

Our Ref: 32563

Confidential

Ms N Klosterkötter-Dit-Rawe
3 Jefferson House
11 Basil Street
London
SW3 1AX

01 April 2005

- **Summary of events**, on Gallagher's page; my Comments to his 13.11.03 'reply' to Rachman Andrew David Ladsky's 21.10.03 Part 36 offer
- For my complaints:
- **Doc library # 2.3 , # 2.4 and # 3.2;**
- **Legal Services Ombudsman # 4**

Dear Ms Klosterkötter-Dit-Rawe

Thank you for your recent enquiry. **My complaint to the LSO of 25.05.05**

Please refer to the enclosed leaflet, which summarises the Ombudsman's role and powers. As you will see the Ombudsman's primary function is to investigate the way in which complaints about lawyers have been dealt with by the relevant professional body. However, it appears from what you have told us in the application form that the Ombudsman is unable to help because the Bar Council are still investigating your complaint and there are no strong reasons which would justify the Ombudsman's involvement at this stage.

At the conclusion of the professional body's investigation, if you remain dissatisfied with the way they have dealt with your complaint or the decision reached, you will have the right to refer the matter to the Ombudsman. However, you must write to the Ombudsman, setting out the reasons why you are dissatisfied, within **three months** of the date of the professional body's final decision letter, unless there are special circumstances which prevent you from doing so.

I am sorry that we are unable to help you at this stage.

Yours sincerely



 Steve Lees
Operations Manager

Enc.

- **As can be seen from my complaint - this is A LIE.**
- As was glaringly obvious from the Bar Council's 27.01.05 decision - **I supplied to the LSO - its decision was final**, and it told me to go to the LSO.
What happened:
- The Bar Council's lapdog, Zahida Manzoor CBE, LSO, decided to come to the help of the BC:
in its 30.03.05 letter (i.e. 2 days earlier) - and 12 months after my 05.04.04 complaint against Gallagher, followed by more documents - it claimed, *falsely*, that my 25.03.05 reply to its decision - (for the benefit of the LSO) "contained new information".
- In my 02.04.05 letter to the LSO I denied it - and asked that it proceeds with my complaint.