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MR GREEN: May it please your Lordship. I have two things for your Lordship before we begin with Mr Latif who is sitting kindly waiting in Islamabad.

There is the physical bundle of claimants' witness statements.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Thank you.
MR GREEN: My Lord, the other thing is an answer to
your Lordship's question about whether we have a list of the Callendar Square bugs.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: We can deal with that after Mr Latif. We will deal with all of those things after Mr Latif.
MR GREEN: I'm most grateful.
Mr Latif, if we look at your witness statement on the Opus screen $\{\mathrm{E} 1 / 1\}$, which hopefully --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I don't think -- we haven't sworn this witness yet.
MR GREEN: My Lord, no, I'm so sorry.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Good morning, Mr Latif. We are just going to administer either the oath or the affirmation. Affirmation.

## MR ADREES LATIF (affirmed)

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Just pausing there, the witness
obviously doesn't have a form of words in front of him
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of the affirmation. I am content that that is a sufficiently close affirmation for the purposes of the court, unless either party wishes me to readminister it -- now is your opportunity? No.
MR DRAPER: No, my Lord.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Thank you, Mr Draper.

## Mr Green, over to you.

## Examination-in-chief by MR GREEN

MR GREEN: Mr Latif, on the Opus screen in front of you you should be able to see a document which says "Amended witness statement of Adrees Latif", can you see that?
A. Correct.
Q. And if we look at page 3 of that witness statement $\{E 1 / 1 / 3\}$, there's a signature there.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Is that your signature?
A. Correct, that is my signature.
Q. And do you believe the contents of your witness statement to be true?
A. I do.
Q. Would you wait there for a moment because counsel for

Post Office will have some questions to ask you.
A. That's correct, that's okay.

Cross-examination by MR DRAPER
MR DRAPER: Hello, Mr Latif. The witness statement you have
provided is a very short one so I want to first ask you some questions by way of background about your branch.
A. Yes sir.
Q. Firstly, can you give some indication of the size of the Caddington branch?
A. Caddington branch is situated in a village of about 12,000 people. It has two main counters and a third combi-counter, so it is a three counter office.
Q. What do you mean, Mr Latif, by a combi-counter? Could you explain that please?
A. A combi-counter is a counter that is open on the same hours as the retail shop, so I have a post office at the back of the premises where there is two main counters and the third counter which is a combi-counter and it is situated nearby the retail counter of the convenience shop which I also operate. And that counter is open at the same hours as the shop counter is open as well.
Q. Thank you.
A. So it is commonly known as out of hours counter.
Q. Yes. Thinking back to two dates specifically, July 2015 and January 2018, which are the dates of the two problems you complain of in your statement, how many Post Office staff members, your assistants, would typically be working in the branch?
A. On those days there would be three members of staff:
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two, including myself which is the third.
Q. If we could call up $\{F / 1038.1 / 1\}$ please. This is a Post Office record, Mr Latif, of the assistants registered in your branch. Can you look down those please and confirm whether those indeed were the assistants in your branch at the two dates that I have just given to you?
A. I can. The first one is a Mrs Christine Helen Barnett, the second one was a Mr Muhammad Rouman Tabassum.
Q. When you say first and second, what do you mean by that? Are you talking about in order of importance as assistants?
A. No, no, they are both manager's level. I'm talking about on the list where you've got the names of my staff on there, so Christine Helen Barnett and then Rouman Tabassum.
Q. On the screen we have it here the first entry is a Christine Fensome. Can you see that at the top of your screen?
A. Yes.
Q. Counting down, just to confirm you are seeing exactly the same document as Iam, it is Christine Fensome, then Christine Barnett, then Michael Brumwell, then Muhammad Tabassum, then Robert Deacock and then Tahir Shabir.
A. Correct, sir .
Q. And if you look down the far right-hand side of the screen, are those to the best of your recollection the Horizon user IDs for those assistants?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. It is not listed on here but am I right to say that your user ID was MLA001?
A. That's not my user ID.
Q. Sorry, did you say that's not?
A. No.
Q. What then was your main user ID?
A. It's ALA001.
Q. Thank you.
A. So can I just repeat that, my Lord?
Q. I got it. I think you said ALA?
A. (Nods).
Q. 001?
A. Correct. Correct.
Q. And looking at the assistants that are still shown on the screen, can you give any indication of how many hours per week they would typically work, whether any of them, for example, worked most of the week and others were less frequent?
A. On an average week the (inaudible) work was 36 hours. Each person.
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Q. I think you may have told me this before, but just to confirm, did any of these assistants have a higher status than any of the others, any additional rights?
A. There's two of them and that is Mrs Christine Helen Barnett and Muhammad Rouman Tabassum.
Q. In what respects were they more senior assistants?
A. Christine was a manager in the post office with me but she used to work mainly in the post office and Muhammad was also the shop manager as well. So he used to manage the shop for me and the post office when I was not there.
Q. Would it be right then that there were some tasks on Horizon and in the post office more generally that Christine Barnett could do because she was a manager but your other assistants wouldn't have done?
A. I didn't quite understand that question. Can you please repeat that.
Q. Of course. Were there any tasks in running the Post Office branch that Ms Barnett could do or would do for you that the other assistants wouldn't?
A. Mrs Barnett and Muhammad Rouman Tabassum were trying to do the balancing procedures as well as myself. Some staff would not know how to balance the office and when I say "balance the office", as you may already be aware that we have to reconcile at the office on a weekly
basis, so every Wednesday we would reconcile the office and both Christine Helen Barnett and Muhammad Rouman Tabassum were fully trained to do that if I was not around.
Q. You say if you were not around. How common would it be for you not to be in the branch on a given day?
A. It's very common. As you know, Post Office ran various training sessions so you were expected to attend those and there could be holidays, there could be various other reasons.

So can I just repeat, Christine Helen Barnett, she used to work for the police so she is very, very trusted. I trust her completely. And Muhammad Rouman Tabassum is a very close friend of mine who has been with me for a long time so these two were completely trustworthy, honest, hard working and very reliable .
Q. So it is fair to say you entrusted the operation of the branch to one or other of those two people, you said "quite frequently". Could you give any more specific indication? Do you mean once a week, twice a week?
A. I tend to be there most days. Five days to six days a week, so -- but sometimes I did take time off, so it was infrequent but it did happen occasionally.
Q. Looking then at hours, I think you said that the hours
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were strange, presumably you mean long, so might there be times of day even on days when you were working in the branch when you weren't there, say early in the morning on are late in the evening?
A. Correct.
Q. How common an occurrence was that, Mr Latif?
A. Uncommon, but it could have happened, it does happen, it did happen. I mean I could have had a meeting where a customer has come in for a financial services product, so I will take them to the room where we hold private conversations so that means I'm away from a counter, so yes, that does happen.
Q. I'm going to ask you some questions now about a stock unit transfer for $£ 2,000$ that you describe in your witness statement. You say that it was carried out in or around July 2015; that's right, isn't it?
A. Correct, sir .
Q. Now, just to explain to you what I'm going to do, I'm going to come on a bit later to tell you what Post Office says happened, but because there is not much detail in your witness statement I'm first going to take you through your account of what happened and ask you questions about that. Do you follow?
A. Okay, I do.
Q. And when I'm doing that it doesn't mean that Post Office
accepts as true the things that I'm exploring with you, I'm just asking you questions about what you say.
A. I understand, sir.
Q. So you say at paragraph 6 of your witness statement $\{E 1 / 1 / 2\}$ that the transfer was from the AA stock unit in your branch to the SJ1 stock unit, is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. I suggest that you have made a small mistake there, Mr Latif -- no criticism, but Post Office's records suggest that there was a stock unit called SP1 but not a stock unit called SJ1. Do you think that might be right?
A. Correct.
Q. So you think it -- forgive me, it is my fault, my question was unclear.
A. (Inaudible) can check my statement.
Q. Yes. It is paragraph 6, the first mention of SJ1, which is the second page $\{E 1 / 1 / 2\}$.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you accept that that's a small mistake?
A. That is a typo, sir, that should read SP1.
Q. Thank you.

Can you tell me anything about these two stock
units, so, for example, what was the AA stock unit? Was
it a specific counter?
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A. Okay, the AA stock unit, sir, is the main stock unit that's in the two counters that's behind the back of the post office, okay? That's where the most interaction happened during normal hours of operation, which are between 9 and 5.30.

SP1 is the combi-counter that I referred to earlier on. Combi-counter is open on the retail side of the premises, okay, and it is adjacent to the shop retail counter.
Q. And where was the cash for stock unit AA kept?
A. Behind the closed, locked doors of the main office.
Q. And what about the cash for stock unit SP1, where was that kept?
A. SP1 had its own dedicated safe. It's a rolling deck safe and how that works is it has got a cassette, an (inaudible) cassette which is supplied by the Post Office as a mandatory requirement of handling stock, so the cash is kept in the RollerCash and a small amount is kept in a flip draw which the Post Office supplied to us for normally about one hour's worth of operation in the flip top, and the rest of the cash is kept in the roller deck safe which is below the flip top safe.
Q. Thank you. So this transfer of $£ 2,000$ in or around July 2015, is it right that the purpose of that
was to replenish the cash stocks in SP1 because it was running low of cash?
A. Correct, sir .
Q. It might be useful to take you now to the statement of one of Post Office's witnesses, Ms van den Bogerd. Her statement is at $\{\mathrm{E} 2 / 5\}$ please. Mr Latif, is this
a witness statement that you have seen before?
A. No.
Q. Okay, going to page 22 of this document please
$\{E 2 / 5 / 22\}$, you see paragraphs 87 to 88 there towards the bottom of the screen. Can I ask you to read paragraph 87 and paragraph 88 and please indicate when you need the page to be turned.
A. Okay. So paragraph 87?
Q. Yes, please, read it to yourself. No need to read it out loud.
A. Okay.

> So:
" If subpostmasters wish to move cash or stock between stock units, there is a process which must be followed. Firstly, the item which is being transferred (in this case cash) must be transferred by the user via Horizon using the back office function (transfer out) from the outgoing stock unit. The cash must then be physically removed from that particular stock unit.
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Providing these two actions are completed, the stock unit from where the cash is transferred should not show a discrepancy."
Q. Thank you. If you stop there.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Mr Draper, you are going to have to be a bit more clear in how you either put questions or express yourself, because I know that you said, rather sotto voce, "Don't read it out loud"; the witness obviously thought you had asked him to read it out loud.
MR DRAPER: Understood.
Mr Latif, that paragraph you have just read, that's an accurate description of the process, isn't it?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Can I ask to you read to yourself, not out loud, paragraph 88 and tell us when you need the page to be turned please.
A. Okay.
(Pause).
Next page please. \{E2/5/23\}.
(Pause).
Okay.
Q. Thank you. That's accurate as well, isn't it, Mr Latif?
A. It is, sir.
Q. It is probably now helpful to go to your witness statement at $\{E 1 / 1 / 2\}$ and paragraph 7 please. Do you
have that in front of you now?
A. I do.
Q. I'm going to take you through it in stages to look to add some more detail to the account that you give. I'm going to ask you to confirm that each of the stages that I describe is correct.
A. Okay.
Q. So first stage, you logged into stock unit AA and you used the transfer out function, identifying the stock unit SP1 to which you wanted to transfer the $£ 2,000$, is that right?
A. Correct, sir .
Q. And when you did that the system printed out a transfer out slip, is that right?
A. That is mandatory, yes.
Q. You say it is mandatory, is it automatic that the system prints the slip?
A. It's automatic, there's nothing -- it's automatic, there's nothing you can do about it, it happens automatically.
Q. It's right, isn't it, that you could also choose to print one? You could press "print" as well; that's right, isn't it?
A. You could print an additional one, sir, if you need to.
Q. Thank you. Could you explain what you then do with the
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transfer slip once it is printed out?
A. We file that with the paperwork from the office.
Q. It's right, isn't it, that you should sign the transfer out slip and take it with you when you go to transfer in?
A. Correct. Well, you also at the same time get the transfer in slip from the receiving stock unit as well, sir.
Q. Yes.
A. And sign -- date stamp both of them.
Q. Thank you. Looking at this specific transfer that you're describing at paragraph 6 of your statement, so far, describing the transfer out from stock unit AA, everything had worked as it should have worked, is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. You say you then moved over to stock unit SP1 to process the transfer in, is that right?
A. Yes, correct.
Q. So you walked from the counter position for stock unit AA to the counter position for stock unit SP1 with the physical cash, is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. You say then that you noticed immediately at stock unit SP1 that the $£ 2,000$ had not transferred
successfully. That's what you say.
A. Correct.
Q. I'm going to talk you through that process to see how you say you saw immediately that it had not transferred successfully, so again I'm going to take it in stages.
A. Okay.
Q. First, Mr Latif, you logged into the counter SP1, didn't you?
A. I'm sorry, I didn't quite hear that. Can you repeat the question please?
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Your voice is incredibly low, Mr Draper. You will have to speak up.
MR DRAPER: Forgive me.
The first step was to log into the counter for stock unit SP1?
A. Correct.
Q. You then went to the back office screen for that terminal and went through the key sequence to view transfers in available on that stock unit?
A. Correct.
Q. And you say that it is at that point that you realised that the $£ 2,000$ had disappeared from Horizon; that's right, isn't it?
A. Correct.
Q. So to check I understand correctly, what you are saying
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is it had disappeared, in the sense that it was not available on the screen as a transfer in?
A. Correct.
Q. You then say, Mr Latif, that you immediately performed a cash declaration on the AA stock unit; is that right, that was your next step?
A. Yes, and also on the SP1 as well.
Q. Dealing first with the cash declaration on stock unit AA, you say you walked back to stock unit AA and carried out a cash declaration which involved you manually counting the cash, is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. And you say that the stock unit balanced. What you mean by that I think is that two things were the case and I'm going to put each of them to you separately. If we assume that before the transfer there was $£ 10,000$ cash physically in stock unit AA and that the Horizon cash figure was 10,000 as well, after the transfer both of those were 8,000 -- just hypothetical figures -- is that what you say?
A. Correct.
Q. And as I understand your evidence what you are saying is you knew from that that the transfer out had been successful because the physical removal of the cash was also reflected in the position on Horizon; Horizon was

2,000 lower as well, the Horizon figure?
A. Correct.
Q. It is right, isn't it, that when you went back to stock unit AA you already had, didn't you, the transfer out slip?
A. I did, correct.
Q. And that showed a transfer out of $£ 2,000$ ?
A. Yes.
Q. You could also have simply printed out the transaction log from stock unit AA to show the transfer out, couldn't you?
A. Yes you could and we did.
Q. Sorry, you say that you did?
A. Yes.
Q. Is there any reason why you don't mention those steps in your witness statement?
A. I just kept my witness statement as simple and straightforward as possible.
Q. Apart from this cash declaration, you don't mention any other steps to identify the transfer out or the transfer in, do you?
A. No, but I can go through those with you. I'm quite happy to go through those with you, sir .
Q. I will come back to those shortly.
A. I'm experienced -- I have been running a post office for
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17 years, sir . I have also worked for the Post Office on training other offices how to run a post office. I was also involved in running and introducing the new Horizon software changes in 2006 onwards, where I went to several offices on behalf of the Post Office to give them training. So I' $m$ an experienced, trained subpostmaster and I ran my business successfully for 17 years. So I may have been a bit brief in the statement but obviously I can run through those -exactly those steps that we would take to make sure that there is no operator error on our behalf.
Q. Maybe we can do it a bit more shortly by my asking you this, Mr Latif. You as an experienced subpostmaster would know that there were lots of reports you could run on Horizon that would show you the transfer out and that --
A. (Inaudible).
Q. Would show you the transfer in?
A. Correct.
Q. And would show you any failure to reconcile the two if there was one missing. Do you follow that?
A. Correct. Correct.
Q. You also say at paragraph 7 of your witness statement $\{E 1 / 1 / 2\}$ that you checked the CCTV to see whether you had performed the process correctly .
A. Yes, sir.
Q. But, Mr Latif, you will have known that, wouldn't you, from your transfer out slip, from the cash declaration and from all of the other reports that you could run?
A. Yes, sir, but when we counted the cash $£ 2,000$ was missing, so that's what alerted us to why we need to check the CCTV and make sure (a) that there was no -nothing was done incorrectly, make sure all procedures were followed and, secondly, make sure there is no theft from employees or (inaudible) or something like that that happened. So we made sure that the $£ 2,000$ that disappeared, we made sure that there wasn't anything untoward in our -- and we were suspicious of Horizon anyhow. Horizon had some glitches in it. I have seen it in other branches and I have seen it in my own branch as well. So we wanted to make sure that there was no other explanation why the $£ 2,000$ is gone.
Q. So you now say, Mr Latif, that you checked the CCTV also to make sure that no one had taken $£ 2,000$ from the branch, is that right?
A. Correct, correct.
Q. When would that have happened --
A. As an experienced subpostmaster -- can I just say as an experienced subpostmaster I would make all the checks to make sure that nothing untoward happened. In any
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business you would do that; whether it is Post Office, whether it is retail, I would make sure that things were done properly and nothing untoward had happened.
Q. The process that you have just described with me, Mr Latif, in relation to the transfer involved you personally taking every step in that process; that's right, isn't it?
A. Correct.
Q. You carried out the transfer out on stock unit AA; that's right?
A. Correct.
Q. You physically moved the cash to stock unit SP1, you say?
A. I did.
Q. And you tried to process the transfer in on stock unit SP1 but you say that failed because there was no transfer in to accept. That's what we have just gone through.
A. Correct, correct. At the same time, sir, can I just stop you there, I just want to clarify a point that's not in my statement which perhaps with hindsight should be there. When the transfer was not there in stock unit SP1, there's a reverse option on Horizon which you can press to bring the cash back. Okay? So you reverse the original transaction which says "transfer out".

It's next to the "transfer out" button, it's a button, an icon on Horizon that you press that brings that money back to AA.
Q. Again that's not in your witness statement, Mr Latif, but do you now say that that's what you did? You say you reversed the transfer out?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. Why don't you mention that important detail in your witness statement, Mr Latif?
A. Well, I'm not sure. I mean looking at that carefully, that's probably -- maybe perhaps I should have done. But can I also say that obviously I had near the time when I made the statement lost my father and I was going through a period of distress and I lost ... so ...
Q. I'm sorry to hear that, Mr Latif --
A. That could be the reason.
Q. I'm sorry to hear that, Mr Latif, but it is fair to point out that you reviewed this statement again this month and you made a correction to it, didn't you, in relation to the transaction --
A. Correct.
Q. You had then every opportunity --
A. Correct.
Q. -- to look again at your statement and correct it or add any further important detail, didn't you?
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A. Correct, but it is never too late, sir. You have to understand we're very busy, running round, so it's obviously, you know, an oversight. Yes, perhaps I should have put more detail in, but you see I kept my statement as simple as possible to keep things simple.
Q. I will take you back to the CCTV footage that you say you looked at and I'm just going to give you the context --
A. Yes.
Q. -- to my question, so it will be quite a long question, if you just wait until I have finished please.

We have just discussed how every step in the process of the transfer out on the stock unit and the physical transfer of the cash, and the attempt to transfer in on stock unit SP1, were all performed by you personally and over a very short period of time; that's right, isn't it?
A. Correct, correct.
Q. Why then would it help you to look at CCTV footage to see whether the $£ 2,000$ had somehow been removed from the branch?
A. Well, I wanted to make sure in my mind that everything was done properly. I looked at the CCTV as a double checkability just to make sure that everything was followed correctly.
Q. But you knew, didn't you, that you hadn't --
A. That's why ...
Q. Forgive me. You hadn't taken the $£ 2,000$ out of the branch, had you?
A. I want to prove to my colleagues that -- Ms Christine Helen Barnett was there, that, you know, the procedure was followed and the money was back at AA where it should be.
Q. So you now say you looked at the CCTV because your colleagues were concerned that you hadn't done the transaction properly?
MR JUSTICE FRASER: No, that isn't what he said, Mr Draper. You can't do that.
A. No, it was just to double check and make sure -- I'm not saying that.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Mr Latif, just bear with me just one second.

You can put what you say the answer amounts to back to him but you can't say that's what he said if you are not putting it back to him in the same terms.
MR DRAPER: Forgive me, I'll find it as closely as I can from the transcript.

The most important bit of it is inaudible so it is hard to see.

