

# HM Courts & Tribunals Service

HM Courts and Tribunals Service,  
Royal Courts of Justice Group  
Appeals Office  
Room WG08  
Royal Courts of Justice  
Strand  
London  
WC2A 2LL

DX 44450 STRAND

T 020 7947 7354

F 020 7947 6724

**RNID Typetalk**

18001 (Text) 18002 (Voice)

(Helplines for the deaf and hard of hearing)

[www.justice.gov.uk](http://www.justice.gov.uk)

Ms N Klosterkotte-Dit-Rawe

(Took delivery  
on 9 Oct.)

**Our ref: QB/2011/0483**

**06 October 2011**

Your ref:


Dear Sir/Madam

**Re: KLOSTERKOTTER-DIT-RAWE (APP) v COMMISSIONER OF POLICE FOR  
THE METROPOLIS (RES)**

**The Judge has refused your application for permission to appeal. I attach a copy of the Court Order.**

**You have until 4.00pm on 17th October 2011 to file and serve a written request to have the decision reconsidered at an oral hearing. If no written request is made for the decision to be reconsidered, it will become final after the time limit for making the request has expired.**

Yours faithfully



Queen's Bench Appeals Office

In the High Court of Justice  
Queens Bench Division  
High Court Appeal Centre Royal Courts of Justice  
Order of Master Eyre dated 9 August 2011  
Case number: HQ11X01471  
Appeal ref: QB/2011/0483

The 06.10.11 Order 'from' Her Majesty's 'Justice' Lang that FULLY endorses the FULL OF LIES 09.08.11 Metropolitan Police Order 'from' Her Majesty's Master Eyre - followed by the 24.10.11 Order 'from' Her Majesty's 'Justice' Mackay that continued to FULLY endorse it.

BETWEEN

KLOSTERKOTTER-DIT-RAWE

*Appellant*

and

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE FOR THE METROPOLIS

*Respondent*

### ORDER

Before the Honourable Mrs Justice Lang DBE sitting in the Royal Courts of Justice Strand London WC2A 2LL on the 5th day of October 2011

UPON considering the application dated 9<sup>th</sup> August 2011 29/30 Aug 11

#### IT IS ORDERED THAT

1. Appellant's application for permission to appeal is refused.
2. **REASONS:** I do not consider that the appeal would have a real prospect of success, nor that there is some other compelling reason why the appeal should be heard.

The Appellant alleges against the Respondent/First Defendant breaches of statutory duty under the Police (Conduct) Regulations, Criminal Procedure & Investigation Act 1996, Malicious Communications Act 1988 and the Police Reform Act 2002 which cannot be pursued in a private law claim.

The remaining claims, which include claims under the Data Protection Act 1998, Protection from Harassment Act 1997 and Human Rights Act 1998, as well as common law claims of misfeasance/misconduct in public office, have no real prospect of success for the reasons set out in the First Defendant's Defence. They are, as the Master said in his Reasons, misconceived and unfounded.

The statement of case discloses no reasonable grounds for bringing the claim and in my view the Master was correct to strike it out under CPR 3.4(2)(a).

3. The Appellant may, within seven days of receipt of this Order, apply for a hearing at which he may renew his application for permission to appeal. Such application may be made by post to the High Court Appeal Centre Royal Courts of Justice Strand London WC2A 2LL quoting the above appeals reference number.
-

## CONTENTS

1	Introduction and background.....	1
2	I submit that, on the basis of the evidence in the case, NO reasonable judiciary regardful of its duty to act judicially would reach the conclusions it did.....	6
2.1	The 29.07.11 and 09.08.11 Application 'hearings' and the FULL OF LIES 09.08.11 MPS Order 'from' Her Majesty's Master Eyre .....	7
2.2	06.10.11 Order 'from' Her Majesty's 'Justice' Lang refusing my Appeal Application against the 09.08.11 Order 'from' Her Majesty's Master Eyre .....	22
2.3	24.10.11 Order 'from' Her Majesty's 'Justice' Mackay also refusing my Appeal Application.....	22
3	Conclusions.....	23
4	APPENDIX – MEDIA SOURCES .....	24

### 1 Introduction and background

(See also my Comments attached to: (i) the [29.07.11 'Independent' Police Complaints Commission \('IPCC'\) Order 'from' Her Majesty's Master Eyre, Queen's Bench](#), and (ii) to the [09.08.11 Home Office Order](#), also 'from' Master Eyre).

My claims against [Her Majesty's Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police Service \('MPS'\)](#) are contained under sections 1, paras 1-139 of the [19.04.11 Claim](#) I filed, as a Litigant in Person, in the [London High Court, Queen's Bench Division](#).

**The trigger to my filing the Claim** was Her Majesty's police ignoring my statute-based Notice of [02.06.10 \(supporting document\) \(police # 5.5\)](#) in relation to 3 "crime reports" it sent me in July 09, following my submitting a [28.05.09 Subject Access Request](#) under [s.7 of the Data Protection Act 1998 \('DPA'\)](#):

- **2002 "crime report", [CR:5604102/02](#)**: a complaint I filed with [Chelsea police](#) following receiving numerous anonymous phone calls, for which I identified [Andrew David Ladsky](#), as the likely perpetrator/instigator. I also reported suffering other forms of harassment from him ([police # 1](#)).
- **2003 "crime report", [CR:5602261/03](#)**: a so-called 'complaint' against me by Ladsky to [Chelsea police](#) that I used "abusive language" towards him, and had "a history of doing this" – leading to the report being classified as a "**Confirmed**", "**Substantiated Offence of Harassment**". I was **denied** the right to defend myself against it ([police # 2](#))
- **2007 report, [CR:5605839/07](#)**: another so-called 'complaint' against me by Ladsky, which, based on the report, as I was **never** contacted by [Notting Hill police et.al. at Kensington police](#) at **any** point in time, accuses me of, on [my website](#):
  - Having "anti-Semitic comments directed in particular at Ladsky, and contained throughout": [15/03/2007-16h14 entry](#).
  - Having "anti-Black and anti-Asian text and pictures contained throughout": [Classification page](#).

- Using the words “pigs” and “monkeys” “as used by the Nazis to refer to Jewish people during the holocaust...Mr Ladsky is Jewish and believes that is what [I am] referring to”: [16/03/2007-18h56 entry](#). “[I] would be aware of this because [I] am franco-german (sic)”: [20.03.07](#) email to my US website Host ‘from’ [TDC Simon J Dowling of the Community Support Unit, Notting Hill police](#) (NB: According to para.12 of the Met Commissioner’s [30.06.11](#) Application Wit.Stat., ‘TDC’ stands for ‘Trainee Detective Constable’. This is of particular note as, in ‘his’ previous email of [16.03.07](#) to my website Host, Dowling positioned himself as “[a] police officer”).
- “[Being] like this because [I do] not want to pay the service charge”, and believe that Ladsky, who is “[my] neighbour” (NB:!!!) is behind the service charge when, ‘in fact’, he ‘merely’ “organised for refurbishment on the flats” [16/03/2007-18h56 entry](#) (see para.20 of my [29.08.11](#) Supplementary MPS Wit.Stat.)
- Having “a lot of slanderous <sup>(1)</sup> comments on the site mainly directed at [Mr Ladsky](#) but also [Kensington & Chelsea police](#) and even [Members of Parliament](#), the [Prime Minister](#) and [Deputy Prime Minister](#). Also against [solicitors](#) and many others”

(see [police # 3](#))

You would think that, from this litany of accusations, it would not be difficult to provide ‘some supporting evidence’. **NONE is provided, because NONE can be supplied. It does NOT exist.**

As I wrote under para.58 of my [17.10.11](#) Request for Oral Hearing of my Permission to Appeal, in response to **Reason 3(3)** ‘of’ Her Majesty’s [Master Eyre](#)’s FULL OF LIES [09.08.11](#) MPS Order: “If my ‘criticisms and accusations’ (definition of ‘tirade’) were not justified and true, I would no doubt have had proceedings filed against me a long time ago. As to my being ‘angry’ (definition of ‘tirade’), I leave the court of ‘Joe public’ to judge me on that in the light of my experience [since 2002](#) with various State parties and other parties in the professions”.

Further, and among many others, the 2007 “crime report”, also portrays me as “suffering some mental issues”, ‘leading’ the ‘psychiatrist’, Trainee Detective Constable Simon J Dowling of the Community Support Unit, Notting Hill police to “speak to social services to see if they are aware of [me]”: [16/03/2007-18h56 entry](#).

Hence (as reported under [police-Overview](#)) – **WITHOUT A SHRED OF EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT** – **these reports FALSELY and MALICIOUSLY <sup>(2)</sup> portray me as:**

- “a Nazi” “anti-Semite” waging some kind of “racist” vendetta against Ladsky;
- as an individual who “suffers from mental issues” – ‘leading’ the MPS to “contact social services to see if they are aware of [me]”;
- as somebody who defaults on her contractual obligations.

---

<sup>1</sup> Oxford dictionary definition of **Slander**: “Law - The action or crime of making a false spoken statement damaging to a person’s reputation”; “A false and malicious spoken statement”. At the time, there was **no** recording on my website.

<sup>2</sup> Oxford dictionary definition of **Malicious**: “Characterised by malice; intending or intended to do harm”

Understandably, these so-called "*crime reports*" are a source of extreme distress and anguish to me – giving me the absolute right, under [s.10 of the Data Protection Act 1998](#), to demand that the police stops processing them. (As discussed below, the additional reason is that the police - et.al. – **are and will continue** - to use these reports maliciously against me).

**My vain, soul-destroying attempts at getting my rights implemented** (detailed under paras 85 – 110 of my [19.07.11](#) MPS Wit.Stat) ([police # 5](#)):

- my [13.08.09](#) letter to the MPS' Public Access Office in which I provided my feedback on the content of the 3 "*crime reports*", and backed-up my position by providing a [bundle of 49 supporting documents](#) ([police # 5.1](#));
- my [20.09.09](#) letter to the MPS' Public Access Office – following its 'get lost' reply of [25.08.09](#), and my concurrent [20.09.09](#) letter to [Chief Superintendent Mark Heath, Kensington police](#), headed "*Kensington & Chelsea police is not exempt from compliance with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998*" ([police # 5.2](#));
- [22.09.09](#) 'response' from [Acting Chief Inspector Steve McSorley, 'Professional Standards' Kensington police](#), on behalf of Mark Heath, that I had "*quite clearly expressed [my] concerns about accuracy to the MPS*", and that "*if [I was] dissatisfied with the MPS response [I] should contact the Information Commissioner*". While, in my correspondence, I had mentioned the possibility of doing this, I knew that the [DPA](#) does not impose a requirement on a data subject to approach the Information Commissioner. The fact that he was trying to push me down that route, suggested to me that he had no concern about it, and viewed it as an opportunity to have yet 'more fun' in sending me on another treadmill.

(At the Pre-action stage, the MPS still attempted to push me towards the Information Commissioner: its [01.04.11](#) letter, to which I replied, on [04.04.11](#), asking where this was stated in the DPA. It did **not** provide a reply in its [07.04.11](#) letter).

