] 11/23	196/13 200/7 200/8	127/25 128/15 128/19
65/13 65/14	systems [10] 14/16	technically [2] 91/20	200/10 207/2 212/23	128/23 131/7 135/19
suppliers [1] 58/14 support [11] 37/17	34/11 41/20 43/2 81/2	95/4	218/11 220/21 221/7	135/20 135/25 136/18
40/4 71/16 80/18	83/21 112/5 162/6	telephone [11] 11/13		136/25 137/4 137/11
85/17 117/20 124/4	172/1 189/2	16/15 25/4 26/23	238/16 243/2	137/16 139/8 145/12
152/14 172/23 173/3	Т	27/11 95/14 95/24 95/24 111/1 178/19	thank [101] 1/4 1/5 1/9 1/23 2/23 3/7 3/21	146/18 147/20 150/5 158/3 161/17 165/21
179/10	table [2] 106/13	179/15	6/3 15/13 18/17 26/25	165/23 166/21 168/15
suppose [4] 44/21	107/9	telephoned [4] 95/13	29/21 40/1 45/1 45/20	168/20 169/8 169/10
97/25 150/10 160/2	tags [1] 182/20	95/16 123/10 241/6	45/25 46/7 47/10	170/14 170/15 175/22
supposed [1] 238/3 suppress [1] 176/10	taint [1] 237/23	tell [10] 16/25 75/23	47/14 47/16 48/21	177/10 177/17 178/9
suppression [1]	tainted [2] 130/1 206/5	181/1 182/12 184/21	57/9 57/10 57/16	178/14 178/18 178/25
213/1	tako [51] 13/5 13/11	188/9 203/1 219/2 237/13 243/4	60/22 63/21 63/23 78/15 88/16 89/4 89/6	181/23 184/12 193/1 194/22 195/2 195/7
sure [17] 19/11 23/16	14/20 39/1 47/3 49/1	telling [6] 35/20 95/7	89/11 89/23 91/5	196/4 197/9 197/18
24/16 31/8 87/9 89/18	50/19 55/4 58/15	98/11 101/14 110/12	92/13 94/6 96/8	201/1 202/7 202/10
98/8 165/23 168/7 184/12 197/9 202/5	60/22 62/12 62/23	168/18	102/13 108/6 116/14	202/20 202/21 205/17
206/14 217/13 230/6	76/8 77/24 78/14 87/4		118/18 121/10 121/14	
230/9 240/24	88/17 92/20 98/8	temporary [1] 37/23	121/17 121/23 131/20	
surely [1] 183/2	98/13 121/12 126/24 127/2 134/6 152/6	ten [2] 47/8 48/25 tended [1] 180/16	132/21 135/16 136/10 137/1 137/15 145/2	216/12 218/21 221/19 226/15 227/15 229/20
surprise [6] 7/10	157/1 159/3 160/14	tendency [1] 180/8	152/6 163/24 164/23	233/18 235/8 235/8
7/12 7/20 9/10 46/17 46/25	160/15 163/25 164/15	tendered [2] 30/7	166/12 167/20 177/3	237/21 239/2 243/20
surprised [6] 8/23	165/1 165/18 165/19	158/20	189/16 189/17 189/25	
68/16 75/5 75/6		tends [2] 69/19 95/23		164/10 212/7 214/7
209/12 209/16	178/4 184/14 190/11 192/5 199/25 200/21	tens [1] 125/16	196/1 196/5 196/17	their [37] 3/11 4/2
surprising [5] 50/1	201/18 201/23 203/22	tepid [1] 82/17 term [1] 122/15	199/12 199/13 202/14 204/17 207/17 218/14	11/24 13/3 21/24 31/6 50/21 70/22 76/20
114/14 115/1 226/3	204/13 204/16 219/15	terminate [1] 192/24	218/15 219/7 219/13	77/3 82/4 84/18 87/4
227/19 Susan [16] 11/16	233/22 242/11	terminated [5] 161/1	219/16 220/22 221/2	96/14 98/12 100/2
Susan [16] 11/16 86/25 101/4 102/2	taken [29] 15/16	161/5 191/9 191/25	221/20 222/1 223/13	100/3 110/2 114/20
102/10 102/14 102/15	21/19 37/11 48/7	192/2	223/15 230/4 231/10	134/24 134/25 136/6
103/16 104/24 105/8	56/12 59/15 82/6 93/2 96/25 97/5 104/16		231/18 233/13 233/19	139/16 143/13 157/17
109/3 136/17 136/21	116/18 117/4 117/18	196/25 termination [1] 190/7	234/7 234/10 240/4 240/10 240/15 240/23	166/5 176/20 195/6 200/17 201/16 222/9
165/6 193/5 210/6	126/9 129/14 130/21	terms [32] 3/1 4/13	243/17 243/19 243/21	222/14 224/19 236/9
suspect [9] 41/2	131/12 144/3 151/4	6/19 10/25 14/8 15/3	244/2 244/3 244/4	237/5 237/19 240/2
45/10 66/15 96/6 118/10 127/21 127/25	155/12 160/5 173/2	15/4 61/8 64/1 67/24	244/8	theirs [1] 155/22
192/15 235/4	104/7 192/10 200/17	68/17 82/12 82/15	thanks [2] 60/21	them [56] 2/19 8/22
suspected [2] 12/18	218/1 221/25 228/9 taker [1] 116/20	99/13 111/15 118/6	177/17	16/19 16/19 17/3 19/2
12/19	takes [1] 156/14	120/8 128/18 151/11 158/15 163/2 163/10	that [1674] that's [143] 2/10 10/5	21/24 23/10 26/3 37/11 49/2 57/17
suspend [1] 197/23	taking [13] 4/18 22/1	164/6 164/7 179/4	10/14 11/5 15/12	67/17 67/18 72/5
L				(97) summarised - them

(97) summarised - them

Т	179/8 181/16 183/12	96/17 96/18 97/5 98/7	93/13 94/6 95/11	32/14 33/2 36/19
	183/17 184/13 185/2	98/14 98/15 99/15	95/21 97/3 97/4 99/3	39/25 53/16 53/16
them [41] 72/25	185/17 186/21 187/18		102/3 107/4 108/7	55/17 76/8 91/5 94/21
75/24 76/5 85/10				
98/12 99/16 100/4	189/21 194/16 202/24	104/4 106/13 106/14	109/1 109/20 112/18	94/22 99/16 100/4
100/7 104/22 119/15	205/5 209/5 211/13	106/18 106/18 106/22	113/2 117/12 119/10	123/24 125/10 134/6
	212/24 212/24 213/6	107/1 110/11 112/16	120/10 121/7 128/8	136/22 138/15 169/6
120/21 132/4 134/24	214/25 217/24 218/16	112/17 112/19 126/16	128/9 132/10 136/23	174/19 175/2 215/5
136/25 143/4 144/19	219/5 227/21 232/10	127/7 136/8 139/16	140/24 142/23 144/12	226/3 226/6 229/16
149/11 149/17 153/19	233/2 233/20 234/3	139/24 140/21 142/20	144/17 145/25 149/2	229/20
155/1 155/3 165/6				
167/13 168/18 169/3	theory [3] 4/20 31/21	143/13 143/24 146/10	149/4 150/23 151/15	throughout [1] 12/12
169/4 169/6 169/9	187/17	147/8 149/3 149/8	151/21 151/22 151/24	throw [1] 201/11
178/16 184/4 197/21	there [254]	150/9 153/8 153/9	152/3 152/23 153/3	thumbnail [1] 21/16
	there's [27] 25/24	153/11 153/13 153/20	153/21 154/23 155/5	thumbs [2] 218/25
197/21 198/18 200/21	28/7 33/1 71/10 73/11	157/11 161/20 162/15	157/12 157/23 161/22	219/3
207/6 212/12 216/7	106/1 106/6 109/15	162/20 163/19 164/13	164/16 164/24 166/7	Thursday [4] 1/1
216/10 222/3 222/16				
231/16	110/10 126/11 145/2	167/4 168/20 169/4	169/16 169/18 170/19	38/20 145/19 146/1
theme [2] 12/12	146/23 149/11 150/12	169/7 177/7 186/1	173/1 175/5 178/18	thus [4] 33/5 141/1
183/9	156/7 167/9 169/24	188/13 188/24 189/19	185/25 186/5 191/4	141/21 154/15
	170/12 170/22 181/1	190/11 192/2 192/3	197/1 202/5 210/16	tight [1] 167/8
themes [1] 69/25	182/14 185/10 195/14		212/13 212/22 220/3	time [129] 2/21 2/21
themselves [7] 79/23	200/21 233/25 235/1	195/15 195/17 197/24	225/13 226/2 228/15	5/12 6/12 7/5 7/5 7/9
99/16 118/2 118/14			228/20 229/8 229/12	7/9 8/8 8/10 8/11
139/19 139/20 153/8	238/8	198/1 200/3 201/5		
then [159] 2/9 2/13	thereabouts [2]	201/14 201/15 202/10	229/20 231/4 231/24	12/13 12/18 12/19
12/5 13/19 15/8 15/23	137/3 165/15	208/1 212/14 224/20	233/11 236/16 238/17	12/25 14/14 15/10
	thereafter [3] 2/18	227/25 228/3 228/7	241/19 243/17	15/19 16/2 21/24
16/14 16/21 18/4	77/11 186/22	228/12 231/20 238/19	though [26] 5/17	21/25 25/25 26/8
18/15 18/16 22/1 22/3	thereby [2] 76/19	239/1	25/19 32/23 38/21	26/12 27/18 28/1
22/6 22/10 22/23 24/4	156/21			
24/4 24/9 24/11 24/16		they'd [1] 39/19	44/13 46/21 49/16	29/15 35/6 37/12 38/5
25/8 26/16 26/23		they're [8] 50/10 88/7	51/8 52/13 53/24	39/4 39/6 39/21 40/6
28/25 30/12 31/3 31/4	44/5 67/17 95/2	149/7 164/13 165/6	56/22 59/25 66/5	47/5 48/3 52/18 54/24
	112/13 114/9 150/10	177/7 202/12 202/12	77/15 78/12 79/9	58/16 64/15 64/19
31/5 31/15 33/1 33/21	161/21 163/6 168/4	they've [1] 166/9	86/19 88/7 88/13	65/10 66/15 67/12
35/17 37/14 37/18	173/10 188/3 188/8	thing [8] 21/4 53/17	105/11 110/10 112/18	69/7 69/18 72/6 75/8
37/25 38/6 38/12				75/11 79/7 80/4 84/5
39/21 43/12 45/1	202/1 206/10 213/6	75/12 133/22 153/9	125/19 143/11 143/17	
48/10 50/6 51/3 54/16	215/24 228/18	153/14 196/15 201/14	165/2	84/10 84/25 85/4
55/4 55/11 55/11 57/7	these [30] 12/20	things [24] 7/3 14/1	thought [38] 13/15	85/17 85/18 89/14
58/5 58/11 58/24 59/8	40/25 51/1 52/9 63/4	42/14 43/4 46/18	16/23 26/14 41/1	91/1 91/24 91/25
	72/3 72/3 88/12 90/15		42/20 53/10 53/15	92/25 94/8 99/22
60/1 65/11 66/18	92/1 95/16 99/1 103/4	75/11 107/9 108/18	62/13 63/3 84/8 84/25	
68/10 68/12 70/7	109/7 123/11 124/13	130/7 140/22 144/14	85/4 104/9 105/13	116/8 118/16 121/6
72/24 73/17 74/10				
74/11 80/9 80/13	139/24 140/5 140/18	165/7 165/19 180/24	110/20 110/21 110/22	
83/14 85/13 85/14	145/15 147/4 149/4		110/22 117/15 119/10	
89/23 91/14 91/19	158/25 160/6 220/9	226/22 228/15 233/11	119/16 119/20 130/9	129/11 129/25 131/17
	224/7 224/20 235/2	235/4	144/14 144/15 144/15	138/4 154/4 162/20
91/20 92/13 93/9 95/4	237/19 239/17	think [284]	144/19 153/20 154/21	162/21 163/9 165/11
95/18 98/8 100/8	thesis [2] 151/25	thinking [12] 23/22	155/9 163/12 192/3	166/9 174/12 176/11
101/23 105/4 108/18		.		
