

CKFT SOLICITORS

Our ref: AS/17/steel
Your ref: L.M.eh.R360/1

Direct tel: 020 7317 8756
Direct fax: 020 7317 8751

e-mail: asalim@ckft.com

Ayesha Salim

Piper Smith & Basham
DX 110 Chancery Lane

LYING, SATANIC CRIMINAL VERMIN See OVERVIEW and EXTORTION

BY DX & FAX 020 7630 6976

WITHOUT PREJUDICE CLAIMANT'S PART 36 OFFER

21 October 2003

Note that, 6 months BEFORE the 15.07.02 (TOTALLY UNSUPPORTED) demand of £736,200 (US\$882,000) - in her 21.12.01 letter to the Jefferson House leaseholders, Joan Hathaway, MRICS, MRJ, wrote: "We have to state that the sum quoted may be exceeded due to disbursements but these will be of a minor nature. Sufficient funds are held to cover the cost of the works within the Reserve Fund"

Dear Sirs

Your Client: Noelle K Dit Rawe
Our Client: Steel Services Limited

Our client maintains that, as a result of the LVT decision dated 17th June 2003, it is entitled to payment from your client of the sum of £10,917.27, as set out in the revised major works apportionment dated 24th June 2003, issued by Messrs Martin Russell Jones.

Your client's decision to challenge both the LVT decision and to continue to defend these proceedings is her own. Her decision to do so has caused inconvenience and expense to all the lessees of the building. Our client can bear the expense and inconvenience but insists that the major works must begin without any further delay so as to avoid any prejudice to other lessees and residents of the building who have, quite rightly, paid their apportioned liability. !!

Who were BULLIED into paying an amount they DID NOT owe

With that in mind, and without any admission whatsoever, our client has, once again, reviewed the revised apportionment dated 24th June 2003.

A copy of the Kilby & Gayford specification is attached and we set out below details of the concessions our client is prepared to make:-

CROOKS!

Page 16: Our client is prepared to deduct the figure of £22,365.00 (relating to central heating) in its entirety for the purpose of calculating your client's liability.

Page 17: Our client is prepared to deduct the figure of £300.00 at item 16.13 (relating to mechanical ventilation for the purpose of calculating your client's liability.

Page 18: Our client is prepared to deduct the figure of £17,975.00 at item 16.15 (relating to heating) for the purpose of calculating your client's liability.

Finally, our client is also prepared notionally to utilise the reserve fund to reduce the total figure and, accordingly, your client's apportioned liability.

see MRJ letter of 7 June 2001 to the leaseholders stating that the fund WOULD be used - as it should be - see LVT point 59, pg 12 "Notionally" = Ladsky did NOT take it into account for my fellow leaseholders

Cawdery Kaye Fireman & Taylor | 25 - 26 Hampstead High Street | London NW3 1QA
Tel: 020 7431 7262 | Fax: 020 7431 7261 | DX: 57567 Hampstead | e-mail: law@ckft.com | www.ckft.com

Partners: Graham Kaye | Daniel Fireman | Simon Taylor | Lanny Silverstone | Joel Leigh | Adam Taylor | Pamela Collis | Adam Blain | Sarah Futerman | Miles Geffin | Iain Roden

LIE. I did NOT. Ladsky DID. Re. challenging HIS application to the LVT - see p64, last pg of report: I HAD THE LEGAL RIGHT TO DO THIS - but it did not suit him

Another LIE, as the amount was the same at 24 June 03

21 October 2003

CKFT

2

Accordingly, the without prejudice reduced figures are as set out below:-

Page 1:	£13,666.00	
Page 2:	£12,140.00	
Page 3:	£25,523.00	
Page 4:	£ 3,924.00	
Page 5:	£ 2,397.00	
Page 6:	£13,340.00	
Page 7:	£ 1,080.00	
Page 8:	£30,534.00	
Page 9:	£22,147.00	
Page 10:	£ 1,852.00	
Page 11:	£ 2,328.00	
Page 12:	£28,888.00	
Page 13:	£ 5,076.00	
Page 14:	£ 2,645.00	
Page 15:	£ 0.00	
Page 16:	£12,350.00	
Page 17:	£ 7,560.00	
Page 18:	£47,361.00	
Page 19:	£ 0.00	
Page 20:	<u>£35,607.50</u>	
		£268,418.50
Contingency:		£ 50,000.00
Preliminaries:		£ 40,000.00
Vat:		£ 62,260.36
Fees & Vat:		<u>£ 45,983.72</u>
		£466,662.58
		<u>£141,977.00</u>
		<u>£324,685.58</u>
Less Reserve Fund:		

It opted to include the contingency fund allowance, in spite of:

Having previously argued (Silverstone's 7 August 2003 letter) against the tribunal's view (point 59 of the 17 June 2003 LVT report) that its client was under no obligation to use the contingency fund

I believe the reason it did this was because I had flagged-up the 7 June 2001 letter from Joan Hathaway, MRICS, Martin Russell Jones, in which she specifically stated that the contingency fund would be used as contribution

As explained in the section on CKFT - it-its client and his other racketeering 'puppet', Martin Russell Jones did NOT take the contingency fund into account for - at least - the majority of the other leaseholders (as the majority ended-up paying the full amount demanded 'by' Joan Hathaway in 'her' 15.07.02 letter)

= IT AMOUNTS TO A £500,000+ FRAUD.

After applying your client's percentage (1.956%), this leaves your client with a liability of £6,350.85 plus interest (of which £2,255.07 was paid on 10 September 2003).

!! We calculate interest on the reduced without prejudice sums as follows:-

25th June 2003 – 9th September 2003 (76 days): interest at a rate of 8% per annum on the full balance of £6,350.85 which is: £105.79

10th September 2003 – 22nd October 2003 (42 days): interest at a rate of 8% per annum on the reduced balance of £4,095.78 which is £37.70

Accordingly, this proposal is that our client shall accept the sum of £6,494.34 inclusive of interest as at the date of this letter (although interest continues to accrue at the daily rate of £0.90). Our client's proposal in relation to costs is that each party bear its own costs.

This offer is made pursuant to Part 36 of the Civil Procedure Rules and shall remain open for 21 days from the date of receipt after which time the offer shall automatically lapse. If the offer is

NOT TRUE: This 'offer', which in fact was a 'pre-action' offer (the LVT report had NOT been implemented) was NOT compliant with CPR Rules as defined by Lord Woolf's in e.g. Ford v GKR Construction Ltd [2000] 1 All ER 802 - as I was NOT supplied with the information necessary for me to assess it.

21 October 2003

CKFT

3

rejected and your client is held liable at the trial of this matter for a greater sum, it would be our client's intention to rely on the provisions of CPR Rule 36.21.



We look forward to hearing from you.

The ORGANISED CRIME MAFIA scare tactics - reinforced by my 'advisor' Lisa McLean, Piper Smith Basham - who was batting for Andrew Ladsky

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'CKFT', is written over a printed name 'CKFT'.

enc