

This Witness Statement was in response to the [Home Office](#)' [07.07.11](#) Application and Defence to have my [19.04.11](#) Claim struck out – [with costs](#).

[Master Eyre, London Queen's Bench](#), granted it its wish in this [09.08.11](#) Order (see my attached comments why I submit that it is unfair)

I enclosed payment with my [22.08.11](#) letter.

(I also copied the Home Office on my [13.09.11](#) letter to the so-called '[Independent](#)' [Police Complaints Commission](#) enclosing payment of [£3,703](#) following the striking out of my claims in the [29.07.11](#) Order). (My claims against the MPS were also struck-out in 'Master Eyre's FULL OF LIES [09.10.11](#) Order)

All subsequent notes are also in green boxes.

Made by Claimant

Witness: [N Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé](#)

4th Witness Statement

Exhibits: 1, 3, 4, 6, 9-11 (14th June 2011 Reply); KDR: 3-8, 13, 14, ; JC: 2

Dated 19th July 2011

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE

[Claim No HQ11XO1471](#)

[QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION](#)

BETWEEN:

[NOËLLE KLOSTERKOTTER-DIT-RAWÉ](#)

Claimant

- and -

[THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS](#)

First Defendant

- and -

[INDEPENDENT POLICE COMPLAINTS COMMISSION](#)

Second Defendant

- and -

[SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT](#)

Third Defendant

WITNESS STATEMENT OF [NOËLLE Y S KLOSTERKOTTER-DIT-RAWÉ](#)

1. I am Noëlle Y S Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé, the Claimant in this action. I am a Litigant in Person, a pensioner, and leasehold owner of flat 3, Jefferson House, 11 Basil Street, London SW3 1AX, where I permanently reside.

2. This Witness Statement is in response to the Third Defendant's [7th July 2011 Application](#).

Snapshot under [My Diary 23 May 10](#)

3. I have been under surveillance since at least the beginning of 2002; time when I challenged the [managing agents](#) for [Jefferson House](#) on the fact that the [intended works](#) included the [construction](#) of a [penthouse flat](#), costs for which I (and my fellow leaseholders) were not responsible. I have evidence, including a witness, in support of my claim that this surveillance was clearly instigated by [my landlord](#), [Andrew David Ladsky \('ADL'\)](#). It has continued every since.

4. I believe that, since the [summer of 2005](#), to this surveillance instigated by ADL has been added surveillance by the State - frequently in tandem with the surveillance instigated by ADL. 2005 coincided with the time I was still battling on several fronts / had just stopped battling in the context of my complaints against various parties in the public, as well as private sector following ADL's (proven) fraudulent service charge demand of 2002. (The [29th November 2002](#) claim [against me for £14,400](#) (I refer to page 16 of Exhibit **KDR 13**) was followed by a [21st October 2003](#) 'offer' for £6,350. (I refer to page 26 of Exhibit **KDR 13**).

[Summary of my complaints: My Diary 6 May 08](#)

5. The last section of this Witness Statement contains a brief overview of my experience with the First and Third Defendants.

6. Surveillance

7. The surveillance includes:

- (1) [Monitoring of and interference with my means of communication](#):

[Introduction to My Diary 2009](#)

mobile phones; post; e-mails and computer that led to, among others, my missing an important event, and have included attempts to prevent me from switching to another mobile phone operator. It also includes interference with public telephones I have been using on more than one occasions.

[Snapshot in My Diary 23 May 2010](#)

- (2) Use of [directed surveillance](#) in the UK which, on occasions, has included: threatening behaviour and abuse; harassment by a police

helicopter; hounding me in public toilets; my movements being reported on by a police officer in uniform, and being mocked by another one. This surveillance was taking place when I was working, including during my lunch breaks. It has also taken place overseas.

[Snapshot in My Diary 23 May 2010](#)

- (3) Use of [covert human intelligence](#) with a focus on assessing / observing my state of mind, probing me on my plans.
 - (4) Use of [intrusive surveillance](#) in my flat.
8. [Interception of my means of communication](#)
 9. The interception of my means of communication includes my mobile phones, e-mail and correspondence.
 10. Because some of my post was intercepted at Jefferson House, 5-6 years ago I set-up a PO Box. The following are just examples of interference.
 11. In 2010, one of my uncles died. To allow me to attend his funeral, in France, my Cousin: (i) left me a message on both my mobile phones (numbers I have had for several years): I did not get them; (ii) sent me an e-mail (on an address she had previously used on numerous occasions): I did not receive it; (iii) sent an express '[3-day delivery](#)' letter: 5 days later, it was not in my PO Box. I only found it in my PO Box the following week – after the funeral had taken place. The content of the letter could be easily guessed from the interception of the voicemails and e-mail, as well as from the fact that my Cousin wrote her address on the envelop and this address is stored on my mobile phones. This interference certainly achieved its objective: not surprisingly, I was very distraught to have missed my Uncle's funeral.
 12. [Other post](#)
 13. The Second Defendant sent me a [22nd February 2010](#) letter, posted 1st class on 23rd February, in which it stated that it was considering an Application for Dispensation from the First Defendant in the context of my complaint against the First Defendant. I refer to Exhibit **JC/2**. In this letter, it gave me 1 week to reply, failing which it would grant the dispensation. On 28th February, the letter

[Introduction to My Diary 2009](#)

was not in my PO Box. I only found it in my PO Box the following week – past the deadline for reply.

More evidence of interception of my post since – see [Intro to My Diary 2009 - Post](#)

14. Following my filing the [19th April 2011 claim](#), I did not receive the [Notice of Issue](#) from the Court.
15. The interception of my post can only take place at two points: at the sorting office, or at my PO Box. Considering the nature of the items intercepted, it suggests that the interception is taking place at the sorting office - under the supervision of a party that has access to related information to assist in the selection of items to be intercepted. This is evidenced, for example, by the interception, in February-March 2010, of my Cousin's voicemails, e-mail and letter, with the latter being released to me once the funeral had taken place.
16. Mobile phones
17. Since about 2005-06, I could tell that my conversations on my mobile phones were being listened to.
18. On [25th October 2007](#), a friend came over to London. 2-3 days previously, he had left a message on my mobile phone to ask whether he could stay in my flat. On the day of his arrival, I had sent him text messages from each of my mobiles, asking him to confirm the time and place where we would meet. I phoned him using my mobile. We agreed to meet in front of Harrods between 18h15 – 18h30. Realising that I was going to be late, I sent him a text message saying that I would be there by c. 18h45.
19. I arrived by the corner of Harrods at 18h40. There must have been over 50 people on the pavement around the station. Before I saw my friend, among the crowd, I spotted immediately a man who looked to me like a cop. Short, in his 40s, grey hair cut very short, wearing a suit. I got the impression I had seen him before which could be why my attention was immediately drawn to him.
20. When I saw my friend, I told him I believed the man was there to observe us. My friend said that, when he arrived at 18h05, the man was already there and had been looking at him. (My friend had a suitcase). Like me, my friend had

immediately spotted the man, and had arrived at the same conclusion as me: he was likely to be a cop. My friend is a bodyguard of many years. His clientele includes high ranking government officials, some of the 'rich and famous', etc.

21. After being in my flat for c. 1 hour, we made our way to a local restaurant. The restaurant was set away from the street, with a large courtyard in front of it. We were placed about 3 tables away from the window. After c. 45 minutes, we both noticed a man, wearing glasses and a brown blouson, lurking around in the courtyard. He was looking at us. I did a rude gesture, and the man departed. Another c. 30 minutes went by, then, a man, in his late 30s, c. 1.80m, average build, English, wearing just an 'office-type' shirt, walked quickly alongside the window of the restaurant, and back, disappearing out of view. I got up to have a look at the side of the window. The man was there, stationary, like hiding in the deep, dark recess. He was wearing head phones. I explained to my friend what I had seen. Like me, he had a look, and saw the man. We left c. 15-20 minutes later. The man was still in the same position: in the deep, dark recess of the window. And, in spite of the low temperature, still only wearing a shirt. I made it very obvious that we saw that he was still there.
22. My friend agreed with me that the events of the evening were, to say the least, very odd indeed, sharing my view that these people were interested in us.
23. In October-November 2007, I contacted a lawyer to discuss events with my employer. I booked an appointment by using a public telephone. The appointment was several days ahead. I had to resort to using my mobile phone to make subsequent calls / receive calls. This lawyer had clearly been approached: having first obtained case information from me, 2 weeks later, he claimed to have a conflict of interest with my employer. Having stated this, as he was repeating: *"I should not be talking to you"*, he was nonetheless trying to extract more information from me I considered as evidence in support of my position. If this contact was not identified as a result of listening to my telephone conversations, then I was followed to his office. I concluded therefore that, either way, I was under surveillance. (Potentially, there could be option # 3: he phoned my employer and made a deal).