- My [08.10.09](#) letter to McSorley, challenging his reply "*in the light of [his] role*" (which he had 'omitted' to state in his [22.09.09](#) letter), highlighting that he had totally ignored my replies.
- This dismissal of my rights led me to send a [08.10.09](#) letter to Heath, headed: "*Do you endorse the treatment I have and continue to be subjected to by [Kensington & Chelsea police](#)?*"
- One month later, the lack of response led me to send a chaser letter to Heath, on [11.11.09](#), and to McSorley, also on [11.11.09](#).
- The [17.11.09](#) acknowledgment from Heath's office: "*The Borough Commander has asked Chief Inspector McSorley to write again to you in order to outline the previous advice given*".
- It was followed by McSorley's [20.11.09](#) letter. In this letter, [McSorley, Head of 'Professional Standards' for Kensington, Chelsea and Notting Hill police](#), dismissed my conclusions in my above [20.09.09](#) letter to Heath of "*gross misconduct*" by the officers involved in the 3 complaints and concurrent "*crime reports*". He wrote:

*"For the sake of clarity, may I stress that I do not accept that there has been any "gross misconduct" by any of our officers in relation to the various crime reports in which you are named. Nor do I accept that TDC Dowling made "malicious, scurrilous or libellous allegations" when he contacted your website host.*

*With regard to the wording of the crime reports, I am satisfied that this represents an accurate account of what police were told at the time even if you do not agree with what was said by third parties.*

*Consequently, I will not be contacting your website host, nor will I be making any alterations to the various crime reports unless enforcement notice is served by the Information Commissioner"*

- In the light of this attitude, I opted to send a [28.11.09](#) 'cry for help', headed "Need for action", to the then [Met Commissioner, Paul Stephenson](#) and then [Home Secretary, Alan Johnson](#) ([police # 5.2](#)). In this letter, I provided an overview of my experience with Kensington, Chelsea and Notting Hill police in 2002, 2003 and 2007 ([police-Overview](#)), and since submitting my [28.05.09](#) Subject Access Request (supported by documents to prove that I was not making it up).

As I wrote under para.94 of my [19.07.11](#) MPS Wit.Stat.(and para.93 of my [19.07.11](#) IPCC Wit.Stat): "*I did this thinking: surely, [the Head of the Metropolitan Police](#) is going to take action when I tell him about my experience; surely he will see that my demands are legitimate; surely the Head of the umbrella organisation, the [Home Office](#), will say: something has been going on there for a very long time; it must be addressed". **How very, very naïve of me!** My value system and theirs are light years apart. Like a visitor to my website wrote, colloquially ([Comment # 40](#)): "**They don't give a crap**".*

- Following receiving McSorley's [20.11.09](#) letter, I sent Stephenson and Johnson a [02.12.09](#) letter, headed: "*[Head of Kensington police](#) approves of illegal conduct by some of its officers". In this letter, I reproduced McSorley's [20.11.09](#) letter (as well as supplied it) and drew a list of conclusions in relation to the 3 "crime reports".*
- It led to a [03.12.09](#) letter from Stephenson's office that my correspondence "[had] been forwarded to Inspector Campbell Mckelvie, Directorate of Professional Standards Customer Service Team".
- The latter sent me a [08.12.09](#) letter, it posted one week later. (I perceived this as a continuation of the contempt). It stated that it was "*identifying the most appropriate person to deal with the issue(s) you have raised. We will then send you the contact details of the person dealing with your complaint*".
- I took delivery of the letter on the 24<sup>th</sup> and replied by letter dated [28.12.09](#) in which, as requested, I provided my contact number (which, of course, the police *knew*, as it has been monitoring and interfering with my mobile phones for a long time e.g. paras 16-29 of my [19.07.11](#) Home Office Wit.Stat.)
- As, by February 2010, the Directorate of Professional Standards had not contacted me, I sent Stephenson, Johnson et.al. a [02.02.10](#) letter, headed: "*When am I due to be killed?*", referring to the [15 Jun 09](#) death threat, "*Enjoy your life. You don't have long to live*" – I had reported on page 7 of my [28.11.09](#) letter. (Of course, the police took no action).
- On 4 Feb 10 - day on which my [02.02.10](#) letter was delivered to Stephenson - Detective Inspector Crispin Lee, Directorate of Professional Standards ([police # 5.3](#)) posted his '[21.01.10](#)' letter to me. In this he wrote that he had "*applied to the IPCC to dispense with your complaint because I consider that you made your complaint more than 12 months after the alleged misconduct without good reason; that your complaint has been made only because you have been unable to obtain the result that you desire through the Public*

*Access Office; and that given the time elapsed it is impracticable to investigate the issues about which you are complaining”.*

- In my [18.02.10](#) reply to Lee – on which [I copied the IPCC](#) - I challenged him, among other, on the “12 month deadline” by stating: “Where, in the [Data Protection Act 1998](#), does it specify a time limit for a data subject to seek – and obtain – an end to the processing of data that is false, unlawful, misleading, scurrilous, libellous, biased, corrupted, incomplete in some very significant aspects – as well as obtain correction of the data to ensure that it is “fair, lawful and accurate?”” (I captured this under para.100 of my [19.07.11](#) MPS Wit.Stat.) (And para.99 of my [19.07.11](#) IPCC Wit.Stat.).

I also asked whether “[he] expected the IPCC to exempt [Kensington & Chelsea police](#) from compliance with the Data Protection Act 1998?” and “to turn a blind eye to what I report?” The answer to the latter 2 questions proved to be a ‘YES’ – **because the police very clearly dictated all the moves ‘by’ the IPCC / undertook them itself** <sup>(3)</sup> (see also media reports in the Appendix to my Comments on the [29.07.11](#) IPCC Order, and latter part of [police # 5.4](#)).

- As detailed in my Comments in relation to the [29.07.11](#) IPCC Order, in ‘its’ [22.02.10](#) letter, the IPCC blindly followed the MPS’ position and, in ‘its’ [02.03.10](#) letter, dismissed my complaint. In doing this, ‘it’ used [Reg.3 of the Police \(Complaints and Misconduct\) Regulations 2004](#) as grounds. This is **TOTALLY IRRELEVANT. IT CANNOT** be called upon to interfere with my rights under the [Data Protection Act 1998](#).

→Hence: **The IPCC’ GRANTED THE POLICE “DISPENSATION” FROM COMPLIANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE [DATA PROTECTION ACT 1998](#) (YES!)**

- As I wrote under para.110 of my [19.07.11](#) MPS Wit.Stat.: “Determined to clear my name of the malicious, false accusations against me, and opinions of me, I summed-up my strength and embarked on extensive desk research with the objective of finding a means of circumventing the repeated refusals to meet my demands. I bought a book on the DPA. From this, realised that I could submit a [Notice under Section 10](#). As it imposes a requirement on a data controller to respond within 21 days, I concluded that doing this would be the solution to my problem”. I followed this by stating: “This was all in vain, as [Chief Superintendent Mark Heath] failed to respond to my [2<sup>nd</sup> June 2010 Notice](#)” ([police # 5.5](#))
- In the following paragraph, para.111, I wrote: “The rejection of my complaint by the MPS, added to the failure of my strategy number 2, above, led me to conclude that the only solution left was to file a claim – as I knew I could do under the [DPA](#)”.

After a further 8 months of very intensive desk research, I sent a [17.03.11](#) **Pre-action letter** to each of the 3 Defendants, and supporting documents ((i) [28.05.09](#) Subject Access Request; (ii) [list of documents](#) supplied with my [13.08.09](#) reply to the MPS’ Public Access Office; (iii) my [02.06.10](#) s.10 Notice and [supporting 67-pg document](#)). For the sake of transparency, I also sent the same pack to Chief Superintendent Mark Heath. **Other than try to stop me from proceeding, none of them made any attempt to resolve the situation ([QB # 2](#)) Hence: continuation of what had been taking place since Aug 09 ([police # 5](#))**

---

<sup>3</sup> Under **Sch.2 of the Police Reform Act 2002, point 6 ‘Staff’** - the IPCC can employ serving members of police forces on a secondment basis. (My view: equivalent to putting the wolves in charge of the henhouse).



After 1 month, I filed my [19.04.11 Claim](#) ([QB # 3](#))

In his [23.05.11](#) FULL OF LIES Defence, the Met Commissioner made a blanket denial of breaching / violating ANY of my rights ([QB # 4\(1\)](#)).

I responded to parts of the Defence in my [14.06.11](#) Reply. In the case of my 7 vain attempts, in [October 2010](#), to get [Chelsea and Kensington police](#) to investigate my 2 well documented complaints of harassment (my [08.10.10](#) report on the [20 & 27 July 2010](#) man; [08.10.10](#) report on the [30 June 2010](#) and previous occasions man) **I was able to expose the LIES, as I had recorded the conversation** – which I filed and served on a CD-ROM, as well as supplied a [transcript](#). I also supplied [the notes](#) given to me by PC Belky Giles that also proved the LIES ([police # 6](#)).

(In relation to the “*crime reports*”, my replies to the [23.05.11](#) Defence and [30.06.11](#) Application are discussed extensively, on the [police page](#), under: # 1, 2002 “*crime report*”; # 2, 2003 “*crime report*”; # 3, 2007 “*crime report*”)

In his [30.06.11](#) Application, the Met Commissioner demanded that “[my] **claim be struck out [CPR 3.4(2)] and/or summary judgment [CPR 24.2] be entered in favour of the MPS and that [I] pay its costs – because: there are no reasonable grounds for bringing these claims; the claims have no real prospect of success**”. He followed this by stating: “for the reasons stated in its witness statement”. In fact, he did NOT give ANY reason, as all he did was continue with his blanket denials, as well as add some padding by discussing how the police ‘deals’ with complaints. ([QB # 4 \(3\)](#))

2 **I submit that, on the basis of the evidence in the case, NO reasonable judiciary regardless of its duty to act judicially would reach the conclusions it did.**

Indeed, I submit that, on the basis of the evidence in the case:

1. my [19.04.11](#) Particulars of Claim;
2. my [19.07.11](#) Wit.Stat. in response to the Met Commissioner's [30.06.11](#) Application and Wit. Stat. to have my Claim struck out;
3. the [documents supplied in support](#);
4. my [14.06.11](#) Reply to the Met Commissioner's [23.05.11](#) Defence including, among other, [my transcript](#) of the [16 Oct 10](#) conversation with [PC Belky Giles, Chelsea police](#) – which irrefutably disproved some of his assertions in his Defence;
5. my repeating the majority of the key points during the [29.07.11](#) Application ‘hearing’;
6. my [30.08.11](#) Application for Permission to Appeal against the FULL OF LIES [09.08.11](#) MPS Order ‘from’ [Master Eyre](#) (discussed below) - supported by: (i) [Skeleton Argument](#) with my claims of breaches / violations of my rights supported by references to legislation and case law; (ii) a [Supplementary Witness Statement](#) (for the reasons discussed below); (iii) [Chronology of events](#); (iv) [bundle of documents](#);
7. my [17.10.11](#) Request for Oral Hearing of Permission to Appeal, repeating the legal basis of my claims - to which I attached an Appendix containing extracts from legislation...