108/18 108/23 109/3	199/11	41/3 47/1 88/13 94/22	207/9 230/21 235/2	176/13 178/23 182/19
109/3 110/15 111/5	they [138] 2/21 2/22	95/9 96/7 113/2 118/6		183/16 186/2 187/19
114/12 114/25 116/19	3/12 4/1 4/22 4/23	146/11 187/11 235/3	thoughts [2] 180/10	191/2 197/1 203/14
	4/24 5/17 8/2 8/12	third [8] 13/22 13/25	181/25	205/3 207/2 207/9
116/25 122/22 123/15	8/12 10/17 10/18	25/24 93/1 111/25	thousands [1]	207/22 216/25 217/8
123/24 124/7 125/13	11/11 12/4 12/6 12/6	124/17 128/16 134/2	125/17	218/17 218/18 219/19
125/25 127/3 127/22	13/4 14/2 14/5 16/5			
128/5 128/15 130/9		this [321]	three [9] 13/15 61/14	220/1 220/11 220/12
131/2 138/17 145/13	16/20 22/17 22/25	those [111] 3/22 4/6	68/14 130/2 130/5	220/21 220/25 221/16
145/16 146/17 147/12	31/2 31/21 39/6 39/21	10/17 14/25 17/4 23/4	133/25 221/2 240/10	222/1 223/2 224/1
147/23 148/13 150/12	48/10 48/11 49/3	26/1 26/5 28/14 30/21	240/13	224/5 226/8 226/16
	50/19 50/20 54/1 55/8	32/4 33/2 33/17 46/18	threshold [2] 68/11	227/16 232/1 235/6
154/1 155/17 158/2	55/11 55/11 64/13	48/20 49/2 49/6 58/22	115/24	235/24 236/5 236/23
159/7 160/15 165/5	68/10 70/22 70/25	61/14 61/22 67/11		239/3 239/20 241/11
165/8 165/10 166/8			thresholds [2] 119/4	
166/11 168/8 170/11	72/2 72/14 77/14	68/21 69/24 74/23	119/7	243/18 244/6
170/24 171/15 172/20	77/15 78/3 78/6 78/17	74/25 75/17 75/19	through [36] 3/13	timed [1] 38/7
172/25 174/5 174/23	78/22 80/11 82/13	77/2 79/22 79/22	22/8 28/10 28/11	timelines [1] 122/18
	85/12 85/16 88/5 88/7	80/10 81/10 82/3	28/13 29/20 30/9	times [7] 4/21 4/22
175/1 175/4 178/18	88/10 88/13 90/11	90/10 92/20 93/9	31/11 31/13 31/13	4/23 4/24 42/13
•	•			(00) theme times

(98) them... - times

Т	top [8] 23/19 23/20	trial [46] 27/24 29/5	175/13 175/18 188/15	231/14
	28/7 50/22 59/10 78/8	35/1 35/6 36/1 39/1	190/25 193/7 195/2	understood [17] 3/25
times [2] 129/14	159/8 174/18	39/4 39/7 53/22 79/7	202/9 206/3 212/12	20/3 49/24 58/3 59/14
129/17	topic [10] 13/16	123/1 123/16 123/18	212/14 225/4 233/11	75/8 75/14 106/14
timetable [1] 32/17	73/23 74/11 113/22	123/21 123/23 123/25	234/21 241/14 242/15	118/7 134/10 135/20
timing [1] 55/21	121/11 138/24 140/8	127/5 128/6 128/11	242/25	167/22 194/19 231/21
title [1] 115/14	146/7 221/22 224/23	129/11 129/22 131/13	two-part [1] 114/12	232/13 232/15 232/20
today [13] 5/3 35/4	topics [2] 149/2	131/18 132/6 132/10	two-stage [1] 193/7	undertake [1] 3/16
49/15 61/16 66/23	160/14	132/25 133/7 134/23	twofold [1] 141/23	undertaking [1]
155/12 160/9 167/1	touch [2] 196/18	138/7 140/13 167/17	typed [3] 91/13 93/8	229/7
171/10 193/6 208/5	242/1	169/12 169/12 169/13		undertook [1] 3/3
215/13 218/24	touched [2] 71/5	171/12 176/15 176/16	typing [2] 23/23	undue [1] 199/2
together [10] 7/23	196/17	186/20 208/7 215/1	56/19	unduly [2] 144/6
26/5 37/11 108/16 133/22 192/19 203/17	tough [1] 15/16	215/5 215/10 215/13		155/17
220/25 224/12 225/4	towards [2] 223/25	217/5 217/6 217/7	U	unexplained [3]
told [79] 14/17 14/18	238/20	tricks [1] 177/4	ulterior [1] 212/15	80/22 123/7 156/21
14/22 14/25 15/23	track [1] 12/5	tried [2] 6/24 78/22	ultimately [8] 37/16	unfair [2] 46/23
16/3 16/19 16/19	trail [5] 23/3 25/10	trite [1] 100/6	40/23 57/4 65/6 118/4	131/7
16/24 17/3 18/8 18/20	79/20 81/3 83/22	trouble [2] 26/17	118/18 172/22 197/11	unfortunate [2]
19/20 21/5 22/12 23/9	train [4] 10/16 88/22	191/2	unclear [4] 10/19	147/11 153/2
26/14 27/6 28/15 31/5	103/11 244/6	troubled [1] 157/15	81/20 93/3 240/13	Unfortunately [1]
36/7 36/14 36/16	trained [4] 220/7	true [5] 1/20 10/14	under [16] 111/7	103/18
36/23 37/20 39/19	220/14 226/12 226/24	91/20 157/11 242/5	125/21 128/1 128/2	unhealthy [1] 41/14
63/10 64/17 70/22	training [12] 9/18	truly [1] 181/13	162/21 179/2 181/1	unhelpful [1] 120/12
73/12 75/24 76/5 76/5	9/23 10/5 10/6 10/7	truncating [1] 218/19		unidentified [2]
82/12 85/4 94/8 95/7	10/14 10/15 112/5	trust [1] 34/9	210/13 217/14 217/20	156/12 158/24
95/10 99/1 99/23	123/5 123/13 227/4	Truth [1] 220/19	217/21 231/8 236/23	unique [1] 208/14
99/24 100/15 114/21	227/6	truthful [3] 179/22	undercover [1] 34/5	universally [1] 34/11
127/5 127/6 127/7	transaction [2] 21/18		underlying [2] 6/21	university [1] 207/3
168/15 168/21 174/2	138/16	try [7] 62/19 86/22	157/22	unknowingly [1]
174/5 175/17 176/21	transactions [6] 22/7	167/8 185/8 185/11	undermine [6] 9/6	185/1
177/1 178/11 178/16	23/24 28/9 28/12	188/17 191/3	111/10 133/5 141/18	unless [2] 88/21
179/3 181/24 182/4	28/25 125/22	trying [4] 24/24 52/23	143/3 147/16	200/21
185/16 191/6 191/12	transcribe [1] 26/24	188/20 212/18	undermined [9]	unlikely [1] 183/7
195/24 208/18 208/23	Transcriber [1]	turn [29] 1/16 11/4	41/18 122/4 129/2	unpaid [2] 62/4 67/16
211/4 217/1 217/18	218/22	49/8 61/11 86/24	133/3 148/12 171/25	unpalatable [1] 100/5
229/16 229/20 239/5	transcript [20] 20/16	96/10 102/13 108/18	176/3 204/20 206/24	unpick [2] 187/18
240/9 240/16 241/7	33/3 54/20 127/4	116/14 120/2 130/13	undermines [1]	187/23
241/14 241/20 242/14	127/7 127/9 134/14	131/20 132/4 137/15	213/16	unpublished [1]
242/16 242/25 243/8	134/15 134/22 134/23	140/8 140/10 140/23	undermining [1]	178/11
tomorrow [2] 165/22	137/13 144/23 208/21	144/21 156/2 160/18	42/25	unreliability [2]
244/5	216/24 217/4 240/21	220/19 222/23 225/23		14/15 133/23
tone [1] 159/24	242/23 243/5 243/11	226/16 227/21 229/25		unreliable [7] 64/20
Tony [3] 145/23	243/13	230/23 233/20 234/7	underplaying [1] 72/22	64/22 81/17 126/10
146/8 159/21	transcripts [14] 128/6 128/8 128/11	turned [4] 225/24		129/3 134/3 190/9
too [18] 15/16 87/17	128/13 129/22 130/2	turning [2] 230/16	9/18 26/18 58/14	
87/19 87/22 88/6	134/13 208/6 208/12	233/6		unspecified [1] 132/2 untenable [1] 212/19
88/13 88/14 93/19	208/20 208/21 217/5	turns [2] 53/20 185/2		untenable [1] 212/19 until [15] 2/6 2/11
144/10 150/2 150/3	217/6 217/7	twain [1] 13/3	111/21 131/15 134/21	3/17 17/23 35/6 38/19
159/15 160/1 162/21	transparency [1]	twice [1] 135/11	140/21 142/25 179/13	
163/3 163/7 163/23	61/20	two [57] 3/18 4/15	179/19 180/23 185/24	
224/5	transparent [6] 51/13		200/14 205/9 207/11	197/16 244/10
took [25] 18/24 34/22	52/10 52/14 87/25	16/17 18/10 25/19	209/20 222/9 229/5	unto [1] 94/13
35/8 67/8 82/3 91/7	102/20 106/15	30/18 31/8 31/16 33/8		unusual [5] 26/10