24. Since 2008, to the monitoring of my mobile phones has been added interference.
25. On 2nd January 2009, the message "Nothing to display" was sent to one of my mobile phones under the name of friends in France. I refer to page 13 of Exhibit **KDR 14**. They did not send this message which, in any case, they would have written in French. I concluded that the objective was to worry me about my website. Earlier on that day, a snapping sound message had been left on my mobile phone. I viewed this as at threat.
26. One of my mobile phones was on the Hutchinson 3G network. In October 2008, I wanted to change to another mobile phone provider. The industry standard is that, in this situation, 3G should have provided me with a code within 2 working days of my request. In actual fact, I had to battle with 3G over a period of 2.5 months that entailed my writing to a high level within 3G. It still ignored my request. Eventually I resorted to contacting Ofcom in January 2009, asking for its help. I refer to page 14 of Exhibit **KDR 14**. Ofcom did help me. I refer to page 16 of Exhibit **KDR 14**. Within 48 hours of this, 3G finally provided me with the code. Why should 3G play these games? What took place was certainly not about preventing a high-spending customer from leaving its network, as I hardly ever use my phone – because I know that whatever I do with it is being listened to / intercepted / interfered with. 3G ignored my repeatedly asking who had put it up to treating me in this way.
27. I transferred my mobile number from 3G to O2. It is clear from events that O2 also got 'on board': (i) the fact that I did not get my Cousin's message in February 2010 (as discussed above); (ii) in July 2010, a public sector employee wrote me that over the previous month, he had been unable to contact me because my phone was not ringing. I tried the phone on 22nd July and could not get a dialling tone. However, I had received a text 10 days earlier, and the voicemail did not give any indication that my phone had been disconnected. In an O2 store, I placed my SIM card in one their phones. On calling the number, the phone rang. One minute later a text from O2 on my mobile stated that it

- was sending me the settings for my phone - hence as though it was the first time that I was using O2. My phone had been disconnected.
28. As ADL cut off / had my landline cut off in the flat in 2005/06, I am reliant on my mobile phones in case of emergency.
29. In its [7th April 2011](#) letter to me (I refer to page 29 of Exhibit **KDR 14**) the Third Defendant wrote, in reply to my [29th March 2011](#) letter in which I related some of the above (I refer to page 24 of Exhibit **KDR 14**) that: *“Much of the covert activity you describe require authorisation under the [Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 \(RIPA\)](#) when used by public authorities such as the police or the Security Service. RIPA requires that, when public authorities need to use covert techniques likely to obtain private information about someone they are investigating, they do so in a way that is necessary and proportionate with regard to human rights”*.
30. Public telephones
31. Knowing that my mobile phones are being monitored, has led me to stop using them and use public telephones instead.
32. My telephone conversations have also been listened to on public telephones I have been using on more than one occasion. This includes, on [7th July 2011](#), when I was talking to a contact from a phone box at a university where I use the library. (I used this phone to e.g. talk to the Third Defendant’s lawyers). The phone box had been accepting my coins. At one point, I told the person about the death threat I received in June 2009 (*“Enjoy your life. You don’t have long to live”*) and followed this by saying: *“Because of my experience with the [police since 2002](#), every night when I go to bed, I ask myself whether this is going to be the night I am going to be killed. In the morning, when I wake-up and realise that I have made it through the night, I ask myself: am I going to be killed today?”*. I needed to put more coins in the phone box. I had a large assortment of coins with me. No matter what I put in the phone box, which must have been half a dozen different coins, none of them were accepted. I told my contact that this line was being listened to because I had used it previously

and that what was happening was that 'they' were interfering with it to end my conversation. It had happened before with another public telephone, when I phoned a contact in the north of England - except that this time the money I had put it in was not being used up. As soon as I commented on this to my contact, my credit started to run down.

33. The implication of the above is that, with the aim of preventing interference, I always try to use a different phone box.

34. E-mails

35. My e-mails on my French account have been monitored for a long time. In addition to my not receiving the February 2010 e-mail from my Cousin, as discussed above, other e-mails have also been intercepted.

36. For example, in November 2010, I met with a financial adviser. When he asked for my e-mail address, I warned him that my important e-mails were being intercepted, and to therefore not rely on this means of communication. We agreed that he would do a test. I never received the e-mail. When I saw him, I verified that he had sent it to the correct e-mail address. He had. Further, the e-mail was not bounced back, as would be expected if it could not be delivered. I told him because the tactic had failed to prevent me from establishing contact with him, he should send me another one, and that I was pretty sure that this time I would receive the e-mail. I did.

[Introduction to My Diary 2009](#)

37. My computer

38. In 2007, I was using a personal Vodafone 3G card for my personal computer. (Vodafone was a client of my then employer). It seemed to me that, when I was using the card, my files were being intercepted / my computer hacked into. I tested it by closing down all the programmes and not doing anything with my computer. The hard drive was nonetheless active, as the light kept flicking. On 20th May 2007, as I was using the directory view, the Vodafone logo replaced the Microsoft 'W' on all my Word documents. I refer to [page 3](#) of Exhibit **KDR 14**. I immediately stopped using the card.

39. In the context of the above, I highlight some of the events that had taken place over the previous weeks: (i) [16th February 2007](#) threat of bankruptcy proceedings and forfeiture from [ADL's solicitors, Portner and Jaskel](#). I refer to page 50 of Exhibit **KDR 13**; (ii) [27th February 2007](#) claim filed against me in [West London County Court](#), by Portner and Jaskel. I refer to page 52 of Exhibit **KDR 13**; (iii) ADL's complaint against me to the First Defendant, in [March 2007](#), falsely accusing me of, among others, having anti-Semitic comments on my website, [www.leasehold-outrage.com](#), and in relation to which the First Defendant never contacted me at any point in time. Instead, it approached my website Host [accusing me of having 'committed a crime'](#). I refer to [my Witness Statement](#) in reply to the First Defendant's [30th June 2011](#) Application; (iv) ADL's letter to my then employer, dated [26th March 2007](#) (I refer to Exhibit **KDR 8**) making the same false accusations against me as told to the First Defendant, added to other false accusations; (v) my then employer then taking actions against me that included cutting off my access to the Internet. I refer to page 5 of Exhibit **KDR 14**, my [10th April 2008](#) letter to my GP.
40. [My flat](#)
41. I am convinced that my flat has been bugged for several years. [Jefferson House](#) is a converted block. Parts of the ceilings in my flat that are alongside the communal corridor are deep, and the ceilings flimsy.
42. I have two spotlights in the ceiling by my bed. In [January/February 2006](#), late at night, as I was in bed, I could see one of the spotlights being faintly lit up. I had not switched on the spotlights. The same thing had happened the previous year - with both spotlights. At the time, I determined the reason to be because some tiles had been removed from the ceiling in the communal corridor leading to the light from the corridor shining on the base of my spotlights. This was not the case this time, and there was no hole in ceiling of the corridor. Hence, the only possible explanation was that the light came from a hole in the wall of the flat next door / ceiling of that flat.

43. One evening, in c.2008, as I was sitting on my bed, I decided to put it to the test by saying: “*Some of them will have a horrible death*”. As soon as I said this, a wire was rattled in the ceiling.
44. In 2009-10, on 2-3 occasions, I saw a man, short, in his 30s, perhaps of Jewish origin, coming into the flat next door, late at night, carrying some kind of briefcase. He would stay for c.10 minutes and then leave. Once, I challenged him; he said something along the line of 'not to worry, he was not doing anything wrong'. I heard him on several other occasions when he did the same thing i.e. stay for c.10 minutes, and, from my window, saw him leave.
45. Especially since 2009-10, I have noted that sound reverberates in: the kitchen (which is contingent with the next door flat); bathroom (contingent with the communal corridor); bedroom area. It was not doing this before. For example, I noted that 'the sensitivity of the recording' appeared to have been turned up on the day I took delivery of the unsupported 'service charge' demand of £24,000, dated 9th June 2010.
46. I bought a special camera in order to look into the ceilings. On 3rd May 2010, I used the camera and saw a conical object in the ceiling of the corridor in my flat. It had evidently been placed there recently, as there was no dust on it. In the ceiling of my bedroom, I saw what looked like an antenna. I refer to page 19 of Exhibit **KDR 14**.
47. In its 31st July 2006 letter to me, the managing agents wanted to get access to my flat “*In order to test the fire alarm system*”. I refer to page 2 of Exhibit **KDR 14**. There is nothing connected with a fire alarm system in my flat. My take on this was that it was an excuse to get access to the inside of the ceilings to my flat.
48. It seems that 'a solution' was found as, following the failed attempt to flood my flat on 6th February 2007, that had caused considerable damage to the ceiling in the communal corridor, the ceiling was dismantled in 2009-10 - giving ease of access to the inside of my ceilings. A very large gap remained opened for many

weeks. As I am out of the flat all day, and do not return until late in the evening, because I absolutely hate being there, I do not know what was done.

49. Sometime in 2009-10, I saw one of the First Defendant's officers come out of Jefferson House. (His face is etched in my memory). As he was at the bottom of the steps to the entrance, he said, looking up towards the entrance door "*Don't worry, I've made sure it can't be found*".

50. I have also noted that ADL 'happens to be' in the main entrance corridor as I leave Jefferson House around the time of certain key events. I do not see him at other times.

51. [Covert surveillance in the UK](#)

Of course, more of the same since – see [Snapshot in My Diary 23 May 2010](#)

52. I am being hounded from the time I leave the flat I call the 'hell hole', the [Jefferson House 'concentration camp'](#), until I return to it. As stated earlier on, some of the surveillance is very clearly instigated by ADL. The rest, I believe to be instigated by State parties. The following are examples of what I believe involved the latter, including some being undeniably carried out by the First Defendant.

53. On 1st June 2005, I had lunch with my Honorary Mum at Dickens & Jones. She was sitting against the wall in the restaurant and therefore facing the restaurant area. At some point, I felt somebody behind us. It was a man, Caucasian, c. 1.80m, sitting by himself, in his 40s, grey hair, wearing a dark green T-shirt. He had a rucksack placed next to him on the table. He seemed to be particularly interested in us. (Later on, my Mum said that he had been "*glaring*" at her). I gave him a look that said 'I am aware that you appear to be interested in us'. He left c. 2-3 minutes later. My Mum and I remained in the restaurant for c. another 40 minutes. We then made our way towards Bond Street station. As we were walking on Oxford Street, I could feel that somebody was very close behind us. I pulled my Mum to the side to let the person go by. It was a man. My Mum immediately said: "*That's the man who was in the restaurant!*" It was the same man.