...Her Majesty's [Master Eyre](#)'s decision to **summarily** (i.e. at ‘case management’ stage = NOT at trial) strike out ALL my claims against the [MPS](#) – [with costs of £8,478](#) - in ‘his’

**09.08.11 Order** - on the ground that "*all of [my] allegations are misconceived and unfounded*" – was **perverse** <sup>(4)</sup> – as was that of... ([QB # 4 \(4\)](#) and [\(6\)](#))

...Her Majesty's '[Justice Lang](#) who, in 'her' [06.10.11 Order](#) denied my [30.08.11 Appeal Application](#) against the Order by endorsing ALL of 'Eyre's 'Reasons' ([QB # 4 \(7\)2](#)),...

...and that of Her Majesty's '[Justice Mackay](#) who, in 'his' [24.10.11 Order](#), denied my subsequent [17.10.11 Request](#) ([QB # 4 \(7\)3](#))

I **SUBMIT** that any fair minded, reasonable, honest individual, cognisant of the evidence in the case would support my conclusion that, in my case, this court was turned into a **KANGAROO COURT** <sup>(5)</sup> ([court's page](#)) that was evidently driven by the blind determination to continue <sup>(6)</sup> protecting [Andrew David Ladsky](#) from the legal consequences of [his criminal activities](#), as well as retribution <sup>(7)</sup> for my 'daring' to stand-up to him and his supporters within the State sector and in the professions <sup>(8)</sup> - for my rights for justice and redress (discussed below) ([police-Overview](#)).

That the main means used were **COLLUSION** <sup>(9)</sup> and **CONNIVING** <sup>(10)</sup> – amounting to a **continuation**, [since 2002](#), of the use of these tactics by prior judiciary (previous Note), as well as by [the MPS](#) - which, to me, **equates glaringly with Masons** <sup>(11)</sup>

## 2.1 The 29.07.11 and 09.08.11 Application 'hearings' and the FULL OF LIES [09.08.11 MPS Order](#) 'from' Her Majesty's Master Eyre

- I submit that Her Majesty's [Master Eyre](#) *wilfully and perversely* ignored the **irrebuttable evidence in the case** in order to assist [the MPS](#)' retention of the "*crime reports*" in their current state, and concurrent criminal charges against me – so that it - et.al. - can continue to use them *maliciously* against me – in the process, blindly endorsing [the MPS and Andrew Ladsky](#)'s *false, malicious, vicious* <sup>(12)</sup> accusations against me and opinions of me, as well as the MPS' blanket denials of non-compliance with the law, and of misfeasance / misconduct in public office (under statements of truth);

---

<sup>4</sup> Oxford dictionary definition of **Perverse**: "Of a verdict: against the weight of evidence or the direction of the judge on a point of law"

<sup>5</sup> 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"

<sup>6</sup> = 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](#)

<sup>7</sup> Oxford dictionary definition of **Retribution**: "Punishment inflicted as vengeance for a wrong".

<sup>8</sup> [My Diary 2009-Intro](#) (visual 'Layers of protection for crooked lawyers')

<sup>9</sup> Oxford dictionary definition of **Collusion**: "To come to a secret agreement in order to deceive others; conspire"

<sup>10</sup> Oxford dictionary definition of **Connive**: "secretly allow (a wrongdoing); often as adjective, **conniving**, "conspire to do something unlawful or harmful"

<sup>11</sup> See media articles in the Appendix to this document; [My Diary 2009-Intro](#), sub-section with the visual headed 'Layers of protection for crooked landlords'

<sup>12</sup> Definition of **Vicious** – Oxford dictionary: "Morally or practically condemnable; reprehensible"; Chambers dictionary: "Spiteful; immoral, depraved"

- I submit that **Master Eyre wilfully and deliberately turned a blind eye to my being placed on an 'unequal footing'**; ([QB # 4 \(7\)](#))
- I very strongly contend that, in continuing complicity (<sup>13</sup>) with the MPS, **Master Eyre tested 'his' (<sup>14</sup>) 09.08.11 Order by sending me a 02.08.11 Draft Order** ([QB # 4 \(5\)](#)).

Examples of events (in addition to the above evidence):

The 'hearing' of the Met Commissioner's 30.06.11 Application took place in 2 stages – with the 1<sup>st</sup> and main one, being on [29.07.11](#). ([QB # 4 \(4\)](#))

- (1) During this 'hearing', I repeated many of the key issues in my [19.07.11](#) MPS Wit.Stat. – I [had sent to the court on that date](#) (as well as served) - stating where I had said this, and highlighted breaches of my rights, in particular, under the [Data Protection Act 1998](#). Hence, added to my [Particulars of Claim](#), **Master Eyre had absolute knowledge of the issues**.

In fact, he had also seen my initial [27.06.11](#) Wit.Stat. in response to the [IPCC's 07.06.11](#) Application and Wit.Stat. – in which I very clearly communicated my position, and discussed breaches of my statutory rights. (Realising from desk research and the [01.07.11](#) court's Notice that I should not have referred to legislation, nor include opinions and arguments), I issued a [19.07.11](#) Replacement Wit.Stat).

During the Application 'hearing', I did not cover everything, as I was conscious that, under [CPR Pt 24](#), the 'hearing' was not a trial – nor a mini-trial (para.28 of my [17.10.11](#) Request). Indeed, in this situation, the only question for the court to consider is whether the case attacked has "some real prospects of success" (This is supported by case law e.g. in *Three Rivers DC v Bank of England*: "**The criterion which the judge has to apply under Pt 24 is not one of probability, it is the absence of reality**").

- (2) With my [24.07.11](#) letter to the court, I copied it on my [24.07.11](#) letter to [the MPS](#) in which I very clearly detailed that some *key pages* were missing from its 22 Jul 11 materially *less redacted* version of the "crime reports" ([2002](#), [2003](#), [2007](#)) - relative to its Jul 09 version ([2002](#), [2003](#), [2007](#)).

The latter were the basis on which I wrote my [19.07.11](#) Wit.Stat. – as I filed and served it on [20.07.11](#) i.e. **before** I was supplied with the 22 Jul 11 version (e.g. para.10 of my [17.10.11](#) Request). This **placed me at a material disadvantage / on an "unequal footing"** ([CPR Overriding Objective](#)), as the redacted text provides very strong support to some of my key conclusions: my [29.08.11](#) Supplementary Wit.Stat., and [17.10.11](#) Request.

Under para.13 of my [17.10.11](#) Request, I also highlighted the fact that the MPS supplying me with the 22 Jul 11 data proved my claim under para.10 of my [Particulars of Claim](#) to be correct, and that **the MPS had lied** in claiming that, in Jul 09, it had "*provided [me] with all the data it was required to supply under the Data Protection Act*" – as evidenced: **(i)** under paras 25 and 12 of the Met Commissioner's [23.05.11](#) Defence; **(ii)** para.15 of his [30.06.07](#) Application Wit.Stat.; **(iii)** previous correspondence of [25.08.09](#).

---

<sup>13</sup> Oxford dictionary definition of **Complicity**: "*The fact or condition of being involved with others in an unlawful activity*"

<sup>14</sup> In inverted commas (as in the case of 'Justices' Lang and Mackay's Orders) because I submit that what took place – and failed to take place – was clearly the outcome of behind closed door conniving – with the 'door' being in all probability that of one or more Masonic lodges. More detailed below.

(3) During the [Application 'hearing'](#) I also raised the issue of the text that had been redacted in the Jul 09 version – in the process, emphasising the fact that it had been supplied to me **AFTER** I filed and served my [19.07.11](#) Wit.Stat:

- a. Among others, the claim in the 2007 “*crime report*”, under the [15/03/2007-16h14-‘Primary Investigation Details: 6’](#) entry, which states: **“NO SUSPICION OF FALSE REPORTING”** - asking why [it had been redacted](#), and how could the MPS make this categorical statement given that it had **never** contacted me **at any point in time** in relation to Ladsky’s so-called ‘complaint’? I repeated this under para.11(1) of my [17.10.11](#) Request and, under this paragraph, as well as under para.72 xii, reported that: “*my asking this led [the MPS](#)’ Counsel [Nicholas Wilcox] to look at [Master Eyre](#)”.*

I also raised this issue of **glaring collusion with Ladsky** under para.23 of my [29.08.11](#) Wit.Stat, stating: “*In the light of the numerous false, malicious accusations and opinions of me in the report, it is abundantly clear why this entry was blocked. How can the MPS make this categorical statement given that it never contacted me, the owner and author of the website - at any point in time? I refer to [WS1 § 49 and 58/119 & 121](#). It does provide irrefutable confirmation of the MPS’ blind determination to make this so-called “crime report” stick against me”.*

- b. Also asking why it had been redacted in the [Jul 09 version](#), I quoted another example in the 2007 “*crime report*”: under the [15/03/2007-16h14-‘Primary Investigation Details: 4’](#), entry, under which [the MPS](#) claims that [the “VICTIM \[i.e. Ladsky\] CONSIDERS HIMSELF INTIMIDATED”](#) – claim it repeated under the “*Victim Details*” section: **“VULNERABLE / INTIMIDATED VICTIM”: “Y”**.

As I wrote under: (i) para.21 of my [29.08.11](#) MPS Wit.Stat; (ii) para.11(2) of my [17.10.11](#) Request, **“This claim is hilarious considering what [Ladsky](#) has done and [instigated](#) against me (and fellow leaseholders) [since 2002](#)”**. Under the former, I wrote: “*Clearly, it was blocked to prevent me from challenging it: its aim is to add weight to the fictional story that ‘poor Mr Ladsky’ is an innocent victim”*.”

- c. Under para.12 of my [17.10.11](#) Request I stated my conclusion that “*the MPS had not provided me with the previously redacted data in order to prevent me from challenging it in my Witness Statement – so that there would be no record of it – and it would be the end of the matter as [my Claim](#) would be [struck-out](#)”.*

(4) I submit that Master Eyre **wilfully** <sup>(15)</sup> **covered-up** the MPS’ deliberate failure to investigate the complaints - **by endorsing its false claims that it had “investigated” them**.

- a. [2002 “crime report”](#) – The Met Commissioner made the claim under para.8 of his [Defence](#), and para.10 of his [Application Wit.Stat](#). Under paras 23-25 of my [19.07.11](#) Wit.Stat. I stated, “*I reject the assertion*” and very clearly, and I believe, convincingly demonstrated strong evidence in support.
- b. Under **Reason 3(1)** ‘Master Eyre’ wrote: **“The [MPS] duly investigated [my 2002 complaint]”**. Under para.37 of my [17.10.11](#) Request I wrote that he was “*repeating [the MPS] false assertions*” and had “*failed to take the evidence into account*”.

