

BEFOREWORD / KEEPING TEXT IN ITS PLACE

ONE CLAIM. A SEPARATE ANALYSIS.

“Document”, “evidence”, and “analysis” enter first as written forms. Use the form to place the wording under examination beside the source passage and a proposed reading. State a specific aim: to clarify a condition, attribution to a participant, agreement, or a status under a rule. The outcome may be an amendment or an explanation of wording retained.

Five principles

1. A word does not become what it names. This applies to every explanation in the form, including “text”, “assessment”, “analysis”, and “boundary”. Labels neither perform nor certify the work they name.
2. Reproduce the source passage accurately. Record translation, summary, and a reading of a connector as a reason, condition, or concession separately; do not insert them into the quotation.
3. Place passages that support, qualify, or question the proposed condition alongside it. Retain their dates, versions, and scope.
4. A claim’s written form does not make it false. Absence of a passage from the selection is not recorded as absence throughout the case. A claim of error is examined through specific passages.
5. After comparison, state the proposed amendment and its basis. If no amendment is proposed, retain the passages examined and the explanation. A further passage may require either outcome to be reconsidered.

For an individual dispute, also identify the materials, applicable provisions, and action sought. Completing the form does not determine the material’s judicial weight, replace procedural requirements, or guarantee an outcome.

BEFOREWORD / KEEPING TEXT IN ITS PLACE

EIGHT FIELDS FOR ONE CLAIM

Each field concerns one formulation under examination. Label quotation, translation, summary, and explanation separately. Completing the fields does not assume in advance that the original wording is wrong or requires replacement.

Field	What to record
1 · Scope and disputed wording	Identify the document, date or version, selected scope, and complete wording under examination.
2 · Source passage	Supply the source wording, boundaries, page or paragraph, and link. Place any translation separately.
3 · Label and added statement	Place the source label beside the formulation proposed in reading it.
4 · Written connector	Reproduce the source connector. State separately the connection proposed in reading it.
5 · Stated condition	Identify the condition on the conclusion and its location. Label any condition proposed by the analysis.
6 · Passages compared	Supply the passages compared, their dates and versions, and an account of their relation to the question.
7 · Limits of the selection	List what is included and the selection's limits. Do not use these as an account of the whole case.
8 · Amendment and limited outcome	Record a proposed amendment or explain why none is proposed. State what would require reconsideration.

The outcome explains what is affected: the claim's scope, condition, attribution, or timing. A difference in wording alone does not determine whether revision is needed. Use separate cards for distinct claims.

WORKED EXAMPLE: SELECTION AND DEBT ACCEPTANCE

1 • Scope and disputed wording

The selection is an item in the debt-recovery section of Rod Ismay's Horizon — Response to Challenges Regarding Systems Integrity, dated 2 August 2010, p. 9. The issue is reading selection as agreement with the amount. "The subpostmaster agreed with the amount" formulates that reading here; it is not a quotation from the report. [4, PDF p. 9]

2 • Source passage

Source extract • [4] • p. 9

Acceptance of debt by the branch - branches do actively choose options in Horizon

"Debt Recovery" section: complete item on acceptance of debt.

3 • Label and added statement

The item contains Acceptance of debt and actively choose options. The first is proposed as a debt-acceptance label, the second as an account of selection. A claim that the amount was agreed to be correct adds a particular reading of acceptance. A status under a contractual rule is examined separately through the passage about the rule and its conditions.

4 • Written connector

A dash separates the item's parts. The proposal here is to read the second part as a basis for the first. This explains a proposed function of the dash; it adds no words to the source. Keep the report item and proposed reading separate in the next record.

THE SAME EXAMPLE: CONDITION AND OUTCOME

5 • Stated condition

Page 5 is summarised as follows: a period is closed by paying cash or passing the amount to central debt handling. This is proposed as a condition on selecting a prescribed operation. A reading of selection as agreement with the amount is examined through a separate passage addressing that agreement. [4, PDF p. 5]

6 • Passages compared

Hamilton paragraphs 21–22 describe demands to cover shortfalls even when disputed; paragraph 24 discusses the Ismay report. These passages are compared with the debt-acceptance item to examine the distinction between payment and agreement. The 2021 judicial account is not used as a log of an individual subpostmaster's actions in 2010. [7, paragraphs 21–24]

7 • Limits of the selection

The selection includes the report item, the period-closure summary, and the cited judgment paragraphs. It includes no individual selection log, statement of agreement, or record applying a specific contractual provision. Their absence from the whole case does not follow. The item's connection to an individual conviction is not reconstructed here.