54. On [15th January 2006](#), I was due to meet my Cousin in Canterbury. I walked from the ~~the~~ flat to Victoria National Express coach station, changing direction twice on my way there (to confuse the 'minders'). As they are residential streets, I thought that it would reduce the incidence of CCTV cameras. I queued for a ticket but was told that I missed the 10h30 bus. I nonetheless bought a ticket thinking I might take the 11h30 bus instead. I placed myself in a corner, which was in a recess, in the same area in order to phone my Cousin. I was therefore out of view when people came into the ticket hall. Quite a few people arrived. However, my 'internal radar' was activated by one man, short grey hair, mid-late forties, c. 1.88m, wearing a navy blue, thigh high, padded, all-weather jacket. Like a significant number of men who, since 2005, I concluded were following me, he looked as though he could be a cop. There was something about him that made it fairly obvious that he had not come in the ticket hall to buy a ticket.
55. He gave me a nasty, hard look as he went by and continued walking for a few steps. He then turned round and again looked at me with the same stern, hard facial expression. I returned the compliment. He yet again turned around and walked to the end of the ticket hall, thereby walking alongside the people who are queuing. At the end, he turned right and walked back, also alongside the people who were queuing, but on the other side i.e. he walked alongside the ticket counters that were manned. As he went passed me, he again looked at me with the same nasty look. Yet again, I returned the compliment.
56. After c. 1 minute, I left the area. I had spotted another man, late thirties, hair greying on the side, black leather blouson, black jeans, sporty, thick sole brown shoes, small brown holder strapped around his waist. He had been walking around and, when I looked at him, started to look at a small leaflet he had been holding with his hands clasped behind his back. As I came out of the hall, he was inside close to the entrance. I refer to [page 1](#) of Exhibit **KDR 14**. I went in the street, where I stopped a few metres from the entrance to observe movements. I walked back into the hall to see if I could spot the man with the grey hair and padded jacket. I could not. I walked out of the hall and turned right to go to the nearby bus stop, as I decided that the next bus would get me

to Canterbury too late for lunch. Within less than one minute, the man wearing a black leather blouson that had been standing inside close to the entrance also walked out and away in the opposite direction. I thought he crossed the road. I was not paying too much attention as I was looking out for the bus.

57. On [2nd August 2006](#), in the evening, I got off a bus at Piccadilly to go into a music store. Within minutes, I felt that I was being observed. After about 20 minutes, I took a bus to get back to the flat. A man, in his 50s, who boarded the bus, came to sit next to me on the other side of the aisle. He was short, skin colour suggesting from India / Pakistan. He was looking at me every so often. As the bus reached my 'usual' stop, the man put his left foot in the alleyway in order to come out of his seat. I did not move. He put his foot back where it was and looked at me. I was laughing inside. As we neared the next stop, I got up to see what he would do. He did not move but was looking at me. My 'internal radar' had also led me to spot another man, in his late 50s/early 60s, c.1.80m, huge pot belly, pot marked face, with a big, fat nose (reminding me of the nose I have seen on some alcoholics). He wore glasses. He got off the bus before me. I decided to stay at the bus stop as though I was waiting for a bus. The man looked at a bit of a loss. I think he realised from the time that we came off the bus that I had spotted him. He walked to the end of the pavement about 10 metres away and stayed there, his back turned to me. He then walked back in my direction a bit, then back to the edge of the pavement. By then I was standing in a doorway that is at the back of the bus shelter in order to have a good view of the 'show'.
58. My guess is that, considering what took place subsequently, the man had sent a message, while he had his back turned to me. He walked back, passing in front of me and stopped at the beginning of the bus shelter, on the edge of the pavement. After more pacing up and down the length of the bus shelter, he positioned himself practically out of my view (I could see his feet) alongside the external face of the bus shelter, at the other end, and hence, on the edge of the pavement where he remained. One man, Caucasian, in his 30s, had arrived, who positioned himself alongside the grocery store. Then another two men, in their late 20s arrived. They were accompanied by a woman of Far East origin,

also in her late 20s. They stayed by the edge of the pavement in line with the man who was positioned alongside the grocery store. They all looked in my direction at different times and hence, turned round in order to do so.

59. After about 3-4 minutes, a taxi stopped close to where they were. Hence, about 8-9 metres from where I was. There were at least three people in the taxi. (1-2 of the passengers stayed in and the taxi departed). One of those who came out of the taxi was a man, tall, about 1.90m, English origin, light colour hair. He was in his early 40s. He looked at me practically from the time he came out of the taxi. Some non-verbal exchange took place between him and the people standing on the pavement. The man walked in my direction while looking at me and continued to do so as he went past me. His facial expression and body language communicated anger and frustration. It was funny to see that pile up and the foot soldiers at a loss as to what they should be doing next. Having gone past me, the 'leader of the gang' i.e. the tall blond man continued walking in the direction of South Kensington. He then stopped about 30m down and was talking on a mobile phone. The two men and the woman walked the two metres to the bus shelter. The woman sat and looked at me several times. A bus arrived which the man who was positioned alongside the grocery store took. I had seen enough. I started to walk in the direction of Knightsbridge, not bothering to turn back to see what the troops were going to do next.
60. On my way back to the flat, I wondered what would happen to me: Would I be ambushed by men, in deserted streets (as had happened on [26th February, 17th March, 22nd March and 19th April 2006](#))? Would there be a repeat of the previous evening when, after midnight, as I was close to Jefferson House and about to cross the dead-end street, 4 men, sitting in a car, who had been waiting for me to arrive, started the car and drove straight at me as I started to cross the street? Would they actually run me over tonight? What else might happen once I walked into Jefferson House? What was waiting for me in the flat: electricity again cut off? Another malicious leak? Might I get murdered during the night? I did not know, but this thought was (and still is) on my mind everyday. I wondered whether I should believe 'a Jefferson House leaseholder' who phoned me at work at c.19h, at the beginning of [January/February 2004](#)

telling me: "*Don't worry, they won't kill you*". Will I make it through the night? Will I wake-up later on to another day... of hell?

61. As per my daily routine: (1) I conducted a thorough inspection of the flat as soon as I came in; (2) then doubled-locked the door, and placed an ironing board against the letter box, in the hope of preventing something being thrown into the flat / being woken up by the board falling; (3) changed into casual trousers and top - in which I sleep - in order to be ready to storm out of the flat if required during the night. (I started to do this in 2006). For this purpose, I also place my rucksack next to my pillow. Also next to me, in the bed, is a long kitchen knife in case I get attacked - as it is abundantly clear to me from my experience with the [First Defendant](#) that, if I do get attacked, there is no point my phoning the First Defendant.

62. On [7th May 2008](#), I saw a psychiatrist, for the purpose of filing a claim against [my employer](#). It was clear that his objective was to 'put me out of action': he was very clearly not interested in what I had to say, getting impatient with me, hurrying me on, and, within less than half-an-hour of the 'consultation', 'recommended' that I "*should immediately book [myself] in a clinic for two weeks*". I refer to page 10 of Exhibit **KDR 14**, my [11th May 2008](#) letter to him, in which I captured events. Knowing that my mobile phones are monitored, I had gone to the 'specialist' office to make the appointment. It provides proof that I was followed. Further, that this 'specialist' had been approached ahead of my meeting with him. At the time, I had to submit my [Witness Statement](#) in relation to the [27th February 2007](#) claim, by [4th June 2008](#). One week after I saw the 'specialist', on [15th May 2008](#) ADL told me, in front of Jefferson House that "[I was] *in very serious need of help*".

63. I highlight that my (Jewish) GP of 37 years, whom I trusted with my life, had also clearly been approached. I went to my GP's surgery to make an appointment. I saw him on [10th April 2008](#) for the purpose of getting a referral to a psychiatrist in order to file a claim against my employer. (He was fishing for information as, for example, he asked me whether I had recorded my conversations at [KPMG](#)). He refused to give me a referral, claiming that I

[Introduction to My Diary 2009 - Medical](#)

[Introduction to My Diary 2009 - Medical](#)

should have seen him before. I replied that I had seen him on 16th April 2007 because of what was going on at work, and that he had prescribed me tranquilisers and anti-depressants. As he was turning the top 2 pages of his file on me, back and forth, he was looking ill-at-ease. He claimed to have no record of my visit and of the prescription. I sent him a letter, dated [10th May 2008](#), enclosing a copy of the prescription, and of the packaging of the medicine. I refer to page 5 of Exhibit **KDR 14**.

64. On [7th August 2008](#), I saw a gynaecologist who was standing in for the one I normally see for check-ups (in another hospital). I had used a public phone box to make the appointment. (Pressing redial on a public phone, brings back the numbers called). I arrived early for the appointment. About 10 minutes before my appointment, a man arrived, carrying a briefcase. He was English, in his 30s, 'office type'. He looked across at the receptionist without saying anything, while continuing to walk. Both nodded their heads implying a prior arrangement. He went into the office next to the specialist I saw. During the consultation I was asked for the name of my GP. I said that I was going to change to a new one. When asked which, I gave the name of one I had no intention of using. Based on 12-month old information, the gynaecologist wanted to operate on me within the following week. I did not agree to this. I subsequently saw a French doctor who simply could not understand this 'specialist' assessment. On 8th / 9th August 2008, I passed in front of the doctor's surgery of which I had given the name to the 'specialist'. Sitting in a car, a few metres from the surgery's entrance, I recognised a man who, at the time, I had concluded was monitoring me, and had assessed as being police-connected.