---

<sup>15</sup> Oxford dictionary definition of **wilful**: “Of an action, etc; done on purpose, deliberate, intentional”

In addition to my 1<sup>st</sup> Wit.Stat., as I explained under paras.5-13 of my 2<sup>nd</sup> Wit.Stat. of [29.08.11](#), the text the MPS had 'very conveniently' redacted in [its Jul 09 version](#), provides even stronger, undeniable support to my [19.07.11](#) position that **the MPS was protecting Ladsky** by, among other, spinning a story about [the Resident](#) that stacks-up even less.

Stating, under paras 8 and 9 of my [2<sup>nd</sup> Wit.Stat](#) that making harassment phone calls is part of [Ladsky](#)'s arsenal of tactics for any anybody who 'dares' stand-up to him, I supported my position by citing: under [para.5\(1\)](#), the [18/02/2002-18h53 entry](#): *"Two other residents have suffered the same way [receiving anonymous phone calls] and it has been the suspect"* (NB: Evidently, this entry was made by a police officer who was not one of the Masons' flunkies (<sup>16</sup>) (see below)); under [para.6\(1\)](#) that another resident had received harassment phone calls (her [18.04.02](#) email to me), as well as [Nucleus, local Citizen Advice Bureau](#), because it was helping us.

To the above, I could have added: (i) the [14.01.01](#) letter to me from the then [Head of Jefferson House Residents Association](#): ***"Ladsky's behaviour consisted of him ranting and becoming increasingly offensive and threatening... he was immensely aggressive...If I spoke, he threatened all the more...His last call to me was 12.40 am, which can hardly be described as reasonable"***; (ii) her [14.01.01](#) letter to Ladsky: ***"There is no reason for you to persist in ringing, including after midnight, without leaving a message... last night my husband counted thirteen such calls during a twenty minute call I was having with him. Just one minute after you conducted your call to me you rang twice more"*** (Note also [Ladsky](#)'s threats to her).

(As the harassment continued, she complained to the police. What happened? In her [18.04.02](#) email to me, a resident wrote: *"Chelsea police advised her off the record to fold her tent and go – which she did, can't blame anyone for that. Her experience was horrendous. I was there on two occasions on Jan & Feb last year with this harassment going on"*).

= **IT IS LADSKY** WHO MADE THE HARASSMENT PHONE CALLS TO ME IN 2002.

Hence, considering the dictionary definition of 'investigate' (<sup>17</sup>), **I very strongly contend that the MPS did NOT "investigate" my complaint – and, consequently, refute emphatically 'Eyre's assertion that it did.**

I view Master Eyre's endorsement of the MPS' position as an extension of what [DC Adams, Kensington police](#), told me on 27 Mar 02: **"You won't be able to prove a link with Andrew Ladsky"** – as I report on the last page of my [02.04.02](#) letter to [Detective Inspector Paul Webster, Kensington police](#). To me, this, (added to the other events), smacks of glaringly obvious Masonic involvement (see below).

- c. [2003 "crime report"](#) – Under para.11 of his [Application Wit.Stat](#), the Met Commissioner made the claim that the police *"investigated"* Ladsky's so-called 'complaint'. Likewise, I rejected the assertion and discussed the undeniable evidence in support of my position under paras. 29-33 and 43-45 of my [19.07.11](#) Wit.Stat.

---

<sup>16</sup> Oxford dictionary definition of **Flunkie**: *"(Chiefly derogatory) a liveried manservant or footman"*

<sup>17</sup> Oxford dictionary definition of **investigate**: *"carry out a systematic or formal inquiry into (an incident or allegation) **so as to establish the truth**"*

Considering: (i) the dictionary definition of 'investigate'; (ii) the fact that [Chelsea police – et.al.](#) - ignored my [11.02.03](#) reply asking for “*precise detail – in writing – of the accusation against me*”, and then closed down the report (discussed below) – it most definitely **cannot claim that it “investigated the complaint”**. Indeed, plagiarising from the [27.01.03](#) threatening, bullying letter from [PC Neil Watson, “Crime Investigator”, Chelsea police: it did NOT ‘get my side of the story’](#). As discussed below, under **Reason 3(2)**, ‘Eyre’ wrote that the MPS “*took the matter no further*”.

- d. [2007 “crime report”](#) – The Met Commissioner made the claim under para.9 of his [Defence](#) and para.13 of his [Application Wit.Stat.](#) I, likewise, rejected this assertion, discussing the undeniable evidence under paras. 48-59 of my [19.07.11](#) Wit.Stat. As [Notting Hill police – et.al.](#) - **never contacted me at any point in time** in relation to this so-called ‘complaint’, referring again to the dictionary definition of ‘investigate’: it most definitely **cannot claim that it “investigated the complaint”**. As discussed below, ditto under **Reason 3(3)**, ‘Eyre’ wrote that the MPS “*took the matter no further*”.

- (5) Under **Reason 8**, Her Majesty’s ‘Master Eyre’ dismissed my claims under the [Data Protection Act 1998](#) by – **UNBELIEVABLY** - stating: “*However, there is also this: the action against the [MPS] amounts to no more than a most obvious attempt to re-write history, and is completely devoid of merit*”.

Under para.145 of my [17.10.11](#) Request, I wrote: “*This conclusion by the learned Master further confirms that he has totally failed to take into account the evidence I supplied. My objective is not to “re-write history”, but, in line with my rights, to ensure accuracy in order to “reflect history”*”.

In addition to the above - damning - evidence:

I have **IRREBUTABLE EVIDENCE** that, overall, **the “crime reports” FALSELY portray me as: (i) “a Nazi” “anti-Semite” waging some kind of “racist” vendetta against Ladsky** (using my Franco-German origin as rationale); (ii) **an individual who “suffers from mental issues”**; (iii) **somebody who defaults on her contractual obligations** – as explained in numerous parts of my [19.07.11](#) Wit.Stat. – starting with my saying it under paras 13 and 14.

In the “*crime reports*”, [Kensington, Chelsea, Notting Hill police](#) – et.al. – have **NOT** provided **ANY** evidence **whatsoever** in support of **ANY** of their accusations against me and opinions of me – **because they CANNOT provide any**. Hence, also the reason for **denying me** the right to defend myself against them.

→ My claims of breaches of my rights under the [Data Protection Act 1998](#) – as discussed in my [29.08.11](#) Skeleton Argument and [17.10.11](#) Request, supported by case law - are therefore **amply justified and legitimate** – and, consequently, **CANNOT** be described as **“misconceived and without merit”**, nor as **“an attempt to re-write history”**.

- (6) Without **any** evidence in support, in 'his' (<sup>18</sup>) [16.03.07](#) email to my US website Host, [Trainee Detective Constable Simon J Dowling, Community Support Unit, Notting Hill police](#) - accused me of 'committing a crime' by stating: **"I am the police officer dealing with this crime"**. From being challenged by my website Host who asked: **"Are you aware that there are laws against making false accusations?"**, in 'his' follow-up email of [20.03.07](#) **'Dowling' backed down** somewhat on 'his' accusations, stating: **"there is nothing we as a police force can do except class it as a racial incident"** – while **still not** providing **any** evidence in support.

Under paras.9, 12 and 18 of his [Defence](#) (repeated under para.12 of his [Application Wit.Stat](#)) the **Met Commissioner made the absolutely outrageous claim** that **"[the] e-mails were sent in the ordinary course of an investigation into complaints made against [me]"**; that the [16.03.07](#) email amounted to: **"ma[king] inquiries to [my] website host"**, and that **"[it] indicated the nature of the allegations [it] was investigating, but did not suggest that [I] was guilty of the alleged conduct"**.

The [09.08.11 \(Reason 7\)](#) and [06.10.11](#) Orders endorse the Met Commissioner's position (para.4(ii) of his [Defence](#)) that I cannot pursue a private claim against it under the [Malicious Communications Act 1998](#) (but 'can' under the [Protection from Harassment Act 1997](#) (which it denied)). While not a qualified lawyer, **I disagree with that** on the grounds that: **(i) it is a tortious act; (ii) s.1 of the Act starts with "Any person"** (paras 117 and 118 of my [17.10.11](#) Request).

I contend that [Her Majesty's Judiciary's](#) **objective** was to let – **unfairly and unlawfully** – the police **escape the consequences** of its actions **by accepting its preposterous assertions**.

→ It simply **cannot** be the case that the police is at liberty to send such malicious, vicious, libellous (<sup>19</sup>) and xenophobic (<sup>20</sup>) emails (paras 119-121 of my [17.10.11](#) Request). In fact, the notes at the bottom of its [16.03.07](#) email warn against doing this.

Other examples of **complicity** and **conniving** between [Master Eyre](#) and the police during the 'hearing' - **and of their concurrent complicity and conniving with [Ladsky](#)**:

- (1) In relation to the **2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence of Reason 3(3)** in 'his' [02.08.11](#) Draft Order / [09.08.11](#) final Order that: **"[On my website I] at first referred to [Mr. Ladsky](#) and his allies as "pigs and monkeys". [Mr. Ladsky](#), not very surprisingly in view of what he says is his racial background took offence"**.

Under para.59 of my [17.10.11](#) Request, I noted that Eyre had **"deliberately ignored the evidence contained under [para. 77](#) of my Witness Statement"**.

And, under para.60, wrote: **"during the hearing, as though, (in breach of [CPR Pt 24](#)), the Master was conducting a mini-trial on this particular issue, he attempted to force me to admit that [Ladsky](#) could have arrived at the conclusion that I was referring to him (as evidenced by**

---

<sup>18</sup> My guess is that it is likely to have been composed by the Masonic network – in the style and tone of individuals who still perceive their island as controlling a British Empire.

<sup>19</sup> Oxford dictionary definition of **Libel**: "Law - the publication of a false statement that is damaging to a person's reputation"

<sup>20</sup> Oxford dictionary definition of **Xenophobia**: "Intense or irrational dislike or fear of people from other countries - Derivatives: xenophobe ; xenophobic"

his statement "not very surprisingly"). I denied this, stating that the objective was to falsely portray me as an anti-Semite. It was clear that the Master's objective was to gain support for the false [15/03/2007-16h14 entry](#) that "...parts of [my website]... are alleged to be of a racial nature and [make] numerous references by name to the victim...".

As he asked me the question, [Master Eyre](#) turned to his computer, asking me for my website's URL "to see where I said this" ('his' **Reason 3(3)**: "**she now says that the terms she used were not strong enough, and changed the description to "morally depraved, despicable beneath contempt scum"**"). Of course, he knew exactly where it was. His game and intimidation tactics were intended to try to catch me out.

- (2) During the 'hearing', I raised my strong objection to [the MPS](#) describing Ladsky as my "neighbour" in the "crime reports" – instead of what he is: [the landlord](#): paras.18-21 of my [19.07.11](#) Wit.Stat. As I wrote under para.20 of my [17.10.11](#) Request, to this [Eyre](#) replied: "**He is your neighbour, isn't he?**"
- (3) [Master Eyre](#) **deliberately** turning a blind eye to the fact that, in relation to [Ladsky's](#) so-called '[complaint](#)' of 2007, [Notting Hill police](#) – et.al. - **never contacted me at any point in time** - by stating, under **Reason 3(3)**: that "**the First Defendant [i.e. MPS] took the matter up with the Claimant [i.e. me]**".

