



EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS
COUR EUROPÉENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME

Overall outcome of this unlawful rejection of my legitimate 26.01.12 Application (see my attached comments in this pack):
 - I continue to be subjected to ongoing criminal treatment by the British State (e.g. **My Diary**);
 - Some 1,100 hours of my life, and over £500 in costs: down the drain (e.g. **Doc library # 1.14**)

(Took delivery on 28 Jun 12,
Was not in PO Box on 12 Jun)

Ms Noëlle Klosterkötter-Dit-Rawé

ECHR-LE11.00 Decision Letter.R (CD10)
PHA/shu

6 June 2012

(Posted on 9 Jun.)

Application no. 11632/12
Klosterkötter-Dit-Rawé v. the United Kingdom

Dear Madam,

= Sir Nicolas Bratza, then president of the ECtHR- and probably et.al. in the **British Jewish-Freemason Brotherhood** (Persecution # 6) who found a compliant judge from the small island of **Malta - Overview # 18**

I write to inform you that on 30 May 2012 the European Court of Human Rights, **sitting in a single-judge formation (V.A. De Gaetano** assisted by a rapporteur in accordance with Article 24 § 2 of the Convention), **decided to declare inadmissible your application** lodged on **26 January 2012** and registered under the above-mentioned number.

In the light of all the material in its possession, and in so far as the matters complained of were within its competence, the **Court found that the admissibility criteria set out in Articles 34 and 35 of the Convention have not been met.**

This decision is final. It is not subject to an appeal either to the Grand Chamber or to any other body. The Registry is unable to provide you with any further details concerning the Single Judge's decision. Consequently, you will not receive any further correspondence from the Court in connection with this case. In accordance with the Court's instructions, the file will be destroyed one year after the date of the Single Judge's decision.

The present communication is made pursuant to Rule 52A of the Rules of Court.

Yours faithfully,
For the Court

u z

Paul Harvey = British
Legal Secretary

EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS
COUR EUROPÉENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME



ECONOMIQUE
ECONOMY

AUTORISATION
99001

99 PARIS INTER

09.06.12

DGM

PORT
PAYE
France

F-67075 Strasbourg cedex



See 2. ECtHR(1) for my
comments

EC

AU

Returns (LP)
PO Box 4025
SLOUGH
SL1 0NJ

UKMail
express parcels & mail



F-67075 Strasbourg cedex

LK1V2 741971225

The 06.06.12 letter from the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) (NB: As per the [28.02.12](#) letter, it is signed by 'Paul Harvey, Legal Secretary'; I conclude from the name that he is British) – states:

“I write to inform you that on 30 May 2012 the European Court of Human Rights, sitting in a single-judge formation (V.A. De Gaetano [()] assisted by a rapporteur in accordance with Article 24(2) of the Convention) ¹, decided to declare inadmissible your application lodged on [26 January 2012](#) and registered under the above-mentioned number.*

In the light of all the material in its possession, and in so far as the matters complained of were within its competence, the Court found that the admissibility criteria set out in Articles 34 and 35 of the Convention have not been met”.

(*) Vincent A. De Gaetano is a Judge from Malta – as can be seen on the [ECtHR’s website \(copy of entry\)](#)

WHY has my Application been declared “inadmissible”? NO REASON given.

FAILURE to state the reason/s amounts to a BREACH of [Article 45 of the Convention](#): **“Reasons shall be given for judgments as well as for decisions declaring applications admissible or inadmissible”.**

It is certainly the minimum a complainant is entitled to expect from a Body, there to ensure compliance with the Convention’s rights – including treating individuals with dignity ([Article 3 of the Convention](#)). **How Article 45 translates in practice:** example from Appendix 15 of (my ‘bible’), Taking a Case to the European Court of Human Rights, Philip Leach, 3rd Ed, Oxford University Press: “The Court found that the right relied on was not a right included in the rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Convention. Accordingly, the application was incompatible *ratione materiae* with the provisions of the Convention, within the meaning of Article 35(3)”.

‘The conclusion’ to be drawn from the assertion that “[Judge De Gaetano has determined that my Application] *does not meet the admissibility criteria set out in Articles 34 and 35*” – **is that [my Application](#) FAILS to meet EACH and EVERY ONE of the criteria under these Articles.**

In relation to Articles 34 and 35, **I count a total of 16 potential criteria for rejection** – and deal with them in turn.

