

CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS

See Note at the end of this document

1.	<u>Date</u>	<u>Event/s</u>	<u>Page/s</u>
2.	<a href="#">25.01.01</a>	Andrew David Ladsky ('ADL') sent a 25.01.01 letter to leaseholders attempting to dissuade us from considering buying <a href="#">the headlease</a> :	<a href="#">B3/T6/696-697</a> ; <a href="#">WS1 § 20(1)/106</a>
3.	Feb 02	End of January-beginning of February, the Appellant ('A') <a href="#">challenged</a> the <a href="#">managing agents</a> that the intended works to the block also included the <a href="#">construction of a penthouse flat</a> . She immediately started to suffer harassment: pressing of her door bell and object thrown at her windows late in the evening; followed by 20 anonymous phone calls over a 3-day period.	
4.	<a href="#">18.02.02</a> <a href="#">Elderly Resident</a> <a href="#">Resident Asso.</a> <a href="#">Other Residents</a>	A reported the above harassment to the <a href="#">Respondent ('R')</a> and identified ADL as the perpetrator / instigator of the harassment. She also identified other residents who had also complained to R of suffering harassment from ADL: <a href="#">CR:5604102/02</a> :	<a href="#">B3/T2/383</a> ; <a href="#">WS1 § 22-26/107</a>
5.	<a href="#">13.06.02</a>	Unhappy with R's handling of her complaint, A filed a complaint with the Police Complaints Authority. (It also includes an overview of the harassment A was suffering):	<a href="#">B3/T3/440</a> ; <a href="#">WS1 § 24(1)/107</a>
6.	<a href="#">05.05.02</a> <a href="#">31.05.02</a>	A approached the Metropolitan Police Authority asking for an independent investigation of her complaint. She provided an update of events in her chaser e-mail:	<a href="#">B3/T3/452 &amp; 456</a> ; <a href="#">WS1 § 24(3)(4)/110</a>
7.	<a href="#">15.07.02</a> <a href="#">17.07.02</a>	The <a href="#">managing agents</a> sent A and other leaseholders a letter purporting to be a Section 20 Notice demanding payment of the global sum of £736,000. Based on A's 1.956% share of the service charges, the demand amounted to £14,400:	<a href="#">B3/T6/705</a> ; <a href="#">WS1 § 38/116</a>
8.	<a href="#">07.08.02</a>	As the demand caused a mini-revolt, Steel Services-managing agents filed an Application to the London Leasehold Valuation Tribunal " <i>to determine the reasonableness of the global sum demanded</i> ":	<a href="#">WS1 § 38/116</a>
9.	<a href="#">07.10.02</a>	<a href="#">ADL's solicitors, CKFT</a> , threatened A with forfeiture unless she paid immediately the £14,400 demanded for the " <a href="#">major works</a> " (and other charges):	<a href="#">B3/T6/709</a> ; <a href="#">WS1 § 65/124</a>
10.	<a href="#">29.10.02</a>	At the <a href="#">Tribunal pre-trial hearing</a> , leaseholders were specifically told to <i>not pay</i> the service charge until the Tribunal has issued its determination and it had been implemented ( <a href="#">Court of Appeal case: Daejan Properties v</a>	

[London Leasehold Valuation Tribunal: LVTs only have jurisdiction to determine service charges that are still unpaid](#)).  
[ADL](#) attended the hearing, claiming to be “*just a tenant*”.

11. [28.11.02](#) Letter from [CKFT](#) to A falsely claiming she sent a [24.10.02](#) [B3/T6/711-713](#) fax to [Kensington & Chelsea housing](#) and to the [Tribunal](#) that were defamatory of ADL, and asking for “*substantial damages*”, failing which, it would issue proceedings. (Stupidly, A sent the faxes on [her employer](#)'s headed paper).  
  
Knowing that the accusations were false, A ignored the diktats, and there was no follow-up. (A few days previously [A had communicated findings](#) to the [Tribunal](#) that [Steel Services](#) was a non-existent company as it had been “*Struck-off the [British Virgin Islands] register for non-payment of licence fee*”:  
[WS1: § 39 and 40/116-117](#)
12. [29.11.02](#) [CKFT](#) filed a claim in [West London County Court](#) on behalf of [Steel Services](#) against [14 flats including A's flat](#) – demanding payment of the [July 2002](#) demand: [B3/T5/675; WS1 § 42\(1\) and 63/117 & 123](#)
13. Nov-Dec 02 and Jan 03 [A](#) repeatedly complained to the [Tribunal](#) that the [managing agents](#) were not complying with [its directions](#) and, in January, asked that the [05.02.03](#) hearing be postponed on this ground. Her request was refused: [WS1 § 69/125](#)  

