

OFFICIAL

Witness Name: ANGUS CRAWFORD

Statement No.: WITN11770100

Dated: 25 November 2024

## POST OFFICE HORIZON IT INQUIRY

---

### FIRST WITNESS STATEMENT OF ANGUS CRAWFORD

---

I, Angus Crawford, will say as follows...

#### **INTRODUCTION**

1. I am employed as a Procurator Fiscal Depute with the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service (“**COPFS**”).
2. This witness statement is made to assist the Post Office Horizon IT Inquiry (the “**Inquiry**”) with the matters set out in the Rule 9 Request dated 3 October 2024.
3. I have been asked to provide information pursuant to Rule 9 of the Inquiry Rules 2006.

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

## **PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND**

4. I qualified as a solicitor in 2002. I hold a current practising certificate with the Law Society of Scotland. I hold an LLB in Scots Law, an LLM in Advanced Advocacy and a Diploma in Legal Practice.
  
5. I began working as a Procurator Fiscal Depute in 2002. Around 2011/ 2012, I was appointed as a Senior Procurator Fiscal Depute in the Economic Crime Unit at Glasgow's Procurator Fiscals Office. The Economic Crime Unit was responsible for the investigation and precognition of all economic crimes, including fraud and embezzlement, which merited proceedings by way of Indictment (a jury trial). At this time, all allegations of economic crimes exceeding £25000 loss, were allocated to the Economic Crime Unit. The Economic Crime Unit was part of the Glasgow Sheriff and Jury Unit.

## **GLOSSARY**

6. I use several terms within the body of this statement unique to Scotland.  
These are:

- a. **Precognition.**

A precognition is a generic term used to describe the process in which a Procurator Fiscal Depute investigates a case and thereafter prepares a document, 'the precognition.' This document refers to all of the available evidence in the case. It is sent to Crown Counsel with recommendations on whether or not to prosecute a case. Crown Counsel makes the final decision

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

on whether a case is indicted or not. Not all cases are sent for Crown Counsels instructions. Often a Procurator Fiscal Depute can mark a case for no proceedings without Crown Counsels approval.

**b. Mark or marking.**

This term refers to the process where a Procurator Fiscal considers the evidence in a case report. It involves deciding whether the report discloses a crime and whether there is corroborated evidence (from two sources) to prove that the accused person committed the crime. This process is called 'marking the case.'

**POST OFFICE CASES**

7. I have been asked to provide details of my involvement in the six cases affected by the Post Office Horizon system which were referred to the High Court of Justiciary by the SCCRC (namely, the cases involving William Quarm, Susan Sinclair, Colin Smith, Judith Smith, Robert Thomson, and Aleid Kloosterhuis). I can confirm that I was not involved in these six cases.
  
8. I have been asked to provide details of my involvement in any other cases which I learnt at the time may have been affected by possible issues with the Post Office Horizon system. I can confirm that I was involved in the following cases.
  - (i) **Case against Rosemary Stewart (COPFS case reference GG13010308)(Gorbals Post Office, Glasgow).** The report was

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

received from the Post Office investigator Mr Robert Daily on 21.05.2013 (**COPF0000195**). The case was allocated to me by my line manager Mrs Allison McKenna (See file note in case papers dated 23.07.2014 at **COPF0000200**). In the note from Mrs McKenna, she states “ *Kenny has asked that ECT now considers this case to establish whether or not we can raise proceedings. You were aware of it from previous discussions with Andrew Lazzarin. Can you now take over from where he left off and if sufficient fill in the template for Kenny to authorise petition proceedings.*” It was marked by me for no proceedings on 04.09.2014, due to concerns I had with the reliability of the Horizon IT system, as well as the failure of the Post Office to disclose documentation with respect to the original audit in 2009 at **COPF0000093** and **COPF0000094**. I can also recall a conversation with Mr Daily, on or around 30.09.2014, where he stated that the original audit figures from 2009 had been lost. (See file note in case papers dated 30.09.2014 at **COPF0000198**)