But are you saying that when you looked at the CCTV
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that was because you wanted to show to Mrs Barnett that you had done the transaction properly?
A. Correct.
Q. So do you no longer say that you were checking the CCTV to make sure no one had taken the $£ 2,000$ out of the branch?
A. Correct, make sure not anything untoward happened. I'm not just saying -- money taken out the branch but money could have gone anywhere so I want to make sure the money goes back in AA where it should be.
Q. I'm going to ask just one more question on this. You were concerned that you personally might have somehow lost the $£ 2,000$ during this process, is that what you are saying?
A. No. All I'm saying is I want to make sure that the procedure was followed, to make sure that all the -Christine and my staff are absolutely confident that the correct procedure was followed, the money was in the right stock unit (inaudible), but make sure it is a software issue not a misplaced cash or cash is lost somewhere else. We wanted to make sure that we had done everything by the book and make sure that nothing untoward had happened.
Q. Thank you. Forgive me, I'm just going to check the transcript a moment because I think some of your answer
was lost.
(Pause).So there are then two elements, two reasons why yousay you looked at the CCTV footage: the first was tomake sure nothing untoward --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. The first was to make sure nothing untoward had happened and the second was to make sure that you had pressed all of the right buttons on the screen, is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. So --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Was the CCTV camera focused in on the counter so that you could see everything that you had physically done at the counter?
A. Yes, sir . I've got a 16 channel system and there is a camera on every counter, which includes SP1, the entrance to the main stock unit, stock position, which is AA where the main two counters are. There is internal and external cameras. So I've got a 16 channel camera system that is designed to catch anything that moves in the office.
Q. If what you say about looking at the CCTV footage were right, that footage would help confirm at least important parts of your evidence, wouldn't it?
A. Can you just repeat that question please, sir, my Lord.
Q. Yes. If what you say is right, the CCTV footage would help to confirm important parts of your evidence, wouldn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. And it might, for example, help you dispute responsibility for any shortfall?
A. Correct.
Q. And it is right, isn't it, that you haven't provided that CCTV footage to Post Office in these proceedings?
A. That's correct.
Q. Why not?
A. Well, that was obviously a long time ago and we were convinced that everything was done properly. The CCTV was just a backup. I'm still convinced that everything was done properly. There is a software glitch that stole our money, you know, that disappeared into magic air where it is not possible and so I -- we were convinced that we were right. So the footage was shown to my colleague who is a trusted member of staff and we were completely confident that we had done nothing wrong. But the problem is with the Post Office, as you may or may not be aware, you are always -- we are always wrong. So if the money is missing, we have to put it in and I just put the money in and said "Okay, you know,

I must be wrong" even though we knew everything was done perfectly, the CCTV was checked, the process was followed properly, we are both experienced personnel and Mrs Barnett was with me for over 13 years and, as I say, she worked for the police, so we were both trusted personnel. However, the way the Post Office view it, if you ring the helpline they will say to you "The money is missing, you have to put it in" and that's how the system -- the procedure works and we're always liable, as per my contract with the Post Office, so I had to physically put that money in from my own pocket and balance the books. As you know, every Wednesday, we must balance the books and that's how we were trained to procedures within the Post Office.

So with the money, any monies -- and I mean this is just one instance of $£ 2,000$ missing. There are several other instances where money has disappeared, small amounts, and we put it down to the fact that it has got to be operator error, you know, that's what we have been told by the Post Office, of "Our software is perfect, it must be you guys, it must be a training problem, must be a staffing problem", or must be somebody making a mistake and that's how we reimburse, so we just put the money in and carry the money (inaudible) Post Office. As we are obviously trained professionals
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to do so, that's what we did. I mean I'm in a fortunate position, I can raise money from the shop, you know, and put the money in, but I think others are not in that position to do so and that's why I'm kind of disappointed with Post Office's behaviour.
Q. Mr Latif, that's a very long answer and I'm not sure it entirely responds to the question I put. I don't accept much of what you just said but I'm going to carry on with the questions and we can come back to those specific points.
A. As the Post Office I don't expect you to, sir. I'm happy for that to be the case.
Q. The next thing you say in your witness statement is that limitations in accessing data and reporting functions made it difficult to interrogate the system. Do you remember that in your witness statement?
A. I do, sir.
Q. That's not consistent, is it, with what you told me earlier, which was that you were able to produce lots of different reports on Horizon that would show you exactly what had happened?
A. Can I just hold you there for one second.

My Lord, we can perform stuff at our end, but there is a -- Post Office had its own servers and I'm an IT guy, you know, I have qualifications in City $\mathcal{\&}$ Guilds
before I came over to the Post Office. So yes, while we can make checks at our end at the stock unit level, there are a lot of stuff that happens in the background. Obviously you've got your own -- the Post Office has its own servers and networks and we can not access those server. We just got our user interface at the front end and we have a back office where we can do the reports, transfers in, transfers out, reports. Yes we can all do that. However, there is other stuff that Post Office does with our data that we cannot access.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Mr Latif, what I'm going to ask you to do now is just listen to Mr Draper's questions and try and confine your answers just to his questions, if you would. Is that clear?
A. Yes, sir, my Lord, I apologise for that.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: No, no, that's all right. It sometimes happens, but Mr Draper's questions are going to be quite tightly focused.

Over to you, Mr Draper.
MR DRAPER: Mr Latif, I suggest that's wrong and that Horizon provided you with all the information you needed on your case. I'm going to take you through that stage by stage with short questions and you should be able to give short answers. Do you follow?
A. Okay.
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Q. Horizon provided you with the information you needed to know that the transfer out had succeeded, didn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. And you say that you saw immediately on stock unit SP1 that the transfer in had not succeeded, so Horizon told you what you needed to know there as well, didn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. And we have already discussed how you could have printed off an unreconciled transfer report that would have identified any transfer out for which there was not a transfer in; that's right, isn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. And you could also carry out reports, or checks on all of the stock units to see any changes in their Horizon cash figures, couldn't you?
A. Yes.
Q. You could also physically check the cash in any relevant stock unit to see whether it was the same as what the Horizon figure showed, couldn't you?
A. Yes, sir, you can.
Q. So if your evidence were right that the transfer out succeeded but the transfer in failed, Horizon could tell you everything you needed to know to confirm that position, couldn't it?
A. I think the issue -- yes, sir, but the issue is what's
happened in-between and I can't see what's happened in-between, sir. And that's -- I think you're not labouring that comment, that you are saying -- you are skirting round that, but that's the crux of the issue.
Q. Do you mean between the time you performed the transfer out and you attempted to perform the transfer in?
A. Yes, sir .
Q. You could also, Mr Latif, during this process have phoned the helpline to ask them whether there was any report or any function on Horizon that would help you investigate what had gone wrong; you could do that as well, couldn't you?
A. You could do, but, as I have said previously, I'm a trainer for the Post Office, I train other branches how to do their procedures, reconciling accounting, balancing, so yes I could do, but you've got two experienced people at the counter that have years of experience behind them and they knew what they're doing, so ...
Q. So I'm going to try to summarise what you just said and tell me if it is not a fair summary.
A. Okay.
Q. You are saying that you and your assistants were so experienced that you did not need to call the helpline
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to ask for any help in finding reports or other functions?
A. We did log a complaint to the Post Office, so there will be a call log to the Post Office, the log to say the money has disappeared, so there will be a call log for that, sir.
Q. That's a separate point. I'm asking why you didn't phone the helpline to seek their assistance in investigating what had gone wrong and I'm trying to summarise your evidence as being that you didn't need to because you were so experienced, you knew what to do?
A. No, we -- first of all, yes, we did ring them, okay? I'm not saying we didn't ring them. I'm saying we are experienced people, we know what we're doing. We did ring them, there will be a call log. Secondly, the helpline is not very good either. It is full of inexperienced people there in a call centre somewhere where we don't know where they are and I have made a number of calls to the helpline and the word "helpline" is not correct for it, it's not a helpline. They go through very basic stuff, okay, and it's not very good. That's my personal opinion; nobody else's, that's my personal opinion.
Q. I'm going to take you to a couple of examples then of the helpline assisting you and your staff, Mr Latif.

Can we call up the call log please at $\{F / 1829.1\}$. If the operator could move down to row 49 please. Do you see in column D, Mr Latif, that this is a telephone call from your branch in November 2014?
A. You said column D?
Q. Yes, that's right. Just looking for the date there. Row 49.
A. Yes.
Q. Then if the operator could please move the screen
sideways so that we can see column M please. That is a description of the call from your branch and I will read it out:
"Is there a report they can do to check what has been transferred through units."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And if the operator can move us along to column $U$
please. This, Mr Latif, is the answer that was given on that call and you see it says:
"Yes tran log using mode for transfers ."
Do you see that?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. So what this shows, I suggest, is that in November 2014 one of your assistants phoned the helpline to ask how to identify transfers between stock units and was told,
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correctly, that they could identify them from the transaction log; that's right, isn't it?
A. Yes, sir .
Q. If we could go now down to row 70 please and across to the left please as well so we can see column A and so on. You see this is another call at row 70 from your branch, Mr Latif, and the date for this one in column D is 20 January 2015. Do you see that?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And if we go to column $M$ please we see again the question -- and I suggest there is obviously a missing word in it, tell me if you disagree, but it should read:
"Can [we] print off report that will show transfers between stock units."

Do you see that?
A. Yes, sir .
Q. And going to column $U$ again please, this is the advice given:
"Advised how to do so - TL mode - transfers print."

I suggest that "TL mode" is "transaction log", do you agree?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. So this is the second occasion on which you or a member of your staff had been told how to show transfers on
reports you could print in the branch; that's right, isn't it?
A. Yes, sir, but can I just make a point here, if I may, my Lord?
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Yes, go on.
A. The branch is open from 6 o' clock in the morning to 9 pm , seven days a week, so at times I may not be there, or Christine Barnett may not be there, or Muhammad may not be there, so if the operator is not sure they will ring up the helpline to get the help that they need, okay? So the fact that there are calls does not really specifically -- you know, I'm not surprised because I can't be there from 6 o'clock in the morning until 9 o'clock seven days a week, sir.
MR DRAPER: Mr Latif, on the basis of what you say happened, the failed transfer between stock units, the truth is there were no limitations on the information that Horizon could provide to you to help you investigate it ; that's the position, isn't it?
A. At the front end, yes, but we don't know what happens at the back end and we don't have access to that, sir, and that's my point, my Lord.
MR DRAPER: Maybe, my Lord, one question before a short break for the transcribers?
MR JUSTICE FRASER: How long are you going to be, because it
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might be we can put the break a little later, but don't feel hurried. If you think you still have --
MR DRAPER: Quite a while, sir .
MR JUSTICE FRASER: All right.
MR DRAPER: What report or information do you say Horizon did not provide you that would have helped you understand what had happened with the transfer out and the transfer in?
A. It's the stuff in-between the transfer in from one place to the other place. It obviously goes through the Post Office servers and we don't have access to that -at the front end at the office, we don't have access to that. All we have is the front end system and that's it . Obviously I'm convinced that something has gone wrong in-between the (inaudible) process, there is a glitch and we cannot-- I'm not in a position to find out what has happened.
MR DRAPER: That's probably a convenient moment, my Lord.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: You want to stop now?
MR DRAPER: For the break and come back.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Mr Latif, we are having these proceedings transcribed which means every hour/hour and 20 minutes we have to have a break for the person who is doing the typing, so we're going to have one of those breaks now. They are usually between 5 and ten minutes.

This one is actually going to be eight minutes long. So you get a break for eight minutes. Can I just ask you two things please: one is please don't touch any of the equipment because I've got previous experience of links dropping over breaks.
A. Yes, sir .

MR JUSTICE FRASER: And the second one is because you are in the middle of your cross-examination, during that break please don't talk to anyone about the case. Is that understood?
A. Yes, sir.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Thank you very much. We will have an eight minute break and come back at quarter to.
A. Thank you.
(11.37 am)

## (Short Break)

(11.45 am)

MR DRAPER: Mr Latif, just before the break you said that you had carried out a reversal to reverse the transfer out on stock unit AA, is that right?
A. Correct, sir .
Q. That's a reversal that you say you personally carried out?
A. Yes, sir .
Q. Using your user ID that you told me earlier was ALA001?
A. Correct.
Q. Can you explain then why Post Office's transaction records show no reversal carried out by you in July 2015?
A. I don't know what records Post Office holds, sir .

I cannot really accept (inaudible) holding.
Q. We will come back to the transaction data shortly, but I just want to make clear that we suggest now there was no transfer out reversal carried out by you in July 2015. Would you like to comment on that?
A. So where has the money gone?
Q. That's a different point, Mr Latif. I'm suggesting you did not carry out a reversal of a transfer out for $£ 2,000$ in July 2015. Can you comment on that suggestion please?
A. Well, if that was the case, or that's what you're suggesting, then the money should be in somewhere (inaudible). It's not there either. I'm saying to you, sir, that there is a glitch with the software and, you know, who knows what happens behind the software. I cannot read -- I cannot see into it. I'm just telling you what I know, sir.
Q. Sorry, Mr Latif, just to clarify something on the transcript, you said "If that were right then the money would be somewhere in ..." then the next word was
inaudible. What was the word you said there?
A. Well, the money will be somewhere in the office, either whether it is SP1 or AA. If you are saying that I didn't do a transfer in -- back into AA then the money would be in SP1 and the money was not in SP1. So the money has disappeared. Where has it gone?
Q. Those are different points, Mr Latif. You are talking about the physical cash at this point. Where the physical cash goes has got nothing to do with Horizon, the physical cash goes where you physically put it ; that's right, isn't it?
A. But -- that's right.
Q. And you say you physically put the cash back in stock unit AA.
A. Correct.
Q. So stock unit AA would then show a surplus, wouldn't it , unless you carried out a reversal of the transfer out?
A. Correct.
Q. Earlier on when we were talking about the helpline, Mr Latif, you said that you did call the helpline and you made some remarks about not finding the helpline very useful. I don't need to hear that again, I just wanted to ask you a short question about that. When do you say you called the helpline about this alleged failed transfer?
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A. I cannot be completely sure when that was, sir, if I'm honest.
Q. Well, was it when the failure happened?
A. I believe it was July.
Q. If I show you the call log for the relevant period and it shows that there are no calls from you or your assistants in relation to a failed transfer, would you accept that you are mistaken?
A. Well, sometimes we also ring the area sales manager, so I may have rang him, so it doesn't necessarily mean that there were no logs of the call.
Q. Which do you say you phoned, the area sales manager or the helpline?
A. I believe it was the helpline, but it's a long time ago.
Q. If we could call up the call log please, which is at \{F/1829.1\}. If the operator could please take us to row 89. Do you see, Mr Latif, row 89 and looking over to column D, that gives a date of 29 June 2015 which is the first entry on this log for June? I'm just confirming that you see it, Mr Latif?
A. Yes, I can.
Q. And if the operator could take us down please to row 97 , and looking again in column D, that's a call on 11 August 2015 and is the last call shown in August. So if we look between those two rows, Mr Latif, that will
be the calls logged from between June and August 2015. Do you follow?
A. Yes.
Q. Please can the operator take us to column $M$ and looking then, Mr Latif, in column $M$ at row 89 we see from column $L$ that this is a call from Chris and the call says:
"[Lots] of customers are coming in saying the website shows the branch has accepting [ukba] aie."
That looks to be a call about the website; that's right, isn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. And looking down these rows, row 90 at column M , that's
a call about a passport, do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Row 91, again a call from Chris is about travel insurance, do you see that?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Row 92 is about ordering euros?
A. Yes.
Q. Row 93 is about an error with transaction acknowledgements, do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Row 94 is about euros again.
A. Yes.
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Q. Row 95 is a miskey error, do you see that?
A. Can you repeat that please, sir.
Q. Row 95 is -- forgive me, it's what I would call a miskey error. One of the assistants has pressed the wrong buttons on Horizon and so has entered the wrong amount for a rem out.
A. Okay, so are you saying the helpline makes a mistake?
Q. I'm saying that someone in your branch, you or one of your assistants, appears from this call log to have made a mistake in performing a rem out; specifically rather than remming it out for $£ 118.74$, it was remmed out for £11.74. Do you see that?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. That's a fairly easy mistake to make, isn't it, Mr Latif, in your experience?
A. Well, everyone is human, sir, so yes, people do make mistakes.
Q. And mistakes like that sometimes happened in your branch, didn't they?
A. Sir, I would inform you that mistakes happen everywhere. But they are easily rectifiable and can be resolved in most cases.
Q. Tell me how they are resolved, those kind of mistakes, Mr Latif?
A. Well, the steps you can take to resolve matters -- in
this case someone remmed the wrong amount out, so you can rem the extra amount out, so there's various things you can do to rem the correct -- make the correct decision. When money goes remmed out it is checked the other side and if it is wrong, they come back and tell you it's wrong. So there are steps in place to make sure that things are done properly. So yes, mistakes do happen, but they are easily rectified.
Q. And those mistakes are usually rectified by your informing Post Office and Post Office helping you by issuing a transaction correction, for example?
A. Not always, sir . That's not my experience with them. Sometimes they do, sometimes they don't. It all depends on what operator you get on what day and that's my personal experience and that's the experience and the mood I have in the office, that it's hit and miss. It depends on which operator you get, how well they are trained, it is whether the response you get back is good or not so good.
Q. It also depends, doesn't it, Mr Latif, on how clearly you identify the problem? You would accept that, wouldn't you?
A. Yes, indeed. In terms of if they are remote they can't see what we've got in front of ourselves. You know, their knowledge can sometimes be very basic. Sometimes
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very good -- sometimes very good, sir, I accept that. But sometimes it's not.
Q. Moving on, Mr Latif, along this spreadsheet that we have been looking at, we were looking down the rows. Row 96, the one below the miskey concerns a car registration document. Do you see that one?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Row 97 relates to travel insurance?
A. Yes.
Q. So those are all the call logs for June to August 2015 and they don't show the call that you say you made. How do you explain that?
A. I'm not sure. Sometimes we ring up and they don't know that we made the call. We've had in the past when we rang up, we say we spoke to somebody and they haven't logged the call properly. Mistakes do happen, sir.
Q. On the basis of these records, Mr Latif, Post Office will contend that there was no call that you made of that kind, but I think I have your answer to that.