65. In [April 2010](#), I had gone to the French Institute, using a different route from the one I normally used to go there every day. The route I took included back streets, where there did not appear to be CCTV cameras. Having reached the Institute, as I was waiting for the door to open, a man arrived. He was flustered, oozing extreme arrogance and anger. He was Caucasian, blond, in his 30s, c.1.85m, slim, sporty and dressed in training gear and trainers. I attributed his arrival to the fact that I had taken a different route, and the police had lost

track of me. As soon as the door of the Institute opened, I went up the stairs at a fairly fast pace, straight to the library. The man followed me, keeping pace with me. Once in, I continued to the next level. I saw him go back down the stairs, and did not see him again. A man, I assessed as being police-connected, came 'to visit' me during the afternoon when I was in the library.

66. On several occasions, some men came to the library and stood purposely in front of me, pretending to look at a book. I used to sit in an area away from other users, where there was only one desk. From their body language and facial expression I concluded that they were police-connected.
67. On [18th April 2010](#), as I arrived in Basil St, a few metres from Jefferson House, I spotted a man standing alongside Patisserie Valerie. He indirectly looked in my direction. My 'internal radar' went on alert. I remained where I was, opting to see what he would do next. He then looked at a piece of paper, and around him, 'as though he were lost'. He stopped by the Capital Hotel (opposite Jefferson House), talking to the doorman, apparently asking for directions. I walked back a few steps on Hans Crescent to be out of view, in case he came back in my direction. He did, and [I took a photograph](#). On [24th April 2010](#), as I was making my way to South Kensington to go to the French Institute (a near daily occurrence at roughly the same time of day), on the corner with Cromwell Road Gardens and Exhibition Road, I again saw the same man. He was stationary, 'apparently' looking at a map. I refer to [page 19](#) of Exhibit **KDR 14**. I have noted that 'looking at a map' tends to be one of the standard tactics used by the individuals who are tracking me, giving them the chance to see what I am going to do next. It may be that this man was under ADL's control rather than the State's.
68. On [6th May 2010](#), on my way to the French Institute, I spotted some snoops who appeared to be interested in my movements. As I arrived in Thurloe Place, at 11h22, a man (man # 1) wearing a black waterproof three-quarter length coat, with a blue rucksack, was stationary alongside the pub, talking in a mobile phone. As my 'internal radar' went 'on alert', I stopped, and prepared my camera. The second man (man # 2) with the tan briefcase arrived, and stopped

alongside the pub, a few metres from man # 1. He had been walking close behind me since Knightsbridge. When man # 1 saw that I was taking a [photograph](#), he started to walk in the direction of Exhibition Road. Man # 2 walked in the direction of Cromwell Place. I did the same thing, crossing over to the pavement where they had been. Man # 2 turned left into Thurloe St, and stood c. 8 metres from the entrance to South Kensington tube station. I also stopped to see what would happen next. After about one minute, he walked to the passage way of the entrance to the station.

69. I did the same thing, and a few seconds later, spotted man # 1 standing alongside the railing of houses that are opposite the entrance to the station. Hence, he had gone round the block: from Thurloe Place, turning right into Exhibition Road, and right into Thurloe St. I took [a photograph](#). I remained where I was, hiding behind the folded shutter of the entrance. (Use of a mobile phone as an excuse to remain stationary is an alternative to using a map pretending to be lost). One minute later, he started to walk in the direction of Cromwell Place. I took another [photograph](#). I decided to follow him to see what he would do next. He stopped about 20 metres up from the corner of the street. (The next street corner, a few metres up, is Thurloe Place, where he was originally positioned at 11h22). I took another [photograph](#). I refer to page 20 of Exhibit **KDR 14**.

70. On [10th May 2010](#), I was in a bookshop in High St Kensington and felt that, as usual, I had been followed. In the bookshop, I positioned myself at the back, at street level, with a good view of the entrance. A young man came in about 1 minute later. He kept walking around, looking at everything and nothing in particular. I knew that his interest was in me, and my 'internal radar' led me to assess him as one of ADL's scums. I stayed where I was, taking one book after the other, and reading the back cover. The man kept circling around. After about 12-15 minutes, I opted to leave the bookshop to see what he would do. As I went past him, he took his mobile phone out of his pocket, and pressed just one key on his mobile. I had seen this done many times before by those I suspect to be monitoring me. I positioned myself slightly out of view, by the phone box. Within about 20 seconds, the man came out of the store. I took a

- [photograph](#). I refer to page 21 of Exhibit **KDR 14**. The man looked panicky. He tried to avoid me by going around the phone box. He went past me at a fast pace in the direction of High St Kensington station. As he went past me, and by then was ahead of me, I shouted "*On whose payroll are you?*" He turned around very briefly. I repeated my question, by which time, he was nearly running away.
71. Having done something else, I returned to the bookshop, and this time, went downstairs where I positioned myself in a corner from where I could see people coming down. A man arrived, (man # 1), who repeated the same 'dance' as the one above: repeatedly circling around the area, looking at everything and nothing, including going back to stands he had previously 'looked at'; coming close to me as if to dare me, intimidate me. After more than 10 minutes, I decided to make myself comfortable to watch 'the show', and sat on the floor, scanning through a number of books. He continued with his 'dance'. Another man arrived, (man # 2) wearing shirt and tie, but no jacket, in spite of the cold weather. I am not sure, but he looked very similar to the man who was 'overseeing' the encounter I had on [17th April 2010](#) (detailed below under Covert Human Intelligence). He remained close by me, 'looking' at books. After about 2-3 minutes, man # 1 also came back close to me. At this point I said "*Vermin!*". They pretended that they did not hear me. Man # 1 continued circling around the area.
72. Another c. 3-4 minutes, and I took the [photograph](#). I refer to page 20 of Exhibit **KDR 14**. The man who had been standing close to me, man # 2, practically jolted and bolted from where he was, in the direction of the stairs, as though his pants were on fire, empty handed, and up the stairs. Man # 1 left within the next 20 seconds - also empty handed. (I should add that, during part of the time, an employee had been taking photographs of the shop and, quite clearly, this had not bothered these two men).
73. From years of being followed, I concluded that the first man in the bookshop was under the control of ADL. Having reported the encounter to ADL, led to the [local 'brigade'](#) turning up in an attempt to intimidate me.

74. These are just examples of what took place on that day - including in this shop. For example, in the bookshop, another man, of Black-African origin, came to sit in the area downstairs c.15 minutes after I arrived. He was still there when I left. At least 1.5 hours later (during which I had gone to the local library where, of course, I was also followed), this man 'happened' to come to McDonalds when I was sitting, in the basement level, and looked at me. I sneered.
75. On [20th May 2010](#), I left Jefferson House to attend a meeting of a support group for victims of the legal sector. It was taking place in a pub in Belgravia. As I was about to go on Sloane St, I spotted a man leaning against a tree opposite the Armani shop. My 'internal radar' went on alert. I tracked back to the corner with Hans Crescent to prepare my camera, out of sight. I then walked back and took a [photograph](#). I refer to page 22 of Exhibit **KDR 14**. The man had a menacing face, squinted his eyes into a slit. His facial features led me to think that he 'might' be from Eastern Europe. I walked past him, and stopped by the Prada shop. He came very close to me and, as he kept walking, said one word. I could not make it out. I turned around and said, loudly "*Go s**** yourself!*"
76. He stopped a few metres down, at the height of the pedestrian crossing, looking at me. Had his eyes been machine guns, he would have killed me on the spot. As I got near him, I asked "*On whose payroll are you?*". He replied "*The devil*". To which I said, in a half laughing tone: "*That, I have absolutely no problem believing*". I crossed Sloane St and went down, past the hotel, on Cadogan Place. I could feel that the man had done the same thing. As I reached Lowndes St, I turned around and, sure enough, he was there. He turned round as soon as he saw me [aim my camera at him](#). He then continued walking in the direction of Lowndes St. We looked at each other. He made a fist gesture at me. I smiled. He did as well.
77. A factor that might have unconsciously led me to spot him is that it seems to me that he was the same man I saw on 14th July 2009, opposite Harrods. (Although I assessed him as likely to be British). I had gone into Sainsbury, opposite Harrods. On coming out, I saw that he was looking in my direction,

and stationary. On seeing that I was looking at him, he then walked to the bus stop, and positioned himself behind it, against the wall of the block of flats behind it. He turned his face away when he saw me prepare my camera. I took a [photograph](#). I refer to page 22 of Exhibit **KDR 14**.