I was aware of this case prior to it being allocated to me as I recall I had discussions with PF depute Mr Andrew Lazzarin who had previously marked the case for proceedings against Rosemary Stewart, (see Initial Report Template in a Serious Fraud dated 30.05.2014 contained within case papers at **COPF0000197**). Mr Lazzarin marked this case for proceedings on the basis of Mrs Rosemary Stewart’s admissions. He does, however, acknowledge that “*there are well publicised concerns about the reliability of the Horizon*

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

system.” I cannot recall the exact dates when I had the discussion with Mr Lazzarin. There is a case note in the file dated 10.10.2013 from Mr Lazzarin, at **COPF0000161** referring to instructions from Crown Office Policy Unit with respect to cases impacted by the Horizon IT system. In this file note Mr Lazzarin states “ *Until the review is complete, Policy have agreed that the Post Office push things on looking for corroboration without using Horizon.*” (See file note by Andrew Lazzarin dated 10.10.2013 in case papers at **COPF0000161**). My interpretation from Mr Lazzarin’s file note was that this was the Crown Office policy, at that time, with respect to cases impacted by Horizon evidence. It may have been around this period that I had discussed the case against Rosemary Stewart with Mr Lazzarin, prior to it being allocated to me, and possibly the first time that I was alerted to the issues with the Horizon IT System.

There was no mention of Horizon IT System issues within the case report from Mr Daily with respect to the case against Rosemary Stewart.

- (ii) **Case against Rauf Akhtar Bashir (COPFS case reference GG14024535). (Toryglen Post Office, Glasgow).** The report was received from Post Office (Mr Daily) on 24.12.2014 (**COPF0000176**). The case was allocated to me by my line manager, Mr Joseph McKenna on 05.03.2015 (see file note in case papers at **COPF0000185**). I prepared a Pre-Petition Report for Crown Counsel

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

on 02.08.2016, recommending no proceedings due to issues with the Horizon IT System. (See Pre-Petition Report in papers dated 02.08.2016 at **COPF0000177**). Within the pre-petition case report, I have copied and pasted an email from Laura Irvine, Brechin Tindal and Oats (BTO solicitors) dated 30.08.2016. This email outlines the Post Office position with respect to live cases and explains that the Post Office will not be able to support "*external matters where Horizon is challenged.*" It also confirms that Post Office would not be able to provide an expert on Horizon to "*support a prosecution brought by a public prosecution service.*" (See email from Ms Irvine, BTO, within the Pre-Petition report in the case papers).

Confirmation was received from Crown Counsel on 06.02.2017 agreeing with my recommendation of no proceedings, (see email from my line manager Mrs Anne Sweeney dated 06.02.2017 in case papers at **COPF0000184**).

There was no mention of Horizon IT System issues within the report received from Mr Daily. I had, however, knowledge of the issues from dealing with the case against Rosemary Stewart. My email to Mr Daily on 03.08.2016 (**POL00333559**) sought once again, information about the reliability of the Horizon system and other evidential matters. (See also same email in case papers dated 03.08.2016 at **COPF0000180**).

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

- (iii) **Case against Murtaza Rasul (COPFS case reference GE13008494 (Carmyle Post Office, Glasgow))**. The report was received from the Post Office (Mr Daily) on 10.04.2013 (**COPF0000118**). I do not recall who allocated this case to me or when it was allocated. The case was previously marked by PF Depute Mr Andrew Lazzarin on 25.07.2014. Mr Lazzarin recommended proceeding against Mr Rasul. He does however acknowledge the potential issues with the Horizon IT system. (See Initial Report Template in Serious Fraud Case in papers dated 25.07.2014 at **COPF0000147**). In this report Mr Lazzarin states *“The investigation was paused for a number of months while the Post Office carried out a review of cases where their Horizon computer system was involved. Paul Miele at Policy was aware of the position. The Post Office have reached the conclusion that the system is reliable in relation to this case but have yet to make a report available confirming this is the case. The problems concerning the system were widely reported at the time so will probably be something that the defence focus on for benefit of the jury.”* The report was marked by me on 24.09.2014 for no proceedings, due to issues with the Horizon IT system and the reliability of civilian witnesses, who were elderly and suffering from dementia at the time they provided their statements to Mr Daily. (See my file note in case papers dated 24.09.2014 at **COPF0000156**). There was no mention of any issues relating to the Horizon IT system within the report.