Now, moving on --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Just before you move on, Mr Draper. Is this in chronological order, this call log?
MR DRAPER: My Lord, it is largely in chronological order.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Because I'm looking at it on my private screen and I thought it would be and it doesn't appear
to be.
MR DRAPER: It is within sections but I think, if I'm right, towards the top --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, row 2, for example, has June 2016 and then later on it goes to 2014 and then back to 2015, so is there any pattern to it?
MR DRAPER: I can't give you a detailed answer as to why, my Lord --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: All right, let's not worry about it at the moment, I just thought I would ask.
MR DRAPER: The point for present purposes is there are on this call log no other calls between June and August.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I understand that's the point that you are putting to the witness and it's not necessary to pursue it now, but, for example, row 2 is a June 2016 entry.
MR DRAPER: Yes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: But we can deal with that separately. You continue with Mr Latif.
MR DRAPER: Thank you.
Mr Latif, in your witness statement you say there was a shortfall in the branch account for $£ 2,000$ that you attribute to the failed transfer that you describe, is that right?
A. Yes, sir .
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Q. The first point on that, Mr Latif, is Post Office's records from the data it has about your branch show no shortfall of that amount between June and August 2015. Would you like to comment on that?
A. Well, we would have put the money in, sir, so by the following Wednesday, reconciliation, the money has to be put in otherwise we cannot rollover with a shortfall, it's not possible.
Q. But it's right, isn't it, that before rolling over you would carry out balance snapshots, variance checks, other kinds of reports that would identify a discrepancy, wouldn't they, if there were one?
A. We would do that if there was discrepancy, sir, anyhow. As soon as we find a discrepancy we print the balance snapshot, transaction logs, so we would do that by definition, we would do that by default. That's how we were trained to do so.
Q. And those steps that I have described, variance checks, balance snapshots, trial balances, all of those things that you do would come up with a discrepancy on the screen, wouldn't they? That's how you would identify it?
A. Yes.
Q. The transaction and event data for June to August 2015 shows no such reports that disclosed a discrepancy of
$£ 2,000$. Would you like to comment on that?
A. I don't know how the Post Office's system works internally. I know the user side of it, but I don't know how the inside works. So I don't know what's going on.
Q. Coming back then to the shortfall that you allege, when do you say you became aware of the shortfall?
A. Immediately after the transfer did not go through we did a cash calculation to make sure, that's when (inaudible) $£ 2,000$ missing.
Q. A cash declaration on which stock unit, Mr Latif?
A. SP1 balanced but AA did not.
Q. If you go back to your witness statement, Mr Latif, at \{E1/1/2\}, at paragraph 7 you describe having done a cash declaration on stock unit AA to confirm that the $£ 2,000$ had been transferred out; that's right, isn't it?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. You then say that after the transfer in failed you took the $£ 2,000$ physical cash back to stock unit AA and put it into the cash drawer?
A. Yes.
Q. That's what you say.
A. Yes.
Q. And this isn't in your witness statement, Mr Latif, but you now say that you performed another cash declaration
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on stock unit AA and that this second one showed a shortfall?
A. Well, once the transfer did not happen to SP1, we became suspicious that something has gone wrong. So we would will do another cash declaration. Balance snapshot was printed, a transfer log was done, transaction log was done, so a number of checks were made to make sure what's happened to the money (inaudible).
Q. Was this cash declaration before or after you say you reversed out the transfer out?
A. One was done before and then the other was done after the transfer in and then we did another one just to make sure that we hadn't counted the money wrong or double-checked every single thing in the office to make sure that everything was as it is.
Q. Mr Latif, why do you give no evidence in your witness statement about this process of finding and failing to understand a $£ 2,000$ shortfall in stock unit AA?
A. When you say "evidence" what are you referring to, sir?
Q. Your witness statement, Mr Latif.
(Pause).
A. Can you repeat that question?
Q. Why do you not in your witness statement say anything about this detailed process that you have now explained of finding a shortfall on stock unit AA and
investigating it?
A. Well, I' $m$ an experienced subpostmaster and to me the steps that we do are basic logic steps, but obviously to other people it may not come across -- I now realise that that's not how it comes across to other people that have no experience within the Post Office, so perhaps in hindsight I could have been a bit more clearer, but the fact remains the money disappeared and there's nothing -- you know, I'm confident -- I'm extremely confident that it is the software that's caused the problem.
Q. Let me ask you a question about the use of the word "disappeared" there, Mr Latif. In your witness statement you say that the transfer in disappeared. We discussed that earlier, do you recall, that when you went to stock unit SP1--
A. Yes.
Q. -- the $£ 2,000$ transfer in was missing? Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. You don't say --
A. Yes, it disappeared.
Q. You don't say anywhere in your witness statement that the $£ 2,000$ physical cash also somehow disappeared, but that seems to be what you are now saying, is that right?
A. Well, the system gave a shortfall of $£ 2,000$ and that's been my statement all the way through, sir, so I don't know what you're trying to confuse me, but there's a shortfall of $£ 2,000$ in stock unit AA and there should not be a stock shortfall . The money is physically there.
Q. If I have confused you, I'm sorry --
A. It was a counting error, sir .
Q. If I have confused you I apologise. I will take it slowly.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I think, Mr Draper, the starting point is paragraph 8 , isn't it, and what he means by his last sentence.
MR DRAPER: Yes, that's right.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Which is probably worth exploring just so you can be clear what his evidence is about.
MR DRAPER: Yes.
I think it is right, Mr Latif, that you are now explaining that you say that immediately after the failed transfer that you describe there was a $£ 2,000$ shortfall in stock unit AA. That's what you say?
A. Yes, sir, correct.
Q. And you say that shortfall was after you had reversed the transfer out, is that right?
A. Correct, correct.
Q. And after you had put the $£ 2,000$ back in stock unit AA?
A. Correct.
Q. So on your account the physical cash in stock unit AA would be the same after all of these processes as it was before, you had taken it out and put it back; that's right, isn't it?
A. Correct.
Q. And you say there was nonetheless a shortfall in that stock unit?
A. Yes, the cash declaration showed a shortfall of $£ 2,000$.
Q. Logically that must mean that the Horizon cash figure had gone up $£ 2,000$ over the same period of time?
A. It should have balanced out, it should have been nil, it should have been no discrepancy. So it looks like the software for some reason is -- done something twice. It has done something it's not supposed to do. There's a glitch somewhere, sir.
Q. Mr Latif, on your account the only thing that can have caused the shortfall that you're describing is the Horizon derived cash figure for stock unit AA somehow having increased; that's right, isn't it?
A. Correct, it's a software accounting issue, sir . That's my statement.
Q. That also isn't described anywhere in your witness statement, that you identified some problem with the --
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A. Well, we cannot look -- I mean I do not have access to the Post Office's internal software so I can only assume the money is missing. It has disappeared into the Post~Office's system. That's all I can say.
Q. Mr Latif, that's not right. Let me take it slowly with you, Mr Latif.

If your account were right, the problem would be that the Horizon cash figure in stock unit AA had somehow gone up by 2,000 when it shouldn't have done so. That's right, isn't it?
A. The money is there but the system doesn't resolve. Something has gone wrong with the transfer, sir .
Q. Can you just answer the question. Am I right that the derived Horizon cash figure would have had to go up by $£ 2,000$ for there to be a $£ 2,000$ shortfall given that the physical cash, on your case, was the same?
A. The Horizon derived figure and the physical figure should have matched, but they did not, sir, and the shortfall -- what I'm saying is there is a loss of $£ 2,000$. So that does not make sense.
Q. If that were right, Mr Latif --
A. It shouldn't have happened.
Q. Mr Latif, it would have been very easy for you to have shown that, wouldn't it, and to have described it in your witness statement? What you would have said was:
before these processes the Horizon derived cash figure for stock unit AA was X thousand and after all of these processes the Horizon derived cash figure was X minus 2,000 and there was no reason for that. Do you follow?
A. That is what happened, that's what I'm trying to say.
Q. I think you said earlier, before the break, that you had had to put $£ 2,000$ into the branch, is that right?
A. Correct, sir .
Q. When do you say you did that?
A. I would have done it on the Wednesday (inaudible), sir .
Q. Do you say you did that without disputing this shortfall, Mr Latif?
A. We are liable. The Post Office 's contract clearly says that we are liable for any shortfalls.
Q. Is your understanding that you are liable for a shortfall even if it is a computer glitch, is that what you are saying?
A. Yes, sir, we're liable.
Q. Mr Latif, you will appreciate we don't accept that there was any such shortfall, or that you paid it in, but can you comment on this suggestion. If you genuinely believed that the derived cash figure on stock unit AA had been increased by a glitch and that therefore you were in no way responsible for any of this, what do you say to the suggestion that it's very surprising that you
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wouldn't raise that with Post Office and complain about it?
A. Well, I have complained to the area manager, sir, so I don't know your saying I haven't complained. I have complained to the area manager, Mr Navjot Jando, a number of times, so I don't know why you're saying I haven't complained about it or raised it.
Q. So do you now say you disputed a $£ 2,000$ shortfall in July 2015 by contacting your area manager and complaining that there was a glitch; is that what you are now saying?
A. Well, yes, we would have obviously raised questions, but there is a glitch or something and we don't know what's happened. This is just one instance, sir, but there are a number of other instances which I haven't given in my statement. It happens all the time and generally we think it's the operator that's causing the problem and that's what the Post Office keep telling us, it's operator error, not necessarily it's a software error, and this is clearly a software error, sir. And also, can I just say, when I have been training other offices they have been telling me a similar story, sir .
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Mr Latif, just hold on a second, please. You gave the name of your area manager and the transcript didn't pick it up. Can you just tell me what
they were called please.
A. Sorry?

MR JUSTICE FRASER: The name of your area manager.
A. Mr N-A-V-J-O-T, J-A-N-D-O.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Thank you very much.
A. Correct, sir .

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Now, all of the rest of your answer has gone onto the transcript so you can take that that's in the record. Can you now just concentrate on Mr Draper's specific questions please.

Mr Draper.
MR DRAPER: Yes.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Just to confirm your previous answer, you said that you would have complained, or words to that effect, about the glitch. Do you say that you in fact did phone your area manager and tell him that you had suffered a $£ 2,000$ loss as a result of a glitch as you have just described?
A. Yes, sir .
Q. Why is none of that recorded in your witness statement?
A. I didn't think it was relevant. I talk to the area manager about a lot of things, so, you know ...
Q. Do you accept that you did not, however, phone the helpline to say that you had suffered a $£ 2,000$ loss as a result of a glitch?
A. There would have been definitely a call to the helpline. I'm not sure why it is not showing up there, but it should have been logged all through helpline as well. As you can see, we quite regularly make calls to the helpline.
Q. I'm going to now take you quickly, I hope, through Post Office's case. Can I ask you to turn to Ms van den Bogerd's witness statement which is at \{E2/5/23\} and paragraphs 90 to 91 of that statement. Can you read please those two paragraphs just in your head, no need to read it out loud please.
(Pause).
A. Okay.
Q. Ms van den Bogerd has taken the three months around the date that you identify. So you say "in around July"; Post Office has looked at June, July and August. She has taken the transaction and event data for your branch and based on her review of that data she says there were no transfers out of $£ 2,000$ in June and in July and August there were transfers of $£ 2,000$ but for every transfer out there was a corresponding transfer in. That's Ms van den Bogerd's evidence. Do you accept that that's what the transaction data shows?
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, first you need to ask him if he has seen the transaction --
A. But that does not mean they were done properly though, does it?
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Mr Draper, first you have to ask him if he has seen the transaction data.
MR DRAPER: Have you, Mr Latif, had an opportunity to see any of the transaction data?
A. Sorry, can you repeat the question please.
Q. Have you looked at any of the transaction data to which Ms van den Bogerd refers?
A. You mean this document in front of me now?
Q. No, forgive me. This is her witness statement. She says here what the data shows. But Post Office has also provided to your solicitors the underlying transaction data documents that she has looked at. Have you seen those Excel spreadsheets?
A. I haven't seen the spreadsheet but I did have a call with my solicitors a few weeks ago.
Q. We don't need to know about that, Mr Latif. But you haven't seen the spreadsheet is the key point there, that's right?
A. No, no.
Q. Okay.
A. I have been out of the country since 19 February as well, sir, so ... I think these transfers are coming in a little bit late and I have poor internet access where
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I am, I' $m$ in the mountains in Kashmir and there is the small matter of tensions between India and Pakistan going on as well, so I have very limited access to the outside world apart from -- predominantly voice calls .
Q. Mr Latif, since when is that that you have been in Kashmir?
A. I arrived on 19 February, sir .
Q. I'm going to show you the underlying transaction data for June 2015, Mr Latif, and the suggestion I'm going to make is that shows no transfers of $£ 2,000$ within your branch. If you are confident that this problem occurred in July, there's no need to look at June. Would you like to look at June?
A. Why not?
Q. I'm sorry, Mr Latif, I missed that. What did you say?
A. I said why not -- while we are here, why not?
Q. If the operator could call up please $\{\mathrm{F} / 1353.1\}$. Mr Latif, I should explain, this is not a document of a type you will have seen. It's not a report printed out in your branch. It's an Excel spreadsheet showing data from Post Office. Do you understand?
A. Okay, I do.
Q. This is the full transaction data and we won't scroll down but it is an extremely long document so what I propose to show you is a filtered version that only
shows transfers out and transfers in, okay?
A. Okay.
Q. If the operator could please call up that version. This spreadsheet has now been filtered using codes that the claimants are aware of that enable the spreadsheet to show only transfers out and transfers in.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Is this an agreed document then this one?
MR DRAPER: No, this was produced shortly before the cross-examination rather than doing it manually. It takes a couple of minutes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: All right, continue. We will need to address this at the end I think.
MR DRAPER: Mr Latif, now that this has been filtered, if you scan your eye down column $L$ there are no transfers shown for $£ 2,000$ on this spreadsheet.

## (Pause).

MR JUSTICE FRASER: I'm not really sure where this is going to get us, Mr Draper, to be honest. It's a bit much to ask a witness to look at a document that has about -how many is it, entries?
MR DRAPER: You won't be able to tell by counting, I don't think.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Quite, that's rather my point. But if your case is there are no entries on there for $£ 2,000$
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in June, just put that point to the witness and he might either agree or disagree.
MR DRAPER: Sure.
Mr Latif, Post Office says there are no entries here for a transfer of $£ 2,000$ in June. Do you accept that?
A. I can understand what you're saying, but I'm confident there's a glitch in the software, so it's possible it's missing.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Maybe a different way, a quicker way of getting to the same point, or a broadly quicker way: Mr Latif, on this document for June it shows various transfers for different amounts.
A. Yes.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Can you remember roughly how often you would have to fill up or replenish the combi-counter cash till with money from stock unit AA?
A. Quite regularly, sir.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: I beg your pardon?
A. Quite regularly, sir.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Quite regularly.
A. At least every other day.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: All right. Back to you, Mr Draper.
MR DRAPER: The next point, Mr Latif, that Ms van den Bogerd makes is that she has checked the transaction data for July 2015 and there were two transfers of $£ 2,000$
between stock unit AA and stock unit SP1, but both of those were successful.
A. How do you determine successful, sir?
Q. Maybe I can show you the spreadsheet. It is at \{F/1365.1\}. This again is the raw data but if the operator can filter it to just show transfers out and transfers in. Mr Latif, can you see that? The first transfer out Post Office says is at row 18352. Do you see that? Maybe if the operator could highlight the four entries starting at 18351 and going down to 18359.

What Post Office says this data shows, Mr Latif, is a successful transfer of $£ 2,000$ from stock unit AA to stock unit SP1 and Post Office says that transfer out was performed by Christine Barnett. You see her user ID. And the transfer in was performed by Christine Fensome, we see her user ID. Do you see that, Mr Latif?
A. Yes, sir .
Q. The next transfer --

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Hold on, before you -- are you moving off this page?
MR DRAPER: To lower down on the page.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: But on these four can you just identify for the transcript, because I think it will be useful, what line shows what happening at what time, out of or
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into of what unit? Because they are grouped together in a way which seems to me to be a bit confusing.
MR DRAPER: Yes. Post Office contends that the transfer out is shown at row 18352 as being performed by Christine Barnett out of stock unit AA, the time is given.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Can you tell me what it is please.
MR DRAPER: 13.52.22. And that is for $£ 2,000$.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: And the date?
MR DRAPER: 21/07/2015.
Then the transfer in is at row 18359. It is performed by Christine Fensome. It is on stock unit SP1, it has the same date, 21 July 2015, it is timed at 13.55 .01 and it is also for $£ 2,000$.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: And that's into SP1?
MR DRAPER: It is .
MR JUSTICE FRASER: And then the other one?
MR DRAPER: The next transfer starts at row 25988.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: No, no, sorry, there are four together there, aren't there?
MR DRAPER: There are four entries. This is probably a point I should explain to Mr Latif.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Just deal with this first and give me the entries and then deal with it --
MR DRAPER: Yes. My Lord, the two I have given you --

MR JUSTICE FRASER: You have given me 18352 and 18359.
MR DRAPER: Yes. Those are the transfer out and the transfer in. They are surrounded on this spreadsheet by two other records. They are not transfers. They correspond to the value of the transfer but they are not actually transfers. They perform a back office reconciliation function that wouldn't be visible to a subpostmaster. If Mr Latif had called up records in his branch he would have seen the two transactions to which I have referred you, he wouldn't see the effectively inverse transaction that are only visible in the back office systems.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I see. All right and then go to the next one.
MR DRAPER: The next one, Mr Latif, starts at row 25988. Do you see that's a transaction performed by another one of your assistants? Can you recall the name of that assistant? I don't have the paper in front of me, Mr Latif. Is that Mr Deacock?
A. Yes.
Q. So we see there --
A. Yes, he is an employee of mine.
Q. 25988, Mr Deacock on stock unit SP1, on 29 July 2015, at 11.49.19 performs a transfer out of the value of $£ 2,000$. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And then if we go a couple of rows lower than that, at 25990 on here we see MLA001. Who is that, Mr Latif?
A. Pardon, LAA001?
Q. Yes, user IDMLA001.
A. That is Mohammad Latif, my brother.
Q. Am I right to say that he wasn't shown on the assistant document that we saw?
A. He is a holiday relief and he was -- he should have been on there. I can't remember ...
Q. Did you register him as an assistant with Post Office?
A. He has been registered with the Post Office, sir .

MR JUSTICE FRASER: If you can just finish your exercise.
MR DRAPER: Yes. So that's your brother then, Mohammad Latif --
A. Yes.
Q. -- performing, Post Office says, a transfer in at 25990 on stock unit AA on the same date, 29 July 2015, at 11.50.30, about a minute after the transfer out, so Post Office says this was a second successful transfer between the two stock units in July but in the opposite direction. Do you follow that?
A. Yes.
Q. On the basis of that, Mr Latif, Post Office says that in July 2015 there were two transfers of $£ 2,000$ between
the stock units you identify, one in one direction and one in the other, but that both of them succeeded because there was both a transfer out and a transfer in?
A. Well, what's your definition of "succeeded"? What's the cash figure? I mean I'm not sure I follow you, because you're saying if you transfer in and transfer out, that it works? That's not necessarily the case. The case it works is where your cash declaration says that it has worked. That's how you confirm that it worked.
Q. Mr Latif, I'm just dealing with your evidence. Your evidence is that you performed a transfer out but then the transfer in was not available on the second stock unit to accept. I have just shown you documents that Post Office will say that there was not such a transfer, there was not a transfer for which there was a transfer out but no transfer in. Do you follow that?
A. I follow that, but I'm still saying that there's a glitch. We transfer stuff all the time and yes, most of the time it works, but there are times when it didn't work and that's what I'm saying.
Q. Ms van den Bogerd then says in her statement that she has looked at the data for August 2015 and there were in fact four transfers of $£ 2,000$ between the stock units but those too were all successful, there was in every case a corresponding transfer in for each transfer out.
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Do you follow that?
A. I do.
Q. Do you accept that that is what the data would show, or would you like me to take you through the data?
A. No, no, I accept.
Q. On the basis of that, Mr Latif, Post Office says there was no failed transfer such as that described in your witness statement and that you are simply wrong about that, it never happened.
A. So you are calling mea liar?
Q. Mr Latif, you may be mistaken or you may be lying.

I put the question that it didn't happen.
A. Well, I state that they did.
Q. Notwithstanding, Mr Latif, that it is not shown on the transaction records, do you say that those transaction records are then wrong?
A. I believe so.
Q. Thank you.

I'm now going to move on, Mr Latif, to ask you about the transaction correction issue in January 2018.