Under para.63 of my [17.10.11](#) Request, I wrote: "...**as with other evidence, the learned Master deliberately failed to take into account at all the fact that the MPS never contacted me at any point in time in relation to the 2007 'complaint'** ([Particulars](#) paras 5.c, 9.f and 21.a). Being so shocked by this conduct by [the police](#), I repeated this on several occasions in my Witness Statement: [WS1 § 8/104](#), [§ 49/119-120](#), [§ 58/122](#) and [§ 84/129](#). I also re-emphasised it during the [Application hearing](#). Of note: the MPS **failed** to address this in its [Defence](#)"

And under para.65 of my [17.10.11](#) Request: "*I contend that the objective of this false assertion is to cover-up the MPS' unlawful failure to contact me – and allow it 'to prove' by means of a 'court order' that 'it did' - in the expectation that the [Order](#) striking out my claim would be the end of the matter. If this is denied, I would like to know how the learned [Master](#) can back-up his assertion*".

- (4) **Reason 3(3)** that "[the MPS] **not surprisingly – recorded it** [[Ladsky's 2007 so-called 'complaint'](#)] "**as a racial incident and nothing more**". Note the "*not surprisingly*" = Again, another example 'of Master Eyre' blindly backing-up the MPS' action – and malicious intent in doing this. Further, he repeated the false claim made by the Met Commissioner, under para.9 of his [23.05.11](#) Defence, that "[the police] *took the matter no further*".

Under para.72 of my [17.10.11](#) Request I reiterated, by referring to my [19.07.11](#) Wit.Stat. that the accusation of a "[Confirmed](#)", "[Substantiated Racial Incident](#)", "[Anti-Semitic Racial Incident](#)", "[Hate Crime – Race, Religion](#)" - was **false** – and that "**to this day the MPS has failed to provide evidence to back-up any of its accusations**".

Under para.73, I also cite how [Notting Hill police](#) - et.al. - took the matter further by "**contacting social services to see if they aware of [me]**" because they 'deemed' that "**[I] suffer from mental issues**": [16/03/2007-18h56 entry](#). This is in addition to holding – very clearly – a criminal charge against me: paras 110(3) and 113 of my [17.10.11](#) Request.

- (5) **Reason 3(2)** that, in relation to Ladsky's [2003 so-called 'complaint'](#) "[the MPS] **took the matter no further**". Again, another example of Eyre's conniving and colluding with the



MPS (as in the case of the 2007 "crime report", he was repeating the false claim made by the Met Commissioner, under para.9 of his [23.05.11](#) Defence) – and by extension Ladsky – as [Chelsea police](#) did "take the matter further". As I wrote under para.51 of my [17.10.11](#) Request (under which I refer to paras in my [19.07.11](#) Wit.Stat. where I discuss it):

- a. it classified the 'complaint' as a "[Confirmed](#)", "[Substantiated Offence of Harassment](#)" – **making the criminal charge of harassment 'stick' against me (s.7(3) of the Protection from Harassment Act 1997**: "A course of conduct must involve conduct on at least 2 occasions") - by **falsely** claiming under the [25/01/2003-13h55 entry](#) that "**this verbal abuse started in November 2002**", and that I had done this "**approximately 3-4 times**";
- b. it processed the pack of lies "crime report" ([on 25/01/03](#)) - **before** contacting me;
- c. **post processing** the "crime report", its 'contact' with me consisted of a [27.01.03](#) threatening, bullying, intimidatory letter [from PC Neil Watson, Chelsea police](#), warning me that I had better shut-up and not challenge 'Dear Mr Ladsky' or "**there may be further consequences**" - signing it "**Crime Investigator**";
- d. it continued to **deny me the right to defend myself against the accusations by ignoring** my [11.02.03](#) letter asking for "precise detail – in writing – of the accusation against me"; and, **on the day it received it, it closed down the report by capturing the lie**, under the [12/02/2003-10h44 entry](#) that "[I had] failed to respond"; **it also lied** by stating, under the [06/02/2003-11h06 entry](#) that it "[had] attended nrrk have left note for susp to call me" – as I **never** found "a note";
- e. in spite of the 2003 report stating that I had been "[Eliminated](#)", in the 2007 report, under the [16/03/2007-19h07 entry](#), it **repeated** and, in the process, **endorsed** the false, malicious accusations against me and opinions of me by stating: "**it shows Ms Rawé used to swear at Mr Ladsky when seeing him in the communal area**".

Contrast that with what the Met Commissioner wrote under para.8 of his [Application Wit.Stat](#): "**In carrying out all investigations officers will always be aware of th[e] subjectivity [of a witness] and as such will keep an open mind**". Well, as in my case it did NOT "carry out investigations"...

- (6) In relation to my [Oct 10](#) complaints of harassment to Chelsea and Kensington police ([police # 6](#)), I contend that **Reason 3(4)** of the Order that they "**recorded the matter, but took no action**" **falsely** infers that my complaints were unsubstantiated / unactionable. Considering the evidence I supplied: (i) [20 & 27 July 2010 man](#); (ii) [30 June 2010 and previous occasions man](#) (both on my website: [My Diary 2010](#)), I contend that 'Master Eyre' did this **deliberately** with the intention of covering-up the MPS' deliberate failure to investigate.

Further, that Her Majesty's **Master Eyre (and 'Justices' Lang and Mackay** – see below) **turned a blind eye to the Met Commissioner's LIES** under para.40 of his [Defence](#) (hence, under a Statement of Truth), that: "*PC Giles did not accuse [me] of following the man*", "*she did not state that [my complaint] would be filed as an intelligence report*". As stated earlier on, I was able to expose the lies by filing, and serving, with my [14.06.11](#) Reply, a recording and [transcript](#) of the [16 Oct 10](#) conversation, as well as copy of the notes she had given me.

The above is discussed under paras 128-132 of my [19.07.11](#) Wit.Stat, and para.79 of my [17.10.11](#) Request.

[PC Giles](#) also challenged me on my claim, in my complaint against the [20 & 27 July man](#), of "**fearing for my safety**". This is confirmed under para.19 of the Met Commissioner's [Application Wit.Stat](#). **How would she know how I felt? I replied:** "Yes, when a man follows me, and then circles around me as I am stationary: I fear for my safety". It is dealt with under para.122 of my [Wit.Stat](#). And the fact that I have had a **death threat**, "Enjoy your life. You don't have long to live", hanging over my head since [15 Jun 09](#) – which the MPS **knew** about, but **failed** to act upon - is discussed under para.98 of my [Wit.Stat](#). This is also discussed under para.122 of my [17.10.11](#) Request.

Under para.125b of my [Particulars of Claim](#), I wrote that, on 17 Oct 10, Sgt Avison told me: "We have to capture everything that is reported, but not unlawful information against people; that's a breach of the Data Protection Act". Under para.40 of his [23.05.11](#) Defence, the Met Commissioner **also denied it**, stating: "Sgt Avison explained to the Claimant that the MPS was not required to record all information provided by the Claimant concerning Mr Ladsky" Under para.14 of my [14.06.11](#) Reply, I rejected this stating that, as I had done with PC Giles', in my Particulars of Claim, I had reproduced Avison's comments verbatim.

As I wrote under para.133 of my [Wit.Stat](#): "As evidenced by the conversation, the MPS' focus was on the [20<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> July 2010 man](#), not on the [30<sup>th</sup> June 2010 man](#). It reinforced my belief that the former had been put up to it by ADL [[Ladsky](#)], and that the latter was a police informant". To this I add the fact that in both, the [Defence](#) and [Application Wit.Stat](#) the police continued focusing on the [20 & 27 Jul 10 man](#) – making no reference whatsoever to the [30 Jun 10 man](#).

Of course, the Masons' lackeys (<sup>21</sup>) and their flunkeys (see below): police and related services, in tandem with [Ladsky's](#) 'dogs' (<sup>22</sup>), have since continued to have me dogged, hounded, tracked and monitored on a daily basis: e.g. snapshot in [My Diary 23 May 10](#). As I report in My Diary, as well as under paras 91-92 of my [19.07.11](#) Wit.Stat in response to the [Home Office's](#) [Application](#) to have my Claim struck out, the 30<sup>th</sup> June man subsequently continued to harass me by dogging me and hounding me e.g. [21 and 22 May 10](#).

The army of 'dogs' controlled by the State and Ladsky did this with particular fervour after I filed [the Claim](#), in the process making extensive use of police helicopters – with the usual aim of: (i) preventing me from getting help e.g. [27 May 11](#); [7 July 11](#); [28 July 11](#); [11 Aug 11](#); (ii) report on my activities e.g. [17 Oct 11](#) (they evidently had access to the – private – library of my ex. university e.g. [27 May 11](#). **WHY ARE THEY – WHO PORTRAY ME AS "[SUFFERING FROM MENTAL ISSUES](#)" – AND, CONCLUDE, IN 'COURT ORDERS', THAT "[MY CLAIMS ARE MISGUIDED AND MISCONCEIVED](#)" - EVIDENTLY SO SCARED OF ME, AND SO OBSESSED WITH ME?**

**(NO: UNLIKE HER MAJESTY'S MET COMMISSIONER (and the racketeering (<sup>23</sup>) Rachman (<sup>24</sup>) [Ladsky mafia](#) (<sup>25</sup>)), I DO NOT CONSIDER MYSELF AT LIBERTY TO LIE**

---

<sup>21</sup> Oxford dictionary definition of **Lackey**: "A servile or obsequious person"

<sup>22</sup> Oxford English dictionary definition of **Dog**: "Informal: a contemptible man; informal: an informer or traitor"

<sup>23</sup> Chambers dictionary definition of **Racketeer/ing**: "A person who extorts money or other advantage by threats or illegal interference"

<sup>24</sup> Oxford dictionary definition of **Rachmanism**: "The exploitation and intimidation of tenants by unscrupulous landlords; 1960's after the notorious landlord Peter Rachman"

**UNDER STATEMENTS OF TRUTH** i.e. **COMMIT CONTEMPT OF COURT** ([CPR Rule 32.14](#)) – as exemplified by the above v. what I captured under paras 116-177 of my [Particulars of Claim](#). This is a point I made under para.10 of my [14.06.11](#) Reply)

(7) Her Majesty's [Master Eyre](#) sickeningly and repulsively (considering the evidence in the case) prostrating himself at Ladsky's feet – thereby demonstrating his unequivocal endorsement <sup>(26)</sup> of [Ladsky](#) being above the law of the land, and of his all-consuming greed <sup>(27)</sup>, moral depravation <sup>(28)</sup>, extreme viciousness, cruelty and sadism <sup>(29)</sup>:

- a. The last part of 'his' **Reason 2** that "[I] recently described [[Ladsky](#)] as *"that evil, greed-ridden monster"*". I replied to this under paras 29-31 of my [17.10.11](#) Request by quoting examples in support of my assessment. Under para.31, I wrote: *"in my world a person who does that is an "evil, greed-ridden monster" to which I add: extremely cruel, vicious, sadistic, and without an iota of humanity"*.