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

In a case note dated 12.12.13, Mr Andrew Lazzarin states that he had a meeting with Mr Daily, Susan Winters of the Post Office and Ms Irvine of BTO regarding the possible issues with the Horizon system. In this file note Mr Lazzarin states that *"They think that Horizon is not as bad as it is made out to be and may be in a position to give us a statement in due course to say that the relevant bits of the system worked properly."* (See file note in case papers from Mr Andrew Lazzarin at **COPF0000159**). In a file note raised by Mr Lazzarin dated 23.07.2013 (**COPF0000201**) he has copied an email sent from Mr Daily who states *"Following Second Sight review on the Horizon System used by Post Office Ltd our solicitors are reviewing all cases submitted for a decision on prosecution"* There was no mention of Horizon IT System issues within the original case report from Mr Daily with respect to the case against Murtaza Rasul.

- (iv) **Case against Khalid Hussain (COPFS case reference GG14010600) (Pollokshields Post Office, Glasgow).** The report was received from Mr Daily on 16.05.2014 (**COPF0000187**). I marked this case for no proceedings on or around 12.11.2014 due to issues with Horizon IT system. (See file note in papers dated 12.11.2014 at **COPF0000191**) I have no recollection of who allocated this case to me, or when it was allocated. The case papers indicate that I was repeatedly requesting information from Mr Daily regarding this case. A file noted dated 21.10.2014 mentions an email I sent to Mr Daily requesting information including documentary evidence and also

OFFICIAL



OFFICIAL

making further enquiries with respect to the reliability of the Horizon IT system (See file note in case papers at **COPF0000189**). On 12.11.2014 my case file (**COPF0000191**) mentions that I had requested documentary evidence of the quarterly audit mentioned in the case report, and also mentions that Mr Daily had stated that the documents would be difficult to obtain as they were kept by an independent company who charged a lot of money to provide them. I also mention the criticism of the Horizon system and noted that Mr Daily stated that he would be unable to defend the system if this case was to go to court. This refers to his disclosure to me with respect to the Rosemary Stewart case. (See file note in Rosemary Stewart case papers at **COPF0000191**). I raised a further file note on 18.05.2015 mentioning my contact with Mr Daily and noting he still had to provide details of an expert witness who could provide assurances that the Horizon accounting system was accurate. (See file note in case papers at **COPF0000190**). There was no mention of Horizon IT System issues within the original case report from Mr Daily with respect to the case against Khalid Hussain.

9. I have been asked to explain the extent of my involvement in the cases at paragraphs 8 above. I was allocated the cases for investigation and precognition. This involved examining all of the available evidence and deciding on whether to prosecute or not. I required to consider each report from Post Office on a case-by-case basis to establish if there was corroborative evidence. Having already considered the potential issues with

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

the Horizon IT system I required to establish if any of the corroborative evidence was reliant upon the Horizon IT System.

10. I have been asked to explain whether any Horizon data was requested from Fujitsu in the cases at paragraph 8 above. I have no knowledge of any Horizon data request from Fujitsu in the cases referred to at 8 above. The Fujitsu issue was not something I was aware of at this time as it was never brought to my attention by Mr Daily that Fujitsu provided data to the Post Office regarding Horizon IT System matters.
11. I have been asked to consider the following documents.
  - (i) **POL00333517** refers to a meeting I had with Mr Daily with respect to the case against Rosemary Stewart and the case against Murtaza Rasul. This is a chain of emails initiated by PF Depute Andrew Lazzarin dated 24.07.2014 with respect to the case against Murtaza Rasul (See 8(iii) above). In this chain of emails Mr Lazzarin enquires about the reliability of the Horizon System. This email was sent prior to the case being allocated to me. Mr Daily in his email dated 29.08.2014 confirms that the Rasul case has been passed to me (see email in case papers at **POL00333517**). I do not recall the exact discussion I had with Mr Daily at this time, but it is clear from the import of his email to Craig Paterson of Greater Glasgow CID that I was asking about the Horizon System. (See email to Craig Paterson from Mr Daily in the case papers). I ultimately marked no proceedings

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

in the Rosemary Stewart case on 04.09.14 (**COPF0000093**) and the Murtaza Rasul case on 24.09.14 (**COPF0000156**), citing issues with the Horizon IT System.