ARTICLE 34 – Individual applications

“The Court may receive applications from any person, non-governmental organisations or group of individuals claiming to be the victim of a violation by one of the High Contracting Parties of the rights set forth in the Convention or the Protocol thereto. The High Contracting Parties undertake not to hinder in any way the effective exercise of this right”

1. ‘I’, ‘the victim of the violations’, HAVE made the Application.
2. The violations of the rights I am complaining of ARE contained in the Convention: I specifically cited them in [my Application](#) – also stating *exactly* where I raised them in [my](#)

¹ [Article 24\(2\) of the Convention](#), states: “When sitting in a single-judge formation, the court shall be assisted by rapporteurs who shall function under the authority of the President of the Court”.

[19.04.11 Claim](#) and subsequent documents filed in the [Queen's Bench Division](#) (as well as served). Further, I support my claims by quoting from decisions from the ECtHR.

3. The United Kingdom (UK) IS a Contracting Party to the rights in relation to which I claim a violation as, not only have I checked that it was, there are decisions by the ECtHR in relation to the UK which concern these rights (and I cite some examples in my Application).

Hence, the assertion that “[my Application] does not meet the admissibility criteria set out in Article 34” - is FALSE.

ARTICLE 35 – Admissibility criteria

“1. The Court may only deal with the matter after all domestic remedies have been exhausted, according to the generally recognised rules of international law, and within a period of six months from the date on which the final decision was taken”

“2. The Court shall not deal with any application submitted under Article 34 that

(a) is anonymous; or

(b) is substantially the same as a matter that has already been examined by the Court or has already been submitted to another procedure of international investigation or settlement and contains no relevant new information”.

“3. The Court shall declare inadmissible any individual application submitted under Article 34 if it considers that:

(a) the application is incompatible with the provisions of the Convention or the Protocols thereto, manifestly ill-founded, or an abuse of the right of individual application; or

(b) the applicant has not suffered a significant disadvantage, unless respect for human rights as defined in the Convention and the Protocols thereto requires an examination of the application on the merits and provided that no case may be rejected on this ground which has not been duly considered by a domestic tribunal”

“4. The Court shall reject any application which it considers inadmissible under this Article. It may do so at any stage of the proceedings”.

4. **Para.1** - Under 2. Section II, 2.4 of [my Application](#), I discussed my [19 Apr 11 Claim](#) by referring to the documents: pre-action stage, post filing, including my Appeal Application and the Orders that rejected it. Under 4. Section IV, I discussed the Orders – and reproduced them - as well as my Appeal Application, and subsequent document.

In the last paragraph (para.356) I stated: ***“I have now exhausted the domestic remedies (Article 35(1) of the European Convention) as CPR Rule 52.16(7) states: “Section 54(6) of the Supreme Court Act 1981 provides that there is no appeal from the decision of a single judge on an application for permission to appeal”***”.

It is therefore glaringly obvious from what I reported, that I COMPLIED with the domestic procedural rules, including the deadlines - and went through ALL the stages that qualify as “[having] exhausted all the domestic remedies”.

5. **Para.1** - Likewise, it is abundantly clear that in my [19.04.11](#) Claim, and in my subsequent documents [filed in court](#), that I RAISED the violations of my Human Rights – by specifying them – thereby giving the domestic court the opportunity to consider my claims.
6. **Para.1** – Very clearly, my Application WAS within the ‘6-month’ period. The period starts from the time of the last decision: in my case, [24 Oct 11](#). As stated in the 06.06.12 letter, [my Application](#) was “*lodged on 26th January 2012*”. (It was posted on that day, and delivered the following day). Hence, just 3 months after the final decision.
7. **Para.2(a)** - As evidenced by my Application: it is NOT anonymous.
8. **Para.2(b)** - As I answered to Q20 on the [Application form](#), “*Have you submitted the above complaints to any other procedure of international investigation or settlement? If so, give full details*”: “NO, I HAVE NOT”.
9. **Para.3(a)** – re “*compatibility with the provisions of the Convention or the Protocols*” – which has [4 aspects](#):
10. (i) my complaint IS about violations that have occurred within the jurisdiction of the UK (*ratione loci*);
11. (ii) my complaint concerns rights that ARE protected by the Convention (*ratione materiae*);
12. (iii) the violations of the rights I complained about HAVE been ratified by the UK (*ratione temporis*);
13. (iv) my complaint relates to violations of my rights BY State parties (*ratione personae*).
14. **Para.3(a)** - re “*manifestly ill-founded or an abuse of the right of individual application*” – when you look at ALL the evidence I supplied in support of [my Application](#) ([bundle of documents](#)), you would have to be brain-dead to conclude that my Application falls into these categories.