I have been asked to confirm with you that the heading in your witness statement is a typographical error and you meant to refer to transaction acknowledgements, is that right?
A. Yes, TC, transaction acknowledgments.
Q. Sorry, I heard that as TC transaction acknowledgment. Did you mean to say TA, transaction acknowledgment?
A. TA is transaction acknowledgment and TC is transaction corrections, so it is two different things, sir.
Q. Yes. In paragraph 9 of your statement, if you could look at that, that's $\{\mathrm{E} 1 / 1 / 2\}$, you say:
"... Camelot sent information to Horizon in relation to scratchcards. Camelot sent this information to Horizon twice."
A. Yes, sir.
Q. First question about that: by amendment to your statement you now say that this was in around January 2018 rather than March 2018.
A. Correct.
Q. What caused you to make that correction?
A. I had a look at the -- we hold the records for the information in the office, so I had my assistants look at the records, transaction logs and that's when I confirmed that it was January rather than March. (Inaudible) was logs in March as well. We made calls effectively every month to Horizon help desk concerning this issue.
Q. When do you say you asked your assistants to check about the date?
A. Yes.
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Q. Sorry, when do you say that happened?
A. It was after I made the initial statement, I was checking.
Q. Roughly when, Mr Latif?
A. It would have been a few weeks ago, sir .
Q. So is it right that you didn't check those records from the branch before making your witness statement?
A. No, I thought I was correct but I double checked and made sure that actually in fact they were correct, those (inaudible), so I was right but initial incident happened in January when TA (inaudible) transaction acknowledgement, the TC, the corrections, they came in March.
Q. Okay. So you say, do you, that the TCs in relation to these transaction acknowledgements came in March 2018?
A. Yes.
Q. And you say that's something you have checked from your records?
A. Yes.
Q. Looking at paragraph 9, why is that put in such vague terms, Mr Latif? What information are you talking about in that paragraph?
A. Which paragraph, sir?
Q. Paragraph 9, starting "In or around January ..."?
A. Yes, the way the system works with Camelot and

Post Office is they have a contract with Camelot, is that the Camelot machine predominantly is based on the retail side of the business, so it's -- retail business is the shop side. So, for example, a customer comes in, does a transaction, buys the scratchcard or the lottery ticket from us, that data is transmitted back to branch, to the Post Office, the following morning. So say on a Tuesday we perform transactions, on the Wednesday morning a TA, which is a transaction acknowledgment, will go to a branch, okay? So the money that was taken in the retailer side is then accounted for in the Post Office's system on our tills, so we have to put our money in to the Post Office till and that's done throughout the country at every Post Office that has a Camelot machine installed at the branch.
Q. So in paragraph 9 what you are referring to is a transaction acknowledgment sent to your branch by Post Office --
A. Yes.
Q. -- relating to Camelot scratchcards, is that right?
A. Yes. I believe they made the mistake and sent out the information twice to every branch up and down the country and that's what we were told by the help desk.
Q. When do you say the help desk told you that, Mr Latif?
A. When we learned in January -- when we got two lots of
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certain TAs.
Q. So you say you phoned immediately when you received two sets of TAs, is that right?
A. Yes, sir. We automatically have to accept the TAs. You can't not accept them. As soon as you log on in the morning, the TAs are there.
Q. So do you say you phoned Post Office and said "You have mistakenly sent me two transaction acknowledgements rather than one"?
A. Yes.
Q. And they nonetheless told you to accept them, is that your evidence?
A. No, sir, you have no choice but to accept them. If you do not accept them you cannot continue to serve in your branch during the day. You have to accept them. There's no way round it.
Q. Mr Latif, why don't you mention this important telephone call in your witness statement?
A. Well, we will make -- I can see we made lots of calls to the helpline, so, I mean it was -- we also had a message come through from Post Office saying that there was an error, there was a glitch, the transaction was put through twice, was sent twice to the branches and "We are going to resolve it ". The Post Office were aware of it .
Q. What form do you say that notice took, Mr Latif?
A. I believe it was a memo view, which is an internal communications system that the Post Office uses to communicate to branches and it pops up on your screen on the Horizon channel.
Q. And you say that this notice told you that Camelot had made a mistake, is that right?
A. That's right, sir. No, it said there was a -- the information was duplicated, so it was sent twice.
Q. And you were told that was Camelot's mistake, you say?
A. Well, they said it was a mistake. They are working with Camelot to resolve the issue. Whose fault it is, I'm not sure.
Q. Mr Latif, have you provided any notice that Post Office sent you referring to a mistake involving Camelot that you refer to in paragraph 10 of your witness statement?
A. I haven't, but that's quite easily accessible to everybody. It's not a -- it's commonly available to the Post Office.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Mr Latif, is that different from the item you have just referred to that pops up on the screen, or is it just a different word to describe the same thing?
A. Well, it 's the same, it's called a memo view, sir, my Lord.
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## MR JUSTICE FRASER: It's called a what, sorry?

A. It's called a memo view.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Memo view.
A. M-E-M-O, V-I-E-W.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: So is your paragraph 10 talking about
the memo view, or is it talking about something different?
A. That's it, that's what I'm talking about.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: That's what you are talking about.
A. Paragraph 10, yes.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: All right, back to you, Mr Draper.
MR DRAPER: Mr Latif, do you accept you might be
misremembering the things you describe in paragraphs 9 and 10 ?
A. No, a notice is a memo view, sir, that's the communication we have with the Post Office.
Q. Do you say --
A. It's a one-way system -- it's a one-way system, sir, how I explained. So if the people at Post Office want to communicate to us something very quickly, that's the system they use. So it's messages about procedural changes, or anything that's about to expire, the memo view comes to our screen and that happens automatically and that goes to every branch up and down the country, all the time.
Q. Do you say that you personally processed the transaction acknowledgements to which you refer in paragraph 9 ?
A. The transaction acknowledgements would have been done by Christine Barnett. It's done when you first log -- when the first person logs in on stock unit AA the transaction screen pops up. The transaction acknowledgment, the TA pops up. That happens almost every day except for Sunday.
Q. But you say you personally received the notice that you refer to in paragraph 10 ?
A. The branch received the notice, sir, so whoever logs in, the first person to log in among the staff, or one of my colleagues, the notice will come in.
Q. Was that you or one of your staff?
A. I believe it may have been Christine -- it was Christine, Christine Barnett.
Q. So is it right to say that everything in paragraphs 9 and 10 are things that have been told to you by Ms Barnett?
A. The memo view, sir, will come to us as well, it will come to me as well, sir. As soon as I log on I will get the memo view as well. So ...
Q. I don't think that quite answered the question. Were you told these things by Ms Barnett, or do you say you personally saw them?
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A. Well, my statement says information sent to Horizon, it does not say sent to me or Christine, sir .
Q. I understand that. I' m asking which it is?

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Mr Draper, I think you are misunderstanding his evidence. His evidence is that it pops up when each person logs in. Now, on the basis that he's got a separate login -- if you want to suggest an alternative method that the information is communicated, you should pursue that.
MR DRAPER: Forgive me.
Mr Latif, is your evidence that even after a transaction acknowledgment has been accepted, it still pops up on someone else's screen when they log in?
A. No.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: No, you were asking him about the notice, Mr Draper.
MR DRAPER: I was asking him about both, my Lord.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, if you were, you were putting it together in one question. Would you like to -- you actually said "Were you told these things by Ms Barnett" and by "these things" you were talking about paragraph 10. Now, paragraph 10 includes the notice/memo view. So if you would just like to pursue it so that it is clear please so that you are not talking about one thing and he is asking questions about
another.
MR DRAPER: Understood. I will put the question exactly as I put it before, my Lord.

Is it right to say that everything in paragraphs 9 and 10 are things that Ms Barnett told you?
A. No.
Q. So which bits of that evidence do you say are from your own personal knowledge?
A. Well, sir, every branch for the last 17 years I have been working with the Post Office gets a TA from Camelot if they are a Camelot authorised branch, so that's standard procedure within the Post Office. I don't understand your labouring this point. It happens every day at every branch, to whoever logs in first gets the transaction acknowledgment to account for yesterday's takings that the Camelot machine has performed. Okay? The notice that I'm referring to as a memo view, every operator gets that memo view, irrespective. As soon as they log in, that memo view comes up automatically. So that's the notice that I'm referring to in section 10 , sir. Have I made myself clear?
Q. No, Mr Latif, you haven't answered the question. It is a really small question. It is not about how TAs work or how memo view works. Are you saying that you personally processed the transaction acknowledgment and 75
that you personally received the memo view message, or are you saying that these are things Ms Barnett told you?
A. What I'm saying to you is that I performed the transaction, but Mrs Barnett will discuss it with me as well that it comes up twice. So that statement is true. You know, as soon as you log on it comes up automatically, the TA comes up automatically, whoever the first person to $\log$ on is, so we would -- you know, we communicate with each other in the branch all the time.
Q. Mr Latif, paragraph 11 \{E1/1/2\} you say that a transaction correction was later received and that you accepted it, is that right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. You said a few minutes ago that that was in March 2018, is that right?
A. The transaction correction, again you have to accept, sir. And yes, that's correct.
Q. You say in paragraph 11 that the TC didn't change the stock figure of scratchcards but Horizon showed an extra $£ 1,000$ of scratchcards in stock.
A. Yes, sir .
Q. You then say that means the transaction correction did not work. Can you explain what you mean by that phrase
"did not work"?
A. The transaction correction corrects -- was meant to correct the stock that was wrongly assigned to us where it was duplicated, so it should have reduced it down to minus 50 , so $£ 500$ worth of scratchcards rather than $£ 1,000$ worth of scratchcards.
Q. Just to be clear, what you mean by "did not work" is that it didn't resolve the problem in your branch. You don't mean that there was something faulty at a technical level with the transaction correction, you mean that it worked technically but that it didn't resolve the problem, is that right?
A. Well, it 's the same thing, sir. If it didn't work, it didn't -- it didn't do what's it's supposed to do, which is to correct our stock figure. It didn't correct the stock figure.
Q. I don't follow, Mr Latif. It did change the Horizon stock level, didn't it?
A. What do you mean, sir?
Q. The figure on Horizon for what the stock level should be changed when you put through the transaction correction, didn't it?
A. No, as I say, my statement says that the correction was $£ 1,000$, but it didn't work. The TC should have reduced the stock, but it didn't. The TA added it twice, the TC 77
should have taken it away. The TC did not take it away. Sometimes the TCs take them away, sometimes they add them. You either get a credit, or you get an invoice. So the TCs work in two separate ways.
Q. Okay, maybe it is unhelpful to focus on the word "worked", but what you say is that the Horizon figure for scratchcards went up by 1,000 but of course the physical number didn't change. That's the point you're making?
A. I think I may need to explain how that works. I think you are getting confused. Can I just explain how scratchcards work, your Honour?
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, I think I understand how they work. I'm pretty sure Mr Draper does, but maybe Mr Draper will just in summary form put it to you so that you can agree it or disagree it.
Mr Draper.

MR DRAPER: It may be the best thing to do, Mr Latif, is to get a short statement on this from a Post Office witness.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: No, I don't think so.
MR DRAPER: Sorry, I mean to go to the statement and we can agree the text.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: By all means if you have got one, yes.
MR DRAPER: If you can turn please to Ms van den Bogerd's
witness statement at $\{\mathrm{E} 2 / 5 / 8\}$ and at paragraph 25 -- do you see that, Mr Latif? Can you read paragraph 25 to yourself please just in your head.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: That's about the PING fix, isn't it?
A. Okay.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: We were on transaction corrections.
MR DRAPER: I believe he wanted me to take him through how one gets a TC for scratchcards and to what it relates.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I don't believe he did, but we will let him read that and then you can put your question.

Mr Draper, you're going to have to pay attention to what his answers are. This is incredibly slow going.
How much longer are you going to be with the witness?
MR DRAPER: I would say about 15 to 20 minutes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: All right.
(Pause).
MR DRAPER: Then, Mr Latif, over the page $\{E 2 / 5 / 9\}$--
A. Okay.
Q. -- Ms Van den Bogerd at 26.6 is referring to the process you described earlier, that scratchcards are first activated on the lottery terminal and then at 26.7 , if you could read that to yourself, she describes the process for TAs and I'm just putting this to you because I think we agree about that process, so if you could read 26.7 to yourself please.
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## (Pause).

Are you there yet, Mr Latif, the end of paragraph 26.7?
A. I am.
Q. What she says there is right, isn't it?
A. She does.
Q. Can I ask you to then go forward to paragraph 98, which is at $\{\mathrm{E} 2 / 5 / 24\}$. What Ms van den Bogerd says there is that the problem in your branch started -- I'm summarising, but the problem in your branch started when your branch received two TAs on 18 January 2018 and she says that they were mistakenly negative in value when they should have been positive. Do you follow that?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Do you accept --
A. Positive has corrected a negative (inaudible) is what we have to put the money into the Post Office till .
Q. Precisely. And she is explaining that was Post Office's mistake when it made the TA. Someone put a minus when they shouldn't have. Do you follow?
A. Yes, sir .
Q. And she says that's what started this problem in your branch. Do you accept that?
A. I do.
Q. The mistake in the transaction acknowledgment would have
been apparent and obvious from looking at the
transaction acknowledgment itself, wouldn't it?
A. I don't follow.
Q. Well, if the transaction acknowledgment was negative rather than positive you would see that --
A. Yes.
Q. -- when you looked at it?
A. We would look into our stock figure and yes, our stock figure would be negative, so in this case the $£ 10$ scratchcard, which is what that TA refers to, it would have been negative.
Q. Yes. I think you're saying after the TA you had a negative balance of scratchcards on Horizon, is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. But that happened, Mr Latif, because the TA was negative and I'm suggesting that that would be obvious from looking at the TA. Do you follow?
A. Well, yes, because we -- it was done twice. It would have been obvious, yes, it would be a negative figure, but what you're saying about -- what Mrs Van den Bogerd is saying is that the transaction was done twice, the TA was done twice in error. So our stockholding would gone negative.
Q. We agree that point, Mr Latif. Your stockholding for
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scratchcards went negative. It did that because of the negative TA. That's common ground.
A. Yes.
Q. Ms van den Bogerd is not saying that there was a mistake made duplicating a transaction acknowledgment, she is just saying it was negative when it should have been positive and I think you have agreed that?
A. Yes, I do. When we (inaudible) like that to the shop, it is activated on a lottery machine, that's a message that goes back that means we have to pay for that scratchcard to the Post Office. Okay? And that got negative, so when we do the TA we then have to send that scratchcard to the system to make it positive, manually. We put the money in at the same time, so the TA was sent in twice.
Q. Okay. We will disagree on that and I will come back to the precise mechanism --
A. Well, you can check.
Q. -- in a moment. The point I wanted to make -- and it is no big criticism, Mr Latif, but the point is you were at your branch required to check the TAs and Post Office made a mistake and you missed the mistake; is that fair?
A. How do you say we missed the mistake? Because memo view said the Post Office will issue a TC, a transaction correction, to correct their mistake. What I'm saying
is that that TC didn't work. Our stock figure stayed, where it should have basically gone into the positive, so rather than being negative it should have gone back to zero and it did not (inaudible) and that's why the TC failed.
Q. Can I ask you then to look at paragraph 99 of Ms van den Bogerd --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Before you do that, Mr Draper, it is now 5 past 1. I don't know if you are paying any attention to the time, but what's your attention, to plough on until you have finished, or to take stock, or -- we have to in some way address the fact this is a time limited trial.
MR DRAPER: Of course, my Lord. My intention was to see whether Mr Latif agrees with paragraph 99 because that then will determine how much more I need to show him.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, in terms of timing for your cross-examination?
MR DRAPER: Oh, forgive me. 15 to 20 minutes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, it was 15 to 20 minutes when
I asked you 15 to 20 minutes ago.
MR DRAPER: Well then --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Is your intention --
MR DRAPER: It will have to be, my Lord.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Is your intention just that we sit here
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until you have finished and then we have a break, or we have a short break for the transcribers now for ten minutes and then come back?
MR DRAPER: No, my Lord. My intention was to show Mr Latif paragraph 99 which will then determine how much more cross-examination is needed on this area and then break.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Right, we will do that then.
MR DRAPER: Mr Latif, can you read to yourself paragraph 99 of Ms van den Bogerd's statement please.

## (Pause).

A. Yes, okay.
Q. Do you agree with what she says there about what happened next?
A. I agree that you cannot roll over with a negative stock figure, Horizon does not allow you to do that.
Q. Do you agree with the rest of it?
A. I do.
Q. Thank you.

That is an appropriate moment, I think, my Lord.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Right and you think another 15 to 20 minutes.
MR DRAPER: I do.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Right, Mr Latif, I know you are in a different time zone. Usually we would have a break now in the middle of the day. Can you tell me what the
time is there please? What time of day is it?
A. It is just going on 10 past 6 , your Honour.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: In the evening, yes?
A. In the evening, yes, your Honour.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Now, are you all right to have a short break for about 40, 45 minutes and come back, or would you prefer to keep going now until we finish your evidence?
A. Your Honour, I would really appreciate your help if we continue to finish so I can get back.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: All right. Well, what we're going to do then is just have a five minute break for the shorthand writers and then we're going to continue. On the basis that this gentleman is on the videolink from Pakistan, Mr Draper, I think that's the best thing to do. So if I can say we have a break until let's say quarter past and then we will come back and then Mr Draper is going to complete your evidence, all right?
A. Thank you.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: So that's about six minutes.
( 1.10 pm )
(Short Break)
( 1.15 pm )
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Mr Draper.
MR DRAPER: Mr Latif, before the break you agreed with
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paragraphs 98 and 99 of Ms van den Bogerd's witness statement \{E2/5/24\}.
A. Yes.
Q. I wonder whether you could read to yourself also paragraph 100 and tell me whether you agree with that please.
(Pause).
A. Okay, yes.
Q. You agree that, Mr Latif?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Can I ask you then to read paragraph 101, starting at the bottom of the page and please do indicate when you would like the page turned.

> (Pause).
A. Okay, page please $\{\mathrm{E} 2 / 5 / 25\}$.
(Pause).
Q. Have you done with paragraph 101, Mr Latif?
A. I am.
Q. Do you agree with that paragraph as well?
A. I do.
Q. Do you then agree, Mr Latif, with the conclusion that Ms van den Bogerd draws in paragraph 102? If you read that to yourself please.
(Pause).
A. Okay.
Q. Do you agree that that's the position, Mr Latif: it was a confusing situation, but once the data has all been analysed, Ms van den Bogerd is right about what happened?
A. Can I just confirm, there was an audit done in September of this year, an audit by a Post Office trained auditor, and my stockholding was still showing negative. And a Jane Lawrence is the auditor and she has -- still could not resolve this matter, so the problem hasn't gone away, the problem is still there. And there have been a number of calls to the helpline to resolve that negative stock and it hasn't worked. They haven't come back with a response.
Q. Mr Latif, the evidence of Ms van den Bogerd that you have just agreed is correct, at least up to paragraph 101, is that the initial mistake by Post Office caused the branch to have a negative stock level, you agree?
A. Yes, correct.
Q. Your branch then carried out a sales reversal that addressed the stock level but created a cash surplus; that's right?
A. Correct.
Q. The transaction correction from Post Office then adjusted the stock level but because of your reversal it
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didn't put the branch back how it should have been. Do you follow that?
A. Yes, okay, go on.
Q. So in effect the transaction correction cancelled out the mistaken transaction acknowledgment, do you agree with that?
A. That's what it's supposed to do.
Q. But the problem was that because of the reversal in your branch, you would need to undo that reversal before the branch would be back as it should have been? That's Ms van den Bogerd's evidence.
A. I still state that an independent audit was done by the Post Office, a Mrs Jane Lawrence, in September 2018 the stockholding was still negative and as the branch was handed over to another subpostmaster that is going to be investigated, it's going to be investigated. If you are now coming back with this evidence, I still say that there is a problem somewhere and I don't know what's happened but we have still got a negative stock figure within our branch.
Q. Mr Latif, that's inconsistent with the evidence that you have just agreed is correct about what the transaction correction did, isn't it?
A. Well, that's what it's supposed to do, but what it did is a different thing. I mean that's what it is supposed
to do.
Q. Why do you not mention the audit in your witness statement?
A. Well, I'm just saying that the stock figure is wrong and the till is wrong, so it's a fact. I mean you should know, the Post Office should know they did an audit of this . I have complained, we made a number of calls to the helpline. We rang Camelot as well to address the issue and they just haven't got back to us. I told them we had an audit coming, "You need to do it before the audit" and if you check the call logs there will be a number of call logs to the helpline about these scratchcards. I'm sure you have those.
Q. Mr Latif, what Post Office will submit about this problem with transaction acknowledgements and transaction corrections in 2018 is that there were a series of human errors that led to a problem in your branch that was quite hard to get to the bottom of, but that did not involve any computer bug or error in Horizon. Do you agree?
A. I agree, but the fact remains that an independent audit happened and the stock we were holding was still negative, so how do you explain that, sir?
Q. Mr Latif, I'm sorry to go back. It's not entirely clear from your answer whether you did agree with me or not.
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Do you agree that the problem with transaction acknowledgements and transaction corrections can be explained by human errors and that there was not a bug or error in Horizon involved in that problem?
A. The human error is when the Post Office, or Camelot, PINGed the information to our terminal, duplicated the information. That's the human error. We then, to balance the office, had to do a number of transactions to correct that cock-up, if I may use that word, my Lord. So, yes, there was a mistake that was made, but I still stress it was on Post Office's side, or Camelot who are their partner.

So the fact remains there was an independent audit happened by your Post Office -- by Post Office 's auditor, her recommendation was that they look into it as is (inaudible) the strategy is still there. And there were a number of calls to the helpline pleading with them to resolve this issue before the audit and there will be a complete trail of that, sir.
Q. I'm going to leave the transaction correction issue now and turn to some final points.