- (ii) **POL00139869** is an email chain initiated by Jarnail Singh dated 03 09 2014 and refers to a meeting I had with Mr Daily and Ms Irvine regarding concerns with the case against Rosemary Stewart. At this meeting I recall raising issues surrounding the reliability of Horizon. I also recall asking them about the provision of an expert report and also a request to provide me with other documentary evidence, including the 2009 audit report in the case against Mrs Rosemary Stewart.
- (iii) **COPF0000093** is a case note I raised in the case file with respect to the case against Rosemary Stewart and refers to a face-to-face meeting with Mr Daily and Ms Irvine (see 8(i) above).
- (iv) **COPF0000094** is a case note I raised after the meeting mentioned at 8(i) above. My recollection is that I had several telephone conversations with Mr Daily with respect to information I had requested. This case note was in reference to these conversations.
- (v) **POL00333559** This document refers to an email I sent to Mr Daily with respect to the case against Rauf Akhtar Bashir (see 8(ii) above).

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

(vi) **POL00165581** appears to be a document generated by the Post Office. I am referred to in this report at page 2. It succinctly describes my position with respect to my refusal to prosecute Rosemary Stewart due my concerns with the reliability of the Horizon system. This report is dated 09.10.2014 after I had informed Mr Daily that I would not be proceeding with the case against Rosemary Stewart (See 8(i) above)

12. I have been asked to provide a full account of my knowledge of the Horizon IT system, the role Horizon data played in prosecutions of Post Office cases in Scotland and my knowledge of Horizon system bugs, errors and defects, or other issues with the Horizon system. My response is as follows:

- (i) My knowledge of the Horizon system issues at the time I was dealing with Post Office cases was limited to the information contained within the Rosemary Stewart papers.
- (ii) I am not aware of any other cases, other than those listed at 8 above, where reliance was placed on Horizon data in support of the prosecution.
- (iii) I cannot recall when I first learned that there may have been issues with the reliability of Horizon data produced by the system. It may have been, as previously explained, when I was allocated the case against Rosemary Stewart (see 8(i) above) or earlier discussions with

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

Mr Andrew Lazzarin. As previously explained, there is a reference to the Horizon System issues in the case file from Mr Lazzarin who had previously been dealing with this case prior to it being allocated to me for precognition. (See file notes by Andrew Lazzarin in case papers dated 10.10.2013 at **COPF0000208** and **COPF0000210**.)

- (iv) I understood that the Horizon system may have defects which could affect the accuracy of financial information recorded on the system. As stated at 8 above, the evidence submitted by the Post Office Investigator Mr Daily, in the cases I dealt with, was reliant upon Horizon data. It was therefore my duty to consider all the evidence provided within the case reports received from the Post Office to establish if there was a sufficiency of evidence to support a prosecution. I also had to be satisfied that the evidence would stand up to scrutiny. I can recall, at this time, that the internet was awash with information concerning the issues with the Horizon IT System. For example, as late as 03.08.16, I was requesting disclosure of the *Second Sight* report (**POL00333559**) to allow me to make an informed decision in the case of Rauf Akhtar Bashir (COPFS case reference GG14024535). The report was never forthcoming.
- (v) When discovering the issues raised during my research, I was concerned that these issues may have an impact on the cases I was dealing with.

