



It also sent me an identical letter, dated 13.11.12

(Took delivery
on 19 Oct)

Ms Noëlle Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé

(See my website 'Other Courts' #2 (2.1)
for my comments. This letter deliberately
misrepresents my letter of 18.09.12)

FOURTH SECTION

Because of the **unlawful** rejection
of my Application - summary of
events: **Overview # 18**

ECHR-LE11.2R
PHA/jsb

11 October 2012

Application no. 11632/12 (inadmissible)
Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé v. the United Kingdom

"Inadmissible" decided by Sir Nicolas
Bratza- et.al. in the British Jewish-
Freemason Brotherhood (Persecution # 6)

Dear Madam,

(NB: Was 18th Sep)

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of 19 September 2012.

I should remind you that the **European Convention on Human Rights does not contain any provision for appeal against a decision** by which the European Court of Human Rights has declared an application inadmissible. The Court's decision declaring your application inadmissible is therefore final.

I should also point out that, by virtue of Article 35 § 2 (b) of the Convention, the Court could not deal with any further application submitted by you which was substantially the same as the above application and which contained no relevant new information.

Moreover, I should inform you that the Court and its Registry have a **very heavy workload. The Registry can therefore no longer answer your letters nor accept any telephone calls from you.**

Yours faithfully,
For the Registrar

Paul Harvey
Legal Secretary = British

In its [06.06.12](#) letter, sent by Paul Harvey (to which my Comments are attached), the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) rejected my [26.01.12](#) Application to the Court, asserting: “**the Court found that the admissibility criteria set out in Articles 34 and 35 of the Convention have not been met**”. It states that the decision was taken by ONE judge, “[Vincent A. De Gaetano](#), sitting in a single-judge formation, assisted by a rapporteur” ⁽¹⁾

In what way does my Application breach BOTH Articles? As can be seen, NO REASON is given in the [06.06.12](#) letter.

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](#)). See the footnote for an example of how Article 45 translates in practice ⁽²⁾

With the objective of identifying the ‘potential reasons’, I undertook an analysis of [Articles 34 and 35](#) and, as can be seen from my Comments attached to the [06.06.12](#) letter of rejection - **arrived at the conclusion that the assertion that my Application ‘breaches both, Articles 34 and 35’ – is FALSE.**

Further, considering the evidence in the case, I also question the conclusion from [Judge Vincent A. De Gaetano](#) that my Application could be “dismissed without further examination” ([Article 27\(1\) of the Convention](#) (and [Court Rule 52A](#)) – and doing this in the light of the declaration he made on taking office: “**I swear**” or “**I solemnly declare**” – “**that I will exercise my functions as a judge honourably, independently and impartially**” ⁽³⁾

The penultimate paragraph of the [06.06.12](#) letter, states: “**This decision is final. It is not subject to 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**”.

¹ [Article 24\(2\)](#) (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”.

[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”.

² 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)”

³ 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”.

In spite of this, in the light of my analysis, I wrote an [18.09.12](#) letter to Sir Nicolas Bratza, then British President of the European Court of Human Rights (until 31 Oct 12), attaching [my analysis](#) (NB: At the time, I did *not* support my claim of non-compliance by referring specifically to [Article 45 of the Convention](#)), and stating:

"As detailed in my attached [analysis](#)....an assessment of each of the 16 criteria, relative to my [26.01.12](#) Application to your Court, has led me to the following conclusions:

- *the claim that my Application breaches Article 34, as well as Article 35 – is false;*
- *it follows that [Judge De Gaetano](#) 'evidently' approves of the violations of my human rights by Her Majesty's named [Judiciaries](#), [1] [police](#) [2] and related services [3].*

Please, let me know in what way, if any, my conclusions are incorrect – such that they justify Judge De Gaetano's rejection of my Application."