93/19 99/11 102/17	transparently [1]	47/4 49/15 55/24 57/5		26/12 59/1 101/5
118/21 150/24 160/3	55/16	64/16 65/8 66/9 68/3	understanding [20]	101/9
161/21 171/2 171/5	Treasury [4] 182/21	78/13 78/21 82/3	4/10 6/20 64/15 90/5	unwillingness [1]
176/25 191/2 192/15	182/21 182/22 203/21		90/8 90/20 91/2 92/6	130/19
199/5 206/20 209/6	trenchant [3] 82/15	115/18 121/6 124/14	94/7 98/3 102/6 104/2	
211/5 215/10 221/17	181/19 181/25	125/15 136/21 136/24		238/1
228/23	trends [1] 69/25	139/24 144/7 144/14	193/18 194/11 194/18	Unwrap [1] 186/16
tool [1] 155/9	trespassing [2]	145/24 160/14 163/2	196/5 241/23	up [62] 2/13 2/20
tools [1] 155/2	143/9 144/7	165/18 173/24 174/2	understands [1]	2/25 7/14 11/4 11/22
				(99) timos - un

(99) times... - up

up. [59] 1722-18/05 usual [1] 171/11 171/1	U	112/17	25/12 34/22 50/19	wasn't [59] 8/13	166/16 176/8 181/10
19/10 22/13 22/13 22/14 04/14 53/15 <th< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>61/22 62/1 69/8 72/12</td><td></td><td>181/10 194/13 206/13</td></th<>			61/22 62/1 69/8 72/12		181/10 194/13 206/13
3/224 40/11 46/8 52/6 30/11 V BM/2 58/7 85/2 58/7 BM/2 58/7 85/2 51/2 21/8 BM/2 58/7 85/2 12/2 18 BM/2 58/7 13/2 18/7 13/2 16/2 18/7 13/8 BM/2 58/7 13/2 13/2 13/2 13/2 13/2 13/2 13/2 13/2					
53/5 57/5 62/22 08/11 V 93/19 9/11 19/11 91/11 20/21 11/21 91/21 20/21 20/21 91/21		80/14 167/6			
68/12 7024 70/12 29/13 12/16 22/17		V			
98/1 32/11 100/2 129/1 131/19 132/6 115/14 115/16 115/23 15/15 132/2 15/51 117/46 103715 103725 10375 129/1 127/1 122/1 122/1 122/1 120/1 122/1 122/1 120/1 122/1 123/1 122/1 123/1 122/1 123/1 122/1 123/1 122/1 123/1 122/1 123/1 122/1 123/1 122/1 123/1 122/1 123/1 122/1 123/1 122/1 123/1 122/1 123/1 122/1 123/1 122/1 123/1 122/1 123/1 122/1 123/1 122/1 123/1 123/1 122/1 123/1 123/1 122/1 123/1		<u> </u>			
100/37 100/32	89/13 92/11 100/13				
10/12 112/14 112/14 112/14 12/16	103/15 103/22 105/5				
12017 1271/21 2779 1271/21 2779 1271/21 1711/21 1711/2					
12/19 12/17 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>					
1/2012 1/2012<					
1469 129/15 <td></td> <td></td> <td>146/25 148/10 148/13</td> <td></td> <td></td>			146/25 148/10 148/13		
173/23 176/22 176/1 153/2 153/2 153/2 126/2 226/22 22/3/2 226/21 22/3/2 203/2 203/2 178/25 168/10 1208/22 vast [1] 132/9 160/3 160/10 161/21 232/25 233/15 233/2 Weehesday [2] 93/3 180/5 198/10 208/22 vast [1] 132/9 160/3 160/10 161/21 232/25 233/15 233/2 week [5] 12/3 18/10 213/12 216/2 217/8 vast [1] 132/9 175/19 176/23 176/25 238/7 238/10 242/4 week [5] 12/3 18/10 240/18 varbatim [1] 94/25 129/15 192/16 203/14 wasting [1] 39/3 weeks [6] 12/8 12/10 240/18 varbatim [1] 94/25 varbatim [1] 94/25 varbatim [1] 94/25 varbatim [1] 16/11 varbatim [1] 16/12 varbatim [1] 16/11 varbatim [1] 16/12 varbatim [1] 16/12			149/19 151/11 151/12	205/13 207/6 225/7	website [2] 1/25
178/25 185/3 180/3 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>					
1895 198/10 102/3 153/10 167/21 222/2 23/3 523/22 170/25 218/25 219/2 216/25 217/2 217/15 170/2 170/25 236/25 237/2 236/25 237/17 24/2 24/2 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
213/12 216/2 217/3 Vormelis [1] 149/1 17/12 17/15 17/47/2 23/25 23/7 238/10 242/4 21/3 65/25 159/20 218/25 219/3 222/23 verki [1] 249/19 175/19 176/23 17/6/25 23/87 238/10 242/4 21/3 65/25 159/20 240/18 verki [1] 249/19 115/5 181/6 184/8 wasting [1] 39/3 weekki [8] 12/9 12/15 240/18 verki [1] 140/13 20/8/23 216/19 232/19 wasting [1] 39/3 weekki [8] 12/9 12/15 16/1 130/22 142/7 versus [1] 187/15 131/17 159/4 163/11 23/4/23 236/15 waster [2] 88/7 88/9 99/5 100/18 100/25 16/1 130/22 142/7 versus [1] 187/15 131/17 159/4 163/11 waster [1] 12/9 116/11 176/18 23/42/1 177/6 196/17 196/18 172/2 35/21 41/9 viruiner [1] 41/4 waster [1] 16/16 2/8 waster [1] 16/16 2/8 waster [1] 16/16 2/8 37/25 58/8 38/9 38/9 38/9 38/9 38/9 38/9 38/9 3					
218/25 218/25<					
240/16 verbatim [1] 94/25 192/15 192/16 203/14 watch [1] 164/16 95/20 105/4 105/17 upon [28] 32/9 34/11 verbatim [1] 94/25 20/13 23/19 watch [1] 185/15 135/11 135/12 135/10 107/10 123/20 146/1 0/21 43/14 76/16 59/7 144/22 views [6] 95/22 views [6] 92/22 views [6] 92/22 views [6] 95/22 views [6] 95/22 views [6] 95/22 views [6] 95/22 views [6] 97/22 views [6] 95/22 views [6] 97/22 views [6] 97/2	218/25 219/3 222/23				
Up 1[2] verdict [1] 14/12 version [3] 57/13 208/23 216/19 232/9 watcheir [4] 155/11 107/10 123/20 146/1 40/21 43/14 76/16 57/13 234/23 235/15 visws [5] 95/21 135/11 135/12 135/12 weeks [1] 13/17 118 62/2 93/17 versus [1] 16/17 13/17 156/11 156/19 77/15 16/17 13/17 156/11 156/19 98/15 100/18 100/29 98/15 100/18 100/29 98/15 100/18 100/25 98/15 100/18 100/25 100/14	240/18				
upon [28] 32/9 34/11 version [3] 57/13 23/423 23/41 35/11 15/11					
440/14/30/14 (70) 59/7 144/22 views [1] 95/22 views [1] 187/15 views [1] 117/15 view					
Bill 60 Bill 1					
1161 130/22 142/12 143/13 230/14 wateria [1] 1121/9 116/11 176/18 23/21 147/18 149/20 143/13 11/11 14/5 15/13 16/2 13/3		versus [1] 187/15			
147/18 149/25 154/14 111114/3 153/15 watering [1] 19/10 watering [1] 19/10 watering [1] 19/10 19/11 13/11					
156/11 158/19 172/12 19/12 35/21 4/07 19/12 35/21 4/07 9/12 12/4 13/9 11/2 177/6 196/17 196/18 19/12 2/24 2/24 4/5/9 4/5/9 10/16 2/8 9/12 16/1 18/13 17/16 18/25 21/16 2/5/2 198/4 209/11 211/9 11/25 52/4 6/5/2 65/13 18/15 52/16 52/2 38/10 4/2/1 65/1 65/8 198/4 209/11 2/17 19/12 35/14 3/9 77/16 15/25 52/4 52/5 5/31 38/10 4/2/1 65/1 65/8 118/8 16/25 17/18 59/25 61/10 62/8 59/26 61/10 62/8 virulent [1] 12/35/14 24/13 26/10 3/4/25 118/8 16/25 17/18 59/26 61/10 62/8 59/26 61/10 62/8 virulent [1] 12/35/14 24/12 49/21 81/20 88/10 97/2 101/12 2/118 61/25 17/18 59/26 61/10 62/8 52/2 82/2 84/2 86/3 88/10 97/2 101/12 10/21 10/72 107/6 114/22 10/72 107/6 114/22 10/72 107/6 114/22 10/72 107/6 114/22 10/72 107/6 114/22 10/72 107/6 114/22 10/72 107/6 114/22 10/72 107/6 114/22 10/72 107/6 114/22 10/72 107/6 114/22 10/72 107/6 114/22 10/72 107/6 114/22 10/72 107/6 114/22 10/72 107/6 114/22 10/72 107/6 114/22 10/72 107/6 114/22 10/72 10/72 10/72 107/6 114/22 10/72 107/6 114/22 10/72 10/72 10/72 107/6 114/22 10/72 10/72 10/72 10/76 114/22 10/72 10/72 10/72 10/72 <td></td> <td></td> <td>vigorous [1] 69/18</td> <td></td> <td>well [99] 7/13 9/3</td>			vigorous [1] 69/18		well [99] 7/13 9/3