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

- (vi) I understood that the Horizon system may have defects, which could cause inaccurate information being recorded on the system.
- (vii) I had regular contact with Mr Daily, Post Office Investigator, with relation to the cases he had reported to COPFS which had been allocated to me for precognition.
- (viii) My input involved a request to Mr Daily for further evidential information, in the cases allocated to me. For example, my email to Mr Daily dated 03.08.2016 (**COPF0000180**) indicates the type of enquiries I made in the case against Rauf Akhtar Bashir (COPFS case reference GG14024535) and (**POL00333559**).
- (ix) I did not agree to prosecute any cases allocated to me that were dependent on the Horizon IT system evidence. I considered the reports allocated to me on a case-by-case basis. I established that all were dependent upon Horizon evidence. I decided not to prosecute these cases owing to my concerns over the possible Horizon system defects and Mr Daily's disclosure to me at our meeting on or around 04.09.2014 (**COPF0000093**) with respect to the case against Rosemary Stewart. At that meeting I advised him that he would be called as a crown witness and if cross examined in court regarding the Horizon IT system could he defend the accuracy of the Horizon IT System? His answers was 'no'.

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

- (x) In **POL00139869** Jarnail Singh alludes to these issues in his email to Ms Irvine dated 3.9.2014 when he states, *“However concerns appears to relate in part to the position with regards to the Horizon System (in the absence of expert evidence) and what might be said in evidence should POL’s security manager be cross examined.”* This disclosure from Mr Daily surprised me, as it was the first time, after repeated requests for an expert report, that Mr Daily ever indicated that there may be issues with the Horizon system that would impact on the evidence in the case.
- (xi) After I had a meeting with Mr Daily and Ms Irvine from BTO on or around 04.09.2014 (**COPF0000093**) and Mr Daily’s disclosure to me (See 12 (ix) above) I considered each report from Post Office on a case-by-case basis and decided that, given that they were all reliant on Horizon evidence, they would not stand up to scrutiny at trial.
- (xii) I would not ever allow a reporting agency to pressurise me to conduct a prosecution in a particular way.
- (xiii) I was not aware of any other Horizon cases, however, any other cases reliant on Horizon evidence which I was aware of would have been treated with the same circumspection, as the cases previously allocated to me.

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

13. My reflections now are as follows.

- (i) **No mention of potential Horizon IT issues within the reports received from the Post Office.** It is essential that a Reporting Agency is completely transparent with a prosecuting authority. Within the four reports I received from Mr Mr Daily there is no mention of the issues that were being raised by Postmasters in England. Mr Mr Daily had to have been aware of these issues at the time he was submitting his reports. The criticism of the Horizon system should have been highlighted within the report to allow the prosecutor to consider the potential evidential impact on a case and make an informed decision. A reporting agency must be trusted to provide all information to the prosecutor, even information which would undermine the Crown case.

Within COPFS each individual office marks their own cases which merit proceedings by way of indictment ( a jury trial) . For example, a Procurator Fiscal Depute in Aberdeen could be marking a Post Office case similar to the cases I marked in Glasgow. If the PF Depute marking the Aberdeen case was not aware of any potential Horizon IT issues, and these issues had not been highlighted in the report, the marking depute would accept the Horizon evidence as being accurate. Assuming there was a corroborated case, usually the Horizon evidence and the accused admissions, that case would likely be prosecuted.

OFFICIAL



OFFICIAL

- (i) **Underlying evidence not available at report stage**. In the Rosemary Stewart case, the Reporting Officer failed to provide evidence of money being transferred from the Post Office to the suspect's bank account or any bank account associated with her. In the transcript of Rosemary Stewart's interview, she denies taking any money, albeit she accepts she attempted to cover up losses. She gave her consent for the Post Office to have access to her bank account. This was not to have been followed up by Mr Daily prior to submitting the report. Or if it had been followed up Mr Daily failed to provide me with the results of his investigations. If Mr Daily had found nothing in Rosemary Stewarts bank account indicating that she had transferred funds from the Post Office to her account that should have mentioned in the initial case report.
- (ii) **Full enquiries not carried out prior to reporting**. In my dealings with Mr Daily, either in face-to-face meetings, telephone calls or emails, it is evident that I was repeatedly requesting additional documentary evidence which he either failed to disclose or was not aware that he had to disclose. For example, in the Rosemary Stewart and the Khalid Hussain case, I requested a copy of the audit reports. This was essential evidence and should have been disclosed at the initial report case. These reports were never forthcoming. I recall being concerned when Mr Daily failed to provide this information when I requested it. The original audit reports were an essential piece of evidence to prove the crime. As previously stated, Mr Daily's explanation for the failure to