[1] Including [QB # 7, Conclusions](#) ; [2] see also [QB # 4](#) ; [3] [QB # 6 and QB # 5](#)

I added:

"If I do not hear from you by the end of your mandate as President of the European Court of Human Rights, due to terminate on 31st October 2012, I will conclude that my above assessment is correct..."

As in the case of the [06.06.12](#) letter of rejection, the 11 Oct 12 'reply' is also from Paul Harvey who, I conclude from the name, is British.

Based on my very extensive first-hand experience ([Overview # 7](#)), I assess this 11 Oct 12 letter as a typical [British 'Establishment'](#)-jackboot, authoritarian, contemptuous response which, equally typically, when it has not got a leg to stand on, totally ignores the content of documents, opting instead to fabricate its own story. It states:

"I should remind you that the European Convention on Human Rights does not contain any provision for appeal against a decision by which the European Court of Human Rights has declared an application inadmissible. The Court's decision declaring your application inadmissible is therefore final."

In my [18.09.12](#) letter, am I "*appealing against the decision* [to reject [my Application](#)]"? **NO**.

ALL that I asked for in my [18.09.12](#) letter was for '**an assessment of my conclusions**' that, contrary to the assertion made in the [06.06.12](#) rejection letter, [my Application](#) does NOT in fact "*breach Articles 34 and 35 of the Convention*". In other words, I was seeking a reply as per the example cited under footnote # 2, on the previous page – and, therefore, **a reply compliant with [Article 45](#) of the Convention**.

"I should also point out that, by virtue of Article 35 § 2 (b) of the Convention, the Court could not deal with any further application submitted by you which was substantially the same as the above application and which contained no relevant new information."

Can my [18.09.12](#) letter be construed in any way, shape, or form as:

- a "*further application*"? As glaringly obvious: **NO**;
- being "*substantially the same as my [26.01.12](#) Application*"? Ditto: **NO**.

CONCLUSION: The fact that my 18.09.12 letter led to the above 11.10.12 'reply' (*) - PROVES that the 06.06.12 wholesale claim of "non-compliance with Articles 34 and 35" - CANNOT be substantiated - thereby confirming my analysis.

It includes the conclusions 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](#).

(*) It sent me an identical letter, dated [13.11.12](#). (I had sent my [18.09.12](#) letter 3 times, the 3rd time on 8th Oct 12). As the letter is *post* the British Presidency of the Court (ended 31st Oct): **is the message that the new President of the Court also endorses the 06.06.12 rejection?**

"Moreover, I should inform you that the Court and its Registry have a very heavy workload. The Registry can therefore no longer answer your letters nor accept any telephone calls from you."

When I read that, and saw the signature as amounting to 4 underlines, I could not help saying: 'Hi Hitler!' (NB: Extremely sick elements in [Her Majesty's police](#) have branded me "a **Nazi**", in among others, 2 e-mails to my website Host: [16.03.07](#) and [20.03.07](#) – see [police # 3 KP\(4\)](#)). (By the way: I had *never* phoned the Court).

YEP! That's 'the [European Court of Human Rights](#)'... under British Presidency. (I draw your attention to: **(1)** footnote # 1, on the first page, which demonstrates that Sir Nicolas Bratza had control of my Application *throughout*; **(2)** 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

(I wonder what decision I would have received from the ECtHR Judge from Ukraine, or from Russia - see [My Diary 25 Jan 12](#)).

This CONFIRMS THE OUTCOME stated under my analysis – 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](#) is given a **4th 'TROPHY'** to add to its database as 'irrebutable proof' of 'supporting evidence' to its PACK OF LIES so-called "*crime reports*" it is processing 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 making me fear for my life (snapshots – [Persecution](#)) ...

■ ...**(2) the British State** CAN ALSO CONTINUE to TORMENT me by interfering with ALL my means of communication (covered in [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](#);
- **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 e-mails 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](#));

⁴ Oxford dictionary definition of 'scum': "A worthless or contemptible person or group of people"

- (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!**