(To this I add the following: **(1)** My Application *complies* with the requirements of [Court ‘Rule 47– Contents of individual application’](#), and its [Practice Direction, under ‘I-General’ and ‘II-Form and contents’](#) – including providing a summary in my [26.01.12 covering letter](#); **(2)** the - **non-existence** - of other factors that could lead to an application being rejected e.g. ‘falsifying documents’; ‘wilfully withholding relevant information from the Court’).

15. **Para.3(b)** – Ditto re. “*suffering a significant disadvantage*” e.g. DENYING me the right to defend myself against TOTALLY UNSUPPORTED, FALSE accusations (NB: the police, as well as Master Eyre, attempted to create ‘evidence’ in support of a KEY false accusation – see [QB # 4\(6\) under Reason 3\(3\)](#)), and concurrent criminal charges held against me by [Her Majesty’s police in “crime reports”](#) - that FALSELY and MALICIOUSLY portray me as:
 - “*a Nazi*”, “*anti-Semite*”, waging some kind of “*racist*” vendetta against “my” ‘poor’ “*Jewish*” “*neighbour*” (!!!) [Andrew David Ladsky](#) – thereby portraying him as ‘the victim’ and me as ‘the criminal’ - when [the glaringly obvious reverse IS the case](#) – and actually stating this in the [2007 “crime report”](#): that “*the victim*”, Ladsky feels “*intimidated*” ‘by me’ (!!!), as well as “*vulnerable*” (Consider these claims against e.g. the snapshots under [Advisors to Jefferson House](#), and under [Extortion](#) – of what [Ladsky, as well as his evil gang of racketeers](#) – under his instructions – have done against me [since 2002](#));
 - an individual who “*suffers from mental issues*” ‘leading’ [Her Majesty’s police](#) to “*contact social services*”;

- an individual who defaults on her contractual obligations ([2003](#), [2007](#)).

Further:

- *on the day* of the so-called 'complaint' - sealing the "*crime report*" with the claim of having "[No suspicion of false reporting](#)" – when the police FAILED to contact me at ANY point in time ([police # 3](#));
- (also in breach of my rights under the [Data Protection Act 1998](#)), refusing to provide me with the contact details of organisations, such as "[social services](#)" to whom the police has supplied data about me – as well as withholding from me, no doubt, even far more damaging data than what it has deemed 'I was entitled to see';
- making the data available to a very wide range of parties, and having a policy of holding on to it until the individual reaches 100 years of age ([police # 5.5](#)).

[Article 27\(1\) of the Convention](#) (and [Court Rule 52A](#)) state: "A single judge may declare inadmissible... an application submitted under Article 34, where such a decision can be taken without further examination".

How can Judge Vincent A. De Gaetano who, on taking office, pursuant to [Rule 3](#) of the Court, made the following declaration: "***I swear***" or "***I solemnly declare***" – "***that I will exercise my functions as a judge honourably, independently and impartially***" – hold the view that my Application could be "*dismissed without further consideration*"? ⁽²⁾

How many individuals in the English police and courts and in the ECtHR – if they had the above done in relation to them - would not see it as "suffering a significant disadvantage"? The obvious answer is: NONE. It is a certainty that they would raise hell, scream outrage from the rooftops, and fight tooth and nail for justice and redress ⁽³⁾.

16. [Para.3\(b\)](#) – While some of my claims of violations of my rights e.g. in relation to the processing of false, damaging data in the "*crime reports*" have entailed the ECtHR looking at similar violations (indeed, I cited some examples in [my Application](#)) the point is that MY RIGHTS CONTINUE to be violated – because [the police](#), followed by the [domestic court](#) have FAILED to take action. **Hence, the violations of my rights have NOT "been duly considered by a domestic court"** – as glaringly obvious from what I report in my Application. Consequently, I HAVE been DENIED JUSTICE AND REDRESS – and CONTINUE TO BE DENIED JUSTICE AND REDRESS.

Hence, in the light of the above, I, likewise, contend that the assertion that "[my Application] does not meet the admissibility criteria set out under Article 35" - is FALSE.

² From the Court's '[Resolution on Judicial Ethics](#)' (28 Jun 08): "***I-Independence***: In the exercise of their judicial functions, judges shall be independent of all external authority or influence". "***II-Impartiality***: Judges shall exercise their function impartially and ensure the appearance of impartiality...". "***III-Integrity***: Judges' conduct must be consistent with the high moral character that is a criterion for judicial office. They should be mindful at all times of their duty to uphold the standing and reputation of the Court". (See the 'Follow-up' note at the end of this document ^(*)).