[25 Nov 02; 09 Dec 02; 18 Dec 02; 12 Jan 03;](#)
14. [03.01.03](#) On coming out of her flat, A found ADL standing by the door. He told her, with a lot of venom in his voice: “*I am going to get you this year!*”: [WS1 § 34/115](#)
15. [20.01.03](#) On coming out of the block, A saw ADL standing by the lift but pretended to not see him. He told her: “*Better luck next time*” followed by a sarcastic laugh. A assumed he was referring to the impending [Tribunal hearing](#) and that he had it ‘sewn-up’. Feeling very angry by what she had been subjected to over the [previous 12 months](#), and knowing that ADL was behind it, A replied in an ‘un-lady-like’ manner: [B3/T2/420; WS1 § 34/115](#)
16. [25.01.03](#) ADL made a complaint to R against A: [CR:5602261/03](#): [B3/T2/407; WS1 § 27-45/113-119](#)
17. [27.01.03](#) A received an intimidatory, threatening letter [from R](#) stating: that ADL had complained against her that she had “*verbally abused him in public*”; “*the complaint has been fully recorded by police*”; “*to avoid any confrontation with Mr Ladsky or there may be further consequences*”. R signed the [B3/T3/459; WS1 § 31/113](#)

letter with “*Crime Investigator*”:

18. [03.02.03](#) A received a threatening letter from [CKFT](#) repeating some of the false accusations made by ADL to R: [B3/T6/718](#);  
[WS1 § 36/115](#)
19. [11.02.03](#) A ignored the [27.01.03](#) letter on the ground that R had no sense of the ridicule. R's chaser letter of [06.02.03](#) led A to reply, asking for “*precise detail – in writing - of the accusation*”. She did not get a reply:  
  
On the day it received her letter, R closed down the 2003 report claiming it had not heard from her: [12/02/03-10h44 entry](#): [B3/T2/423](#);  
[WS1 § 44/119](#)
20. [04.03.03](#) The [managing agents](#) asserted to the [Tribunal](#) that the construction of a penthouse flat was “*not a viable proposition*” v. [the photographs](#) taken by A showing that a [penthouse flat was built](#): [B3/T6/720](#),  
[727](#); [WS1 § 42\(3\)/118](#)
21. [17.06.03](#) The Tribunal issued its report. The outcome was [a reduction of c.£500,000 of the global sum demanded](#) (incl. £144k for the contingency fund): [WS1 § 64/124](#)
22. [21.10.03](#) [Steel Services](#) made A ‘an offer’ for £6,350 (v. the [£14,400](#) originally demanded). The Consent Order was endorsed by [the Court](#) on 01.07.04: [B3/T5/678 & 681](#); [WS1 § 63 & 64/123 & 124](#)
23. [21.10.04](#) The [managing agents](#) sent A an unsupported invoice for £14,400, and repeated this 3 weeks later. Hence: as though no offer had made, accepted, paid and endorsed by the court: [B3/T6/725 & 726](#);  
[16.11.04](#) [WS1 § 63/123](#)
24. [29.08.06](#) The letter to A from the [Institute of Chartered Accountants for England and Wales](#) confirmed that the majority of leaseholders were made to pay the original July 2002 demand: [B3/T6/728](#);  
[WS1 § 42\(2\)/117](#)
25. 10.09.06 A launched her website [www.leasehold-outrage.com](#): [WS1 § 63/123](#)
26. [03.10.06](#) [Portner and Jaskel, solicitors](#), sent A's website host a fax threatening libel action for “*unsubstantiated allegations against our client Mr Andrew Ladsky*” and demanding the immediate closure of the site. Although [the accusations were unsupported](#), A's ISP complied. [B3/T6/738](#)
27. [25.12.06](#) A relaunched her website.

28. [16.02.07](#) [Portner](#) sent A a letter threatening her with “*bankruptcy and forfeiture*” unless she paid immediately the sum of £8,937 to “*Roostock Overseas Corp*” - a company A had never heard of: [B3/T5/685](#); [WS1 § 42\(5\)/118](#)
29. [27.02.07](#) Ignoring [A's reply](#) asking for clarification, Portner filed a £10,357 claim against A in [West London County Court](#) on behalf of “*Landlord: Roostock (sic) Overseas Corp*”. The [Particulars of claim](#) demanded payment of £8,933 in the name of: “*Landlord: Steel Services, c/o of CKFT, solicitors*”: [B3/T5/687](#); [WS1 § 42\(5\)/118](#)  
[B3/T5/694](#); [WS1 § 42\(5\)/118](#)  
After a 16-month battle, Portner sent A [a Notice of Discontinuance of all the claim against her](#):
30. [15.03.07](#) ADL filed a complaint against A with R: [CR:5605839/07](#). [B3/T2/424](#); [WS1 § 46-84/119-129](#)  
Based on the report, as A was never contacted by R, the complaint was based primarily on numerous, unsupported (and unchallenged) accusations that [A's website](#) contained racist material.
31. [26.03.07](#) ADL sent a letter to A's employer in which he repeated some of the false accusations he made to R, as well as added others: [B3/T6/742](#); [WS1 § 57/121](#)
32. [10.04.08](#) A's GP prescribed her tranquilisers and anti-depressants ([A's letter of 10.04.08 to her GP](#)): [B3/T6/745](#); [WS1 § 57/121](#)
33. [28.05.09](#) A made a Subject Access Request to R: [B1/5/49](#)
34. Aug 09 – Feb 10 Between August 2009 and February 2010 A battled with R to get it to accede to her demands in relation to the 3 “*crime reports*”, as well as address her questions, including being provided with the name of recipients of her personal data: [WS1 § 86-107/129-135](#)
35. [21.01.10](#) R applied to the [Independent Police Complaints Commission](#) (IPCC) for dispensation on the ground that A's complaint was made “*more than 12 months after the alleged conduct*” and because she had “*been unable to obtain the result [she] desire[d] through [R's] Public Access Office*”: [B3/T3/569](#); [WS1 § 99/133](#)  
[18.02.10](#)  
A replied that R was incorrect, highlighting that the [Data Protection Act 1998](#) does not impose a time limit on a data subject, and [copied the IPCC](#) on her letter: [B3/T3/580-587](#); [WS1 § 100/133](#)
36. [22.02.10](#) A received a letter from the IPCC that it was considering R's dispensation on the ground R had communicated to A, asking [A to “provide good reasons for the delay”](#): [B3/T3/588](#); [WS1 § 101-103/133-134](#)  
[02.03.10](#)  
While A only received the letter past the 7-day deadline, she [WS1 § 102-](#)

