

Horizon Compensation Advisory Board
Secretariat: Department for Business and Trade
Old Admiralty Building
London
SW1A 2DY

Nigel Railton
Chair
Post Office
Group CEO
100 Wood Street
London, EC2V 7AN

12 June 2026

Dear Nigel,

Post Office Objections to Appeals Against Convictions

Thank you for your letter dated 28 May received on 9 June.

Colleagues and I have considered carefully the extensive legal argument that you set out. It is not balanced or persuasive and does not change our view.

We remain firmly of the view that:

1. It is just not right, just or fair that the PO should object to these appeals, given that it was the perpetrator of the fundamental injustice that caused this whole scandal, and such harm to victims, both convicted and unconvicted.
2. In corporate governance terms, the conflict of interest for the Post Office is blatant.
3. Given the history of POL as prosecutor to appeals, and its lawyer-informed stances taken on compensation and the quashing of convictions, your lawyers will, rightly in our view, be perceived as lacking the necessary independence and objectivity to advise you wisely.
4. These considerations seem to us powerfully to override any procedural requirements in standard appeal cases, where an investigating and prosecuting authority did not cause the originating injustice.
5. The cases have been considered and investigated independently by CCRC, which concluded that there is a clear case that the convictions are unsafe.
6. The decisions are up to the Court of Appeal. Should it feel in need of assistance in deciding the appeals, it can no doubt arrange this independently.

Given our firm views, we do not see much point in meeting, but would be content to do so at our next meeting on 30 June if you wish.

Yours sincerely,

Christopher Hodges

Christopher Hodges OBE PhD MA FSALS FRSA
Emeritus Professor of Justice Systems, Centre for Socio-Legal Studies, University of Oxford
Chair, Horizon Compensation Advisory Board