177/6 196/17 196/18 42/24 42/24 43/3 43/3 19/2 Watt [6] 19/24 19/34 19/3 11			vii [1] 175/4		
198/4 209/11 211/9 47/10 40/22 51 virulent [1] 41/14 189/21 189/24 190/17 18/25 21/16 29/2 213/14 234/14 53/14 57/9 57/16 virulent [1] 41/14 18/25 12/16 38/10 44/21 65/1 65/8 URN [1] 1/23 59/25 61/10 62/8 virulent [1] 41/14 24/13 26/10 34/25 69/17 70/22 71/7 74/9 URN [1] 1/23 59/25 61/10 62/8 virulent [1] 41/14 24/13 26/10 34/25 69/17 70/22 71/7 74/9 22/15 29/13 36/9 45/8 51/25 22/17 82/2 84/18 84/24 86/7 86/19 89/2 97/7 98/1 86/2 99/16 103/5 88/10 97/2 101/2 22/15 29/13 36/9 45/8 81/15 81/19 81/25 82/2 82/2 84/2 86/3 86/19 89/2 97/7 98/1 86/19 89/2 97/7 98/1 80/2 11/16 11/2 100/2 100/5 100/2 100/5 100/2 100/6 102/9 104/20 106/5 104/21 65/16 16/6/1		42/22 42/24 45/9 45/9			
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$			virulent [1] 41/14		
upset [1] 38/25 59/25 61/10 62/8 vitaly [1] 235/14 24/13 26/10 34/25 69/17 70/22 71/7 74/9 us [50] 5/2 7/17 9/4 62/14 64/7 65/12 66/5 vitaly [1] 235/14 24/13 26/10 34/25 69/17 70/22 71/7 74/9 21/5 29/15 36/74 62/14 64/7 65/12 68/5 vitaly [1] 235/14 24/13 26/10 34/25 69/17 70/22 71/7 74/9 23/15 29/13 36/9 45/8 82/2 82/2 84/2 86/3 vitaly [1] 85/2 99/16 103/5 86/10 97/2 101/12 10/21 11/14 10/21 11/14 10/21 11/12 10/29 104/20 106/5 53/11 55/13 36/9/47 104/21 111/4 111/17 104/21 111/4 111/17 wait [2] 175/24 176/1 130/8 140/17 141/14 113/31 119/14 127/13 107/2 107/6 114/22 93/12 105/19 107/19 121/14 126/14 126/13 121/14 126/14 126/13 199/12 198/19 188/10 188/17 189/6 144/20 144/14 133/24 136/5 138/19 19/13 118/24 120/16 126/16 165/14 179/13 143/31 143/7 144/1 133/24 136/5 138/19 196/16 157/22 198/19 188/10 188/17 189/6 166/14 162/2 166/24 166/13 166/21 170/19 172/8 120/12 106/13 129/17 143/31 143/7 144/1 143/21 163/25 168/21 165/1	213/14 234/14	51/2552/452/553/15 53/11/57/057/16			
URN [1] 1/23 62/14 64/7 65/12 66/5 vote [1] 15/1 52/12 80/2 81/18 84/24 86/7 1/8 16/25 17/18 22/15 29/13 36/9 45/8 81/15 81/19 81/25 81/15 81/19 81/25 81/15 81/19 81/25 81/15 81/19 81/25 81/15 81/19 81/25 81/15 81/19 81/25 81/15 81/19 81/25 81/15 81/19 81/25 81/15 81/19 81/25 81/15 81/19 81/25 81/15 81/19 81/25 81/15 81/19 81/25 81/15 81/19 81/25 81/15 81/19 81/25 81/15 81/19 81/25 81/15 81/19 81/25 81/15 81/18 84/24 86/7 81/16 84/24 86/7 81/16 84/24 86/7 81/16 84/24 86/7 81/16 84/24 86/7 81/16 81/25 81/16 84/24 86/7 81/16 84/24 86/7 81/16 84/24 86/7 81/16 84/24 86/7 81/16 84/24 86/7 81/16 84/24 86/7 81/16 103/5 81/16 11/25 10/21 101/21 101/21 10/21 101/21 101/21 10/21 101/21 101/21 10/21 101/21 11/21 10/21 11 12/11 11/21 12/17 11/21 12/17 11/21 12/17 11/21 12/17 11/21 12/17 11/21 12/17 11/21 12/17 11/21 12/17 11/21 12/17 11/21 12/17 11/21 12/17 11/21 12/17 11/21 12/17 11/21 12/17 11/21 12/17 11/21 12/11 11/21 12/11 11/21 12/11 11/21 12/11	upset [1] 38/25				
Tills 16/25 17/18 76/27 16/22 81/9 81/15 81/19 81/25 88/10 97/2 101/12 11/8 16/25 17/18 81/15 81/19 81/25 81/15 81/19 81/25 81/15 81/19 81/25 22/15 29/13 36/9 45/8 81/15 81/19 81/25 81/15 81/19 81/25 110/3 111/15 119/6 102/9 104/20 106/5 35/11 55/13 55/20 86/19 89/2 97/7 98/1 104/21 111/17 119/21 119/24 130/8 140/17 141/14 115/16 118/25 119/3 66/18 67/1 67/3 70/20 93/12 105/19 107/19 119/7 119/21 119/24 197/16 143/11 14/15 144/18 122/14 126/11 127/19 19/12 105/19 107/19 136/24 137/19 142/12 136/24 137/19 142/12 139/7 144/10 188/17 189/6 144/20 151/5 163/12 19/31 205/19 107/19 136/24 137/19 142/12 136/24 137/19 142/12 198/23 199/7 192/21 209/9 212/4 165/4 165/31 66/3/12 156/16 165/14 179/13 144/11 146/9 147/24 143/11 14/15 144/18 144/20 151/5 163/12 166/17 66/24 73/14 146/21 100/19 172/8 12/4/25 223/23 237/13 158/25 159/7 160/10 38/3 41/2 44/21 57/7 Wasp [1] 6/6 187/18 191/22 192/19 199/25 239/5 240/16 242/14 163/12 66/12 56/17 66/24 73/14 166/17 66/24 73/14 166/17 66/24 73/14 187/18 191/22 192/19 18/22 183/21 185/8 <td></td> <td></td> <td>vote [1] 152/12</td> <td></td> <td></td>			vote [1] 152/12		
11/16 11/16 11/16 11/16 11/16 11/16 11/16 10/29 10/4/20 106/5 22/15 29/13 36/9 45/25 20/22 28/28		76/21 76/22 81/9			
2213 2213 2212 223 223 237 236 119/13 119/13 119/14 127/13 107/2<		81/15 81/19 81/25			
53/11 55/13 55/20 60/19 69/2 9/17 90/1 62/16 65/13 65/14 104/21 11/4 111/4 11/17 66/18 67/1 67/3 70/20 104/21 11/4 111/4 11/17 93/12 105/19 107/19 12/1/4 126/4 126/13 19/8 18/24 120/16 12/1/4 126/4 126/13 136/13 140/16 155/21 136/2 17/19 142/12 136/13 140/16 155/21 136/2 17/19 142/12 136/2 12/14 126/14/14 126/14/14 126/14 126/14 126/14 126/14 126/14 126/		82/2 82/2 84/2 86/3		119/13 119/14 127/13	
62/16 65/13 65/13 65/14 104/21 111/71/71 111/71/71 111/71/71 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>130/8 140/17 141/14</td> <td></td>				130/8 140/17 141/14	
66/18 67/1 67/3 70/20 93/12 105/19 107/19 121/14 126/4 126/4 126/4 126/4 126/4 126/18 127/15 129/9 145/10 151/14 164/11 133/24 136/25 138/19 120/14 126/4 126/4 126/4 126/18 127/15 129/9 145/10 151/14 164/11 133/24 136/25 138/19 170/17 171/6 187/13 140/16 155/21 136/24 137/19 142/12 136/23 140/16 155/21 136/24 137/19 142/12 136/23 142/2 187/23 203/1 203/1 206/22 214/25 223/23 237/13 160/14 163/9 163/12 158/25 159/7 160/10 158/25 159/7 160/10 158/25 159/7 160/10 158/25 159/7 160/10 158/25 159/7 160/10 138/3 41/2 44/21 57/7 158/25 159/7 160/10 138/3 41/2 44/21 57/7 160/14 163/9 163/12 239/5 240/16 242/14 242/16 242/23 243/4 121/5 112/24 205/4 121/5 12/24 205/4 121/5 12/24 205/4 121/5 12/24 205/4 121/5 12/24 205/4 120/2 210/15 222/7 236/10 useful [20] 4/6 5/11 15/3 25/10 30/14 233/17 34/5 40/15 233/16 240/11 241/12 199/23 202/14 223/18 19/24 36/25 38/11 15/3 25/10 30/14 233/17 34/5 40/15 233/19 234/7 234/11 233/19 234/7 234/11 233/17 34/5 40/15 233/19 234/7 234/11 233/17 34/5 40/15 233/19 234/7 234/11 233/19 234/7 234/11 233/19 234/7 234/11 233/19 234/7 234/11 233/19 234/7 234/11 233/19 234/7 234/11 233/17 34/5 01/2 200/25 200/25 0/13 117/25 121/24 01/25 200/25 00/25 0/13 117/25 121/24 01/25 200/25 00/25 0/13 117/25 121/24 01/25 200/25 00/25 0/13 117/25 121/24 01/25 200/25 00/25 0/13 117/25 121/24 0/13 117/25 121/24 0/13 117/25 121/24 0/13 117/25 121/24 0/13 117/25 121/24 0/13 117/27 100/17 101/23 0/13 106/9 129/23 150/2					