³ Subsequent to my writing this, **the reaction of the English police, end Sep 12**, following being - allegedly - called "**plebs**" by an MP, in the course of a verbal exchange - **very amply supports my conclusion** - see [Media: The 'pleb' saga](#)

I therefore conclude from the above that Judge Vincent A. De Gaetano: (1) APPROVES of the violations of my rights by [Her Majesty's police](#) and related services (see [QB # 6](#)), as well as [Judiciaries](#) (e.g. [QB # 7 – Conclusions](#)); (2) considers himself exempt from compliance with the Convention Articles, including [Article 45](#), as well as the [Rules of Court](#). (See Note at the end **(*)**)

(The alarm bell first started ringing when I concluded that [Andrew Ladsky](#) had been informed of my Application – BEFORE the Court had written its [28.02.12](#) acknowledgment letter: [My Diary 26 Feb 12](#)).

OUTCOME – in “*Britain [, that] has a long and exemplary record on human rights*” (Prime Minister, David Cameron, [My Diary 25 Jan 12](#)):

- (1) - ‘Very conveniently’, [Her Majesty's police](#) was given a **4th 'TROPHY'** to add to its database as 'irrebutable proof' of 'supporting evidence' to its PACK OF LIES so-called "*crime reports*" against me (previous 'trophies' were the Orders from [Her Majesty's Judiciaries](#) of: [09.08.11](#), [06.10.11](#), and [24.10.11](#) following my [17.10.11](#) Request for Oral Hearing of my Appeal Application) – thereby allowing it to CONTINUE processing them.
- (2) - **The KEY BENEFICIARY** – according to [Her Majesty's Kensington & Notting Hill police's](#) so-called "*crime report*": “my” ‘poor’, “*Jewish*” “*NEIGHBOUR*” (!!!), [ANDREW DAVID LADSKY](#), the “*VULNERABLE VICTIM*” ‘I’ “*INTIMIDATE*”, and to whom ‘I’, ‘of course’, represent ‘*A RISK*’, as well as ‘dare’ describe as “*that evil, greed-ridden monster*” ([Her Majesty's Master Eyre: QB # 4\(6\)](#)) (contrast that with e.g. [Overview](#) ; [Extortion](#) ; [Advisors to Jefferson House](#)) - is currently enjoying [the fruit](#) of his [fraudulent activities](#)...

...- **while laughing his head off at me** for having his so-called ‘complaints’ against me:

(1) **2003** ([police # 2](#)) ; **CR:5602261/03** - versions: [July 09](#) ; [July 11](#);

(2) **2007** ([police # 3](#)) ; **CR:5605839/07** - versions: [July 09](#) ; [July 11](#)...

...**REMAINING in their current state**.

- (3) – **IN BREACH OF THE LAW OF THE LAND** (see [QB # 6](#))...

(1) **the British State, operating in tandem with Andrew Ladsky's scum** ⁽⁴⁾, HAVE CARTE BLANCHE – in relation to [ME, the GLARINGLY OBVIOUS VICTIM OF ORGANISED CRIME](#) – TO CONTINUE to dog me, hound me, track me, monitor me, harass me, persecute me (in the process, circulating widely photographs / film footage of me), and make me fear for my life (snapshots – [Persecution # 2](#))...

...(2) **the British State** can ALSO CONTINUE to TORMENT me by interfering with ALL my means of communication (covered under [Persecution # 3](#) ; some also covered in my [19.07.11](#) Wit.Stat in response to the [Home Secretary](#), Theresa May's [07.07.11](#) Application to have my [19.04.11 Queen's Bench](#) Claim struck out ([QB # 6](#)):

- **phones** – including interception and retention of important messages e.g. relating to a family funeral;
- **post** - including interception and retention of important post, comprising of an 'Express' letter about a family funeral, financial statements, etc., i.e. stealing my post - leading me to a 'Fair Comment' ([Defamation Act](#)) conclusion that it gives some / all of it to [Ladsky](#);

⁴ Oxford dictionary definition of ‘scum’: “A worthless or contemptible person or group of people”

- **e-mails** - including interception and retention of important e-mails e.g. relating to a family funeral, as well as giving my e-mails and the e-mail address of my correspondents to [Andrew Ladsky](#) ([My Diary 6 Aug 12](#));
 - **bug my apartment**;
 - **hack into my computer**.
- **(4) - NEARLY 3 WHOLE YEARS OF MY LIFE, and £000s IN COSTS - fighting - IN VAIN - against the PACK OF LIES "crime reports"** (covered in e.g. my [19.07.11](#) police Wit.Stat)