78. On leaving the support group meeting, and heading back to the flat, I could see that I was being monitored, and recognised one of snoops from a previous occasion. I made it known that I knew it by doing a 1 finger sign in my back. I stopped by Waitrose. Within 2 minutes of my being there, a man, English, middle-age, c. 1.7m, cop-look, also oozing negativity, came into the store from the West Halkin St side, the side on which I had come in. I was standing by one of the empty checkouts, with no cashier, waiting for an employee who had gone into the store room. On seeing me, the man made a beeline in my direction. As he was close to me I said: "*Ladsky's dog*". He immediately went back the way he had come from, oozing anger.
79. On [30th June 2010](#) – I refer to **Exhibit 11** of my 14th June 2009 Reply to the First Defendant's Defence in which I reported events as well as captured the [photographs](#) I took at the time.
80. On a previous occasion, one evening, as I was heading back towards the flat, the same 30th June 2010 man had also been sitting on one of the same benches on the elevated section, on the Brompton Road, in Knightsbridge. He had given me a very nasty look as well as made a remark. Having gone past him, I did a 1 finger sign in my back. The following evening, shortly after I left the French Institute, in South Kensington, he had ensured to come face-to-face with me. (Hence, he obviously knew about my movements on that day). I sneered.
81. See also, below, [21st May 2011](#), when this man followed me from Knightsbridge to Gloucester Road.
82. On [12th July 2010](#), I went to a law bookshop near Tottenham Court Road. I had done a few errands prior to getting there. Within 3-4 minutes of being there, I ended-up chatting to a sales assistant about my case. As I was doing this, I spotted a man standing about 3 metres from us, pretending to read a book,

while very clearly listening to every word of our conversation. At the end of our conversation I sat on the floor, in a recess, against a window, such that nobody could come close to me, looking at various law books. After a while, another scum turned up. He kept on circling the relatively small area. As I did not look up, annoyed that I was not paying him attention, he positioned himself immediately in front of me, evidently with the aim of intimidating me. Still not looking at him, I said: "*Pauvre con!*", to which he replied: "*I speak French*". I said, while still not looking at him "*I thought you might*". He eventually left.

83. The above snoops turning up within minutes of my being in the store, and being definitely interested in my movements, is one of many such instances. How did they know where to find me?
84. On [29th July 2010](#), as I reached the French Institute I spotted a man stationary at the other end of Queensberry Mews West, about 6 meters down from the corner with Queens Gate. He was looking in my direction. He was kitted out with the 'standard outfit' of a certain type of goons: high quality weather proof jacket; trekking shoes; ruck sack. I refer to [page 23](#) of Exhibit **KDR 14**. Knowing from previous experience that the snoops are positioned around from where I am, I opted to cross Queensberry Place, and walked down Queensberry Mews West, on the opposite pavement. As I started to do this I could see the man getting a paper tissue out of a pack, in a highly exaggerated way, while looking in my direction. My take on this was that the gesture was intended to justify his being stationary. He then started walking in my direction, looking at me sideways. Half way down the short street, I stopped to take [a photograph](#) and stayed where I was. On reaching Queensberry Place, the man turned left and looked at me as he did this. I walked back and positioned myself close to the entrance to the French Institute to see what he would do. He walked all the way down Queensberry Place to Cromwell Road and, before turning – left – on the Cromwell Road, turned round to look back on Queensberry Place. If his plan was to go, not only on Cromwell Road, but actually at the height where he was going, all that he needed do was to walk straight ahead on Queens Gate from which he had come in order to turn into Queensberry Mews West. Why take the route he took?

85. My taking the above photograph led to 'disapproval' being expressed. Among others, the following day, [30th July 2010](#), I arrived (unusually) from Queensberry Mews West into Queensberry Place in order to go to the French Institute. A man, oozing extreme arrogance and self-importance, was standing a few metres down from the corner, on the pavement that leads to Harrington Road. He was holding a small bottle of mineral water. My 'internal radar' switched on. I stopped. We exchanged looks, his communicating anger and self-importance, mine aiming to communicate contempt. (Evidently, he knew who I was). After about one minute, during which both of us remained stationary, I sneered, shook my head aiming to communicate 'pathetic scum', crossed the road and entered the French Institute.
86. Normally, my doing that meant that I was going to be there until the evening. However, after a few seconds, I decided to go back out to check whether my assessment had been correct. I saw the man walking towards Harrington Road, looking full of himself. He then stopped by a Mercedes E220, number plate P66 WHU. I took [a photograph](#). I refer to page 23 of Exhibit **KDR 14**. He did not see me do that. He then removed his jacket. I returned to the Institute. Wondering whether he was from the police, I subsequently saw an unmarked Mercedes car with a flashing light put temporarily on the roof i.e. undercover officers.
87. On [13th December 2010](#), I took a bus to go to John Lewis in Oxford St. The stop is right in front of the store. I immediately went in, up to 2 flights of stairs to go to the women's toilets. They are very clearly marked as such and, from the shop floor, require going up one flight of stairs. It can be seen from the bottom of the stairs that they lead directly to the toilets i.e. it is clear that there is nothing else. After I had been there for about 10 minutes, a man walked into the toilets: mid 30s; wearing jeans and blouson; carrying a shopping bag. Having looked at me, he immediately turned around and, as he started to walk back down the stairs, he talked inside the left hand side of the collar of his blouson. This is the store from which I gave the snoops the run on [16th May 2010](#) (detailed below), which led to the use of a police helicopter. Evidently, this time, they were determined to not run the risk of losing me.

88. Considering that: (1) from the flat, I came to the store by bus; (2) the bus stop is immediately opposite the entrance to the store; (3) I rapidly went straight-up to the toilets; (4) the man was not on the bus - leads to the conclusion that he had been within the vicinity of the store before my arrival – and evidently knew who he was looking for i.e. had been provided with a photograph / film footage of me.
89. Week of [2 March 2011](#), one evening, I boarded a bus in north-east London, from a stop I have been using fairly frequently, at roughly the same time. I was wearing: a three-quarter-length coat buttoned-up to under my chin, jeans (no slits in them) and trainers. (I was *not* wearing my [T-shirt](#) that states “*Victim of Fraud and Corruption – www.leasehold-outrage.com*”, which I usually wear over my clothes). On walking past a man to go and sit at the back of the bus, I could feel that he was looking at me intently. While I did not look at him, from what I saw from the corner of my eye: he was white, overweight, short-medium height (further confirmed), dressed casually, and appeared to be in his 60s. After c. 2 stops, I saw from the corner of my eye that he turned round to look at me. I again ignored him by continuing to look out into the street. He then went to the upper deck where he remained for the next 2-3 stops. On coming back down, I could see from the reflection in the window that he was looking in my direction. He started to call me: “*a whore; a bloody foreigner who comes to this country as a freedom fighter*”, etc. As I was ignoring him, and never once looked at him, he kept on repeating the abuse, and adding more to it. I assumed from the sequence of events that I was being observed through the CCTV cameras on the bus.
90. From where did that man get the information that: (1) I am a “*foreigner*”? (I did not speak to anybody); (2) I am a “*freedom fighter*”? I concluded that he had been snooping on me before and/or had been shown/given a photograph and/or film footage of me. I wondered how many of these scums have photographs / film footage of me – and what they have been told about me. And the worst part of it is that I am the innocent victim of crime – *not* the criminal. Meanwhile, [the criminal and his equally criminal aides](#) are going

about their business unhindered – and laughing their head off at me: their victim.

91. As detailed in the last part of this Witness Statement, in [October 2010](#), I attempted to file [a complaint](#), with the First Defendant, against a man who had been following me over the course of 4 hours on [30th June 2010](#), and had also harassed me previously. I refer to **Exhibit 11** of my [14th June 2009](#) Reply to the First Defendant's [Defence](#). This man has continued to harass me.
92. For example, on [21st May 2011](#), I took a bus from Knightsbridge to go to Gloucester Road. I suspected that I was being monitored. In the street on which the Gloucester Road tube station is located, I went into shops. As I came out, I saw that the 30th June 2010 goon was c.20 metres ahead of me, and turning back to look in my direction. I pretended to not see him. I crossed the street. In shop windows I could see that he was looking in my direction. I went back down the street. The following day, [22nd May 2011](#), I went to my PO Box. From there I backtracked to get back on the Brompton Road. I then walked on the elevated section of the pavement. As I did so, the same goon was walking in my direction and purposely passed very close to me to ensure I would see him. I continued walking as though as I had not seen him. I crossed the street to go into M&S. On leaving the shop, as I started to walk in the direction of Harrods, I saw from the corner of my eye that the goon was resting on the railing on the elevated section of the pavement, looking in my direction. Yet again, I pretended to not see him.
93. On [9th April 2011](#), as I arrived on Hans Crescent from Pavillion Road, I saw a man stationary, on the left-hand corner of Hans Crescent and Herbert Crescent - facing Pavillion Rd, the Harrods end of Hans Crescent. He immediately looked at me. A woman was unlocking the door to the children's clothes shop. Although he was quite a few meters away from her, and turned away from her, I initially assumed that he was with her. Having walked past, my 'internal radar' was telling me otherwise. So, I decided to turn around, by which time he had turned around and was turning left into Herbert Crescent. I took [a photograph](#) of him with his back to me because my 'internal radar' told me that he would

backtrack. He did. I took a [second photograph](#). I refer to page 31 of Exhibit **KDR 14**. Given that I had just left the flat, he might have been under ADL's control.