At paragraphs 15 and 18 of your witness statement \{E1/1/3\}, Mr Latif, you make a number of very general allegations about Horizon. Do you see those?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. I can't meaningfully challenge you on those because there is no detail for me to engage with, but I just formally make clear that Post Office does not accept that what you say there is correct. Do you follow that?
A. Okay, I accept the Post Office explanation, but that's not my experience. I think you have to accept that as well please.
Q. Mr Latif, we saw earlier a mistake in your branch. Do you remember the remming error with the cheque? Do you recall seeing that?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. If we could go back to the call log please at
\{F/1829.1\}, and if we could go please to row 172.
Mr Latif, this is a record of a call from your branch, Caddington, on 26 March 2018 and we get that from column D and the content of the call is shown at column M and it says there at M :
"Thursday: customer wanted to withdraw $£ 1,000$ but did as a deposit so now $£ 2,000$ down."
A. Yes.
Q. So what happened there, Mr Latif, was the assistant processed on Horizon a deposit for $£ 1,000$, that's right?
A. Can I just stop you there. That incident, a customer came in, distracted the counter clerk, okay, made comments about her, made her feel uneasy. There were
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two buttons next to each other on Horizon, one to the left, one to the right, so she pressed the wrong button, okay. We -- instead of withdrawing money we put money into his account. So rather than taking $£ 1,000$ out of his account, in fact the button hit was the deposit button, so we put $£ 1,000$ into his account. So the shortfall was $£ 2,000$. That same night when we did the cash declaration, we realised the mistake, we checked the CCTV and proved that the customer -- in fact the wrong transaction occurred. I personally contacted the customer, the customer refunded us the money and that is the correct procedure followed to make sure that the money was put back into the system.
Q. Mr Latif, prior to that resolution that you were able to reach there will have been a $£ 2,000$ shortfall within the branch, wouldn't there?
A. (Inaudible) yes, but before the next balancing period.
Q. If we go --
A. The customer put the money back, sir.
Q. If we can go to row 182 please. We see there a mistake where someone -- you or one of your assistants -- has accidently entered a council tax bill for $£ 13$ as $£ 130$, so what I would call a miskey error.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. So it's fair to say, isn't it, Mr Latif, that there were
errors and mistakes in this your branch of that kind that could lead to shortfalls?
A. I would say that every branch has shortfalls, sir . Everybody is human. We all make mistakes, but most mistakes are corrected. However, with software glitches you cannot correct those.
Q. One conclusion point, Mr Latif. Do you accept that everything you complain of in your witness statement can be explained by human errors, whether Post Office errors, or errors in your branch, and might not have involved any bug or error in Horizon?
A. No, no. I would say some errors are human error, but there is also a bug in the Post Office system and that's my evidence, sir .
Q. Just one short last point, Mr Latif, just to confirm. Post Office's position is that you ceased to be the subpostmaster of the Caddington branch in September of last year. That's right, isn't it?
A. Correct.
Q. Was it --
A. That's -- the date it happened -- 27 September is when the audit was.
Q. It doesn't matter, but Post Office records suggest it was the 26th, but it doesn't matter, Mr Latif.
A. Yes.
Q. Is it therefore a mistake in your witness statement that you failed to correct when you say in paragraph 1 that you are currently the subpostmaster?
A. I did discuss that with the -- my solicitor and they said because the incident happened while I was in charge it didn't really matter.
Q. Thank you, Mr Latif.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Re-examination?
MR GREEN: My Lord, I'm just going to ask -- because he's got a four hour drive home I'm going to ask two --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I'm not encouraging any.
MR GREEN: But I need to do some.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I'm not stopping you, but he has been in the witness box for three hours.
MR GREEN: Precisely. So, my Lord, I was just going to explain, I'm asking two indicative questions.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Yes.

## Re-examination by MR GREEN

MR GREEN: Could you be shown the transcript please at page 40, line 15 . Sorry, Mr Latif, just bear with us a second. We're just trying to find the transcript --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: You can just read out the question and answer if you want.
MR GREEN: At page 40, line 15 \{Day2/40:15\} Mr Draper asked you:
"Question: If we could call up the call log please ..."

Which is at 1829.1, which we will look at
in a moment. And then it says:
"Question: ... row 89 and looking over to column D, that gives a date of 29 June 2015 which is the first entry on this log for June?"

And you will remember his Lordship spotted that there were some dates which were out of order. Could the operator please go to that document 1829.1 \{F/1829.1\}. And could you please enable editing and filter by date please, sort by date, sort and filter, custom sort, sort by created date. "Okay". And please can you then look at row 95. Can you see that's actually 22 June?
A. Correct.
Q. And if we go across to the right we can see in rows $L$ and M the caller is identified as Chris and it says:
"Customer rang as she is trying to complete an existing reversal on a rem in. She is using the session ID and it is not accepting and coming up with an error message 'unable to reserve as remmed as product in AD '."

Do you have any recollection as at today what that was about?

## 95

A. To be perfectly honest, I don't.
Q. Okay, thank you.

Then could we just use the duplicate of that
spreadsheet please that you had, the unfiltered one.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Whereabouts are we going?
MR GREEN: We're going to be going to row 167 , my Lord, in the original version.

If we can go down to row 167 very kindly and look at 167, that's 25 January 2018.
A. Okay.
Q. Now, Mr Latif, you mentioned there were a number of calls about the issue.
A. Yes. Yes, sir.
Q. Can we go across to row M first please. Let's pause, "Description":
"TC received for launch of $£ 10 \times 100$ scratchcard games ... only received 50 ... if we accept the TC, will cause a discrepancy?"
A. Yes.
Q. Can you remember what that was about?
A. That's it, that's the -- the thing we discussed earlier on.
Q. Can you go to the right to column U please, "Resolution details ", we have only got a certain amount of text in this box. It says:
"Sent below email to P\&BA team:
"Good afternoon, I have received a call from 0561347 ..."

Is that your FAD code?
A. That is my branch, sir, yes, my FAD code.
Q. "... Caddington office, disputing the TC they received
this morning relating to the issue of the $£ 10$ game 1100 scratchcards."

I think that should say 100 scratchcards, should it?
A. It should say 100 , sir .
Q. Okay, just a miskeying error.
"The TC received says that they should have had ..."
Can you remember what came back?
A. That is the problem: nothing came back from Camelot. And again we kept chasing them, we kept chasing the Post Office and nothing came back until September the audit happened. Thank you, sir .
Q. Thank you very much, Mr Latif.

I don't know whether his Lordship has any questions? Questions from MR JUSTICE FRASER
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I just have a couple of questions which will be quite quick.

I think you said the audit was carried out -- was the lady called Jane Lawrence?
A. She was, my Lord.
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MR JUSTICE FRASER: Jane Lawrence. And when the audit happened in September 2018 was Mr Jando still your line manager, or was it somebody else?
A. No, Navjot still was just there.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: All right. Thank you very much for giving up so much time and being cross-examined on the videolink and that's now the end of your evidence.
A. Thank you, sir . Thank you, my Lord. Thank you for your time.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Right. We're going to come back at quarter past 2. There's going to have to be a somewhat different approach in terms of timing. We are supposed to have three possibly four witnesses today. I don't think -- if the other witnesses take as long as that witness we're just going to massively run out of time.

Also I would have thought things like a notice or a memo view ought really to be, if they are contentious, explored in advance. I imagine the Post Office will be able to produce a list of the memo views that were sent out in January 2018. I would like that to be done please. I'm not going to make an order but we will revisit that on Wednesday morning and if it is going to be difficult then I can have an explanation then and I might make an order, but there's no point having disputes of fact where there are none, because there are
enough genuine disputes of fact in this case it seems to me.

We will come back at quarter past 2. So who is your next -- just remind me your next witness?
MR GREEN: It is Mr Tank, my Lord.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Mr Tank and then after that if we reach
them it is one of the --
MR GREEN: Anup Patny.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Which is Mr Patny senior.
All right, so quarter past 2.
( 1.40 pm )
(The luncheon adjournment)
( 2.15 pm )
MR GREEN: My Lord, I'm going to call Mr Tank, if I may.
MR JAYESH TANK (affirmed)
Examination-in-chief by MR GREEN
MR GREEN: Mr Tank, there should be a witness bundle there in front of you.
A. Yes.
Q. If you turn to tab 6 please $\{E 1 / 6 / 1\}$ you should see a witness statement there with your name on it.
A. That's right.
Q. And if you go to page 3 of that witness statement there's a signature $\{E 1 / 6 / 3\}$. Is that your signature?
A. It is.
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Q. And do you believe the contents of that statement to be true, subject to what you have dealt with in your subsequent one?
A. Absolutely.
Q. Can we look please at your supplemental statement which is tab $11\{\mathrm{E} 1 / 11 / 1\}$.
A. Yes.
Q. If we go over to page $2\{E 1 / 11 / 2\}$, you deal there with having read Ms van den Bogerd's second witness statement and enquiries that you then followed up in the light of that?
A. Yes.
Q. And you have then dealt with the $£ 195.04$ issue she referred to in 2011?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you have dealt with the $£ 600$ issue and you have said there it was in 2014.
A. Yes.
Q. You have originally said that was 2011.
A. Correct.
Q. Subject to those matters do you believe these statements together to be true?
A. I do.
Q. I'm most grateful.

Cross-examination by MR HENDERSON

## MR HENDERSON: Mr Tank, good afternoon. <br> A. Good afternoon. <br> Q. Hopefully you can see the screen to your right which has the documents on it. Is that clear enough for you there? <br> A. Yes. <br> Q. Great. Can you first of all just tell us a little bit about the nature of the branch where you were the subpostmaster. <br> A. Of course, we were a two-counter rural post office. We offered almost the entire suite of Post Office products and services, everything apart from the AEI, identity checking machine. I considered it to be a busy branch. It was a high turnover, lots of cash coming in, lots of cash going out, a full range of transactions as well. <br> Q. And is it a retail premises as well? <br> A. It was -- we had a small retail premises attached to the post office and that sold gifts, cards, stationary. <br> Q. And there are two counters, you said? <br> A. Yes. <br> Q. And so how many assistants did you have? <br> A. Over the course of ... <br> Q. Generally? <br> A. Generally it would just be myself, my wife and possibly one other member of staff.

## 101

Q. Right. Now, you have given two witness statements, as you have just been taken to, and you have dealt with three events. There is a power cut which you say led to a loss of $£ 600$ ?
A. Yes.
Q. A shortfall of $£ 195.04$ ?
A. Yes.
Q. And you have some observations about label transactions?
A. Yes.
Q. So I want to deal with each of those in turn.
A. Okay.
Q. First of all, in your second witness statement which you provided a few weeks ago you tell us that when you saw Ms van den Bogerd's evidence responding to your first statement you thought you would have a look at the forum group that you used to use?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you call that the list?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that something that's notorious amongst
subpostmasters?
A. I wouldn't call it notorious.
Q. Well-known?
A. Well-known, yes.
Q. Can you tell me, can you tell us, tell his Lordship,
a little bit about what that forum was used for?
A. The forum, it was just a space where subpostmasters could share information, knowledge, advice.
Q. If the operator could go to $\{F / 1257.1\}$. This I think is the extracts of the forum that you attached to your second witness statement?
A. Yes.
Q. And if we could just scroll through that -- I will come back to some individual entries, but just scroll through that. We can see -- actually just before we scroll through, I assume your username is jaytank23, is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And if we just page down -- I will come back to that particular entry, but if we just page down just to get a feel for the sort of thing that's being said, so people come on and they say "I've got a bit of a problem can you help" and other people chip in and say "The same thing happened to me" and so forth?
A. Correct.
Q. How often did you personally post things on the forum do you think?
A. Not very often.
Q. Would you generally post whenever you had a problem?
A. No.

## 103

Q. Some of the time when you had a problem?
A. Some of the time, yes.
Q. How often did you look at it?
A. Every day.
Q. Every day.
A. Yes.
Q. So you were well aware that this was something which was relevant to the nature of issues being faced by postmasters?
A. Yes.
Q. And when you prepared your first witness statement you obviously knew this resource existed, didn't you?
A. I did.
Q. And it is plain that it is relevant to your evidence, isn't it?
A. It is.
Q. Why didn't you think to look for this material when you were preparing your first witness statement?
A. Because my first witness statement was I think short, brief, and it was just my way of -- I didn't really fully research the whole background regarding it, I just put my statement in.
Q. Can I just press you a little bit on that. You understand that what's being said in this case, by you amongst many others, is that you carried out certain
very specific actions which you did correctly and that the Post Office is at fault, or the Horizon system is at fault?
A. Yes.
Q. So it is important, isn't it, to have been precise in the evidence that you give?
A. Yes.
Q. And I'm just wondering why you didn't make some effort to find what was plainly a relevant document in putting forward what you agree to be the need for precise evidence?
A. Because I didn't -- I didn't feel that my information in my initial witness statement was going to be taken any further, so I -- it wasn't as important as it now has become.
Q. Were you asked to look for relevant documents?
A. Yes.
Q. And what effort did you make to find them?
A. I kept all my Post Office sort of related paperwork in a box file and that's -- when I was asked to look for evidence I went strictly to that box file and that's where I sourced all my information from.
Q. Can we look at your second witness statement $\{\mathrm{E} 1 / 11 / 2\}$ in paragraph 6. Your evidence there is you hadn't looked at this previously:
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"... as I did not think I would be able to access the forum group and it did not seem relevant."

Can you just explain how on earth you could conclude that it wouldn't seem relevant?
A. Sorry, can you ask the question again.
Q. How did you reach the conclusion that the forum posts would not be relevant?
A. I didn't reach that conclusion.
Q. Well, you say in paragraph 6, Mr Tank:
"... I did not think I would be able to access the forum group and it did not seem relevant."

I'm just wondering how you reached that conclusion?
A. Because when I made my first initial witness statement I wasn't aware of $£ 195.04$ loss, that information only came to light after reading Ms van den Bogerd's statement.
Q. But you were putting forward evidence, Mr Tank, about various matters including a number of matters that you now say you got the date wrong in relation to?
A. I wasn't aware that my first initial witness statement was evidence. I thought it was just a witness statement. I thought ... yes, that's what I thought. I didn't think it was --
Q. Is your evidence that you didn't take care over the preparation of your first witness statement?
A. I did.
Q. But not much?
A. It was very general. My original witness statement -I was just trying to get the point across -- because I was referring back to my memory as well, I couldn't realise the importance of what was important as -- it is only subsequently after finding the information and having -- being able to go back into -- it was only a few weeks ago that I managed to get back into the forum. I left my post office in 2016, so I stopped visiting the forum.
Q. Right. Ms van den Bogerd's statement is dated 16 November 2018. You can take that from me. We can look at it, but take that from me. And your second statement that you have just referred to is dated 27 February 2019, so just over three months later, after Ms van den Bogerd's statement. When did you first think to look at the forum?
A. It would have been a matter of weeks ago. I can get more specific if I go into my email history.
Q. All right, well, let's turn now to the power cut. I would like to ask you some questions about the power cut.
A. Okay.
Q. And there's some confusion about this, at least on my
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part which may be my fault, but let me go through it in the way that I understand it.

Could we first of all have a look at your first witness statement at $\{\mathrm{E} 1 / 6 / 3\}$ and we can see there that that was signed on 28 September 2018 and on the first page, page 1 of that $\{E 1 / 6 / 1\}$, you say the information is true to the best of your knowledge and belief and in paragraph 6 , which is on the second page $\{\mathrm{E} 1 / 6 / 2\}$, you give evidence that a power cut occurred and that while you could not recall the specific date, it "definitely occurred in or around 2010-2011". Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, why were you able to say that it definitely occurred in those dates?
A. Because when I went to the box file that I mentioned earlier there would have been a handwritten note somewhere in amongst that that would refer to that incident and that's what led me to believe that that was the particular date.
Q. You now say -- and we're only talking about the $£ 600$ here, all right? The incident relating to the $£ 600$. Do you agree?
A. I think so, yes.
Q. You now say that that event that you describe in your first witness statement did not in fact take place in

2010 to 2011, but actually took place three or four years later on 16 September 2014. That's your evidence I think?
A. I -- yes.
Q. Can you just assist with how you came to make that error? It's a big lump of time, isn't it? There's a big, big difference, a four year difference -- three or four year difference. How did you come to make that error?
A. I just must have misjudged it. It was a failing in my recollection.
Q. Anyway, your evidence, as I understand it -- I'm not sure that this is right but I want to put it to you fairly. Your evidence as I understand it is that you say that that is the only mistake you made in relation to the alleged loss of $£ 600$. In every other respect the facts set out in your first witness statement you say are accurate, is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. So your evidence is there was a power cut
in September 2014, a complete electrical failure to the entire building, yes?
A. Yes.
Q. There was a transaction for a withdrawal from a customer's Post Office card account for exactly $£ 600$ ? 109
A. Yes.
Q. At the end of the day you had a shortfall of exactly £600?
A. Yes.
Q. And you rang the help desk and told them about the power cut but they said there were no problems?
A. Correct.
Q. And your evidence remains that you investigated this at the time and even tried to contact the customer, but that she had passed away.
A. Yes.
Q. Presumably within a few days of coming into the branch?
A. Yes.
Q. And, again, whereas before you thought that the customer had passed away in 2010/2011 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- he or she passed away four years later . Okay, well, I'm going to come to the detail of that in a moment, but just one small point before I carry on. One of your complaints is that you had to look at -- and in fact it is still on the screen, it's in paragraph $9\{\mathrm{E} 1 / 6 / 2\}$. You investigated this event and you complained that you had to look at a very long report in order to see what had happened. You say it was 15 to 18 feet long.
A. That's correct.
Q. A couple of points. First of all, you were as a matter of fact you say able to work out what happened, weren't you, from looking at this report?
A. No. Because then -- if I was able to look at what happened then I might have an idea what happened to the $£ 600$.
Q. We will come on to look at that. But you didn't have to print that, did you, you could have looked at it on the screen?
A. Yes, but the length of the report and the screen would mean you would probably have to page down over 100 times.
Q. But you could have filtered it in various ways, couldn't you?
A. I could have filtered it, yes.
Q. The point is that the impression that your evidence gives is that you had to print out this comically long document and go through it, but you didn't have to do that, did you?
A. No.
Q. And you have now been reminded that you went onto the forum to complain about this, so can we have a look at the forum entries which prompted your memory. That's \{F/1257.6\}. And just while that is being turned up, I think you will agree -- I think perhaps you have
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already agreed and apologies if I'm repeating myself, but the point of going on to the forum is to try and get assistance from other subpostmasters presumably?
A. Correct.
Q. And in order to do that I imagine you would generally give them as much information as possible?
A. Yes.

MR GREEN: Do you mean point 1 at page 6?
MR HENDERSON: I do, yes. I'm very grateful to my learned friend. It is 1257.1 at page $6\{F / 1257.1 / 6\}$.

At the top quite helpfully in red we can see your entries and this is what has prompted your memory about the correct date, as I understand it?
A. I think so, yes.
Q. And you say:
"I too have had a recent unexplained loss of c.£600 on 16 September. Settled centrally on 17 September."

And so forth. You don't say anywhere on that that there had been a power cut, do you?
A. No.
Q. And why is that?
A. I just omitted it.
Q. You just referred to an unexplained loss?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, again just to put this in context, if we go to --
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { we may have to flip backwards and forwards a little bit } & 1 \\ \text { so apologies, but the actual shortfall which the } & 2 \\ \text { Post Office write to you about is at } 1262.1 \text { \{F/1262.1\} } & 3 \\ \text { and that is actually in the amount of } £ 660 \text {. Do you } & 4 \\ \text { recall that? } & 5 \\ \text { A. Yes. } \\ \text { Q. Not } 600 . & 6 \\ \text { Now if I could ask the operator to go to \{F/1257.4\} } & 7 \\ \text { and if you could enable editing I think that makes it } & 9 \\ \text { easier to manipulate. } & 10 \\ \text { As far as the Post Office can tell there was no } & 11 \\ \text { power cut on that day, all right? } & 12 \\ \text { And if the operator could go -- if you go into the } & 13 \\ \text { top left -hand box that says A8, if you type in } 11676 \text {-- } & 14 \\ \text { I think you may need to keep the "A" in to tell it that } & 15 \\ \text { it is the row. It is at the bottom of the page. Is it } & 16 \\ \text { possible to bring it up to the top and if you go to the } & 17 \\ \text { right, keeping the tab in that row, row } 11676 \text {-- can you } & 18 \\ \text { scroll right. } & 19 \\ \text { We can see in red there a transaction for £600, do } & 20 \\ \text { you see that? } & 21 \\ \text { A. Yes. } & 22 \\ \text { Q. And there’s another transaction after it for another } & 23 \\ \text { £600? } & 24 \\ \text { A. Yes. }\end{array}$ 113
Q. Now, Post Office say that if there had been a power cut at or around this time they would expect it to either see no activity for a period of time --
A. Yes.
Q. -- or certain repeat events such as two sequential log ons performed by the same user in a short period of time, but no log off in-between. In other words, there are certain indications of where there has been a power outage. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And when we come on to look at one, the $£ 195.04$, we will see those indications.
A. Okay.
Q. But we don't see those indications here. Do you accept that?
A. I do.
Q. We could, for your Lordship's note, also -- I don't suggest we necessarily need to go to it, but we can also look at a slightly different spreadsheet which is the events data spreadsheet at $\{F / 1257.5\}$ rows 4171 to 4457 and again one would expect to see evidence of outage around row 4253. I'm just putting that in the transcript, my Lord, I don't think we necessarily need to go to it, it's the same point.