(I should have also quoted from: (i) a [01.11.02](#) letter to me from a resident, about [Ladsky](#): *"He acted like a petty tyrant, and I am not afraid to put on record that I believe that he is capable of any unscrupulous actions in order to achieve his aims"*. (ii) a [29.01.01](#) letter to me from the then [Head of the Jefferson House Residents Association](#): *"Ladsky is not a man who cares about the law...he proposes to force residents out by making the financial situation intolerable...He then forces residents to sell to him at a loss and he turns the block into service flats. To fight is one thing, but to be the focus of harassment in your own home by a resident landlord is not something I would wish on anyone"*. I have many more such letters from the then Head of the Residents Association).

- b. **Reason 3(2)**, in relation to my response to Ladsky provoking me in [Jan 03](#) by telling me *"Better luck next time"*, followed by a sarcastic laugh (leading me to conclude, correctly as it turned out, that he had the impending [London Leasehold Valuation Tribunal](#) hearing 'sewn-up') - that "[I] say - *though without the least sign of shame - that [I] reacted by using the most disgusting and undignified language towards him...*".

I replied to this under paras 47-49 of my [17.10.11](#) Request highlighting that Eyre had **totally** ignored my reply under para.34 of my [Wit.Stat](#), preferring to rely on the MPS' [25/01/2003-13h45 entry](#) – which **fails** to reflect what actually took place. Under [para.49](#), I noted the fact that, during the 'hearing', Eyre did **not** ask me whether I felt *"ashamed"* and what I would have replied – had I been asked.

I contend that the outpouring of 'sympathy' for Ladsky and proclamations of 'shock' and 'disgust' are used, at least in part, to divert attention away from the very active, key role played by some

---

<sup>25</sup> Definition of **Mafia** –Chambers dictionary: *"Any group considered to be like the Mafia in the criminal and unscrupulous use of power, fear, etc. to gain its ends"*

<sup>26</sup> I submit: **Masons**: 'One for all and all for one' (see Appendix). Plus: very clearly, from the same mould as Ladsky, including, it seems, Jewish connection

<sup>27</sup> Oxford dictionary definition of **Greed**: *"Intense and selfish desire for wealth, power..."*

<sup>28</sup> Oxford dictionary definition of **Moral depravation**: *"Morally corrupt; behaving without principles of right and wrong"*

<sup>29</sup> Oxford dictionary definition of **Sadism**: *"The tendency to derive sexual gratification or general pleasure from inflicting pain, suffering or humiliation on others"*

State parties in the events [since 2002](#) i.e. judiciary, tribunal, police, heads of departments, 'regulators', etc. ([My Diary 2009 – Intro, visual 'Layers of protection for crooked landlords'](#)).

I submit that the above Reasons, and wording of others in the [09.08.11](#) Order are, among other, intended to endorse [the MPS, Ladsky - et.al](#)'s malicious position that I am waging some kind of "racist" vendetta against [Ladsky](#), including the aim of endorsing their highly vicious 'assessment' that I "[suffer from mental issues](#)" (paras 11 and 33 of my [17.10.11](#) Request).

Further, that it is done with the **ultimate objective of putting me 'out of action'** <sup>(30)</sup> – **which is motivated by REVENGE from the Masonic network** ([police-Outcome](#)) (see below) for:

1. My 'daring' to stand-up to the Rachman, sociopath <sup>(31)</sup> Ladsky – by fighting for my so-called 'rights' in the face of [his repeated fraudulent 'service charge' demands and court claims](#) – motivated by his decision that I (and fellow leaseholders) <sup>(32)</sup> should pay for the [construction](#) of a [penthouse and addition of 3 other apartments](#) to the apartment block, Jefferson House, 11 Basil St, London SW3 1AX - so that he could make a [multi-million £ jackpot](#). (Considering subsequent events, it must be the most notorious penthouse in the whole of London, and possibly the country. Ladsky can certainly claim that, for the sake of feeding his all-consuming greed, he has not found a shortage of individuals prepared to throw their reputation down the plug hole... perhaps that was their reputation).

**YES – THE ROOT CAUSE FOR – EVERYTHING – THAT HAS HAPPENED TO ME SINCE 2002 - IS MY 'DARING' TO CHALLENGE LADSKY'S FRAUDULENT ACTIVITIES BY FIGHTING FOR MY SO-CALLED 'RIGHTS'.**

Having given in once - in 2003: my [19.12.03](#) letter to his racketeer solicitors, [Cawdery Kaye Fireman & Taylor \(CKFT\)](#), to whom, "for the sake of bringing the dispute to an end", following: (i) his [07.10.02](#) threat of "forfeiture" (taking the apartment away from me) unless I paid immediately [£14,400](#) for "[the major works](#)"; (ii) his [29.11.02](#) [West London County Court](#) claim demanding payment of [£14,400](#) (in breach of, among other, the [tribunal's directions](#) (pg5)); (iii) his [21.10.03](#) "offer" of £6,350 - I paid [£6,350](#) I did **not** legally owe either: [01.07.04](#) [Wandsworth County Court](#) Consent Order...

→ ...**my 'daring' to not give in when**, 3 months after the above Consent Order, **he had** his racketeer managing agents, [Martin Russell Jones](#), send me **a totally unsupported [21.10.04](#) demand of £14,400** i.e. as though no "offer" had been made, accepted, paid, and endorsed by the court; my ignoring it led to **the demand being repeated**, 3 weeks later in an equally unsupported [16.11.04](#) invoice, to which a further £1,000 had been added...

→ ...**my 'daring' to, yet again, refuse to be defrauded, in 2007-08** through his racketeer solicitors, [Portner and Jaskel](#), who: (i) sent me a [16.02.07](#) letter threatening me with "bankruptcy and forfeiture" unless I paid immediately £8,937.28 to "[Rootstock Overseas Corp](#)" - a company I had *never* heard of at the time (and still do not know anything about);

---

<sup>30</sup> This country, and more accurately, Masons and their lackeys on their order, **do** lock-up 'inconvenient people', such as those who, as in my case, have gone through an experience that has removed the blindfold from their eyes and have seen too much to have it put back on – see e.g. [My Diary 2011](#), above 4 Feb 11, the sub-section headed 'Secret prisoners'

<sup>31</sup> Oxford dictionary definition of **Sociopath**: "A person with a personality disorder manifesting itself in extreme antisocial attitudes and behaviour"

<sup>32</sup> See definition of 'residential leasehold' in the earlier part of the '[Abbreviations and Definitions](#)' section

(ii) on the day it received my [25.02.07](#) reply that I could not owe money to a company I had never heard of, (iii) it filed a [27.02.07](#) claim against me in [West London County Court](#). After 16 months of absolute sheer, utter hell with [Portner](#) and [Her Majesty's judiciary](#), Portner issued me with a [06.06.08](#) Notice of Discontinuance of "All" of the claims against me...

→...**my 'daring' to not fall apart from, since Jul 10, being sent ever growing fraudulent upon fraudulent 'service charge' demands**, from his racketeer managing agents, [Martyn Gerrard](#), who are currently demanding the fraudulent sum of over [£31,000](#). This fraudulent demand started with **a totally unsupported 09.07.10 demand of £24,000** from his racketeer managing agents, [Martin Russell Jones](#), predecessor to Martyn Gerrard. **Both of them have ignored my repeated demands for evidence in support** e.g. my [07.07.11](#) letter to Martyn Gerrard. I know that, for reasons detailed under [Martyn Gerrard](#), this demand is **likewise fraudulent**.

**The objective in doing that? To 'get me' through mental torture and, in the process, get my flat** – a pledge Ladsky made to me in Jan 03, with a lot of venom in his voice: "[I am going to get you this year!](#)" Also, typical of these Rachman landlords, is to force the leaseholders towards taking legal action – in the knowledge (as very amply demonstrated by my experience [since 2002](#)) that, wherever the leaseholders turn to for help, there will be landlord-friendly Masons / their lackeys (<sup>33</sup>) / flunkies at the ready to do their bidding. Having so far failed to achieve his objective of putting me totally 'out of action' (in spite of the very active help and support he has and continues to receive from the corrupt (<sup>34</sup>) elements within the Masonic network – see below), he is more than ever consumed with achieving his objective. Depicting his mental state, it also includes acting like a 2 year old unable to get his way, by stomping his feet in the entrance corridor on [26 Feb 12](#) (something he first started to do in 2002, when I challenged the true nature of "[the works](#)").

2. In the process of my 'daring' to fight for 'my rights', **my 'daring' to stand-up to, and challenge the 'authorities'** = Masonic network (see below) e.g. [judiciary and 'Justice' department](#); [tribunal](#); [police and its 'regulators'](#); [council](#) and [its 'regulator'](#), [the local government ombudsman](#); my [Members of Parliament](#); [Parliamentary Ombudsman](#); [Financial Services Authority](#), etc. and doing the same thing with [lawyers and their 'regulators'](#); [surveyors and their 'regulator'](#); [accountants and their 'regulator'](#), etc. ([My Diary 2009-Intro](#) (visual 'Layers of protection for crooked landlords')) – demonstrating that I am not scared of them and will not, as expected, walk away 'like a good little girl' – to make life easy for the morally depraved, corrupt miscreants - by ignoring the unbelievable injustice I have and continue to suffer. (See [My Diary 6 May 08](#) for a summary of my battles attempting to get redress and justice).

**It is clear that those I have 'upset' are some of the ego-crazed, power-corrupted, crooked '2 year olds' within the Masonic network.** As can be seen from media reports in the Appendix, most of the judiciary are believed to be Masons; the police that has long comprised of Masons, now has its own Masonic lodge; other Masons include other individuals in the public sector: members of Parliament, mandarins, etc.; senior members of the Royal family; members of the professions: lawyers, accountants, surveyors, etc. And, as

---

<sup>33</sup> Oxford dictionary definition of **Lackey**: "A servile or obsequious person"

<sup>34</sup> Oxford dictionary definition of **Corrupt**: "Willing to act dishonestly in return for money or personal gain; evil or morally depraved"

demonstrated by e.g. the ['Memorandum of Understanding'](#) between the police and the Law Society, there is, of course, a close 'working relationship' between them.

Below the Masons are their lackeys with their layers upon layers of flunkies. With such a gigantic and **totally uncontrolled, above the law** octopus with very far-reaching tentacles, the likelihood for somebody in my position is that – as demonstrated by my experience ([My Diary 2009-Intro](#) (visual headed 'Layers of protection for crooked landlords') - wherever you turn to for help, you will end-up facing a Mason / somebody controlled by Masons, or who will end-up being controlled by Masons / their lackeys or flunkies because, as the police officer said <sup>(35)</sup> *"People will sell their soul to the devil"* (as I experienced e.g. medical practitioners, 'friends', acquaintances, work 'colleagues' – who therefore aligned themselves with [Ladsky: My Diary 2009-Intro](#) (from 'Medical')) <sup>(36)</sup>.