94. On [25th April 2011](#), on leaving Jefferson House, I turned right in order to go to the bus stop on Sloane St. The stop is near the corner with Basil St. Within 1-2 minutes of my being there, a man, who looked like a younger version of ADL, arrived from where I had come from. He positioned himself against the lamp post, on the corner of Basil St and Sloane St. This was Easter Monday, just gone past 10 a.m. The streets were practically deserted. None of the shops were open. He remained in this position. I decided to take [a photograph](#). I refer to page 32 of Exhibit **KDR 14**. After a while the bus I wanted to take arrived. He was still in the same position. As soon as I boarded the bus, he left, turning back down Basil St.
95. Practically on a daily basis, I have noted my being watched, and the individual/s then departing as soon as I get on the bus. Occasionally, it is done as obviously as in the above example. As I then get tracked on leaving the bus – by individuals who were not on the bus - e.g. [10th May, 12th July and 13th December 2010](#), above; 21st May, above, and [27th May 2011](#), below – it has to be a fact that I am being monitored through the State-controlled CCTV cameras on buses. And when I am not on a bus that I am being tracked through the State-controlled CCTV cameras in the streets e.g. [April 2010](#), above. Or indeed, by police helicopters, as discussed below.
96. On [27th May 2011](#), on leaving the Royal Courts of Justice, instead of turning left, as I had done on previous occasions, I turned right in the direction of Aldwych, then right into Kingsway and, a few metres up, went into a fairly large coffee shop. I sat at the front end of the shop, a few tables from the door. Some of the other tables were occupied. There were other tables further inside the shop, some of which were also occupied. Having been there for c. 10-12 minutes, a man walked into the coffee shop, holding a mobile phone to his ear. He was in his c.30s, possibly of Mediterranean origin. He looked like a rough type wearing his 'Sunday best': a cap in a brown and beige kind of tweed

pattern, and similar jacket. I immediately sensed that he was looking for me. My feeling was confirmed as his eyes went directly to me. He did not look at anybody else. To cover-up his true motive for coming into the coffee shop, he pretended to be looking for somebody as he walked 2-3 steps past my table, turned around immediately and then walked out of the shop. As he was nearing the door, he was talking on his mobile, and continued to do so once out. He turned left.

97. I assumed that he was one of ADL's scums, because he was in his image, including emanating a very toxic aura. How did this man know where to find me? He was not on the bus I used to come to the Court.
98. On leaving the coffee shop, I also turned left as I had intended. I did not see him. However, my 'internal radar' led me to feel that I was being followed. I turned round and, among the numerous people on the pavement (lunch time hour), spotted the man in the [photographs](#). I refer to page 33 of Exhibit **KDR 14**. He stopped walking abruptly and appeared to me to be figuring out his next move. My take on his reaction is that my turning round suddenly and looking directly at him had unsettled him. Likewise, I felt a negative energy from this man. This, plus his reaction, added to the body language and facial expression (superior / arrogant); the attire, in an office area, from a man of an age who should be working (this attire is too casual, even for a dress-down Friday) - led me to conclude that this man had been following me. His next move was to cross the street. At which point, I took the above [photographs](#).
99. Within 48 hours of my reporting the above on my website, 2 men came in the library of the university I have been using regularly. It is a private library for use by students and alumni like me who are provided with a card in order to get access. The floor area is large, with many rows. It was near empty. Clearly intending to get my attention, one of the men sat at the end of the row on which I was working, dangling his feet. Knowing his objective, I barely glanced at him and saw that he was wearing a very similar, tweed-like cap, as worn by the man who came into the coffee shop on 27th May 2011 (as detailed above). I briefly glanced at the other man. It seemed to me that I had seen him before

and assessed him as being police-connected. They left within the next 2 minutes.

100. Surveillance during my lunch breaks when I was working

101. On [4th January 2006](#), being absolutely convinced that I was also followed as soon as I left the office, at lunch time, I decided to again put it to the test. I went to Blackfriars tube station (unusual for me to do this at lunch time, suggesting I was going somewhere). I stayed in the corner, in between the ticket office and the automatic ticket dispenser (as though I might be waiting for somebody), but out of the way so that I would not inconvenience anybody. There was nothing 'suspicious' for the first 4-5 minutes. After that a man arrived, c. 1.90m, Caucasian, mid to late 30s, glasses, wearing a black leather jacket, black trousers and black sporty shoes. He spent over a minute reading a notice on one of the boards next to which I was standing. He then went to the automatic ticket dispenser, looking at it for nearly one minute, making a face like he could not figure things out. He then went to have a look at the rail & underground map which was a few meters away. He came back to have a look at the ticket dispenser, still with an expression as though he could not understand. (He could have easily gone to the ticket office if he required assistance. There was not a queue).

102. He then went to the pamphlet holder which was about 1.5 meter to the right of the automatic ticket dispenser. He took a leaflet and looked at it for 2-3 minutes. He repeated the same thing with another leaflet, and another one, and another. During this time he occasionally looked in my direction, but not at me. I believed he did this because his attention had been caught by people arriving in the station.

103. After c. 10 - 12 minutes of this, I went through the automatic barriers, down the stairs in order to get to the platform. A man, late 30s, blond, wearing a dark blue-greyish, padded blouson was a few steps behind me as I walked down the steps to the platform. As I was pacing on the platform, keeping him in my line of vision, he went to the kiosk to buy a newspaper. At this point, I left the platform and went back up to go out of the station. The man who had been

looking at the leaflets was still there. I came out of the station through a side exit. I then run across the street. When I was the other side, I turned around. The blond man with the dark blouson had also come out of the station and was walking on the pavement. I was left in no doubt that I was being followed.

104. On [9th August 2007](#), I repeated a similar test. On leaving the office, at lunch time, I went on the passageway of a deserted building near Blackfriars tube station. There was nobody around. Within 2 minutes a man arrived - in the typical attire of a certain type of goons that included carrying a large bag that appeared to be empty / near empty. I refer to [page 4](#) of Exhibit **KDR 14**. He remained there, stationary. There was absolutely nothing of interest in this area. I made it clear that I would not be intimidated by, likewise, remaining stationary and looking in his direction. He eventually left.

105. Once, on leaving the office late at night, in [2006/07](#), I opted to go by St Paul's, then crossed the Millennium Bridge and walked south of the river up to Westminster, then on to the flat. The snoops must have lost track of me as, the following evening, one of my employer's security guards who had been on duty the previous night asked me how I went back. I replied: "*Why? Did the minders lose track of me?*". (Various forms of transport are used to track me down - none which could come on the route I took that evening. In those days, a police helicopter (discussed below) had not yet been used to track me down / harass me). On leaving the office, I sometimes said to the security guards: "*Alert the minders. I am leaving the office*".

106. Surveillance by local officers in uniform

107. On [22nd April 2011](#), around lunchtime, I was in Hyde Park, heading towards Edgware Road. About 50 metres after the bridge, past the coffee shop, in the alley called Main Street, a police van was parked in the middle of the alley. Other than a couple a few metres behind me, there was nobody close to the van. An officer was sitting in the passenger seat. The window was pulled all the way down. I walked along that side of the van. Having gone past and walked about two steps, I heard him say: "*She's just gone past*". Before getting to the park, I suspected that I was being followed.

108. On [16th April 2011](#), before I turned into the street where my PO Box is located, I walked past one of the First Defendant's local officers. Over my coat, I was wearing my [T-shirt](#) that states "*Victim of Fraud and Corruption – www.leasehold-outrage.com*". Although I did not look at him (I can no longer bear the sight of them), I noticed that he seemed to be looking at my T-shirt. About 10 minutes later, in a nearby street, I happened to walk past the same officer. As I did so, (yet again, without looking at him), he said, in an arrogant, challenging, contemptuous, mocking tone "*Alright then?*". I ignored him. I assumed that he had been 'informed' as to who I was. By then, I had sent my [17th March 2011](#) Pre-action letter to the First Defendant, including to the [local Chief Superintendent](#).

It has since continued:
[Snapshot in My Diary 23 May 2010](#)

109. Hounded and harassed by police helicopters

110. On [16th May 2010](#), as I went to several places in the West End, I could feel that I was being followed. In the sports section at John Lewis, I spotted a man who, I concluded, was interested in my movements. I quickly left the store through an emergency staircase and, from the back of the store, went to a nearby restaurant.

111. By 18h10 I was in Duke Street, in front of the very large, multi-door entrance to Selfridges (which, by then, was closed), to shelter from the rain. It has a freestanding glass roof that covers the whole length of the entrance, and is of a width that shelters a large part of the fairly wide pavement. A man arrived from the Wigmore St side, late 30s, of Far Eastern origin, emanating a lot of negativity. Although the whole length of the entrance to the store was deserted, he positioned himself less than 1 metre to my right. I held my open umbrella on the side, turning it rapidly c. 60cm in front of his face to force him away. He did not move. He took a mobile phone out of his pocket, and pressed 1-2 keys. Within seconds, a helicopter flew right above us, with underneath lights blazing. It was so low it seemed that it was about to land on the roof of Selfridges. The man did not look up. At this point, he left in the direction of Oxford St.

112. On [18th September 2010](#), at c.13h30 I was walking through Hyde Park, from Knightsbridge, to go to Edgware Road. Because of the event held later on for the visit of the Pope, there were a lot of police officers in the park. I was walking on the alley called Main Street. As I reached about half way up, I noticed a helicopter circling above. I assumed it was part of the security measures. As I continued walking, the helicopter kept circling above me. It did it again once I reached Stanhope Place Gate to get out of the park. In light of what took place on [16th May 2010](#), (detailed above), at this point I did a one finger gesture.

113. I left the park and walked into Stanhope Place, which was deserted. By the time I reached the end of the short street, and found myself on the corner with Seymour St and Connaught Square, the helicopter was again hovering above me. I again did a one finger gesture. I continued on the right hand side of Connaught Square (which was also deserted). As I reached Connaught St (also near deserted), I crossed the street and stopped on the other side. Yet again, the helicopter circled above me. Yet again, I did the one finger sign. I walked the short street to Edgware Road. As I reached it, the helicopter - yet again - circled above me. It continued hovering around. I then went into an internet café.

114. The same thing has happened on at least 3-4 other occasions e.g. (i) on [22nd September 2010](#) in South Kensington; (ii) when I was in Hyde Park, and ended-up hiding under trees; the helicopter kept hovering, circling right above the trees; and when I moved, it followed me.