93/12 105/19 107/19 12/14 120/14 120/15 wales [1] 4/9 193/3 17/01/1 171/6 187/13 144/10 144/14 109/8 118/24 120/16 126/18 127/15 129/9 196/16 197/22 198/19 188/10 188/17 189/6 144/20 151/15 163/12 136/13 140/16 155/21 143/3 143/7 144/1 walk [2] 100/2 100/7 212/14 224/19 235/3 169/21 170/19 172/8 156/16 165/14 179/13 144/11 146/9 147/24 walk [2] 100/2 100/7 212/14 224/19 235/3 169/21 170/19 172/8 203/1 203/1 206/22 154/9 155/11 155/21 want [2] 7/2 13/11 wast [1] 6/6 182/22 183/21 185/8 239/2 20/16 242/14 155/16 163/12 58/13 62/14 65/18 WBON [1] 151/6 187/18 191/22 192/19 126/17 87/18 160/14 163/9 163/12 58/13 62/14 65/18 WBON 0000870 [1] 194/11 199/19 199/25 239/2 201/15 222/7 160/14 163/9 163/12 58/13 62/14 65/18 WBON 0000870 [1] 194/11 199/19 199/25 236/10 126/14 165/18 177/24 128/20 184/11 wel [2] 2/20 107/6 205/15 206/19 208/9 15/3 25/10 30/14 199/23 202/14 223/18 19/24 36/25 38/11 14/2/16 166/3 209/1 209/23 211/13 13/17 34/5 40/15 233/19 234/7 234/11 108/2 108/4 119/18 166/11 189/22 201/11 214/25					
1098 118/24 120/16 136/13 140/16 155/21 136/24 137/19 142/12 143/3 143/7 144/1 198/23 199/7 192/21 209/9 212/4 165/4 165/13 169/17 126/16 165/14 179/13 180/23 182/2 187/23 144/11 146/9 147/24 144/11 146/9 147/24 144/11 146/9 147/24 165/2 159/7 160/10 212/14 224/19 235/3 169/21 170/19 172/8 203/1 203/1 206/22 158/25 159/7 160/10 158/25 159/7 160/10 38/3 41/2 44/21 57/1 want [23] 7/2 13/11 ways [1] 6/6 182/22 183/21 185/8 239/5 240/16 242/14 165/5 166/12 66/17 66/24 73/14 144/21 57/7 199/21 199/9 192/21 200/9 200/19 201/11 200/9 200/19 201/11 167/2 169/18 171/18 163/24 165/5 166/12 66/17 66/24 73/14 144/21 200/9 200/19 201/11 200/9 200/19 201/11 167/2 169/18 171/18 189/21 191/23 192/7 200/14 220/22 227/11 144/21 200/9 200/19 208/9 201/25 202/21 202/24 192/21 193/19 195/23 230/8 240/24 12/9 15/3 15/19 18/12 201/15 206/19 208/9 209/1 209/12 21/13 209/1 209/12 21/13 209/1 209/12 21/13 209/1 209/12 21/12 214/25 217/2 21/24 214/25 217/2 21/24 214/25 217/2 21/24 214/25 217/2 21/26 201/25 206/2 209/1 223/2 23/22 23/27 23/19 234/7 234/11 108/21 186/18 227/12 21/4 220/10 225/10					
136/13 140/16 155/21 143/3 143/7 144/1 walk [2] 100/2 100/7 212/14 224/19 235/3 169/21 170/19 172/8 136/16 165/14 179/13 144/11 146/9 147/24 wane [1] 165/25 235/8 242/20 244/1 173/12 174/12 174/17 180/23 182/2 187/23 154/9 155/11 155/21 154/9 155/11 155/21 wane [1] 165/25 235/8 242/20 244/1 182/2 183/21 185/8 239/5 240/16 242/14 163/24 165/5 166/12 58/13 62/14 65/18 WBON [1] 151/6 187/18 191/22 192/19 242/16 242/23 243/4 165/25 165/12 58/13 62/14 65/18 66/17 66/24 73/14 144/21 200/9 200/19 201/11 142/15 112/24 205/4 163/24 165/5 166/12 26/17 66/24 73/14 169/21 170/19 172/8 199/19 199/25 120/2 210/15 222/7 198/12 196/13 199/15 188/12 127/24 128/20 184/11 wate [1] 147/2 200/9 200/19 201/11 15/3 25/10 30/14 199/23 202/14 223/18 192/24 139/15 192/24 139/15 12/9 15/3 15/19 18/12 211/5 211/22 21/22 15/3 25/10 30/14 233/19 234/7 234/11 108/2 108/4 119/18 166/11 189/22 201/11 211/5 211/22 21/22 23/16 240/11 241/2 23/16 240/11 241/2 23/16 240/72 43/22 23/16 240/72 43/22 23/16 240/72 43/22 23/16 240/72 43/22 23/16 240/72 43/22 23/16	109/8 118/24 120/16				
156/16 165/16 165/16 179/13 144/11 146/9 147/24 wane [1] 165/25 235/8 242/20 244/1 173/12 174/12 174/17 180/23 182/2 187/23 154/9 155/11 155/21 154/9 155/11 155/21 159/7 160/10 38/3 41/2 44/21 57/7 214/25 223/23 237/13 163/24 165/5 166/12 58/13 62/14 65/18 66/17 66/24 73/14 187/18 191/22 192/19 239/5 240/16 242/14 163/9 165/5 166/12 66/17 66/24 73/14 144/21 200/9 200/19 201/11 242/16 242/23 243/4 167/20 169/18 171/18 82/10 88/7 108/1 weid [2] 2/20 107/6 194/11 199/19 199/25 210/2 210/15 222/7 189/21 191/23 192/7 200/14 220/22 227/11 weid [2] 2/20 107/6 205/15 206/19 208/9 236/10 199/21 193/19 195/23 200/14 220/22 227/11 weid [2] 15/16 6/3 209/1 209/23 211/13 15/3 25/10 30/14 233/19 234/7 234/11 198/24 36/25 38/11 140/17 140/21 145/10 201/25 206/2 209/1 214/25 217/2 219/6 3/3/17 34/5 40/15 239/16 240/11 241/12 236/1 238/5 238/8 140/17 140/21 145/10 201/25 206/2 209/1 232/9 233/2 233/2 239/16 240/7 243/22 93/22 93/22 93/22 93/24 93/16 23/3 28/18 140/17 140/21 145/10 201/25 206/2 209/1 239/16 240/7 243/22 239/16 240/7 243/22					
180/23 182/2 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>					
203/1 203/1 203/1 203/2 203/23 158/25 159/7 160/10 38/3 41/2 44/21 57/7 WBON [1] 151/6 187/18 191/22 192/19 239/5 240/16 242/14 160/14 163/9 163/12 58/13 62/14 65/18 66/17 66/24 73/14 144/21 200/9 200/19 201/11 242/16 242/23 243/4 163/24 165/5 166/12 66/17 66/24 73/14 144/21 200/9 200/19 201/11 use [9] 87/17 87/18 178/15 180/4 182/22 127/24 128/20 184/11 we'l [2] 2/20 107/6 205/15 206/19 208/9 210/2 210/15 222/7 199/15 119/1/3 199/7 200/14 220/22 227/11 we'l [2] 5/16 6/3 209/1 209/23 211/13 15/3 25/10 30/14 139/21 191/33 199/15 wanted [17] 2/21 199/23 202/14 223/18 19/24 36/25 38/11 142/16 166/6 166/10 214/25 217/2 219/6 33/17 34/5 40/15 236/1 238/5 238/8 140/17 140/21 145/10 201/25 206/12 209/1 232/9 233/2 238/7 33/17 34/5 40/15 239/16 240/11 241/12 176/8 176/9 176/13 219/4 220/10 225/10 239/16 240/7 243/22 93/22 93/22 93/24 93/16 240/11 241/12 235/7 warned [1] 242/9 21/3 23/7 239/16 240/7 243/22 91/2 13/13 48/7 wig [2] 31/13 48/7 warned [1] 242/9 70/13 117/25 121/24 46/19 67/5 77/10					
214/25 223/25 2371/3 160/14 163/9 163/12 58/13 62/14 65/18 WBON0000870 [1] 194/11 199/19 199/25 239/5 240/16 242/14 163/24 165/5 166/12 66/17 66/24 73/14 144/21 200/9 200/19 201/11 242/16 242/23 243/4 167/20 169/18 171/18 82/10 88/7 108/1 we [425] 200/9 200/19 208/9 210/2 210/15 222/7 189/21 191/23 192/7 192/21 193/19 195/23 230/8 240/24 we'd [2] 2/20 107/6 209/1 209/23 211/13 236/10 199/21 193/19 195/23 230/8 240/24 129/53 38/11 12/9 15/3 15/19 18/12 211/15 211/22 212/21 15/3 25/10 30/14 33/17 34/5 40/15 199/23 202/14 223/18 190/21 208/4 119/18 140/17 140/21 145/10 201/25 206/2 209/1 214/25 217/2 219/6 33/17 34/5 40/15 236/1 238/5 238/8 140/17 140/21 145/10 201/25 206/2 209/1 232/9 233/2 233/2 239/16 240/11 241/2 235/7 211/1 222/13 232/7 239/16 240/7 243/22 239/16 240/7 243/22 239/16 240/7 243/22 21/9 200/2 25/10 239/16 240/7 243/22 239/16 240/7 243/22 23/9 233/2 233/2 239/16 240/7 243/22 23/9 233/2 238/7 239/16 240/7 243/22 23/9 233/2 238/7 239/16 240/7 243/22 23/9 233/2 238/7 239/16 240/7 243/22 239/16 240/7 243/22 23/9 23/7 23					