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

provide the original audit reports in the Rosemary Stewart case was,  
(i) The information is kept by another organisation, and it is expensive for the Post Office to retrieve the information and (ii) The original audit report had been lost. Even if the Horizon IT system proved to be reliable the absence of the original audit reports would have undermined the crown case.

- (iii) There was no mention of **Fujitsu's role** in the supply of data supporting the information contained in the Horizon System. It is likely that if I had been aware of Fujitsu's involvement, I would have requested sight of the data to consider whether I required a witness from Fujitsu to speak to that data.

**COPFS Institutional knowledge of Horizon issues.**

14. I have been asked to provide an account of any information I have provided to Senior other COPFS colleagues about Horizon system bugs, errors and defects, or other issues with the Horizon system, specifically in relation to the potential to affect the reliability of Horizon data used in support of prosecutions. My response is as follows.

- (i) I reported to my line managers in relation to Post Office cases in which Horizon data was being relied upon. I worked in the Economic Crime Unit for around three years. The Economic Crime Unit was part of the

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

Glasgow Sheriff and Jury Unit. The Sheriff and Jury Unit was responsible for precognosing all cases which could potentially be indicted ( For a jury trial). The line management structure within the Economic Crime Unit included a Principal Depute, to whom I reported, an Assistant PF and a District PF. Cases would be allocated to me from my line manager. I was allocated the Rosemary Stewart case from my line manager Allison McKenna. Instructions came from Mr Kenneth Donnelly, then Head of the Glasgow Sheriff and Jury Unit. (See case note by Allison McKenna in Rosemary Stewart file dated 23 07 2014 at **COPF0000200**). The other line managers to whom I reported to during my time in the Economic Crime Unit were Mr Joseph McKenna (See file note from Mr Joseph McKenna dated 05.03.2015 **COPF0000185** in the case of Rauf Akhtar Bashir, reference GG14024535) and Mrs Anne Sweeney (See file note in papers dated 06.02.2017 in the case of Rauf Akhtar Bashir, reference GG14024535, at **COPF0000184**).

- (ii) I had discussions with Mr Paul Miele at Crown Office Policy Unit with respect to issues with the Horizon IT system. (see 14(iii) below)
  
- (iii) I had contact with Mr Paul Miele at Crown Office Policy Unit during the period I was investigating the Post Office cases allocated to me. I cannot recall the date or dates of these discussions; however, I think it was after Mr Daily had made the admission on or around 04.09.2014 concerning his inability to defend the integrity of the Horizon IT system.

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

The nature of my discussion with Mr Miele was around the issues with the Horizon IT system and my concerns over its accuracy. My recollection is that Mr Miele was on a fact-finding exercise at this time. My understanding during this period, was that Crown Office Policy Unit was aware of the issues being raised about the possible unreliability of the Horizon IT system.

- (iv) I am not aware when Crown Office was notified by Post Office that allegations relating to the integrity of the Horizon system were being made by subpostmasters. In the case of Rosemary Stewart, there is a file note from Andrew Lazzarin dated 10.10.2013 referring to Horizon issues, (See 8(i) above). I also note that Mr Paul Miele printed the summary of evidence in the Rosemary Stewart case on 21.05.2013 (See case directory in the Rosemary Stewart papers at **COPF0000247**).
- (v) I have no recollection of receiving any instructions in relation to Post Office Horizon cases from within my local office or from COPFS.
- (vi) I have no knowledge of when COPFS ceased prosecutions against subpostmasters in relation to Post Office Horizon cases. The last live case that I had any involvement with was against Rauf Akhtar Bashir (GG14024535), when I received Crown Counsel's instructions on 16.02.17 agreeing with my recommendation not to prosecute owing to issues with the Horizon IT system. (See file note in papers dated

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

06.02.2017 in the case of Rauf Akhtar Bashir, reference GG14024535  
at **COPF0000184**).