115. [Covert surveillance overseas](#)

116. In early [August 2010](#) I went to Orlando to meet with my website Host. The flight stopped in Newark, where I needed to change to another flight. As I was coming out of the plane, I recognised a man I had seen in my local area, and had assessed as police-connected. His face is etched in my memory. He stayed behind me as we walked to immigration control; looking extremely self-important and arrogant, pure hatred was oozing out of him as he looked at me.

117. Within 48 hours of my being in Orlando, as I was very close to my motel, I went past a man, sitting on a block of cement in a deserted car park, in a practically deserted street. He said 'hello' to me. (No, judging from his overall appearance, he was definitely not a tramp). I replied by just saying 'hello'. To this he said: "*You are French aren't you?*" I replied: "*Who told you?*" His response: "*I can tell*". I refuse to believe that such a person can arrive at this conclusion on the basis of my just saying 'hello'. In addition to which, I could have been from French speaking Canada, a more likely visitor due to the proximity. Or, I could have been from Belgium, Switzerland, etc. This, plus the circumstances of the situation, added to the fact that I recognised the police-connected individual on the flight, led me to conclude that I was under surveillance – and this encounter was intended to make me realise it in case I thought I had escaped the British surveillance. I did not need to be told: I knew it from the time I recognised the individual on the flight.

118. I know that I have also been followed on other overseas trips. For example, in August 2007, in Normandy, it entailed an English man who stayed in the same hotel as mine; turned up in the same 'quartier' restaurant in which I was having dinner. I know that some locals were used to track me out in the sticks.

119. [Covert human intelligence](#)

120. Some individuals, including my contacts, have been used to observe / assess my state of mind, attempt to catch me out and gain information from me.

121. In [April 2007](#), I felt very distraught by what had taken place over the previous weeks: (i) the conduct of the First Defendant in relation to the [March 2007 complaint](#). (I refer to my [Witness Statement](#) in response to the First Defendant's [30th June 2011](#) Application); (ii) [the conduct](#) of [my employer](#) following ADL's letter of [26th March 2007](#) (I refer to Exhibit **KDR 8**); (iii) ADL's [16th February 2007](#) threat of bankruptcy and forfeiture, and [27th February 2007 fraudulent claim](#). (I refer to pages 50 and 52 of Exhibit **KDR 13**). I needed a refuge, which could not be the flat as, in addition to hating being there, I also felt very insecure. I also needed to bring some kind of normality back in my life.

[Introduction to My Diary 2009](#)

122. I opted to rent a room in Hackney, in the house of somebody I had known for several years. The first weekend I was there, I went to Oxford Street. I knew that I was being followed. On my way back to Hackney, on the train, a man with a 'cop look', dressed in casual clothes, dangled under my nose a plastic bag from Partridges (which appeared to be empty). As he did this, he was looking at me intently with a superior, self-important, very arrogant air. Partridges is an upmarket delicatessen with only two of its shops using this particular bag (I checked with the shop): both in my local / nearby area of Kensington & Chelsea. In addition to the body language, the probability of somebody in Hackney shopping in Partridges is extremely small. I concluded from the choice of carrier bag that this individual was obviously well acquainted with the area, and that the objective of the exercise was to make me realise, in case I thought otherwise that, even in Hackney, I would not escape the surveillance.

123. At first, I let the tears flow. However, I realised that my contact was observing me (as opposed to trying to discuss things with me). It led me to suppress my emotions. On one occasion, I decided to have a bit of fun. It was on 31st August 2007. I had taken the day off in order to work on [my Defence](#). I got up at my usual time and dressed-up smartly, ready to go out. Once he had left, I changed into casual clothes and stayed in the house all day. I concluded from the (hilarious) look on his face when he came back in the evening that he had passed on the information that I was about to leave, and had been told that I had not left the house. Around midday, 2 men, wearing suits, rang the door bell. I saw them from the first floor. I ignored them.

124. In early 2008, on numerous occasions, within about 5 minutes of my arriving at an Internet cafe in South Kensington (at different times of the day), a man would turn up. Several times, I remarked to him on this 'amazing coincidence'. On, I think, the 2nd occasion, I briefly talked about my case. When he asked me about who the people were, in the context of my giving the names, I said that I had learnt from the police that the driver 'of activity' is Jewish, and, quite clearly, so are [his aides](#). I added that, among others, because I am of part German descent, it had led to my being branded [a "Nazi"](#) by [the police](#). To this

he replied, looking at me intently: "*Hitler should have killed them all, don't you think?*". While very shocked by this statement, I limited my reply to saying that I had a Jewish doctor, as well as Jewish friends. This statement was clearly intended to provoke me / get a reaction from me. I thought: 'they' are trying to make the false 2007 accusations stick against me. I refer to Exhibit **KDR 8**, the 16th March and 20th March 2002 e-mails from the First Defendant to my website Host.

125. On 3rd April 2010, I was in an Internet café in South Kensington where I spent c. 2 hours, until c.17h30. My 'internal radar' locked on a man who arrived some time after and sat at the 2nd computer to my left. As I was packing to leave, I saw him key something into his mobile phone. A few metres before the entrance to the tube station, my 'radar' locked on a man: Caucasian, probably English, early 40s, c. 1.90m, stocky, arms folded on his chest, oozing arrogance and self-importance. He was facing the coffee shops across from the station. Having walked for c.30 metres past the man, I heard my name being called from behind. It was Priya, a student I initially met at the French Institute in September 2009 who said she would welcome the opportunity to speak in French as she had an exam coming-up. Happy to help, at the time, I spent an afternoon with her and also had dinner.

126. In December 2009, Priya was in the French Institute's library. As we were having a coffee on site, I spotted a man sitting at the next table and immediately knew that he was interested in our conversation. What was also obvious was his choice of table, as I would bet that, in the circumstance, anybody else would have sat somewhere else. Priya told me that she was concerned about her flatmate, also a student, because she was "*depressed*" and it impacted on her as it also made her "*feel depressed*". She attributed her flatmate's condition to, among others, her lack of confidence. I told her about a book and, on my computer, showed her examples of exercises from the book. I promised to send her 1-2 examples but, afterwards, changed my mind as it's important to read the book. Consequently, I only sent her the reference details of the book. She did not acknowledge receipt.

127. What Priya said to me on [3 April 2010](#): (1) that she was sitting outside the coffee shop and saw me walk by. (She obviously had not as, by the time she called my name, I was already c. 30 metres past the coffee shop); (2) she felt cold, and was shivering. (It led me to wonder why she was sitting outside); (3) she had come into town in order to use the French library, but it was closed. (She had therefore been in the area for several hours); (4) she had gone to the Victoria & Albert museum (close by) and said that she "*felt lonely*". (If so, I wondered why she had come back to South Kensington, to sit, by herself, in a coffee shop instead of going back to her parents' home. She did mention having an appointment later on); (5) she was thinking of moving into a place of her own because her flatmate continued to be "*depressed*" and was "*depressing*" her. However, she was worried that she might "*feel lonely*". Being by herself in the museum made her "*feel lonely*". She laboured those points. I viewed them as a series of hooks she was throwing in the hope I would say that I have these feelings. At the end of the conversation I gave her a card of my website, saying: "*In case you want to have a look at it*". She said that she would be in the library during the following week. I did not see her, and never heard from her again.

128. On [17th April 2010](#), after leaving [Jefferson House](#), wearing my [T-shirt](#) over my coat that says "*Victim of Fraud and Corruption – [www.leasehold-outrage.com](#)*", I noted that, as per usual, I was being followed. One of the snoops was a man, English, c. 1.85m, somewhat overweight, in his 30s, wearing a dark blue suit. He stopped by the next corner after Harvey Nichols, at the height of the Sheraton hotel, and smoked a cigarette. I positioned myself in the recess of the hotel. After 2-3 minutes, he was still there. Another 2-3 minutes and he was gone. I continued on my way in the direction of Hyde Park Corner, purposely walking slowly. As I reached the next street corner, the same man was there, stationary, 'apparently' looking at a shop window.

129. I crossed the street. As I reached the opposite pavement, a young man, British, Caucasian, c. 1.78m, slim, wearing a blue woollen hat, came from behind me. My 'internal radar' went on alert but I decided to play the game as I wanted him to feedback certain messages. The man asked me what my website was about. I

gave a brief overview. At one point I stated that, in spite of [accepting an offer in 2003](#) for the sake of ending the dispute, I had subsequently received [another invoice](#) as though no offer been made, accepted, paid and [endorsed by the Court](#). This was the cue for theatrics, as the man got an inhaler out of his trouser pocket. I asked him if he was alright. Reply: *"Yes, it's just that hearing that stresses me"*.

130. He led the conversation onto comparison with France. He then probed me about my plans. I replied that, with God's help, I intend to fight to the last breath in my body. He told me that I was *"very strong"*. Providing further confirmation that he was tasked with 'assessing me', he asked whether I had friends here. I replied that I no longer trust anyone in this country, and that, luckily, I love my own company - an upside from my childhood that included spending several years in an orphanage. In reply to his question, I confirmed that the majority of the establishments in which I spent my childhood were run by nuns - and that therefore the principles of right and wrong had been drilled into me at an early age.