239/3 240/10 242/14 163/24 165/5 166/12 66/17 66/24 73/14 144/21 200/9 200/19 201/11 242/16 242/23 243/4 167/20 169/18 171/18 82/10 88/7 108/1 we'll [21] 201/25 202/21 202/24 112/15 112/24 205/4 178/15 180/4 182/22 127/24 128/20 184/11 we'll [21] 5/16 6/3 209/1 209/23 211/13 236/10 199/23 202/14 223/18 230/8 240/24 12/9 15/3 15/19 18/12 211/15 211/22 212/21 15/3 25/10 30/14 233/19 234/7 234/11 108/2 108/4 119/18 166/11 189/22 201/11 211/25 217/2 219/6 33/17 34/5 40/15 239/16 240/11 241/12 198/21 08/4 119/18 166/11 189/22 201/11 221/1 222/13 232/7 93/22 93/22 93/24 93/22 93/24 239/16 240/11 241/12 176/8 176/9 176/13 201/25 206/2 209/1 232/9 233/2 238/7 93/22 93/22 93/24 vi [1] 31/23 vi [1] 31/23 178/16 196/18 227/12 20/12 5206/2 209/1 239/16 240/7 243/22 93/22 93/22 93/24 vi [1] 31/23 vi [1] 31/23 vi [1] 31/23 vi [1] 31/23 235/7 20/13 117/25 121/24 239/16 240/7 243/22 95/22 181/19 220/20 vi [2] 31/13 48/7 warned [1] 242/9 warned [1] 242/9 vi [2] 31/13 45/3 46/19 67/5 77/10		160/14 163/9 163/12	58/13 62/14 65/18		
use [9] 87/17 87/18 107/20 105/16 17 1/16 05/17 We [425] 201/25 202/21 202/24 112/15 112/24 205/4 178/15 180/4 182/22 127/24 128/20 184/11 we'd [2] 2/20 107/6 205/15 206/19 208/9 236/10 199/21 191/123 192/7 200/14 220/22 227/11 12/9 15/3 15/19 18/12 211/15 211/22 212/21 used [20] 4/6 5/11 196/12 196/13 199/15 230/8 240/24 12/9 15/3 15/19 18/12 211/15 211/22 212/21 15/3 25/10 30/14 33/17 34/5 40/15 199/23 202/14 223/18 19/24 36/25 38/11 140/17 140/21 145/10 201/25 206/2 209/1 214/25 217/2 219/6 33/17 34/5 40/15 236/1 238/5 238/8 140/17 140/21 145/10 201/25 206/2 209/1 232/9 233/2 238/7 239/16 240/11 241/12 176/8 176/9 176/13 219/4 220/10 225/10 239/16 240/7 243/22 93/22 93/22 93/24 97/7 113/11 121/4 131/23 178/16 196/18 227/12 27/21 28/1 47/3 52/20 239/16 240/7 243/22 93/22 13/2 23/3 28/18 61/24 62/3 71/1 1117/5 warning [3] 97/23 70/13 117/25 121/24 46/19 67/5 77/10 93/22 93/22 93/24 97/3 11/1 241/1 241/6 138/4 140/11 159/3 16/13 45/3 93/22 93/22 93/24 93/1 241/1 241/6					200/9 200/19 201/11
112/15 112/12 <					
210/2 210/15 222/7 236/10 169/21 191/23 192/7 192/21 193/19 195/23 192/21 193/19 195/23 230/8 240/24 12/9 15/3 15/19 18/12 12/9 15/3 15/19 18/12 211/15 211/22 212/21 213/6 214/3 214/12 213/6 214/3 214/12 214/25 217/2 219/6 232/9 233/2 238/7 239/16 240/11 241/12 243/22 3/17 34/5 40/15 48/12 65/14 65/25 93/22 93/24 97/7 113/11 121/4 155/22 181/19 220/20 weful [1] 87/6 using [6] 23/3 28/18 61/24 62/3 71/1 23/1 234/7 111/12 108/2 108/4 119/18 108/2 108/4 119/18 140/17 140/21 145/10 235/7 166/11 189/22 201/11 201/25 206/2 209/1 232/9 233/2 238/7 239/16 240/7 243/22 23/9 23/2 238/7 239/16 240/7 243/22 vicim [1] 31/23 vicim [1] 117/5 vicim /loser [1] 117/5 view [73] 4/25 18/6 warned [1] 242/9 warning [3] 97/23 241/1 241/6 warned [1] 242/9 70/13 117/25 121/24 138/4 140/11 159/3 wetl [17] 6/13 45/3 46/19 67/5 77/10 61/24 62/3 71/1 vicim [1] 117/5 view [73] 4/25 18/6 was [793] 159/3 162/18 165/13 106/9 129/23 150/2					
236/10 192/21 193/19 193/23 230/8 240/24 12/9 15/3 15/19 18/12 211/15 211/22 212/21 used [20] 4/6 5/11 196/12 196/13 199/15 wanted [17] 2/21 58/21 71/4 116/2 213/6 214/3 214/12 15/3 25/10 30/14 199/23 202/14 223/18 19/24 36/25 38/11 142/16 166/6 166/10 214/25 217/2 219/6 33/17 34/5 40/15 233/19 234/7 234/11 108/2 108/4 119/18 166/11 189/22 201/11 221/1 222/13 232/7 48/12 65/14 65/25 239/16 240/11 241/12 176/8 176/9 176/13 219/4 220/10 225/10 239/16 240/7 243/22 93/22 93/22 93/24 23/16 240/11 241/12 176/8 176/9 176/13 219/4 220/10 225/10 239/16 240/7 243/22 97/7 113/11 121/4 155/22 181/19 220/20 vi [1] 31/23 178/16 196/18 227/12 we're [25] 1/5 27/1 239/16 240/7 243/22 via [2] 31/13 48/7 vic [1] 117/5 vic [1] 117/5 warning [3] 97/23 70/13 117/25 121/24 182/22 61/24 62/3 71/1 vic [73] 4/25 18/6 was [793] 159/3 162/18 165/13 106/9 129/23 150/2					
1201 4/6 5/11 199/23 202/14 223/18 19/24 36/25 38/11 142/16 166/6 166/10 214/25 217/2 219/6 33/17 34/5 40/15 233/19 234/7 234/11 108/2 108/2 108/4 119/18 166/11 189/22 201/11 221/1 222/13 232/7 48/12 65/14 65/25 38/2 32/4 140/17 140/21 145/10 201/25 206/2 209/1 232/9 233/2 238/7 239/16 240/17 243/22 239/16 240/17 243/22 243/22 178/16 196/18 227/12 201/25 206/2 209/1 239/16 240/7 243/22 239/16 240/7 243/22 239/16 240/7 243/22 239/16 240/7 243/22 warned [1] 219/4 201/0 225/10 239/16 240/7 243/22 warned [1] 219/4 201/0 25/10 239/16 240/7 243/22 warned [1] 217/2 28/1 27/2 28/1 21/2 werte [25] 1/5 <					
15/3 25/10 30/14 233/19 234/7 234/11 108/2 108/4 119/18 166/11 189/22 201/11 221/1 222/13 232/7 33/17 34/5 40/15 236/1 238/5 238/8 140/17 140/21 145/10 201/25 206/2 209/1 232/9 233/2 238/7 93/22 93/22 93/24 239/16 240/11 241/12 176/8 176/9 176/13 219/4 220/10 225/10 239/16 240/7 243/22 97/7 113/11 121/4 155/22 181/19 220/20 vi [1] 31/23 178/16 196/18 227/12 we're [25] 1/5 27/1 239/16 240/7 243/22 vi [1] 31/23 vi [1] 31/23 235/7 27/21 28/1 47/3 52/20 182/22 well-known [1] using [6] 23/3 28/18 otim/loser [1] 117/5 victim/loser [1] 117/5 241/1 241/6 138/4 140/11 159/3 46/19 67/5 77/10 view [73] 4/25 18/6 was [793] 159/3 162/18 165/13 106/9 129/23 150/2					
33/17 34/5 40/15 48/12 65/14 65/25 93/22 93/24 97/7 113/11 121/4 155/22 181/19 220/20 useful [1] 87/6 using [6] 23/3 28/18 61/24 62/3 71/1 236/1 238/5 238/8 239/16 240/11 241/12 243/22 140/17 140/21 145/10 176/8 176/9 176/13 235/7 201/25 206/2 209/1 219/4 220/10 225/10 232/9 233/2 238/7 239/16 240/7 243/22 we're [25] 1/5 27/1 239/16 240/7 243/22 231/13 48/7 victim [1] 117/5 victim/loser [1] 117/5 view [73] 4/25 18/6 140/17 140/21 145/10 176/8 176/9 176/13 235/7 201/25 206/2 209/1 219/4 220/10 225/10 232/9 233/2 238/7 239/16 240/7 243/22 we're [25] 1/5 27/1 239/16 240/7 243/22 we're [25] 1/5 27/1 235/7 182/22 well-known [1] 182/22 warning [3] 97/23 70/13 117/25 121/24 46/19 67/5 77/10 46/19 67/5 77/10 victim/loser [1] 117/5 was [793] 159/3 162/18 165/13 106/9 129/23 150/2					