**Statement of Truth**

I believe the content of this statement to be true.

**GRO**

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Dated: 25.11.24

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

**Index to First Witness Statement of Angus Crawford**

<b><u>No.</u></b>	<b><u>URN</u></b>	<b><u>Document Description</u></b>	<b><u>Control Number</u></b>
1	COPF0000118	Standard Prosecution Report - GE13008494	COPF0000118
2	COPF0000147	Witness statement of Murtaza Rasul	COPF0000147
3	COPF0000156	Angus Crawford Workstation report - GLASGOW2-144	COPF0000156
4	COPF0000159	FOS User - Andrew Lazzarin – Note	COPF0000159
5	COPF0000201	Report re: postponing the submission of the requested statement and productions - FOS User: Andrew Lazzarin	COPF0000201
6	COPF0000187	Standard Prosecution Report for accused fraud of Subpostmaster - Khalid Hussain	COPF0000187
7	COPF0000189	Update notes from Angus Crawford RE: Email sent to RO on Horizon accounting system	COPF0000189
8	COPF0000191	Angus Crawford message	COPF0000191
9	COPF0000190	Message regarding a request for expert witness on Horizon IT system	COPF0000190
10	COPF0000195	Standard Prosecution Report of Rosemary Stewart and Jaqueline El Kasaby	COPF0000195
11	COPF0000200	Note from Alison McKenna to Angus Crawford re filling in the template to authorise petition proceedings	COPF0000200
12	COPF0000198	Message by Angus Crawford regarding the defensibility of Horizon's accuracy in court	COPF0000198
13	COPF0000197	Request to Sheriff and Jury Functional Lead for authority to place accused on petition for Fraud case - Rosemary Stewart	COPF0000197
14	COPF0000161	Email to Andrew Lazzarin RE: PO and Horizon	COPF0000161
15	COPF0000176	Standard Prosecution Report - Strathclyde (GG14024535)	COPF0000176
16	COPF0000177	Pre Petition Report - Rauf Akhtar-Bashir	COPF0000177
17	COPF0000184	Message from Mairi to Angus re Prosecution	COPF0000184

OFFICIAL

## OFFICIAL

18	COPF0000180	Email from Angus Crawford to Robert Daily re: Case v Bashir. GG14024535	COPF0000180
19	COPF0000093	Email from Angus Crawford to Unknown RE; Angus stating that evidence in relation to the accusation of fraud on a post office branch is unavailable, nor does post office have results an audit referred to as 'the audit in 2009' nor can RO and 'solicitor 'defend' the Horizon accounting system ' / Record of meeting between Angus Crawford and RO	COPF0000093
20	COPF0000094	Angus Crawford note of communication with RO	COPF0000094
21	COPF0000185	Email from Joe McKenna RE: Deposits, ATM use	COPF0000185
22	COPF0000208	File note re Robert Daily re Review of Horizon System	COPF0000208
23	COPF0000210	Note recorded by Andrew Lazzarin re Robert Daily statements	COPF0000210
24	COPF0000247	Screenshot of case file documents relating to GG13010308	COPF0000247
25	POL00333559	Post Office and COPFS emails re case v Bashir [GG14024535 - Toryglen PO] (Scotland) with questions for PO including seeking assurances re Horizon and a copy of the Second Sight report.	POL00333559
26	POL00333517	Email from Craig Paterson to Robert Daily re: Rasul - concerning case which has been passed to Angus Crawford	POL00333517
27	POL00139869	Email chain from Jarnail Singh to Laura Irvine, cc Martin Smith, Andrew Parsons and others re Scotland / Gorbals Post Office	POL00139869
28	POL00165581	Email from Robert Daily to Denise Reid, Brian Trotter, John Breeden and others re: Case closure - POLTD/1213/0164 - Gorbals	POL00165581