So there's no evidence from Post Office's point of
view of any outage, power cut at this point.
Could we have a look at your amended schedule of information which is --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Before you do that and you don't need to take me there, but is there a document similar to that that does show how a power outage would appear?
MR HENDERSON: Yes, my Lord, and we're coming to it.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: All right.
MR HENDERSON: Could you look at your amended schedule of information, $\{F / 1717.1\}$. Now, you will recall that this is the document that each of the claimants, including you, have had to fill in to give a summary of your claim. Do you recall this?
A. Yes.
Q. And I think you have signed this, haven't you?
A. I think so.
Q. If we look at page 4 in section $2.4\{F / 1717.1 / 4\}$, it is the big paragraph in the middle, you say:
"When the branch incurred a shortfall, I didn't always contact the Helpline as I did not trust the advice which I received. Sometimes, after a few days, the shortfall would resolve itself in any case but if it didn't, I would try to resolve the issue myself by contacting other post Office representatives. I recall that on one occasion there was a shortfall of around
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$£ 600$ which I knew could not be right. There had been a power failure when we were processing the transaction which, to my knowledge, did not complete."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Just for completeness and to be clear, you don't refer, for perfectly understandable reasons, in this schedule of information to the $£ 195.04$ incident because you were reminded of that by Ms van den Bogerd's evidence?
A. Yes.
Q. But if we look at page 5, the following page $\{F / 1717.1 / 5\}$, at section 3.1 , at the very bottom you are talking about apparent or alleged shortfalls and in the bottom paragraph it says:
"I recall that there were also unexplained cash shortfalls of ... [various numbers] in May 2008 and also £660 in August 2014."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, this is part of where I am confused, because your evidence here is that there are two events. One is a power cut on a date that you don't specify which led to a loss of $£ 600$ which we saw on page 4 , do you remember?
A. Yes.
Q. And the other is a separate incident in August 2014 for $£ 660$ but again no mention of a power cut. Can you explain the anomaly?
A. The fact that I didn't mention the power cut?
Q. Well, you do mention a power cut-- I apologise -- if

I'm taking it too quickly, I apologise. Your evidence now is that there was a power cut in September 2014 which led to a loss of $£ 600$.
A. Okay.
Q. Well, if you disagree say so?
A. No, I agree.
Q. Okay. And in this document you refer, as I understand it, to two separate incidents. One is a power cut on a date you don't specify, which led to a loss of $£ 600$, and the other is the loss of $£ 660$ in August 2014 and I'm just asking if you can explain what appears to be a rather strange situation?
A. Just confusion, I would ... I was just confused.
Q. You are confused. So are we to take it that the $£ 660$ in August 2014 is caused by the power cut and there's only one incident that you meant to refer to in this?
A. I couldn't say for sure. As I tried to explain earlier , in drafting my original witness statement I went back to my box file and it was filled with various bits of paper, different sizes, different formats and with
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handwritten scribbled notes on and that's where I tried to piece together the information that I provided in this.
Q. I'm not trying to trip you up here, Mr Tank, I'm just trying to understand what your case is. Because you appear to now be saying that there were two power cuts. One was in December 2011 and it resulted in the loss you say of $£ 195.04$ and you were reminded of it by
Ms van den Bogerd's statement. Yes? That was one power cut?
A. Yes.
Q. And we will come on to that in a moment, but Post Office agrees that that was a power cut.
A. I didn't -- no, it wasn't a power cut. The transaction was unable to complete on the $£ 195$ because if you --
Q. Okay, well, we will come on to that --
A. I put the sequence of events, the fact that three receipts printed out, so it was a lot more detailed, so I'm not sure -- I don't think that was a power cut. I'm not sure if it was a power cut.
Q. You're not sure one way or the other, okay.
A. I'm not sure if it was a power cut, but the transaction was unable to complete.
Q. Right. What I'm trying to test with you is is it possible that the evidence that you give in your first
witness statement about the power cut, power outage, actually is evidence that is relevant to the $£ 195.04$ transaction rather than the $£ 600$ transaction?
A. It could well be, yes.
Q. Because my understanding -- well, never mind about my understanding. Is it your suggestion that there have been two incidents of outage, if I put it like that: one for $£ 195$ and one for $£ 600$ ?
A. That I'm aware of, yes.
Q. Okay. Well, let's look at -- I'm still talking about the $£ 600$ transaction at the moment.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Did you use "outage" there meaning a power cut, or did you use "outage" as a discrepancy?
MR HENDERSON: I mean a failure -- I mean Horizon going offline for a moment, as opposed to a power cut to the whole shop.

So let's look at the transaction. Now, first of all, it wasn't you -- this is the $£ 600$.
A. Yes.
Q. It wasn't you who carried out this transaction, was it?
A. No, it was a member of staff.
Q. Louise I think?
A. Louise Boneham, yes.
Q. So all the evidence you give is based on what Louise told you?
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A. It is, as also with what I viewed over the CCTV.
Q. Okay. You don't mention anything about the CCTV in your witness statement I don't think.
A. No.
Q. Why was that?
A. Because this -- after viewing the CCTV it wasn't conclusive. We have seen Louise performing the transactions on the computer system, receipts going one way, the banking slip coming the other way, everything looked in order. When I phoned to investigate the incident they said from what they could see everything looked fine: there was a cash withdrawal, there was a cash deposit.
Q. Well, let's have a look at what might have happened. First of all, the relevant transaction for $£ 600$ was from a Post Office card account, wasn't it?
A. Correct.
Q. And as I understand it that's quite a basic bank account offered by the Post Office?
A. Sort of. The card account is a vehicle for people to receive benefits payments from the Government. The daily cash withdrawal limit on a Post Office card account is $£ 600$.
Q. Right and it only offers basic withdrawal services, doesn't it, from a post office counter or

## a Bank of Ireland ATM?

A. Yes.
Q. So Post Office card account customers are not able for example to deposit money into their account?
A. No.
Q. To use a debit card facility, or to transfer funds from a Post Office card account to another bank institution?
A. Yes.
Q. You agree?
A. I do.
Q. Thank you. So if a Post Office card account customer needs to transfer money from the POCA account to one of the Post Office's partner banks, they will typically within the same customer session undertake the following transactions: they will complete a cash withdrawal from POCA and they will deposit the withdrawn money directly into the other account --
A. Yes.
Q. -- by means perhaps of a debit or deposit card issued by that bank?
A. Yes.
Q. There wasn't any other way to do it?
A. Well, in this instance it was a little paper paying in slip, so we take the paper paying in slip off the customer, input the sort code and account number and
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then deposit the cash.
Q. Fine. Let's go back to the ARQ data at 1257.4 \{F/1257.4\}.

Could we go -- again I'm afraid we will have to enable editing I think, if we go back to the row I looked at before. Could we go back to -- again if you keep the "A" in and you just put 11676. And again if I could trouble you to the bring it to the top of the screen I just think it's a bit easier to see. Thank you. And again if you could go right.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Can we just go left a couple of columns. MR HENDERSON: Yes. Stop there, that's perfect.

So what we see here is the red figure is the withdrawal of $£ 600$ from the Post Office card account, yes?
A. Yes.
Q. And then below it, immediately, there is a cash deposit into a Lloyds Bank?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, it's possible, isn't it, that what actually happened is that the cash was accidently handed over to the customer and also registered as being deposited with Lloyds Bank?
A. It's possible, but, as I have mentioned, I checked the CCTV and we could see what was going backwards and
forwards across the counter and it was receipts going to the customer and a paying in slip coming from the customer.
Q. Well, Mr Tank, you haven't referred to any CCTV in your witness evidence.
A. I understand.
Q. Which I accept you thought was only provisional but we take a bit more seriously.
A. Okay.
Q. And as far as I'm aware, you haven't given disclosure of any CCTV, have you?
A. No.
Q. Okay.
(Pause).
Based on the evidence here, you can't say that what I have suggested to you, which is that an error was made, a simple user error was made, you can't say that didn't occur, can you?
A. I can say that. I can say that there is no cash that went over the till.
Q. Based on what you tell us you saw on the CCTV?
A. Correct, yes. Obviously I can't evidence that, but ...
Q. I'm just wondering how you can be so confident about what happened, about this particular transaction when you couldn't even get the year right to the tune of four
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## years?

A. I investigated the loss to the best of my ability. I turned to the Post Office for help. What they told me on the telephone was everything looked fine, they could see the transaction, they could see the $£ 600$ going out, they could see the $£ 600$ going in.
Q. Exactly.
A. So that's why it is an unexplained loss, because I can't explain it.
Q. Well, I understand that it is a frustrating loss, but there's a perfectly simple explanation for it which is an understandable user error?
A. I agree.
Q. And you nevertheless come into court and say on oath that you are so confident that you did nothing wrong, that that didn't happen, because of evidence you have seen and we haven't.
A. Okay. Fair point.
Q. In a situation where you couldn't, until reminded by Post Office, recall the date of the transaction to the tune of four years?
A. But you have to bear in mind I paid that $£ 600$ back. I beared that loss. I never thought that I would actually get it back. My relationship with Post Office ended a couple of years ago, so that money was written
off. I wrote that money off myself. I paid that back.
Q. I understand that. But if it was, as I'm suggesting to you, or if it's possible that it was a user error then you would have to pay it back, wouldn't you?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, let's turn then to the shortfall which you did report on 13 December 2011 for $£ 195.04$ and just to recap, this is not one you mentioned in your first witness statement but you read Ms van den Bogerd's statement and she, just to remind you, said "I can't see anything that suggests there was a problem for $£ 600$ in 2010/2011, but it does make sense in a relation to a transaction for $£ 195.04$ ".
A. Yes.
Q. And you tell us in your second witness statement -- and we can go to it if necessary but I think you have already agreed -- that before you saw Ms van den Bogerd's evidence you had no real recollection of this event at all?
A. No.
Q. So everything that you are basing it on now is really based on the forum, is it?
A. It is, yes.
Q. Now, this is an example of you, quite understandably, contacting the helpline about a shortfall of less than 125
£200?
A. Yes.
Q. And presumably you would routinely report any discrepancy at that sort of level?
A. No.
Q. Not necessarily?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. I wouldn't say routinely, no.
Q. Okay, let me put the question more precisely, it is my fault. If you felt that there was an unexplained shortfall --
A. Yes.
Q. -- for something like £200, I'm suggesting it would be perfectly understandable and that in the natural course of things you would contact Post Office?
A. Okay, so if I can just explain about the $£ 195.04$. Obviously I was reminded about that from --
Q. Yes.
A. -- looking at the forum posts, which is in red on the screen --
Q. Yes, we will come to it .
A. £195 withdrawal and I state, you know, what happens, the screen says "Cash to customer, balance due zero". I subsequently then go on to report that I tried to find
that transaction the following day and there was no record of it. On whatever I could access on my terminal, I could not find the $£ 195.04$. After phoning the helpline, they were able to find that transaction. I think they use a system called Credence which we don't have access to.
Q. I will come on to all that. I'm just exploring at the moment what your practice was about reporting an unexplained shortfall and I'm suggesting that when you have got an unexplained shortfall of $£ 200$, quite understandably you have contacted the helpline.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hm}$.
Q. And I'm asking you whether that would be your usual practice, if you had an unexplained discrepancy? You might have an explained discrepancy, you might know that something went wrong, you remember "Oh, I messed something up" or "I know what that's about", but if it is an unexplained discrepancy I'm suggesting that at that sort of level you would generally report it, I imagine?
A. I think it's the other way round. If it was an explained then I would report it. If it's unexplained then I'm less likely to report it because it could be down to human error.
Q. All right, let me put it in a different way then. If
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you felt it called for some further explanation then you would contact the helpline?
A. Yes.
Q. And certainly if it was more than a few pounds you would do that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So let's have a look again at the forum comments which are $\{F / 1257.1\}$. This is 13 December 2011:
"Some advice/help required.
"Yesterday during HOL failure ..."
Horizon Online, HOL?
A. Yes.
Q. "... was in process of POCA card withdrawal.

Transaction seemed to go through okay apart from Horizon printing 3 identical receipts.
"Receipts showed a disconnected session with recovery code. Receipts also showed."

And you go through total due to customer, blah, blah, blah:
"Because receipts showed cash due to customer. we paid out.
"Come evening balancing till showed approx $£ 200.00$ loss. Thought at time must be mis-count and will try to sort in morn.
"This morning produced transaction log for the
period of HOL FAILURE. No record of 195.04 transaction at all !!!!
"Phoned help-line and was told by very irate member of staff that loss is mine unless I can sort out with customer directly ..."

And so forth. Then at the bottom of the page:
"What should be my next course of action???
"Speak to press (is there anything in contract preventing me doing this?"

Then if we can go down the page:
"Speak to CWU (not member of POLFED anymore)?
"Speak to Shoesmiths?
"Try taking POL to small claims court?
"Any useful suggestions appreciated."
So you were pretty cross about this by the look of things?
A. Yes. In the one hand I have receipts produced by Horizon and then the following day when I go to look for that transaction there was no record of it. It was very, very frustrating.
Q. I understand.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Can we go back to the previous page please \{F/1257.1\}.
MR HENDERSON: So what appears to have happened was a transaction from Post Office card account was in the
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middle of being processed and so it was in the stack presumably.
A. Yes.
Q. But had not yet been posted to Horizon. So you hadn't cashed out on that transaction, you hadn't completed everything to do with that transaction?
A. On the stack --
Q. It's on the stack.
A. It's on the stack, but the stack has a balance of zero, so to clear the stack you just press "enter" and it goes straight --
Q. But you hadn't got to the point of clearing the stack?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. Okay. My suggestion is that there was probably an outage at just the point where the money had been taken from Post Office card account but had not been processed onto Horizon. That's my suggestion to you.
A. Okay.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, is the witness going to be in a position to agree or disagree?
MR HENDERSON: Well, he might be if he recalled.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Do you recall that happening when there were outages?
A. No. I cannot recall .

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Were you aware of when outages would
occur like that?
A. Not all the time.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Do you want to put the question again?
MR HENDERSON: Yes. What I'm suggesting is that the cause
of this problem was that an outage occurred at
a particular point in time.
A. Yes.
Q. You were in the process of effecting a transaction from POCA?
A. Yes.
Q. It was in the stack and it had cleared from POCA?
A. Actually you mentioned the word "outage". I'm not -was there a power outage?
Q. I'm not sure if it was a power outage, but I think it may have been a problem with the system.
A. Ah, okay.
Q. The system went down in some way.
A. So -- yes, because you said that if there's a power outage then there's evidence when you have to log back in, so did that happen on this occasion?
Q. Okay, I want to come to all this and I'm doing this clumsily. What I'm suggesting is that what may have happened -- and if you don't recall, you don't recall, but what may have happened is that the transaction was in the stack, the money had been taken from the
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Post Office card account and before you cleared the stack there was an outage.
A. Possibly .
Q. Okay.

Let's look at the events data at $\{\mathrm{F} / 869.1\}$. And if we enable editing.

That is not the document I was expecting. 871.1. \{F/871.1\}. No, I don't want that.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: What are we looking for, the event data?
MR HENDERSON: We are looking at the event data.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Is it 1257.5? That's just a partly educated guess based on ...
MR GREEN: I think it is F/869.1 but you have to click on the sheet tab. You were in the summary tab.
MR HENDERSON: Right, I couldn't see that. Thank you very much.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: It doesn't show up on the common screen, the tabs at the bottom, you can't see them on the common screen.
MR HENDERSON: I'm so sorry, back to \{F/869.1\}. And there is I think --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I think you have to click on the tab before you go full screen, so if you go into half screen you will be able to see the tabs at the bottom. At the bottom you will see "Sheet 1 ", click on "Sheet 1 " and
now expand it.
MR HENDERSON: Thank you very much.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Is that what we are after?
MR HENDERSON: That is what we are after I believe.
If you go to the top and type A327, what we see here
is that you are logged on at 13.39. Do you see that at the top there?
A. (Nods).
Q. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay and then there's a message at 13.40 to say
"Session ... could not recover".
A. Yes.
Q. And then there's a gap of 22 minutes and there's
a session receipt at 14.02 . Do you see that?
A. Yes.

MR HENDERSON: Now, my Lord, in answer to your Lordship's earlier question, that is what Post Office would expect to see when there is an outage.

So then the Horizon system comes back online and at that point there will be a recovery process, won't there, various screens that you need to go through?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And if we could have a look at

Ms van den Bogerd's statement at $\{E 2 / 5 / 16\}$, if you look
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at paragraph 53 and just read that to yourself.
(Pause).
Have you read that?
A. I'm just getting to the bottom of it.
Q. Sorry.
(Pause).
A. Okay.
Q. Do you agree that that's a fair summary, an accurate summary?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay, thank you.

When power is restored there is a procedure to be followed, isn't there?
A. Yes.
Q. And that procedure will result either in a transaction being cancelled, or recovered?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Let's have a look at the Horizon Online quick reference guide at $\{F / 1365\}$. You will see at the top there:
"Disconnections and screen freezes on Horizon Online are dealt with differently to Horizon. If either occurs during a customer session Recovery actions may be required.
"You need to make sure you do the right thing at the
time the counter becomes unavailable."
If you drop the next session section and it says
"Disconnected session receipt", do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. "The system will then settle the session automatically and print 3 copies of a disconnected session receipt before automatically logging you out.
"The copies of the receipt are, 1 for the customer,
1 to be kept with your stock unit, 1 to be kept at the
failed terminal."
Okay?
A. Okay.
Q. And then below it says, again missing out the next section:
"The system treats transactions as
either: recoverable ... or cancelable ..."
This is a recoverable one, isn't it, because it is a card transaction?
A. Okay.
Q. We see that from below. Do you see
"recoverable/cancelable products" including debit/credit card payments, et cetera?
A. Yes.
Q. And then at the end of that:
"These will be recorded on the disconnected session
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receipt as completed and must be settled with the customer."

Okay?
A. Okay.
Q. Then if you look on to the next page $\{F / 1365 / 2\}$ there's a flowchart which takes you through that process.
A. Yes.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: I think that flowchart is what you do higher up the page on the first page, isn't it?
MR HENDERSON: Yes, I think that probably is right.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, let's go back to the page before \{F/1365/1\} just to make sure I follow what charts go with which. Is that's what referred to as page 2 of the document under "Disconnected session receipt"?
MR HENDERSON: Yes, I believe so.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: So:
"... a disconnected session receipt will not be produced if the system freezes or there is a hardware failure. Page 2 of this document describes what you should do in this scenario."

And the flowchart is on page 2. Is that right?
MR HENDERSON: I think that must be right, my Lord, but what Mr Tank says here is he was provided with three receipts.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Yes.
MR HENDERSON: Then if we go to page 3 of this same document
$\{F / 1365 / 3\}$, this is "When online connectivity is
restored ". Do you have that, Mr Tank?
A. I do.
Q. "Page 4 of this document provides a simple diagram that
explains the actions you should take when Horizon Online
connectivity is restored the system will carry out
Recovery for customer sessions that were in progress at
the time of failure. When you next login to the
terminal where the failure occurred, the system will
recognise that the last session did not complete
properly and will automatically commence Recovery. You
will see the following message ..."
Then "Recovery receipt":
"You should follow all on-screen instructions. Once
the Recovery process has completed, a Recovery receipt
will be printed automatically."
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I think we are on a different page to
you.
MR HENDERSON: I'm so sorry. Page 3. I just hadn't noticed
the screen. Right, I have just read out the top section
and I'm looking now at the "Recovery receipt" section.
Do you see that, Mr Tank?
A. I do.
Q. "You should follow all on-screen instructions . Once the
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Recovery process has completed, a Recovery receipt will be printed automatically.
"The Recovery Receipt should be attached to the Disconnected Session receipt stored at the failed terminal."

Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. So what this procedure tells you is that if you follow the Horizon procedures properly you get three receipts for the disconnected session and a recovery receipt, do you agree?
A. I agree, but I don't actually remember having this document in my office.
Q. This is online I think.
A. Oh, this is online?
Q. I thought it was online but I might be wrong.
A. It is quick reference guide, it states it is version 5 . The only version I remember having was just a single piece of A4 -- a double-sided A4 piece of paper. This suggests that there were four -- two pages. Because you are on page 3 at the moment. I never had -- I never had ...
Q. All right. I don't know what you had, candidly, at the moment.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: We did have some evidence on this in the
common issues trial and a document was produced that was a single A4 sheet, but it did look different to this . It had red on rather than blue.
MR HENDERSON: Right. The point is, however, that this document that I have taken you to sets out the procedure that needed to be followed. Do you accept that?
A. That document does, yes.
Q. Okay.
A. I never had that document, so I could never refer to it .
Q. But you would have been taken through the screens that came up on Horizon?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Your evidence -- I think your evidence is that you gave -- I should have asked this before and I apologise. Was it you doing this transaction, was it Louise or another assistant, or do you not recall?
A. I can't recall.
Q. Okay, that's fair.

Your evidence at $\{E 1 / 6 / 2\}$, in paragraph 7 , the penultimate sentence, is:
"A series of receipts were printed which she then gave to the customer."

Now, the reason I'm pointing to this, Mr Tank, is this is the evidence you give in relation to the $£ 600$. A. Yes.
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Q. But I have suggested to you already, and I think you have accepted, that it's possible that this evidence in fact relates to events in 2010/2011 in relation to the £195.04?
A. Yes.
Q. And it seems that what was done was all of the receipts were given to the customer?
A. Yes.
Q. Which is not the proper procedure?
A. Which is not the proper procedure, no.
Q. So do you accept that the proper procedure wasn't followed?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you call the help desk and we see that in \{F/1286.1\}. If we enable editing and actually you can scroll down to row 120 I hope. Can we go across, keep going across ... I think this is the wrong ... no, I'm sorry, I have given you the wrong reference. It is the call log -- this is 1286.1 , is it?
MR GREEN: You might be looking for the "Remedy" tab.
MR HENDERSON: I do want the "Remedy" tab and I hadn't spotted that it hadn't -- I'm so sorry, at the bottom there the "Remedy" tab, thank you.

If you then go to -- if you just go into the top left hand and if you delete the 1 and put 120 , or you

```
can scroll down, whichever is easier. Then if we go to row 120 and if you just stop there.
This is the call made from your branch, Mr Tank, yes?
A. Yes, the following day.
Q. And it is column I:
"Called this morning about a Horizon failure yesterday, branch completed a withdrawal and the 195.04 failed recovery receipt ..."
And so forth and so on. And that resulted in a PEAK being raised, which you wouldn't have known about at the time, I accept.
A. No.
Q. But let's have a look at it \(\{\mathrm{F} / 870\}\). And if you go to page 2 of that document \(\{F / 870 / 2\}\) in the first yellow section there -- do you see that? It says date 14 December 2011, do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. "Summary", it says:
"The banking transaction had completed ... including the receipt print ... and money should have changed hands.
"The basket settlement failed from 13.35 with 'no response received from data centre' and then two retries also failed and the attempt cancelled
```
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"The Disconnected Session receipts show 'Cash TO CUSTOMER 195.04' so the customer's account should be correct but the branch will have a shortage (for a withdrawal) because the session hasn't been recorded." And that's just explaining what had happened.
A. Yes.
Q. And then if we go to $\{F / 871.1\}$, the transaction correction is raised.
A. Yes.
Q. So you were refunded this amount of money?
A. I was.
Q. That's not something you mentioned in your witness statement, is it?
A. No.
Q. Why is that?
A. Because I was referring to the incident in terms of something that I had no control over that caused a loss to my office.
Q. But it didn't --
A. The fact that -- it caused a loss. The fact that that loss was resolved afterwards was not the issue. The fact that it caused a loss and I had no explanation for it, that's what I was reporting, that's what my witness statement was for.
Q. Okay. But having now seen everything that's happened
and looked at the procedure that should have been followed, do you still maintain that this event shows that there's something wrong with Horizon?
A. Yes.
Q. It is Horizon working as it is supposed to, isn't it? Something has gone wrong and a procedure has been followed --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hm}$.
Q. -- from the user point of view not quite correctly because you should have kept some of the receipts, but nevertheless you have raised it, it has been investigated and the money has been refunded?
A. Yes.
Q. How is that a fault with Horizon?
A. Because the error shouldn't have happened in the first place. If -- it seems like -- with the relationship between postmasters and the Post Office, it's very much one-sided and we as subpostmasters bear all the risk.
Q. But that's not true for this transaction, is it? You failed to follow the proper procedure --
A. Okay.
Q. -- maybe for understandable reasons, I don't know.
A. Okay.
Q. You raised a query and a few days later you were refunded the money. I don't see what the complaint is?
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A. If I didn't call in to report, would I still have got the refund?
Q. I think you would have actually, yes.
A. I wasn't to know. I didn't know there was a PEAK --
Q. But I'm not sure, I don't have the -- okay --
A. I don't know either.
Q. -- we will explore that later this week.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Can you not overspeak one another.
MR HENDERSON: Apologies.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Mr Henderson, do you just want to reput what you --
MR HENDERSON: I think I completed what I --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well I didn't get the answer because you then started speaking.

You were asked, Mr Tank, "You raised a query, you were refunded the money" and Mr Henderson said he didn't see what the complaint is and what was your answer to that please?
A. On the day of the transaction my office showed a loss of nearly £200. I -- the following day I went to investigate that loss, I couldn't find any record of it on my terminal and then that's when I phoned through to the helpline and reported.
MR HENDERSON: Okay, but the way --
A. What was going on in the background in terms of the PEAK
review or whatever, or -- I don't know if that was automated, or if my call to the network business support centre instigated the refund.
Q. The point is that the way Horizon works, it either records the transaction as having been completed properly --
A. Yes.
Q. -- or it generates the evidence to demonstrate that
there has been a problem?
A. Yes.
Q. Identifying that particular transaction.
A. Yes.
Q. I want to ask you a few questions about the third area you deal with, very brief questions, on label transaction issues.
A. Yes.
Q. Now, you say you experienced some problems with printing labels --
A. Yes.
Q. -- where you say no label could be printed even though you were charged for it .
A. Yes.
Q. And again we've got a timing issue here because in your first witness statement you said that that happened in 2007.
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A. Yes.
Q. And Ms van den Bogerd says she could find no evidence of that at all.
A. Okay.
Q. And now you say in your second witness statement that you think it was 2011.
A. Yes.
Q. And again can you help with how that error came to be made?
A. Again, my initial witness statement I was just relying on my memory and my supplemental witness statement is when I was able to research it a bit more.
Q. And what was the evidence that you got for your second witness statement that helped you on this date, because I'm not sure that I'm aware of any?
A. Again, it was Horizon generated receipts, print-outs, with hand-written dates and reference numbers on them.
Q. Sorry, where are these documents?
A. With my solicitors .
Q. Oh. I don't think they have made their way over, but I might be wrong.

Now, there are again processes on Horizon which cover this type of eventuality, aren't there?
A. No.
Q. Well, Horizon allows you to record a label as rejected,
doesn't it?
A. It does, yes. Usually, usually, but in this particular scenario it didn't give you that option.
Q. But normally it would prompt you to specify whether or not the label has been printed correctly, wouldn't it?
A. Yes, this is my point: during this particular issue, Horizon doesn't perform as it should.
Q. And it is also possible, isn't it, to process a completely separate transaction for spoiled postage labels and printing a replacement? Have a look at \{F/1848.6\}. This just summarises the procedure that's in place.
A. "A label can only be spoiled, if the label is on hand."
Q. Ms van den Bogerd's evidence at paragraph 82 of her witness statement at $\{\mathrm{E} 2 / 5 / 21\}$ says this process is available even if the printer had not produced a label at all. Do you accept that?
A. No, because the previous page showed that you had to have a label on hand.
Q. So she is wrong about that?
A. Yes. Well, it is contradictory, isn't it?
Q. Well, I accept that that's what that document says, but the evidence from Post Office is that in fact you could do that even if the printer had not produced a label at all?
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A. I could do that, but then it would be contrary to the other instructions.
Q. If you could do it -- my point is a simple one, Mr Tank. There were procedures built into Horizon to cater for the situation that you explained -- I have to say in the vaguest of terms, but as I understand what you are saying, there were procedures in place which ensured you could deal with the situation, weren't there?
A. No.
Q. We will have to differ .

Finally, you were investigated for various matters in 2015, weren't you?
A. Not investigated.
Q. You were interviewed on 5 November 2015, do you recall?
A. I had a performance interview, yes.
Q. And this resulted in a letter from Post Office to you of 15 February 2016. We see that at $\{F / 1431.1\}$.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Just let me read this quickly.

## (Pause).

Actually I will do it on my screen, give me a second.
MR HENDERSON: If you go to --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Just give me a second, Mr Henderson. There is a reason. I will explain at the end. Let me just quickly read it.
(Pause).
Is this a Civil Evidence Act situation? I will tell you what, just pause there.

Mr Tank, I'm just going to ask you just to pop out of court for literally two minutes. There is just something I need to ask counsel.
A. Okay.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: I just ask out of caution. In the
common issues trial there were two claimant witnesses who had to be given the warning against
self-incrimination under the Act because of potential criminal offences. It was obviously a situation that was at the forefront of everyone's mind because of the nature of that trial, so before those questions were put I knew in advance whether I had to give that warning or not.
MR HENDERSON: I understand, my Lord.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Is this one of those situations? MR HENDERSON: I think it probably would be sensible to do so.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: It does seem to me based on the four items listed that the witness is entitled to it.
MR HENDERSON: I think that's probably right.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Any observations, Mr Green?
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MR GREEN: My Lord, no, I think it should be given. 1 MR JUSTICE FRASER: Let's have Mr Tank back in. I did have the form of words with me last time. I don't have it now but I'm pretty confident that I can do it effectively ; if either of you think I haven't, correct me.
(In the presence of the witness).
Thank you very much, Mr Tank. Just have a seat. Just before Mr Henderson asks you some questions, there is just a formal warning I have to give you in relation to the right you have not to answer any questions if you think answering them may incriminate you in respect of future criminal proceedings.

It is a statutory warning. It was given in two other cases that you don't have to be concerned with in the previous trial and it is something standard but I have to draw it to your attention. So depending on what questions Mr Henderson is asking you, what the subject matter of them is, you are entitled to say that you don't wish to answer the question.
A. Sure.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Is that sufficient?
MR HENDERSON: I'm grateful.
If we go to the second page of that letter
\{F/1431.1/2\}, do you recall that at that meeting you had
a discussion which is referred to here in the second paragraph:
"We also discussed the inappropriate official postage claims conducted at the branch. During the period 25 August 2015 and 15 September 2015 nine claims of $£ 100$ official postage were undertaken totalling $£ 900$. These claims were subsequently reversed on 23 September 2015. A further claim of $£ 500$ was made on 2 October 2015 and subsequently reversed on 27 October 2015.
"As discussed the use of official postage in this manner is contrary to the instructions contained within Horizon Online. The 'stamps for official use' icon on Horizon Online must only be used for postage costs that are incurred when undertaking official Post Office Limited business and where no official pre-paid envelope is available. For full instructions please see Horizon help back office ..."

> And so forth. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall this incident or this --
A. The meeting?
Q. The meeting and what was said?
A. Yes.
Q. And official postage is a function on Horizon that
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should only, as we have just seen, be used for postage costs incurred when undertaking official Post Office business, that's right, isn't it?
A. Yes.
Q. And you have always known that presumably?
A. Yes.
Q. And essentially, as I understand your position, you considered that you were experiencing certain issues which were causing you loss --
A. Yes.
Q. -- and you decided to take matters into your own things and to take official postage, is that right?
A. No, it was just my way of formally recording my dispute. Communication channels with the Post Office weren't particularly good. Every time I tried to air any grievances, I never really found I got anywhere, so this was my way of complaining.
Q. To help yourself to some official postage?
A. I wasn't helping myself. I wasn't helping myself. No money actually left the office. Official postage is -it's a computer function and all it does is allocate that money under that particular ... so there's no -I'm not helping myself at all.
Q. Well, if there was another shortage in Horizon, for example, that would make up for it, wouldn't it? I mean

```
    one way or the other -- one way or another, by claiming
        official postage you're doing something you shouldn't do
        which improved your financial position?
A. No.
Q. How not, Mr Tank?
A. Improved my financial position?
Q. Yes?
A. How would it improve my financial position? We're
    talking about -- it's just a ledger entry.
Q. Just a ledger entry?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's have a look at the transcript of your interview at
    {F/1399.1}.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: We need to have a break for the
    transcribers.
MR HENDERSON: My Lord, I'm very happy to but I only have
    five minutes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: All right, we will keep going then.
MR HENDERSON: 1399.1, if we go to page 14 {F/1399.1/14}.
    You are obviously "Jay "; KB is?
A. Keith Bridges.
Q. Keith Bridges. He says:
    "Okay thank you. Let's move on to the postage
    claims for the moment. So in my letter I gave details
    of the claims and the reversals that you completed since
```
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    25 August. I think my first question would be that
    I know that you reversed them but why undertake them in
    the first place bearing in mind these are, in effect you
    are stating the transactions which took, well say the
    transactions have taken place which you have used
    official postage for which in effect did not take
    place."
        And you said:
            "... I understand the actions were wrong, but the
        money never left the office. The receipts were always
        kept and I did reverse them but again it was just a form
        of protest ..."
    A. Yes.
    Q. When you were warned about this you did reverse them,
didn't you?
A. Yes.
Q. But you hadn't told Post Office that you were doing that
at the time you were doing it?
A. I did.
Q. How did you do that?
A. Network business support.
Q. Okay. I have seen some references to this .
A. Yes.
Q. If we look at Post Office letter $\{F / 1374.1\}$, this is
I think the letter that Mr Bridges was referring to and
in the third paragraph he says to you:
"I understand from our conversations on occasions when this scenario has happened the branch has claimed a compensating value in official postage and thereby recovering the value of the postage label resulting in no loss to the branch. Would you please in future process by contacting the NBSC ..."
A. Yes.
Q. And if we look at the NBSC call log at $\{F / 1286.1\}$, under the "Remedy" tab, at row 216 and if you go right to column I:
"PM wanted noting that due to a RM complaint cust has over SD he is going to refund the customer SD as official postage. Advised PM he cannot do that that and I have advised him so."

And then in row 310 this is an event that is discussed in your interview you have said:
"PM is putting in $4.34 \times 10$..."
So you felt there had been a discrepancy of $£ 4.34$ and you put in an official postage of ten times that, is that right?
A. Yes, but if I can just explain the reason why

I multiplied it by ten: this was something I had noticed before, the label transaction issue, and I reported it using all official channels and nothing was ever done
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and then the fact that it happened again and caused a financial loss --
Q. You just put in official postage?
A. Yes.
Q. And just the final reference, $\{F / 1252.1\}$ is a letter from an Andrew Morley, an internal Post Office letter I think. If we go to the second page of that -- that doesn't look right. It doesn't matter. It is a further document where you mentioned that you were doing this.

When did you start taking official postage in this sort of way?
A. I can't remember.
Q. And I have tried to take you to various entries that I'm aware of where you notified Post Office, but it's right, isn't it, that you didn't notify them on each and every occasion that you were doing that, there was a whole series of $£ 100$ s that were referred to in your interview?
A. Yes, but I knew they were being recorded, so ...

I wasn't informing network business support centre but because I was putting the entry onto the computer I knew that there was a record of it.
Q. Well, it wouldn't be obvious to Post Office whether that was official postage or not, would it, or whether you had just helped yourself to it?
A. I think it would be obvious that it wasn't official

```
Q. All right.
    Nothing further. If you just stay there, Mr Green
    may have some questions.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I assume not for very long, Mr Green.
MR GREEN: Really very short, my Lord.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Yes.
    Re-examination by MR GREEN
MR GREEN:Could you look back at {F/1365} please. This is
    the document you were shown and let's leave aside for
    the moment this is a }2015\mathrm{ version.
A. Yes.
Q. Just park that, because I think you have already made an
    observation about what you did or did not have.
A. Yes.
Q. But at least as at 2015, do you see sort of halfway down
    on the right-hand side there's a print-out?
A. Yes.
Q. Post Office.
A. Yes.
Q. And you come down and it says "Total due to customer:
    102.34".
A. Yes.
Q. And it is in red.
A. Yes.
```
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Q. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. It says:
"You must take care to only settle with the customer
for the amount specified on the receipt ..."
A. Yes.
Q. Is that what you did?
A. Yes.
Q. And when we go to $\{F / 1257.1\}$, which is the Facebook
post -- sorry, the Yahoo! -- the list.
A. Okay.
Q. It was put to you that this whole episode is a good example of Horizon working well.
A. Yes.
Q. And I just wanted to take you through your contemporaneous account of what happened very quickly.
A. Okay.
Q. So you begin:
"Yesterday during HOL failure ..."
A. Yes.
Q. Did you regard that as Horizon working well, when it failed?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And it says:
"Transaction seemed to go through okay apart from

Horizon printing 3 identical receipts."
A. Yes.
Q. Was that what should have happened, three identical receipts, or not?
A. Normally, no, that wouldn't happen.
Q. And then:
"Receipts showed a disconnected session ..."
A. Yes.
Q. Is it meant to have a disconnected session or not?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And then you get total due to customer, 195.04.
A. Yes.
Q. And you hand that over.
A. Yes.
Q. And then it says -- you say that:
"Because receipts showed cash due to customer, we paid out."

Then:
"Come evening balancing till showed approximately £200 loss."
A. Yes.
Q. Was that Horizon working correctly?
A. No.
Q. "Thought at time must be miscount and will try to sort in morning.
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"This morning produced transaction log for the period of HOL FAILURE. No record of 195.04 transaction at all !!!!"
A. No.
Q. Was that Horizon working well?
A. No.
Q. "Phoned helpline and was told by very irate member of staff that loss is mine unless I can sort out with customer directly ..."
A. Yes.
Q. Did you feel that that was a satisfactory response?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. "... apparently there is a message on screen during HOL failure to not pay any money to customer ..."

Is that what you saw, or did you see a message that said "Pay the customer £195"?
A. I cannot remember.
Q. "Asked irate staff to pass call up as I was not a happy bunny, was told she was not going to do this ..."
A. Correct.
Q. Was that what you felt you should reasonably expect?
A. No.
Q. "... only after I asked to speak to contracts manager or somebody from POL press office with regards to speaking to press about my loss was I given a number for

## Chesterfield ."

A. Correct.
Q. Did you think it was appropriate that you should have to make those threats to get the relevant telephone number?
A. No.
Q. "So spoke to POCA lady at Chesterfield who after
pressing a few buttons was able to find transaction ..."
A. Yes.
Q. Did you think it was satisfactory that she could see
a transaction involving your branch that you couldn't
see?
A. No, it wasn't satisfactory .
Q. "She couldn't promise anything ..."

Did you find that satisfactory?
A. No.
Q. "... but will see if she can get a credit TC after she has spoken to Fujitsu??? She took my number and promised to call back after speaking to Fujitsu, being very non-committal about possible loss."

Did you find that a satisfactory response?
A. No.

MR GREEN: My Lord, no further questions.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: No questions from me.
Thank you very much. I'm sorry you had to be asked to leave court for a couple of minutes but sometimes
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these things just happen and it is important that sometimes there's a debate without a witness hearing what it is.

Thank you very much, you are free to go.
We're going to have a short break for the
transcribers and then you are calling your next witness.
MR GREEN: Mr Patny.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Is there any prospect of finishing him today?
MR HENDERSON: I don't think so.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: All right. Are you cross-examining,
Mr Henderson?
MR HENDERSON: Yes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: We will have five minutes until 10 to 4 and then we will run to about half past 4 but if you find a convenient break at or around that time or earlier it's up to you. Right, so until 10 to 4 . Thank you very much.
( 3.44 pm )
(Short Break)
( 3.52 pm )
MR GREEN: My Lord, I am going to call Mr Anup Patny.
MR ANUP PATNY (affirmed)
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Do have a seat.
A. Thank you.

## Examination-in-chief by MR GREEN

MR GREEN: Mr Patny, in front of you is a folder and if you kindly turn to tab 3 of that folder $\{E 1 / 3\}$ you see a document that says "Witness statement of Anup Kumar Patny".
A. Yes.
Q. And if you turn to the third page of that $\{\mathrm{E} 1 / 3 / 3\}$ there's a signature.
A. Yes.
Q. Is that your signature?
A. It is.
Q. And do you believe the contents of your statement to be true?
A. Yes.
Q. Most grateful. Would you just wait there.