48/12 65/14 65/25 93/22 93/24 97/7 113/11 121/4 155/22 181/19 220/20 useful [1] 87/6 using [6] 23/3 28/18 61/24 62/3 71/1 239/16 240/11 241/12 243/22 176/8 176/9 176/13 178/16 196/18 227/12 235/7 219/4 220/10 225/10 we're [25] 1/5 27/1 239/16 240/7 243/22 well-known [1] 27/21 28/1 47/3 52/20 57/2 60/25 60/25 using [6] 23/3 28/18 61/24 62/3 71/1 vi [1] 117/5 victim/loser [1] 117/5 view [73] 4/25 18/6 vi [73] 4/25 18/6 176/8 176/9 176/13 235/7 219/4 220/10 225/10 we're [25] 1/5 27/1 27/21 28/1 47/3 52/20 57/2 60/25 60/25 239/16 240/7 243/22 well-known [1] 182/22					
93/22 93/22 93/24 97/7 113/11 121/4 155/22 181/19 220/20 useful [1] 87/6 using [6] 23/3 28/18 61/24 62/3 71/1 243/22 178/16 196/18 227/12 235/7 we're [25] 1/5 27/1 27/21 28/1 47/3 52/20 57/2 60/25 60/25 well-known [1] 182/22 vi [1] 31/23 via [2] 31/13 48/7 victim [1] 117/5 61/24 62/3 71/1 warned [1] 242/9 victim/loser [1] 117/5 victim/loser [1] 117/5 warned [1] 242/9 warning [3] 97/23 57/2 60/25 60/25 70/13 117/25 121/24 weth [17] 6/13 45/3 46/19 67/5 77/10 61/24 62/3 71/1 victim [1] 117/5 view [73] 4/25 18/6 was [793] 159/3 162/18 165/13 106/9 129/23 150/2					
97/7 113/11 121/4 155/22 181/19 220/20 useful [1] 87/6 using [6] 23/3 28/18 61/24 62/3 71/1 vi [1] 31/23 via [2] 31/13 48/7 victim [1] 117/5 victim/loser [1] 117/5 victim/loser [1] 117/5 view [73] 4/25 18/6 235/7 warned [1] 242/9 varning [3] 97/23 241/1 241/6 was [793] 27/21 28/1 47/3 52/20 57/2 60/25 60/25 70/13 117/25 121/24 138/4 140/11 159/3 159/3 162/18 165/13 182/22 went [17] 6/13 45/3 46/19 67/5 77/10 77/17 100/17 101/23 106/9 129/23 150/2					
useful [1] 87/6 victim [1] 117/5 warning [3] 97/23 57/2 60/25 60/25 went [17] 6/13 45/3 using [6] 23/3 28/18 victim/loser [1] 117/5 victim/loser [1] 117/5 victim/loser [1] 117/5 241/1 241/6 138/4 140/11 159/3 46/19 67/5 77/10 61/24 62/3 71/1 view [73] 4/25 18/6 was [793] 159/3 162/18 165/13 106/9 129/23 150/2				27/21 28/1 47/3 52/20	182/22
using [6] 23/3 28/18 victim/loser [1] 117/5 varing [3] 57/25 70/13 17/25 12/124 46/19 67/5 77/10 61/24 62/3 71/1 victim/loser [1] 117/5 241/1 241/6 138/4 140/11 159/3 77/17 100/17 101/23 61/24 62/3 71/1 view [73] 4/25 18/6 was [793] 159/3 162/18 165/13 106/9 129/23 150/2					
61/24 62/3 71/1 view [73] 4/25 18/6 was [793] 159/3 162/18 165/13 106/9 129/23 150/2					
		VIEW [13] 4/20 10/0	was [133]	109/3 102/18 165/13	100/9 129/23 150/2
					(12.5)

(100) up... - went

W	168/15 170/9 172/8	169/17 170/4 171/19	177/22	136/16 136/23 155/25
	180/21 188/6 189/14	172/13 173/25 175/13	why [86] 6/8 12/5	163/19 168/16 169/1
went [6] 150/3	195/15 198/3 198/5	175/18 176/2 176/3	12/14 12/19 15/1 17/3	182/5 222/24 223/6
151/20 153/15 190/3	200/10 203/4 207/23	176/23 177/25 178/12	21/11 26/13 38/7	223/16 225/2 225/5
190/12 213/24	207/24 213/14 223/23	179/1 182/12 183/10	38/18 45/12 63/24	225/18 226/6
were [271]	229/20 237/4 243/5	188/2 188/7 190/19	69/6 70/17 71/1 75/18	wish [5] 95/19 112/6
weren't [13] 5/18	243/8	194/12 195/6 195/17	81/12 84/7 97/25 99/9	
8/13 11/18 11/23 12/7	whereby [3] 57/21	197/22 198/12 198/19	101/25 102/6 103/11	wished [2] 85/16
31/19 46/21 112/17	181/16 185/25	198/19 204/6 211/10	119/16 123/23 127/6	190/11
126/7 131/2 131/4 168/7 213/25	whether [64] 16/1	212/20 213/16 213/23	127/8 128/14 129/18	wit [1] 11/14
	31/8 31/19 50/16	219/5 225/24 228/4	134/22 136/25 139/6	withdrawals [1]
West [2] 125/13 125/22	50/20 52/3 63/3 63/17	228/8 231/20 234/6	139/21 140/16 144/16	21/18
what [279]	64/5 64/13 66/11 68/5	235/3 235/20 235/23	150/4 151/3 153/17	withdrawn [2] 99/19
what's [18] 17/6	72/19 75/21 76/2 77/8	236/14 236/22 238/11	159/1 161/16 172/16	217/23
22/21 23/2 24/5 35/22	77/8 82/11 85/15	242/16 242/19 242/20		withheld [4] 38/19
52/7 62/20 69/21	89/16 89/20 93/4 99/6	242/22 243/9 243/24	176/1 176/6 180/2	134/21 135/4 238/1
70/20 72/25 84/4 90/1	115/24 116/16 117/17	243/25	180/23 183/2 185/12	withhold [1] 37/21
107/19 165/11 179/13	118/8 126/15 135/3	whichever [1] 100/5		withholding [1]
181/11 182/8 197/23	140/14 146/3 152/14	while [2] 3/1 51/16	191/18 208/4 208/6	136/1
whatever [3] 65/25	155/4 158/19 162/23	whilst [12] 28/22	211/1 218/6 225/7	within [31] 10/7 13/2
185/16 237/12	182/7 182/11 182/13	33/13 33/14 120/6	225/10 226/22 228/23	
whatsoever [1] 23/1	183/13 184/24 191/21	120/11 125/8 126/2	230/1 232/6 233/20	29/9 29/22 33/16
when [68] 3/19 4/11	194/18 195/6 195/11	141/24 148/16 152/25		
4/21 4/22 4/23 4/24	198/1 204/12 206/17	161/3 202/19	234/25 235/14 235/15	
8/14 8/23 11/10 11/12	206/19 212/12 212/16		235/19 236/16 236/18	
12/6 14/13 17/18 18/5	212/17 220/6 220/8	10/17 10/20 11/15	237/15 238/7 238/11	94/11 96/19 97/15
19/25 20/3 21/19 22/6	223/19 229/21 230/9	14/25 16/19 16/19	238/14 238/24 239/14	104/6 104/16 149/3
26/18 45/14 45/19	233/8 236/25 237/1	17/3 19/19 19/24	239/17 240/4 242/8	150/6 150/8 176/17
46/5 52/4 67/8 69/17	237/8 237/9 241/5	21/17 24/7 26/2 26/14		194/1 216/14 220/11
75/6 80/1 88/9 92/1	241/7 241/18	26/19 27/9 31/9 40/14		237/18
100/2 100/16 100/17	which [157] 6/18 8/17 9/9 9/9 15/1	60/1 64/22 68/2 74/25 77/5 77/18 77/20	223/24	without [14] 7/23 8/2 35/20 38/13 62/19
103/11 103/20 106/3	22/25 23/14 23/25	77/20 77/20 77/21	wide-ranging [1]	139/18 152/3 159/11
107/22 114/5 117/21	24/12 24/13 25/10	80/10 85/10 86/8	223/24	175/1 177/7 199/20
119/8 121/9 126/4	25/24 28/11 30/19	93/13 93/13 94/9	widely [1] 154/17	215/9 231/6 241/6
129/9 136/8 139/15	31/7 31/7 39/6 40/21		wider [8] 41/3 120/13	
157/14 163/20 163/20	41/1 41/9 42/10 42/17	96/5 97/4 97/21	136/5 143/17 200/7	1/24 13/6 114/1
176/2 179/19 182/17	42/19 43/14 43/20		200/8 200/10 237/17	witness [65] 1/11 5/4
182/23 186/5 187/6	44/1 44/20 50/6 50/8	105/11 117/4 117/7	wider-ranging [1]	9/14 9/15 11/2 26/9
	50/17 57/13 58/21	121/5 136/14 139/13	237/17	26/21 40/14 45/2
207/5 207/22 208/18	59/2 62/5 62/16 64/18	140/1 142/5 142/23	widespread [2] 34/7	63/20 64/20 72/7
208/21 212/1 215/25 220/3 222/15 227/24	66/7 69/8 70/11 71/13	143/8 144/12 144/17	170/10	74/21 75/12 75/13
228/20 237/14 240/23	71/14 71/19 72/10	151/15 151/21 152/2	wild [1] 43/16	75/25 80/17 80/19
when I [1] 11/12	73/12 73/12 74/15	154/23 155/24 161/20		80/24 83/14 83/15
whence [1] 176/13	75/24 76/18 77/12	164/16 164/16 165/4	23/21 35/15 51/1	83/16 83/18 101/1
where [75] 4/14 5/2	79/1 79/7 80/11 81/7	165/5 165/8 165/10	51/16 54/15 55/8	113/25 126/10 128/9
7/21 16/14 22/13	82/24 82/25 86/11	166/7 176/4 178/16	55/11 55/11 56/13	129/3 130/1 133/1
22/15 24/4 26/8 31/9	87/3 87/9 88/22 90/8		62/6 71/19 89/6 112/2	133/3 134/4 161/20