My 22 Mar 07  
Acknowledgment of  
Service clearly  
highlighting these facts

'The IPCC' (= evidently [the MPS](#)) was referring to the [Police \(Complaints and Misconduct\) Regulations 2004](#) - Reg.3(1) and (2)(a) re **dispensation** – which is TOTALLY IRRELEVANT in the context of breaches of the [Data Protection Act](#)

opted to not respond on the ground that if the IPCC could not see her reasons – and her rights – from all the documents it would have been supplied with by R, there was nothing else she could add.

[105/133-134](#)  
[B3/T3/589](#);  
[WS1 § 106-108/134-135](#)

1 week later, the IPCC informed A that it granted dispensation to R:

37. [02.06.10](#) & [02.06.10](#) A sent R a [Section 10 Notice under the Data Protection Act](#) 1998. She did not get a reply: [B1/6/56](#);  
[B3/T3/590](#);  
[WS1 § 109-110/135](#)

38. [09.07.10](#) The [managing agents](#) sent A an unsupported invoice for £24,000. A's [several demands](#) for evidence have since been ignored. As with the previous invoices, this invoice is fraudulent: [B3/T6/757](#);  
[WS1 § 62\(6\)/123](#)

39. [04.10.10](#) A made a total of 7 visits to [R's local stations](#) in vain attempts to file 2 complaints of harassment she captured in 2 reports: [B3/T4/659-666](#); [WS1 § 113-139/136-143](#)  
– [17.10.10](#) (i) [20 and 27.07.10 man](#); (ii) [30.06.10 and previous occasions man](#):

[My Diary 30 June and 27 July 2010](#)

Throughout, R's focus was on the 1<sup>st</sup> man. It stated that it would not file A's complaint as a crime report because: she had "*followed the man*"; had "*not provided sufficient evidence*". [WS1 § 133/141](#)  
[B1/8/81](#).

Under [para.40 of its Defence](#), R denied having said this to A: [B1/9/84](#),  
[B3/T4/668](#);

A had recorded the conversation. In the context of [her Reply](#) to R's Defence, A supplied the recording and [transcript](#): [WS1 § 128 & 131/139](#)

**I SUBMIT** that looking: (1) at the evidence I supplied in support of my case (incl. the [Bundle of documents](#)); (2) the outcome: [Master Eyre's FULL OF LIES MPS Order of 09.08.11](#), and the [2 Queen's Bench judges, Lang and Mackay](#) twice refusing my [29/30.08.11 Appeal Application](#) against the Order ([06.10.11](#) and [24.10.11 Orders](#)) – **any fair minded, reasonable, honest person** would support my conclusions that **my 19.04.11 Claim was dealt with by a kangaroo court\* absolutely intent on protecting Andrew David Ladsky from the legal consequences of his criminal activities – by means of collusion\* and conniving\* with the MPS - that has been doing the same thing since 2002.**

(= Like the judiciary in: (i) West London County Court in [2002-04](#) and [2007-08](#); (ii) [Wandsworth County Court in 2004](#); (iii) [Supreme Court Costs Office on 30.01.09](#); the [London Leasehold Valuation Tribunal in 2002-03](#))

\* (Chambers dictionary definition of **Kangaroo court**: "A court operated by a mob, by prisoners in jail, or by any improperly constituted body; a tribunal before which a fair trial is impossible; a comic burlesque court")

\* (Dictionary definition of (i) **Collusion**: "To come to a secret agreement in order to deceive others; conspire"; (ii) **Connive**: "secretly allow (a wrongdoing); often as adjective, **conniving**, "conspire to do something unlawful or harmful",