Cross-examination by MR HENDERSON
MR HENDERSON: Mr Patny, good afternoon.
A. Good afternoon, sir .
Q. You were subpostmaster in the Spencefield branch for a relatively short time, between October 2014 and August 2016, is that right?
A. Yes, sir .
Q. And you ran a retail business from the same premises?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Are you still running that?
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## A. Yes, sir.

Q. And can you just describe what the set-up was when you had the Post Office there?
A. Well, it's a single-counter Post Office. Well, it came within my branch counter. We had two tills before for the counter but we took one out for post office side and retail side there's one counter for retail and one counter for the post office.
Q. Okay. And it may sound like a silly question, but what else do you sell in the newsagent? It is it just papers and cigarettes and so forth?
A. Yes, newspapers -- mainly it is high in home news deliveries and cigarettes and cards, stationary, et cetera.
Q. How many other people work in the shop? We obviously know about you and your son?
A. Yes, my wife, she ran -- she worked in the retail and she worked in the post office as well, with one other assistant.
Q. Okay, so four of you in total?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. So there was a separate post office counter in the branch, is that right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And how does that work from a practical point of view?

If someone wants to buy something from the newsagent and do something at the post office counter as well, how do you sort that?
A. Well, most of the time there's one person allocated to the post office. In the morning there's two people, in the afternoon there's two people as well. I am there floating to serve on the counter both sides. My wife, she was there for the same reason as well. So whenever somebody required, you know -- if my wife is like serving on the post office side I would hop onto the retail side and vice versa because there's two different queues we had for post office queue and for retail queue.
Q. And what if someone comes in and wants to buy a newspaper and some cards and do something at the post office counter as well, how does that work?
A. Well, they will have to go to the post office queue afterwards or beforehand.
Q. Right. Now, you tell us in your witness statement that you remmed in cash on 11 May 2016, I think.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. But your son undertook a balance on that same day, on 11 May. Do you remember that?
A. Yes, sir .
Q. And I want to ask you some questions about both of those
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activities, but first of all, was that your usual practice, was it you that would rem the cash in and your son who would carry out what you call the balancing exercise?
A. Most of the time, because me and my wife normally came in in the morning. The cash normally came in just before 12 o'clock. That would come in, I would check the cash, rem in and then put it safe in the safe and then my son would come in just in the afternoon and take it from us.
Q. And he would do the balancing at the end of the day?
A. At the end of the day or every Wednesday, yes.
Q. And when you do the balancing, presumably it's not uncommon that there's some sort of discrepancy between the cash that Horizon expects you to have, for example, and the cash you have actually got?
A. Well, it happens sometimes.
Q. Sure. And I'm just interested in how you reacted if you found that there was a discrepancy. If it was just a few pence or a few pounds would you just make up that difference from your own pocket?
A. Well, under normal circumstances, yes, so if it is a few pounds or few pence, yes.
Q. And if it was more than that, say $£ 40, £ 50, £ 60$ or above, would you investigate it?
A. Yes.
Q. And raise it with Post Office?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

Now, I want to start off by asking you some
questions about an outage that took place on 9 May 2016.
Do you recall that?
A. Yes.
Q. This was a Horizon system outage, wasn't it, it wasn't a power cut to your ...?
A. No, it was a Horizon outage.
Q. Can you recall how long it went on for?
A. To my memory I think it is just over an hour.
Q. Okay. And do you recall what you were doing at the time of the outage?
A. Well, it was my wife -- she was serving on the post office counter and the screen went black and we couldn't do anything to the system. I think I have had a customer come in saying that the post office down the road -- it's a mile away from there -- they are having problems. We thought nothing of it. I tried to ring the helpline, couldn't go through, and found out later on there was an outage.
Q. And you tell us you closed the branch at that time?
A. The branch was closed all that time, yes.
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Q. We can see evidence of this outage if we go to \{F/1834.3\}.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: You might need the other tab.
MR HENDERSON: Yes, I do need the other tab. If you go to row 47. If you just highlight row 47.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Can you see that okay, Mr Patny?
A. Yes.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Because we can change the view. Can we go to "View" in the top task bar please and just increase the magnification. That might work a little bit better, Mr Henderson. Can you work from that?
MR HENDERSON: Yes. It may mean going along a bit but that's okay.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Row 47.
MR HENDERSON: So row 47, do you see that highlighted, Mr Patny?
A. I can see that.
Q. So that's at 8.22 and if we scroll right so we see the full column at H . So "No recovery required", so this is what tells Post Office that there has been an outage --
A. Okay.
Q. -- and you are logging back in. Do you see that? And it says that no recovery procedure was required. That suggests that there were no particular problems caused by the outage as far as your session was concerned. Do

```
you see that?
A. I don't know.
Q. Well, what was going on -- what Ms van den Bogerd's evidence is is if you look at -- you don't need to move the screen, but if you look at row 42 and row 45 , what was going on at the time of the outage was that there were two postage labels to be printed and that they were printed, but it is possible that the transaction was interrupted before it could be completed. Do you see those entries?
A. \(\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hm}\), yes sir.
Q. So as far as this data is concerned, the worst case scenario that could have occurred as a result of this outage is that the labels might have been handed over and payment taken in cash -- because the PIN pad won't work when the Horizon terminal isn't working -- without following the correct recovery process and what that would result in is a small surplus of cash, not a shortage. Do you accept that?
A. It looks that way, yes.
Q. Okay. But what this doesn't in any way suggest is that the outage could have given rise to a discrepancy of \(£ 17,000\) or so, which is what I think you believe happened?
A. Well, at this stage we didn't have the rem ins.
```

$$
169
$$

Q. No, I'm so sorry. The rem ins -- this is the 9 May, this is before the rems.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay? We're just looking at the outage on 9 May at the moment.
A. Yes.
Q. There's nothing in this data to suggest that at this point it could possibly have caused a discrepancy of $£ 17,000$. Do you see that?
A. I can see that there, yes.
Q. Now, you say in your evidence that you rang the helpline and I think you said a moment ago in answer to a question that you didn't manage to get through to the helpline, is that right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. I don't think that's explained in your witness statement, but that's fine, we can agree on that.

But your position as I understand it is that this outage was responsible in some way for a shortfall of $£ 17,000$, is that right?
A. Might have been.
Q. Might have been or was?
A. Well, there's no other argument for that. I mean never had a shortage before like, you know, all --
Q. Okay, well, let's have a look at it. I mean first of
all, do you agree that if it was the outage on 9 May that caused a shortfall of $£ 17,000$, you would expect that to show up on that day?
A. I think so, yes.
Q. Let's have a look at the event data spreadsheet at 1507.1 \{F/1507.1\}.

This is one where we will need to enable editing and then remove the filter . Then if you could go to row -if you go in the top left -hand corner if you just type in D13904. If you can bring that row up to the top of the screen.

This shows the cash declaration at the end of 9 May 2016. Do you see that, the cash declaration for a total of $£ 48,021$ ?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And below that it says that there is a discrepancy of £1,138.21.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. So do you accept then that the outage that happened earlier in that day could not have been responsible for a $£ 17,000$ discrepancy arising?
A. I can't say that.
Q. Well, had it been responsible there would have been a much higher discrepancy shown, wouldn't there, for cash as a result of the declaration; isn't that right?
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A. Could be.
Q. Well, it would be, wouldn't it?
A. I can't say that. I don't know.
Q. Well, let's look at the same document but the cash declaration for 11 May, two days later. That's at 14515.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Row?
MR HENDERSON: Row -- yes, 14515.
So on 11 May, two days later -- this is I think when your son did the balance --
A. Yes, sir.
Q. This is just the daily cash declaration and we see there a cash total of $£ 71,000$-odd and a discrepancy there of 17,339.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And then when your son called the helpline on 11 May -and we see that at $\{\mathrm{F} / 1522.1\}$, row 136 . So if you again enable editing and if you could bring that up to the top.

So this is 11 May 2016, so the same date that we have just been looking at for the cash discrepancy and if you could go across to column N :
"Doing BP and got a shortage in cash $£ 17,000$. Had a rem in of 46,500 cash, 16,000 coin."

That column is what's used by the help desk operator
to report what is said when someone rings up?
A. Yes.
Q. So it looks as though what your son had said was that there had been a rem in of $£ 16,000$ worth of coins?
A. No, as I can remember Aakash came in home that night and he said there was a shortage shown and he had phoned the helpline and they said there has been a rem in of $£ 16,000$ coins and they asked him to do some reversal or something.
Q. Okay. Let's have a look -- if we just go over and look at column V in that same row. So what he was told to do according to this was ask the subpostmaster to make sure only one cash declaration and make sure rem was scanned in correctly. So it seems from this, doesn't it, that the helpline thought that perhaps there had been a problem -- either a problem with declaring the cash, in other words counting it, or some sort of problem remming it in?
A. No, remming in was fine.
Q. Well, let's look at how the discrepancy may actually have arisen. So on 11 May -- let's have a look at \{F/1834.2\}. This is the cash that was remmed in on 11 May, do you see that?
A. I can't see that clearly.
Q. No, okay. And the second row down shows that there was
$£ 16,000$ worth of $£ 10$ notes, do you see that? Do you see the second entry?
A. Yes, I can see that.
Q. Okay, so I think there's $£ 26,000$ worth of $£ 20$ notes, 16,000 of $£ 10,4,500$ of $£ 5,1,000$ of $£ 1$ and then there is coins. So I think the important one is $£ 16,000$ worth of $£ 10$ notes.

Now, it's a bit fiddly this, but bear with me. If we look at $\{F / 1438.1\}$. This is filtered data, all right, so we have put a filter on this just to show the cash that was remmed in to your branch over this period and you can see that there is highlighting on 11 May but there was no cash remmed in on 12 May, the following day. Are you able to recall whether that's right? You have given evidence of the cash that you remmed in on 11 May, all I'm saying is that there was no cash remmed in on 12 May.
A. Well, 11 May -- the cash comes in on a Wednesday, all the time.
Q. Right, okay. So it wouldn't come in any other day?
A. Well, unless it came in by post, if he required some -any time we would ask the ADC and they would send it, like an emergency.
Q. All I'm suggesting to you is that there was cash remmed in on the 11 th and there was no cash remmed in on the

12th, as far as Post Office's records can tell.
A. Okay.
Q. Do you accept that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, if we look at the cash management report for your branch, which is at $\{\mathrm{F} / 1514.1\}$. Actually these relevant rows are highlighted. Do you see the highlighting on rows 383,384 and 385 ?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay.

If you could just scroll right a couple of cells.
Thank you, that's fine.
So the declaration on 10 May -- if you just look at the $£ 10$ note column in column M, do you see that?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. So that's 16,070 .
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Okay. And then we know that you remmed in $£ 16,000$ worth of $£ 10$ notes on 11 May.
A. Yes, sir .
Q. But the 11 May $£ 10$ notes are only 22,130 . So what you would have expected, on 11 May, would be something like $£ 32,000$ of $£ 10$ notes, which is the 16,000 from the 10 th, plus the 16,000 from the 11 th, less any notes that had been paid out in the course of 11 May; do you agree?
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A. Yes, sir.
Q. And in fact, as we can see, there's only $£ 22,130$ worth of $£ 10$ notes, but the cash declarations for the following days in $£ 10$ notes are very much higher: 37,650 and 35,700 . Do you see that?
A. I can see that, yes.
Q. And even though there had been no cash remmed in in that period?
A. Well I think when my son rang the NBSC on that 11 May they asked him to do some adjustments.
Q. Well, what I'm suggesting is that the most natural explanation for this, whatever adjustments were made, is that at some point on 11 May someone hadn't counted a big pile of $£ 10$ notes. They had been put in a safe and forgotten about, which is understandable, and that they were found the next day, or located, and there was an accurate cash declaration on 12 May.
A. I don't know about that, sir .
Q. It's perfectly plausible, isn't it?
A. I can't say anything to that.
Q. Well, the final piece of this little jigsaw is at \{F/1507.1\} and I think you will need to --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: What document is this?
MR HENDERSON: This is going back to the events data showing the cash declarations on 13 May. Now, we saw before
that on 11 May the cash discrepancy was minus $£ 17,000$. Do you remember that? We looked at that a few moments ago?
A. Yes, sir .
Q. And two days later the discrepancy is plus 17,000 , in other words it looks as though it has gone, it has cancelled out. Do you see that?
A. I can see that, sir.
Q. So it's a bit of detective work and it's a bit fiddly and I apologise for that, but doesn't it look overall as though what the problem here was is nothing to do with an outage, it's been a mistake somewhere in the branch, temporary mistake, counting cash and once the cash count was done properly, the problem disappeared?
A. I don't know, sir. I don't think so.
Q. You didn't suffer any loss as a result of this incident, did you?
A. I still think this is because of the adjustments NBSC had asked my son to make. I don't know.
Q. What I'm trying to put to you, I hope fairly, Mr Patny, is your evidence is -- I think your evidence is that there were some sort of problems in Horizon that caused all of these difficulties and all I'm trying to demonstrate to you is that if you go through the various records that are available it looks as though in fact
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there has just been a difficulty with declarations of cash. Do you accept that?
(Pause).
A. I wouldn't know how to answer that.
Q. Well, let's just look at one other document which is \{F/1834.3\}. Again I think we need to minimise it and go to the other tab, sheet 1 , and if you go to row 2336 .

If you look at row H -- well, these are two entries. Row 2336 and 2337 are two entries only seven minutes apart, do you see that? One is at 17.28 and one is at 17.35 , do you see that?
A. Yes, I can see that.
Q. Okay, thank you. Seven minutes apart for the same
sign-on, APA001-- is that you or is that your son?
A. That's me, but it would be my son because that looks like it has been logged on since the afternoon.
Q. So he was using your log on?
A. He was, yes.
Q. Why would he do that?
A. Well, normally between three of us nobody else would go on apart from the three of us, so we didn't really mind, whosoever is logged on we just carried on and continued with it.
Q. If you look there are two cash declarations seven minutes apart, one for $£ 68,000$-odd and one for

## £52,000-odd.

A. Yes, I can see that.
Q. Now, I can also show you -- and my apologies that this is slightly painful in terms of how long it takes, but if we go to $\{F / 1482.1\}$--
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Do you mean within this document or a different document?
MR HENDERSON: No, sorry, a different document, F/1482.1. And we will need to do the tab at the bottom. And if we go to row 4323 , this is the transaction data for the branch. Thank you.

Between those two times that I told you about, those two declarations, if you see 4323 is at 17.28 , there is a single transaction for a $£ 300$ cash withdrawal, do you see that in row 4323 ?
A. Yes, sir .
Q. Okay.

So the picture that emerges, I'm suggesting, Mr Patny, is this, that you've got two cash declarations minutes apart, substantial difference in value, which isn't explained by any transactions. Do you see that?
A. Yes, I can see that.
Q. Okay. What I'm suggesting to you is that things were pretty chaotic in your branch when it comes to these sorts of things. The cash declarations look like they
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are all over the place. Is that a fair observation?
A. Sometimes when you do the cash declaration, say if you wanted to change something for that particular column, you just have to delete that section to put in a new figure. Sometimes what happened is if you carried on adding the digits in, that would take it -- you are thinking that you put the right amount in and just crosses the declaration and that cancelled declaration comes wrong.
Q. I don't understand that, I'm sorry.
A. Like when you declare the cash -- I mean I haven't done that so many times, my son had done it. When you declare the cash, all the coins and notes, you put in the entry how much you got in there. If you see under the declaration, if there's a difference, if you check your balance and everything, if you -- say you counted the cash again and if there's a difference in there and you have to $\log$ on to change to that particular denomination -- the amount of that denomination, if you don't delete that amount and put a new entry in, sometimes what happens is if you put some figure in it just adds onto that figure and you are thinking that you have changed that value and you process it again and then it shows an amount, the difference amount.
Q. Mr Patny, your evidence, as I understand it, is that
your experience of Horizon leads you to conclude that there are bugs in the Horizon system.
A. Well, how else -- I mean these shortages have occurred and there's no explanation to that.
Q. Well, I'm suggesting to you that there's a perfectly sensible explanation, which is that as far as we can see, none of the events that you refer to are consistent with there being a serious problem in Horizon and all of them are consistent with things being pretty chaotic in your branch.
A. But where the cash has gone then?
Q. Are you suggesting that you actually lost this cash?
A. No.

MR HENDERSON: My Lord, I don't have a great deal more, but it is now 4.30.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: I assume you are going to put the detailed points to Mr Patny's son about what he in fact did and was told, are you? On the basis that he was the one who called the helpline and --
MR HENDERSON: Yes, but I mean the records are the records but --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, Mr Henderson, that's not really an answer to my question.
MR HENDERSON: I wasn't intending to repeat cross-examination that I have already done.
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MR JUSTICE FRASER: I didn't interrupt you because obviously this gentleman's log in was used and he is the subpostmaster but I'm not going to have his son cross-examined by proxy through him so you are going to have to put some of these points to his son.
MR HENDERSON: Okay, that's fine.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Do you think you will be longer than five minutes with this ...
MR HENDERSON: Possibly, yes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: All right, I think we will stop until tomorrow.

Right, Mr Patny, this just happens sometimes so don't -- it's not ideal, but you are going to have to come back tomorrow.
A. Okay.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Because you are in the middle of your cross-examination that means you mustn't discuss things connected with the case or your evidence with anyone overnight.
A. Yes, my Lord.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: In your situation that's going to be probably harder because obviously you worked with your wife and your son as well, but please don't discuss your evidence with either of them and come back tomorrow at 10.30 .
A. My Lord.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Is that all right?
A. Yes, sir.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Anything else in terms of the evidence? Don't think so.
MR GREEN: My Lord, there was just one thing that your Lordship asked us for yesterday.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Hold on a second, I can let Mr Patny go.
MR GREEN: I'm sorry.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I can let Mr Patny go.
You can leave the witness box by all means, we have a few bits and pieces to sort out.

Mr Green.

## Housekeeping

MR GREEN: Your Lordship asked whether we had a list of all the branches affected by Callendar Square.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: If you have give me the reference or hand it up rather than read it out.

MR GREEN: What we have is a document which has Callendar Square and some others on it .
MR JUSTICE FRASER: How many are there?
MR GREEN: There are 20 that it records as having been affected and others that reported problems but probably didn't have losses, it says.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Is it on Magnum?
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MR GREEN: It is. It is $\{\mathrm{F} / 322.1\}$ and we don't know whether that's the same list that Mr Godeseth is referring to at \{E2/7/5\}, paragraph 15.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, Mr Godeseth is not being cross-examined until next week.
MR GREEN: Of course.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: So I'm sure Mr De Garr Robinson and Mr Henderson and Mr Draper between them will let you know if it is what he is talking about, if it is not I'm sure they' ll tell you which one he has. But I can now go and have a look at it, all right.

You and Mr De Garr Robinson were going to tell me about your proposals for closings insofar as you had thought about it? Is that right?
MR GREEN: My Lord, yes, I have discussed it with my learned friend --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Just give me some dates if you have agreed them.
MR GREEN: It is the 8th and 9th.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord, yes. My learned friend's team has problems the previous week so he suggested 8 and 9 May.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Can you just remind me --
MR GREEN: It is Wednesday the 8th and Thursday the 9th.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Do those dates work for you,
Mr De Garr Robinson?1
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord, yes. There is one member ofthe team that won't be able to be here but we can closeorally on that basis.MR JUSTICE FRASER: All right. A day each?MR GREEN: My Lord, yes.MR JUSTICE FRASER: Given it is going to be some weeks laterthan initially planned I'm going to ask for the closingsto be submitted somewhat earlier than normal and I willjust have to think about when that's going to be.MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord, I quite understand. I meanI would ask for --MR JUSTICE FRASER: You want as much time as possible ofcourse.MR DE GARR ROBINSON: Your Lordship didn't need me to saythat.( 4.35 pm )20
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[^0]Housekeeping ................................... 183
MR JUSTICE FRASER: No, no, I know you want as much time aspossible and I will try and give you as much time aspossible, but if it is going to be then I will givemyself more than the usual 48 hours to read them.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord of course. ..... 21
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I will of course take that into account. ..... 22
Anything else tonight? No. So we will resume with ..... 23
Mr Patny senior tomorrow and then after him it is ..... 24
Mr Patny -- his son. Thank you all very much. ..... 25 ..... 25
(The court adjourned until 10.30 am on Wednesday, 13 March 2019)
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