3. After 5 years of my being, in effect, told repeatedly to 'get lost' wherever I turned to for help within the State sector and the professions ([My Diary – 6 May 08](#)), **my 'daring', in Sep 06, to set-up a website** - as a 'cry for help' - by reporting chapter and verse of my case – and, as a result, exposing all the corrupt miscreants = organised crime <sup>(37)</sup>.
4. **Last, but, by far, not least: my profile** which, as I described under para.76.e.i of my [Particulars of Claim](#) is: female; single; limited financial means; no influential connections; of 'no status': a tenant v a landlord who, in addition, claims to be 'Jewish'; of foreign origin, including being of part German descent (which, added to having a 'Jewish' landlord, has led to my being (falsely) branded *"a Nazi"* ([16/03/2007-18h56 entry](#); [16.03.07](#) and [20.03.07](#) emails to my website Host 'from' [Trainee Detective Constable Simon J Dowling](#)).

Hence, the absolute blind determination by Her Majesty's police – et.al. – including [Her Majesty's Judiciary](#) involved in my [19.04.11 Claim](#) - to keep the *"crime reports"* in their current state - which amount to holding criminal charges against me (paras 110(3) and 113 of my [17.10.11 Request](#)) – added to, for sure, even more damaging data about me I have not seen.

**I am absolutely convinced from events that Ladsky's so-called 'complaints' – captured in the 2003 and 2007 "crime reports" (added to, for sure, even more damaging data I have not seen) – are KEY to the 'justification' given by Mason-led State parties for dogging me, hounding me, harassing me and monitoring me on a daily basis, including all my means of communication which, at times, entails interference** (e.g. my [19.07.11 Home Office Wit.Stat](#); my Comments attached to the [09.08.11 Home Office Order](#)) – and are doing this in tandem with Ladsky's army of scum <sup>(38)</sup> and 'dogs' e.g. snapshot in [My Diary 23 May 10](#).

[Master Eyre](#) ended the 'hearing' at the point when costs should have been discussed, claiming he had *"run out of time"*. His theatrics included asking in a kind of apologetic, embarrassed way

---

<sup>35</sup> Guardian newspaper article, 24.04.09, [in the third tape](#), as part of ["Police caught on tape trying to recruit Plane Stupid protestors as spy"](#)

<sup>36</sup> It is like the Wild-West, but worse, as there is no sheriff to whom the 'little people' like me can turn to for help and protection. Meanwhile...some of the judiciary tell us that *"we must defer to the courts and let justice take its course otherwise the rule of law and our system of criminal justice, which are the hallmarks of a civilised society, would collapse"*.

<sup>37</sup> Oxford dictionary definition of **Organised crime**: *"Of or pertaining to a coordinated organization directing (esp. illegal) operations on a large or widespread scale. Esp. organised crime"*

<sup>38</sup> Oxford English dictionary definition of **Scum**: *"A worthless or contemptible person or group of people"*

when it could be completed. When I said that the [Home Office's Application](#) 'hearing' was scheduled on [09.08.11](#) at 14h30, he faintly smiled to himself, and fixed it on that date, at 14h00.

I *knew* the 'hearing' would not be completed on that day as, in breach of CPR (Pt 44 PD, para.13.5(2)), the Met Commissioner had **not** sent me his Schedule of Costs (it was first sent to me by letter dated [04.08.11](#)). (It was sent a 2<sup>nd</sup> time by letter dated [10.08.11](#)). (By contrast, [the IPCC](#), for which the [Application](#) 'hearing' took place immediately prior to that of the MPS, [had sent me its costs](#)).

While [Master Eyre](#) did **not** say anything about it during the 29 Jul 'hearing', he subsequently sent me a [02.08.11](#) Draft Order. It was posted 1<sup>st</sup> class on that day, a Tuesday. While it should have arrived the following day, it was *only* delivered on Friday 5<sup>th</sup>. Luckily, (having a premonition) I had unusually gone to my PO Box on that day of the week and time (the PO Box people told me that it had "*just been delivered*"). (My conclusion is that, as with some of my other important post (see [Intro to My Diary 2009, 'Post'](#) (after mobile coms)), it had been intercepted at the sorting office [by the police](#) / under its direction – see [My Diary 7-8 Sep 11](#)).

As 'the completion' of the [Application](#) 'hearing' was scheduled for Tuesday 9<sup>th</sup> August, from 14h00, I replied as best I could and posted my [07.08.11](#) reply on Monday 8<sup>th</sup>, by 'Special Delivery – Next Day before 13h'. 'As best I could' as, at the time, I had no knowledge of the format for responding i.e. formulate an appeal. Still, I believe that **any** unbiased, impartial judiciary would have concluded from my response that the Draft Order was very seriously flawed and unfair – even more so considering the evidence that had already been supplied.

On 9<sup>th</sup> August, as [Master Eyre](#) claimed that he had "*not seen*" [my reply](#), I gave him a copy. Other than note in [his' final Order](#): "*AND UPON the Claimant's application for leave to appeal on the grounds set out in her 8-page Comment on the draft*" - **he took no notice** of its contents, and proceeded with printing [his' Draft Order](#) as a final version i.e. the version attached to this document ([QB # 4 \(6\)](#))

I contend that sending the Draft Order, and the police concurrently intercepting it to limit my ability to respond, was done in the belief that it would be the end of the matter (<sup>39</sup>) – **leaving the police with a trophy: a 'court order' – [with costs](#) - that 'very conveniently'**:

**(1) undeniably endorses the MPS and [Andrew Ladsky's](#) numerous *false, malicious and highly vicious* accusations against me and opinions of me in the "*crime reports*" ([2002](#), [2003](#) and [2007](#)) – as being 'the truth';**

---

<sup>39</sup> Based on my 'non-appeal standard' reply of [07.08.11](#), and the consequent assumption that, as a Litigant in Person, I would not have the necessary knowledge to file a CPR-compliant Appeal Application. I contend, also in the knowledge that, if I tried to contact a solicitor for help, measures would be taken to stop me from getting help (I am being dogged, hounded, tracked and monitored on a daily basis by State's goons e.g. my [17.07.11](#) Witness Statement in response to the [Home Office's 07.07.11](#) Application to have [my Claim](#) struck-out - in tandem with [Ladsky's](#) scum e.g. snapshot in [My Diary 23 May 10](#)) – **which is what happened** – see [My Diary 11 Aug 11](#). I did it as a test, as I expected this to happen. I therefore spent 3 weeks frantically doing desk research, developing my documents, etc. in order to file my [29/30.08.11](#) Application. Equally frantically, I then continued researching and learning afterwards, knowing that my Application would be rejected – culminating in my [17.10.11](#) Request - that was evidently '**not liked**' (see below, last page). (They should have paid more attention to the parable of the horse: [My Diary 5 Apr 07](#))

(2) backs-up the MPS' actions and lack of action – including, among others, the Met Commissioner's blanket denials in his [23.05.11](#) Defence and [30.06.11](#) Application Wit.Stat. (under statements of truth) of breaching / violating *any* of my rights; *falsely* stating that the police had contacted me in relation to the [2007 'complaint'](#) - in the process absolving the police of *any* wrongdoing, and dismissing my claims of misfeasance / misconduct in public office: **Reason 5**: "*to say nothing of alleging malice, conniving with [Mr Ladsky](#)*"; I quoted examples in my [17.10.11](#) Request: paras 11, 43 and 129-133.

Indeed, I submit that, in the light of the evidence in the case, in 'his' [09.08.11](#) Order Her Majesty's [Master Eyre](#) glaringly pinned his colours to [the MPS'](#) mast – and that of [Andrew Ladsky](#) (as I wrote under para.61 of my [17.10.11](#) Request). In fact, he acted like an extension of them.

One question: if the MPS was '[so certain](#)' of its position: why did it make me a [07.07.11](#) "[Without Prejudice Offer](#)" of "*not pursu[ing] the costs of [its] application*" if "[I] *discontinu[ed] my Claim [against it]*"? In my [13.07.11](#) letter, I rejected "*the offer*" on the ground that it had "*not given me reasons to discontinue my claim – which I maintain*". (Not only would [Kensington, Chelsea, Notting Hill police - et.al.](#) have been able to claim that ALL of their (FALSE) assertions in the Met Commissioner's [Defence](#) and [Application Wit.Stat](#) were 'therefore undeniably proven' – the Met Commissioner would have also hit me with [his other costs](#)).

On 9<sup>th</sup> August, while waiting to go into Master Eyre's room, I communicated my awareness of 'the Draft Order trick' to the Met Commissioner's Counsel, Nicholas Wilcox, saying that I had been alerted to it by the fact that, in breach of CPR, he had *not* sent me his client's costs ahead of the [29.07.11](#) 'hearing'. He told me that "**[I was] going to lose**". I replied that, considering the evidence I had, I would take my case to the European Court of Human Rights. (The dismissive, arrogant look he gave me suggested that he was thinking that I would not have the necessary knowledge to pass the prior hurdles that would clearly be waiting for me). (I did pass the hurdles – and [I did file an Application with the ECtHR](#))

Nicholas Wilcox also told me: "**Master Eyre is not pleased with [your website](#)**". I replied that it was obvious from events and '[his](#)' [Draft Order](#), and that he should ask **me** how **I** felt about the treatment I have and continue to be subjected to by, among others, [the courts](#) and [the police](#) since 2002. **Note under Reason 3(3)** how 'Master Eyre' shows his barely veiled fury at my website – and frustration at being unable to do anything about it:

- "**The Claimant had by now launched her own web-site. It consists of a single page of nearly 50,000 words, in other words the single page is as long as some published novels...**". Under para.55 of my [17.10.11](#) Request, I wrote: "*This is irrelevant (in addition to being incorrect, as my website contains many sections). However, it helps confirm the Master's disposition towards me*".
- Also under **Reason 3(3)**: "**...The page is no more than a sustained tirade against Mr. [Ladsky](#) and his supposed allies**". As I wrote under para.58 of my [17.10.11](#) Request: "*If my 'criticisms and accusations' (definition of 'tirade') were not justified and true, I would no doubt have had proceedings filed against me a long time ago. As to my being 'angry' (definition of 'tirade'), I leave the court of 'Joe public' to judge me on that in the light of my experience [since 2002 with various State parties and other parties in the professions](#)*".



**Another event:** the Met Commissioner's deadline for filing and serving his Defence was 24<sup>th</sup> May. As by 25<sup>th</sup> May I had not received it, assuming it had been intercepted, I went to [the court](#). I was told "**It has sent it. It's with Master Eyre**" and to "**come back on Friday**". As, by Friday 27<sup>th</sup>, I had *not* received it, I returned to the court. Speaking to the same person, I repeated what she had told me on the Tuesday. She denied it, and said that **the court "has not received it"** <sup>(40)</sup>.