8 • Amendment and limited outcome

Proposed wording: the report names debt acceptance and describes selection of options. Reading selection as agreement with the amount calls for a separate passage about agreement; a status under a rule calls for the rule, its conditions, and a record of application. That status is not renamed voluntary agreement.

The amendment concerns the summary and establishes neither a debt nor its absence. If a statement, rule, or record of application is added, identify what changes in the proposed wording. If a further comparison leads to no amendment, explain the wording retained.

CONDITIONS AN AMENDMENT MUST RETAIN

Display and loss

SOURCE SUMMARY AND PROPOSED READING

The Receipts/Payments Mismatch notes are summarised as follows: a discrepancy disappears from the branch display while remaining in another accounting view; a loss or gain is possible. Retain both accounts in the next explanation. Do not rewrite the absence of a displayed discrepancy as absence of an actual loss. [6, PDF pp. 1–3]

The second option is summarised as proposing recovery or a refund, with an explanation, although the branch display shows no discrepancy. Retain its position among the options. No separate record of implementation is supplied here; a connection to an individual case amount would require relevant material. [6, PDF p. 3]

Login and attributed authorship

The Ismay report is read as connecting branch-level entry with a conclusion about accounting ownership. Hamilton paragraph 49 recounts Fraser J's findings about Fujitsu changes that could appear to be the subpostmaster's actions. Compare these accounts of capabilities while retaining dates and versions; this does not establish that an intervention occurred in a particular account. [4, PDF p. 1; 7, paragraph 49]

Proposal and completion

When discussing a proposed review, retain its task, materials, and limits. Present the report's reasons separately from the judgment's discussion. "Independent" and "sufficient" do not replace the substance of an examination, and the general principle about written form is no instruction to abandon review. [4, PDF pp. 19–20; 7, paragraph 24]

APPLICATION TO AN INDIVIDUAL DISPUTE

Conditional example: if confirmation of an operation is presented as agreement with an amount, the next record aims to clarify whether agreement or a status under a rule is attributed. Complete the card from the dispute's materials; no document, jurisdiction, or outcome is assumed.

Fields 1 and 2 contain the wording under examination and the record it cites. Fields 3 and 4 examine the connection between the account of an operation and the agreement attributed to it. Fields 5 and 6 give interface conditions or rules and relevant passages. Field 7 lists what is included.

A possible field 8 entry: "The passage is read as describing confirmation of an operation. Reading confirmation as agreement with the amount calls for a passage about agreement; a status under a rule calls for the rule, its conditions, and a record of application. That status is not renamed voluntary agreement." Revise this wording to fit the case material. If no amendment is proposed, explain why.

A procedural submission separately identifies the material's relevance, applicable requirements, and action sought. Written form does not, by itself, invalidate legal force, dispense with expert examination, or establish that the circumstances described are absent. The analysis form prescribes no outcome for a court.

Scope and citation

Selected passages and material context are reproduced; complete archives need not accompany each analysis. Citation: Shebetov, K. Keeping Text in Its Place: Wording, Connections, and Status Attribution. A Source-Based Study of Horizon. beforeword, 23 September 2026. Identify the section or paragraph used.

Sources

[4] **POL00026572** · postofficehorizoninquiry.org.uk

[6] **FUJ00081584** · postofficehorizoninquiry.org.uk

[7] [2021] **EWCA Crim 577** · caselaw.nationalarchives.gov.uk

The full study, completed analysis cards, and sources are included in this package.

BEFOREWORD / KEEPING TEXT IN ITS PLACE

CLAIM CARD

THE SOURCE RECORD

Document title, date or version: _____ Claim under
review: _____

1 • Scope and disputed wording

2 • Source passage

3 • Label and added statement

4 • Written connector

Keep the original, translation, and explanation separate. The same card continues on the next page.

BEFOREWORD / KEEPING TEXT IN ITS PLACE

CLAIM CARD CONDITION AND AMENDMENT

Document title, date or version: _____ Continuation of the same card.

5 • Stated condition

6 • Passages compared

7 • Limits of the selection

8 • Amendment and limited outcome

In field 8, record the proposed amendment, its scope, and what would require reconsideration. If no amendment is proposed, identify the passages compared and explain why. Keep quotation, summary, and proposed wording separate.