From my battles in 2002, following - attempting - to file a complaint of [harassment](#) against [Andrew Ladsky](#) ([police # 1, incl. background](#)), followed by:

- **(2)** responding to the 2003 so-called 'complaint' against me by [Ladsky](#) ([police # 2 ; police # 2 KP\(10\) to \(12\)](#));
- **(3)** dealing with the [16.03.07](#) and [20.03.07](#) malicious, highly vicious and perverse emails from [Notting Hill police](#) to my website Host ([police # 3 KP\(4\)](#));
- **(4)** my soul-destroying battles, from Aug 09 to Feb 10, with the police, including the then Met Commissioner, Paul Stephenson, and the then Home Secretary, Alan Johnson, as well as the 'Independent' Police Complaints Commission - to get them to comply with my rights under the [Data Protection Act 1998](#), in relation to the "crime reports" ([police # 5](#));
- **(5)** my [02.06.10 Data Protection Act](#) s.10 Notice, and [supporting document](#) (that was ignored by Chief Superintendent Mark Heath, Borough Commander, Kensington police) ([police # 5.5](#));
- **(6)** my 7 vain attempts, in Oct 2010, at getting [Kensington & Chelsea police](#) to act on my 2 (well documented) complaints of harassment against by 2 men: [30 June 10+ man](#) and [20-27 July 10 man](#) (about which Paul Stephenson then lied in [his Defence](#)) ([police # 6](#));
- **(7)** preparing for, pre-filing and pursuing my [19.04.11](#) claim ([Other courts](#)), including appealing against the [09.08.11](#) police Order 'from' Master Eyre ([QB # 4\(6\) and # 4\(7\)](#))...

...HER MAJESTY'S POLICE AND HER JUDICIARIES cost me OVER 4,000 HOURS OF MY LIFE. Based on a 35-hour week, it amounts to **MORE THAN 2.5 YEARS OF MY LIFE.** To these are **added £000s IN COSTS** (limited by the fact that I did everything by myself i.e. no lawyer).

The ECtHR cost me an additional c.500 hours of my life, and c.£250 in costs.

More! Doc library # 1.14

= Nearly 3 WHOLE YEARS OF MY LIFE, and £000s IN COSTS - ALL IN VAIN.

WHY? ALL because '[Dear Mr Ladsky](#)' decided he was 'entitled' to make [a multi-million £ jackpot](#) - through [extortion](#) - [at my expense \(and that of my fellow leaseholders\)](#)...

...[And they ALL said: YES! Of course, O' Great One!](#)

Case summary



FOLLOW-UP

As 'my luck' would have it, [my 26.01.12 Application](#) to the Court coincided at the time when it was under British Presidency, that of Sir Nicolas Bratza (until 31st October 2012). (The 6-month time limit meant that I did not have a choice).

I sent Sir Nicolas Bratza this [18.09.12](#) letter, asking him to confirm my above conclusions from the 06.06.12 letter. (NB: At the time, I did *not* support my claim of non-compliance by referring specifically to [Article 45 of the Convention](#)). The [11.10.12](#) 'reply' confirmed them ([ECtHR # 2.1](#))

I draw your attention to the fact that Sir Nicolas Bratza had control of my Application throughout as, under:

[Court Rule 52\(1\)](#): “Any application made under [Article 34 of the Convention](#) is assigned to a Section by the President of the Court” (NB: There are 5 sections)

[Court Rule 27A\(1\)](#): “The President of the Court: appoints single judges; draws-up in advance the list of Contracting Parties in respect of which each judge will examine applications throughout the period for which that judge is appointed to sit as a single judge”

[Article 24\(2\)](#) of the Convention (**and [Court Rule 18A \(1\) and \(2\)](#) and [Rule 27A\(3\)](#)**): “When sitting in a single-judge formation, the Court shall be assisted by non-judicial rapporteurs who shall function under the authority of the President of the Court. They are appointed by the President of the Court”.

To this, I add the standard 'Get Lost!' outcome of my 40+ 'cries for help' / complaints to parties in the English State sector, as well as other institutions – see [Overview # 7](#). Doc library

Noëlle Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé – www.leasehold-outrage.com

And the 'Get lost!' continued from escalating my complaint:

-

(1)- 15.01.13 letter to Nils Muiznieks, Commissioner for human rights, and

-

(2)- 15.01.13 letter to Thorbjorn Jagland, Secretary General of the Council of Europe

-

(**Overview # 18.5 / ECtHR # 4**)

(My identical comments are attached to the letters)