By Tuesday 31<sup>st</sup> May, I still did not have the Met Commissioner's Defence, leading me to send this [31.05.11](#) letter asking whether he intended to submit a Defence. As can be seen from the [Defence](#), it was posted to me on 1<sup>st</sup> Jun 11, with a covering letter dated 31.05.11. Note that the Defence is dated '23<sup>rd</sup> May 2011'.

Question: Did Master Eyre review the Met Commissioner's Defence before it was sent to me? Or was this conduct [a continuation of the MPS](#) demonstrating its utter contempt of me, and of its treating me like a piece of dirt, a non-entity who does not have the right to have rights?

## 2.2 06.10.11 Order 'from' Her Majesty's 'Justice' Lang refusing my Appeal Application against the 09.08.11 Order 'from' Her Majesty's Master Eyre

- I submit that, on the basis of the evidence in the case, in refusing my Appeal Application in 'her' [06.10.11](#) Order - by fully endorsing ALL the Reasons in [Her Majesty's Master Eyre's 09.08.11](#) Order – [Her Majesty's 'Justice' Lang](#) was likewise a party to the collusion ([QB # 4 \(7\)](#))

In support of my position I cite the above – including the content of my key documents, as referred to above, under header 1 (bar, of course, my [17.10.11](#) Request).

I repeat my position that, on the basis of the evidence in the case, no reasonable judiciary regardful of its duty to act judicially would reach the conclusion that I had "*no reasonable grounds for bringing the claim*" and therefore "*no real prospect of success*".

Indeed, I most strongly contend that, in my [19.04.11](#) Claim, I demonstrated (more than) "*reasonable grounds for bringing it*" ([CPR Rule 3.4\(2\)](#)), and the irrefutable evidence I subsequently supplied confirmed that I had "*real prospect of succeeding at trial*" ([CPR Rule 24.2](#)) – **at least in an unbiased, impartial court.**

## 2.3 24.10.11 Order 'from' Her Majesty's 'Justice' Mackay also refusing my Appeal Application

- I very strongly contend that the [24.10.11](#) 'Order' 'from' '[Her Majesty's 'Justice' Mackay](#) was agreed ahead of the 'hearing' – and that my [17.10.11](#) Request was evidently 'not liked' ([QB # 4 \(7\)3](#))

In support of my position, I cite:

1. the fact that Her Majesty's 'Justice' Mackay **read** 'his' Reasons i.e. had them prepared **ahead** of the 'hearing' (as I wrote in my [28.11.11](#) complaint to the Office for Judicial Complaints);

---

<sup>40</sup> On Friday 27<sup>th</sup> May, after leaving [the court](#), I was (as per usual) heavily dogged, hounded and monitored– no doubt, on this occasion, with the added anticipation that the 'apparent' lack of defence from the Met Commissioner would lead me to seek legal advice – see My [Diary 27 May 11](#)

2. as stated on the [24.10.11](#) Order: *"the Respondent was neither present nor represented"*;
3. the fact that 'he' **failed** to include 'his' Reasons for rejecting my – legitimate - Appeal, and subsequently **refused** to do so (my [31.10.11](#) and [14.11.11](#) letters; 'his' reply of [25.11.11](#) that to get them, I should *"pay for transcription"*; followed by my [28.11.11](#) complaint to the Office for Judicial Complaints which, in its [05.12.11](#) 'Get lost' 'reply' deliberately misrepresented my complaint);
4. the fact that the 'Order' does **not** refer to my [17.10.11](#) Request – which was the **subject** of the 'hearing' (The 'Order' only states: *"And upon the Judge having read the written evidence filed"*). (Does this mean that my Request was destroyed?).
5. To this could also be added the wrong date for my Application, as it states *"30 October 2011"* - instead of [30<sup>th</sup> August 2011](#)'

**I repeat my comment about how a reasonable judiciary regardful of its duty to act judicially would have acted.**

**(You can see why 'the PM, David Cameron', wants to pull the United Kingdom out of the scrutiny of the European Court for Human Rights) <sup>(41)</sup>**

### 3 Conclusions

No doubt, [the MPS](#) will have rushed to place its 'trophy': [09.08.11](#), [06.10.11](#) and [24.10.11](#) Orders, on its database with the *"crime reports"*, and whatever other highly damaging data it holds about me – as 'irrebutable proof' of 'supporting evidence' for the data, as well as 'justification' for what it has and continues to do to me, as well as instigates against me e.g. my [19.07.11 Home Office](#) Wit.Stat. (Its database is accessible by many State parties. And, who knows, perhaps even non-State parties such as e.g. its protégés in the leasehold sector).

**OUTCOME:** as has been happening to me [since 2002](#) when he had his 1<sup>st</sup> fraudulent 'service charge' demand sent to me - **the KEY BENEFICIARY is my 'poor', "[Jewish](#)" "[neighbour](#)", [Andrew David Ladsky](#), the "[VULNERABLE VICTIM](#)" 'I' "[INTIMIDATE](#)", and to whom 'I', 'of course', represent '[a risk](#)' – currently enjoying [the fruit](#) of his [fraudulent](#) activities, while laughing his head off at me for having his [2003](#) and [2007](#) so-called 'complaints' against me remaining in their current state - so that they can continue to be used against me.**

**(I continued to expose many of the LIES, CONNIVING and COLLUSION I report, among others, in this document, in my: (1) [22.08.11](#) letter to the MPS – enclosing payment of [£8,478](#), following the [09.08.11](#) Order; (2) [13.09.11](#) letter to the so-called '[Independent](#)' [Police Complaints Commission](#) – enclosing payment of [£3,703](#), following the [29.07.11](#) Order – on which I copied the [Home Secretary](#) stating that she very clearly approved of the conduct of [the MPS and IPCC](#); (3) [22.08.11](#) letter to the [Home Office](#) – enclosing payment of [£5,000](#), following the [09.08.11](#) Order).**

---

<sup>41</sup> In early 2012, he told the European Court that it *"should concentrate on countries such as Russia that do not respect Human Rights"*. (My Diary [25 Jan 12](#)) As I wrote on pg 12 of my [13.09.11](#) letter to the IPCC: *"In the light of my experience, I laughed when, this week, during his visit to Russia, David Cameron lectured the Russians by saying that they "must crack down on state corruption" and that the "rule of law is vital"*. Like a sticker (I saw very briefly on TV, and may not therefore be quoting accurately) on an overseas train/tram, it seemed, in the area of a European organisation: *"So, so, so British!"*

#### 4 APPENDIX – MEDIA SOURCES

##### BBC2's Newsnight – c. summer 2011

In the context of the phone hacking scandal, Simon Hughes, senior LibDem, said on one of the BBC2's Newsnight programmes that *"the challenge in setting-up an inquiry would be to find a judge who is not a Mason"*.

##### [The Telegraph - "Judges no longer have to declare Freemasonry" - 05.11.09](#)

*Since 1998, those becoming judges or magistrates have been required to say if they are a Mason after the then Home Secretary – Mr Straw – said membership of "secret societies such as freemasonry" could raise suspicions of impartiality and objectivity".*

*But, now Justice Secretary, Mr Straw (<sup>42</sup>) has abandoned the requirement after the United Grand Lodge of England threatened legal action following a ruling by the European Court of Human Rights.*

*In 2007, the court ruled in favour of Italian Masons that making an official declare their membership breached their rights to free association and was discriminatory.*

*Mr Straw yesterday said a review had shown no evidence of "impropriety or malpractice" as a result of a judge being a Freemason and that it would be "disproportionate" to continue with the practice".*

##### [The Telegraph - "Freemasons in the police leading the attack on David Cameron's riot response" - 20.08.11](#)

*"Leading police officers have set up a national Masonic lodge...named "Sine Favore", after the Latin motto of the Police Federation, "Without Fear, Without Favour".*

*Lodge number 9856 was officially opened by a senior Masonic official, Russell Race. He is the Metropolitan Grand Master, head of the Grand Lodge of London, a corporate financier and chairman of a construction firm behind the huge Westfield shopping centre in west London and the Pinnacle office development which, when completed, will be the tallest building in the City of London.*

*The lodge is based at 10 Duke Street in central London, which is also the headquarters of the Supreme Council of the 33<sup>d</sup> Degree, one of the most important and mysterious bodies in international Masonic circles, which has an elite membership of only 75 people.*

*The founding members of "Sine Favore" include senior officials from the Police Federation, the police staff association, which is currently fighting the Government over its plans to cut budgets.*

*The new Masonic lodge is led by John Tully, a Metropolitan Police officer... Other founder members include officers from the Metropolitan Police..., a personal injury lawyer who*

---

<sup>42</sup> (i) [West London County Court # 28 and # 30](#); (ii) [Lawyers, Courts & Legal Services Ombudsman](#), section C – 'The replies from the Ministry of 'Justice' to my 2 January 2010 Subject Access Request under the Data Protection Act 1998 = continuation of the breach of my rights by the Ministry of 'Justice'; (iii) [My Diary – February 2009 and beyond](#), under 'Cabinet ministers, MPs, MEPs and Quangocrats on the "grave train"';

*specialises, according to his firm Russell Jones and Walker, in "road traffic accidents and public liability cases for both private clients and associations including the Police Federation".*

*Membership is open to all serving and retired officers across Britain and others working alongside the police, including lawyers, criminologists and even the financial advisers who managed 'officers' retirement plans.*

*Masonic rules require members to do all they can to support each other, to look after each other and to keep each others' lawful secrets. New members of the so-called Brotherhood are blindfolded, a hangman's noose placed around their necks and they are warned their throat will be slit and their tongue torn out if they break their oath. Critics argue this could put them at odds with discharging their duty to serve the public.*

*The "Sine Favore" Lodge was opened despite the conclusions of a Parliamentary inquiry which warned of public fears that "Freemasonry can have an unhealthy influence on the criminal justice system". The inquiry followed questions about Masonic involvement in the abandonment of an investigation into a shoot-to-kill policy in Northern Ireland and with the West Midlands Serious Crime Squad, which was disbanded after evidence of police malpractice.*

*The Police Federation refused to discuss whether any of its officials had disclosed their involvement with Freemasonry. A spokesman said: "Being a member of any organisation is a matter for the individual, so long as membership of that organisation does not compromise their duties and responsibilities as a police officer".*

#### **Daily Mail - "Freemasons open a new branch...at Buckingham Palace" - 09.03.08**

*"...it is being formed by members of the Royal Household and police who protect the Royal Family.... The Palace has no power to halt the formation of the lodge... the Queen's cousin, the Duke of Kent, is head of the organisation as Grand Master of the United Grand Lodge of England... a spokesman for the Queen said "Buckingham Palace has not, and would not, endorse this sort of arrangement. No permission has been given by the Palace for a Buckingham Palace lodge or anything similar..."*

*The founding of the lodge has also alarmed Royal staff who do not want to be associated with the fraternity famed for bizarre initiation rites, mystical regalia and mysterious codes of conduct. It is also likely to cause consternation among career women in the Palace, as it is a men-only organisation. Masons are widely believed to further the business and professional interests of brother Masons, although they would deny this and claim it is a harmless social and charitable organisation"*