32/8 32/12 32/24 34/2	90/15 93/2 94/13	194/3 196/4 202/18	116/1 116/18 116/20	163/4 163/11 163/14
34/4 34/6 41/2 42/18	94/24 100/17 105/6	210/16 215/15 219/18		166/4 179/10 179/18
46/19 48/17 62/13	105/13 107/12 108/1	225/2 227/9 231/3	139/13 141/3 147/3	180/4 181/7 183/14
68/7 76/22 77/10	108/19 111/3 111/9	237/25 238/1 240/21	148/10 152/17 155/9	184/9 188/6 188/10
77/14 77/16 79/17	111/10 112/3 112/24	241/14 242/14	160/15 160/25 166/9	194/22 197/9 197/10
80/20 82/18 83/10	116/1 119/5 122/15	whole [5] 57/15	201/17 201/18 208/13	
83/11 83/17 85/8	126/13 127/13 128/13 128/25 129/23 133/5	110/12 112/11 114/18 174/13	230/4 233/24	202/13 204/19 212/18 213/17 213/23 227/2
93/12 96/18 96/25	133/7 135/9 139/8	wholesale [1] 91/4	Williams [38] 6/12	213/17/213/23/227/2
97/5 97/13 109/9	140/18 141/4 141/14	wholly [8] 97/1 97/6	6/15 11/14 11/19	232/14 232/16 232/13
109/16 111/12 116/14	140/16 141/4 141/14 141/14 141/14	113/4 114/9 115/4	11/21 16/13 27/8 45/7	237/25 238/1
119/2 121/25 131/24	142/20 143/13 143/19	115/5 134/3 134/4	45/17 45/19 46/11	witnesses [3] 9/12
137/17 140/9 141/7	143/24 145/5 149/15	whom [7] 2/16 7/3	49/12 53/4 53/9 53/9	10/9 11/11
142/7 148/14 148/20	152/20 155/2 157/6	76/25 143/1 149/15	53/14 70/14 71/11	wolf [1] 94/9
150/21 152/13 157/10	157/10 157/16 159/12	199/16 204/19	71/24 77/10 104/25	woman [1] 202/18
157/19 162/21 168/13	163/2 163/4 165/14	Whose [2] 56/19	105/4 117/15 135/11	won't [3] 89/12 116/3
				(101) wont won't

(101) went... - won't

W won't [1] 201/23 woodwork [2] 210/12 210/16 word [22] 5/11 15/4 28/18 43/23 65/13 69/21 75/10 86/22 87/17 87/18 93/10 93/13 93/23 93/25 100/12 104/12 122/3 151/19 155/22 181/19 197/23 222/7 worded [5] 86/18 86/21 86/23 159/15 160/2 wording [5] 70/16 115/9 157/1 168/23 168/23 words [19] 33/17 76/21 76/23 82/3 82/20 83/10 93/14 93/22 97/7 150/23 158/25 185/18 187/3 188/19 212/22 230/12 231/4 231/18 236/10 work [18] 2/20 2/22 3/1 3/3 3/17 5/10 5/10 5/14 11/3 11/25 62/4 67/16 87/24 98/1 110/19 114/19 120/25 184/15 worked [9] 10/25 17/25 21/25 58/14 119/14 140/22 220/24	$\begin{array}{r} 48/12\ 52/19\ 53/15\\ 56/5\ 56/7\ 56/9\ 56/11\\ 56/12\ 61/8\ 62/2\ 62/4\\ 62/20\ 63/25\ 64/12\\ 66/4\ 66/19\ 67/11\\ 67/16\ 68/7\ 68/16\\ 69/11\ 69/12\ 70/25\\ 74/25\ 77/11\ 77/15\\ 78/6\ 79/5\ 85/14\ 85/17\\ 90/6\ 90/21\ 91/2\ 94/2\\ 94/3\ 95/9\ 96/9\ 96/12\\ 96/22\ 96/24\ 97/16\\ 97/17\ 101/5\ 101/9\\ 102/6\ 102/21\ 102/22\\ 103/22\ 106/5\ 106/7\\ 107/2\ 107/22\ 108/20\\ 110/9\ 110/11\ 112/5\\ 112/8\ 112/14\ 112/20\\ 116/10\ 116/10\ 116/11\\ 118/7\ 118/9\ 127/22\\ 138/15\ 139/1\ 142/19\\ 143/3\ 146/2\ 147/16\\ 148/2\ 148/5\ 148/24\\ 152/14\ 152/20\ 152/21\\ 152/22\ 153/2\ 153/8\\ 153/9\ 153/16\ 154/16\\ 154/19\ 154/21\ 157/4\\ 157/10\ 158/11\ 158/17\\ 158/22\ 165/19\ 167/7\\ 167/15\ 168/8\ 170/15\\ 170/18\ 171/19\ 171/23\\ \end{array}$	217/2 writer [4] 10/24 95/10 177/8 185/23 writing [13] 40/25 46/9 63/3 73/15 80/4 101/10 105/16 115/12 115/12 128/3 182/7 217/10 224/15 written [35] 7/21 8/2 9/24 9/25 17/10 27/2 28/4 38/18 39/11 61/1 70/11 77/16 81/25 82/15 85/9 88/10 90/21 91/18 92/15 94/2 97/22 122/2 127/1 127/3 128/7 151/13 162/25 163/1 183/22 193/6 201/4 202/13 212/14 228/7 237/3 wrong [32] 13/18 14/19 15/5 15/7 18/7 28/23 40/16 49/25 66/21 128/18 131/19 132/18 132/20 133/11 136/7 138/11 144/15 151/19 168/9 182/6 185/2 192/17 198/3 201/21 201/25 206/16 210/25 211/1 212/16 226/18 226/22 238/14 wrongly [2] 53/7 79/17	183/24 221/1 221/10 221/15 223/22 225/11 225/11 233/10 234/16 239/6 239/11 239/13 240/20 242/2 year [3] 61/25 128/17 208/25 years [14] 5/17 65/5 66/3 80/15 83/13 115/1 132/10 132/24 164/13 188/10 204/1 207/3 215/10 235/3 years' [1] 204/2 Yep [3] 22/2 22/5 22/9 yesterday [1] 87/3 yet [2] 54/1 66/10 yield [1] 147/25 you [1166] you'd [11] 15/10 65/22 73/7 173/21 186/5 186/6 191/24 198/24 204/1 218/12 238/24 you'll [7] 9/20 25/3 48/24 77/24 183/16 209/21 216/1 you're [46] 2/23 25/16 40/23 43/23 44/20 67/14 69/17	184/4 186/2 188/17 203/13 203/13 203/25 208/10 208/17 208/23 211/8 211/8 211/9 214/1 217/25 221/5 224/22 227/14 230/8 239/5 your [249] yourself [10] 8/3 29/2 44/20 53/3 59/3 100/13 187/20 188/18 225/20 226/5 Z zones [1] 13/3 zoom [1] 83/9
222/24 235/9 working [12] 11/9 13/2 94/9 112/4 142/14 145/9 145/19 146/1 146/3 162/6 187/2 191/21	171/24 176/22 177/13 177/14 182/5 184/6 184/7 186/7 186/16 191/7 191/15 191/25 192/16 192/17 192/24 194/8 194/16 198/2 199/2 200/9 201/5	wrote [24] 5/17 56/21 62/21 76/9 77/14 90/8 90/14 100/10 100/16 101/22 119/9 121/1 127/11 128/10 129/18 178/25 201/9 208/11 213/6 213/10 213/18	91/22 92/23 92/24 98/25 99/24 128/18 130/11 130/14 159/8	
works [1] 119/5 world [4] 164/4 164/7 164/15 164/20 worried [2] 185/5 210/11 worry [1] 16/9 worrying [2] 38/13	201/6 204/4 204/8 204/18 204/20 205/4 205/10 205/11 205/15 205/17 205/22 206/23 206/24 209/11 209/16 209/19 210/2 210/12	216/25 217/8 235/6 Y yeah [92] 2/3 2/5 5/7 8/1 8/4 12/11 13/12 15/6 15/9 15/12 15/12	186/8 186/11 194/15 195/10 202/15 203/4 205/19 206/8 207/15 209/20 210/25 212/22 215/10 224/9 224/15 225/1 225/12 227/14	
180/24 worse [1] 12/14 worth [2] 41/6 171/16 would [219] 4/1 4/8 6/5 6/11 6/14 7/8 7/14 7/17 7/19 8/21 8/21	210/23 213/2 213/11 214/14 214/21 215/7 216/10 217/20 217/22 221/3 231/21 236/12 236/15 236/15 237/22 237/24 238/14 238/20 238/25 239/23 240/1	27/3 28/18 29/6 29/25 32/3 32/25 33/23 35/19 37/19 38/11 40/25 43/24 45/5 45/5	you've [70] 10/16 12/4 15/3 15/13 26/24 27/12 37/4 49/2 51/20 52/9 63/22 66/11 69/12 69/20 73/25 81/9 92/18 93/22 94/14 94/17 95/21	
10/3 12/2 12/3 12/4 12/5 14/20 14/21 18/5 18/8 19/11 27/7 27/10 27/11 27/12 29/19 31/11 31/12 32/9 32/14 35/21 35/23 36/2 36/20 37/8 37/12	Wouldn't [17] 10/11 11/19 11/21 23/1 45/12 64/15 74/7 87/18 153/14 183/7 195/4 206/23 210/23	45/16 48/16 52/11 56/1 56/17 57/1 59/24 61/8 63/8 66/22 67/20 70/2 70/19 71/9 72/4 73/3 73/6 77/25 78/23 82/1 90/2 91/10 99/5 107/18 107/22 110/1	113/25 115/4 122/1 122/2 135/7 137/23 143/17 149/16 149/25	
39/25 40/16 41/10 41/13 41/16 41/18 42/7 42/8 42/14 43/13	214/15 214/21 222/7 239/1 write [8] 86/22 108/20 127/22 179/20	113/24 124/15 127/17 127/19 129/10 131/3	163/11 166/25 175/15 175/15 175/16 178/15 178/20 180/7 181/12 182/4 183/17 183/22	(102) won't - zoom

(102) won't... - zoom