131. To my saying that I would die knowing that [ADL and those who have and continue to help him would be known as the people who killed me](#), the man replied: *"He does not care!"*. He said something about ADL then getting my flat. I replied that it was clearly the game plan: waiting for me to die / being 'put out of action' permanently, and added that, once dead, I obviously would not care about the flat. Fairly early on in the conversation which lasted about 8-10 minutes, he said words to the effect: *"Are you going to bump him off?"* I replied: *"Ladsky is not worth spending a nano second in prison for"*. I ended the conversation by saying that I'd better continue on my way. After walking a few steps, the man came from behind me saying that he happened to be going in the same direction. He proceeded ahead at a fast pace. It seems to me that he took a bus - going in the direction from which we had come i.e. going back West.

132. I am absolutely livid with fury to be under this highly intrusive, very distressing constant daily surveillance and interference with my private life,

and from realising that photographs/film footage of me are being widely circulated for the purpose of hounding me – and with clearly a highly damaging ‘story’ about me being fed to the snoops. This is an ongoing direct attack on my human dignity.

133. In the 43 years I have lived in this country I have never been engaged in any activity and/or conduct that justifies this extreme, ongoing surveillance, as well as monitoring and interception of my means of communication. I am a law-abiding, decent, taxpaying individual who, until 2002, when I was dragged kicking and screaming by ADL into this truly horrendous nightmare that has totally destroyed my life, had *never* had any dealings with the police and the courts.

134. And, as is blatantly obvious, contrary to the malicious opinions of me captured by the First Defendant in its [2007 “crime report”](#) (I refer to Exhibit **KDR 7**) `opinions it communicated to social services: I do not suffer from “*mental issues*”.

135. I have done *nothing* wrong. [I am the innocent victim of organised crime – not the criminal](#). [I am a victim who ‘dares’ stand-up for her rights](#), and is being persecuted for ‘daring’ to do this.

136. I cannot begin to express the level of repulsion I feel at the morally depraved, vicious, cruel and sadistic actions against me e.g. making me miss my Uncle’s funeral; approaching 2 of my medical contacts, and making a deal that entailed: trying to lock me up in a mental institution; falsely suggesting that I needed an operation.

137. This highly intrusive surveillance and interference have blighted my life. In addition to making me live constantly on my guard as though I were a criminal on the run, it, among others: (i) affects all of my daily activities in a highly material way; (ii) has led me to cut-off ties with all my UK contacts to avoid the risk of their being also monitored; (iii) has greatly reduced my frequency of contact with my family and friends in France, as well as affects the content of these contacts. In effect, it has stopped me from having a normal life – a

Fundamental Human Right, as I have done *nothing* wrong. In the process, in order to survive, it has led me to ‘shut down’ parts of me that are about being a human being – another Fundamental Human Right.

138. My experience with the [First](#) and [Third](#) Defendants
139. Comprehensive details are contained in my [19th July 2011](#) Witness Statement in response to the First Defendant’s Application of [30th June 2011](#).
140. Not only is the State very clearly tracking me as though I were a terrorist and, in the process, harassing me, causing me extreme distress and anxiety, the authorities are also clearly endorsing the harassment by ADL.
141. In [February 2002](#), I reported suffering harassment from ADL to the First Defendant. I refer to Exhibit **KDR 3**, [“Crime Report” - CR:5604102/02](#), in which the First Defendant captured this, including some of the detail. No action was taken. In its [23rd April 2002](#) letter to me (I refer to page of Exhibit **KDR 4**, the First Defendant wrote: *“No crime report has been reported to this police borough regarding Mr Ladsky...”*. I knew that it was not true as some of my fellow leaseholders had reported suffering harassment from ADL to the First Defendant and had evidence of having done this: (i) I refer to page 1 of Exhibit **KDR 4**, an identical 11th October 2001 letter from CKFT, solicitors, to [Mr & Mrs \[X X\]](#), flat 12, and to [Mr & Mrs \[X X\]](#), flat 14, stating that they had reported its client, ADL, to [the police](#); (ii) I refer to page 5 of Exhibit **KDR 13**, an [18th April 2002](#) e-mail to me from a resident stating that, Mrs [X X], the person who was running the [Residents Association](#) had reported suffering harassment from ADL to the police. According to the resident, Mrs [X X] had apparently been told by the police to *“fold her tent and go”*; (iii) on 25th March 2002, one of the First Defendant’s officers had told me that Mrs [X X], a resident alleged to have made 20 anonymous phone calls to me had complained to him of suffering harassment from ADL, to which I replied: *“So, there are five people now who have complained to the police about Andrew Ladsky: Mrs [X X], myself, Mr [X X] in flat 12, Mr [X X] in flat 4, and, I believe, Mrs [X X] who used to live in flat 5”*. This is captured in my [2nd April 2002](#) letter to the First Defendant. I refer to page 7

[Elderly Resident](#)
[Resident Association](#)
[Other Residents](#)
[Resident K](#)

- of Exhibit **KDR 4**. In light of this evidence, looking at the [23rd April 2002](#) letter to me from the First Defendant, those of us who had suffered harassment from ADL concluded that the police was protecting him.
142. In [January 2003](#), when ADL complained to the First Defendant that I ‘swore at him’, and falsely accused me of having a history of doing this, a [“Crime Report”- CR:5602261/03](#), was processed against me under “*Substantiated Offence of harassment*” - before contacting me. I refer to Exhibit **KDR 5**. On the day the First Defendant received my [11th February 2003](#) letter (I refer to page 3 of Exhibit **KDR 6** in which I asked for “*precise detail – in writing – of the accusation against me*”, it closed down the report, claiming that I had not responded. It did not reply to my letter. To date, the First Defendant has refused my demands in relation to this report.
143. In [March 2007](#), ADL made another malicious complaint against me that resulted in the First Defendant processing a [“Crime Report” - CR:5605839/07](#), under “*RI racial incident; RS anti-Semitic incident*”; *Hate crime*” relating to “*Race*” and “*Religion*”: “*117*” which must mean ‘Jewish’. I refer to Exhibit **KDR 7**. The First Defendant never contacted me, the owner and author of the website, at any point in time – but it sent an unsupported [16th March 2007](#) e-mail to my website Host, accusing me of having ‘committed a crime’, as it wrote: “*I am the police officer dealing with this crime*”. I refer to page 1 of Exhibit **KDR 8**. Following being asked by my website Host: “*Are you aware that there are laws against making false accusations?*”, the First Defendant backed-down in its [20th March 2007](#) e-mail - while still not providing any evidence in support. I refer to page 2 of Exhibit **KDR 8**. As to the 2007 report, it is a web of malicious, vicious, unsubstantiated accusations and opinions of me by ADL, some of which are endorsed by the First Defendant. The First Defendant also ‘recycled’ one of ADL’s false accusations from the 2003 report – in spite of the report stating that I had been “*eliminated*”. To date, the First Defendant has refused my demands in relation to this report.

144. The said 2007 report shows that the First Defendant “looked” at my website. By then, on my website, I had reported numerous instances of my being followed, monitored, including being harassed and threatened. No action was taken.
145. In a letter [28th November 2009](#), I asked the First and Third Defendants for help in relation to the 3 crime reports, as my demands were being ignored. I refer to **Exhibit 1** of my [14th June 2011](#) Reply to the First Defendant’s Defence. 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. To this effect, in this letter I provided an overview of my experience with [Kensington, Chelsea and Notting police in 2002, 2003, 2007](#), as well as reported my experience since submitting my [28th May 2009](#) Subject Access Request. To prove that I was not making it up, I supported my letter, to each of them, with 11 enclosures. Hence: another costly letter.
146. Following receiving [a reply from one of the First Defendant’s officers](#), I again wrote to the First and Third Defendants, in a letter dated [2nd December 2009](#), in which I drew conclusions from the officer’s letter in relation to events that had taken place at Kensington, Chelsea and Notting Hill police that were directly related to the 3 “crime reports”. I refer to **Exhibit 3** of my Reply to the First Defendant’s Defence.
147. The First Defendant contacted its Directorate of Professional Standards as I was approached by the latter in [December 2009](#). As [my reply](#) was ignored, I wrote another letter to the First and Third Defendants, dated [2nd February 2010](#). By then, I was ‘fuming’. I refer to **Exhibit 4** of [my Reply](#) to the First Defendant’s [Defence](#). I headed my letter: “When am I due to be killed?”, referring to the [15th June 2009](#) death threat I had mentioned in my [28th November 2009](#) letter to the First and Third Defendants. I refer to **Exhibit 1** of my Reply to the First Defendant’s Defence.

[Police \(Complaints and Misconduct\) Regulations 2004 states under Reg.3\(1\) and \(2\)\(a\) that for the purposes of para.7 of Sch.3 of the Police Reform Act 2002.](#)

dispensation relates to "complaints where more than 12 months have elapsed between the incident, or the latest incident, and no good reason has been provided, or that the delay would likely cause injustice"

148. What followed was [an Application for Dispensation by the First Defendant](#) to the Second Defendant. The Second Defendant [agreed to this](#), in the process, dismissing my complaint. I could not believe my eyes. (I refer to my [19th July 2011](#) Witness Statement in response to the First Defendant's [Application](#)).

149. In its Defence and [30th June 2011](#) Application the First Defendant claims that it "*investigated*" the 3 complaints. I strongly disagree with that.

150. In the same way that I strongly disagree with the Second Defendant's claim in its [7th June 2011](#) Application of having "*taken into account the representations [I] made in my [18th February 2010](#) letter to the First Defendant*". The Second Defendant is the appropriate body to escalate a complaint to if the First Defendant fails to address the situation. I maintain that the Second Defendant has also failed me.

151. Because of what had taken place in relation to the 3 above complaints, I had concluded that there was no point my reporting, to the First Defendant, the ongoing harassment instigated by ADL. As to the other parties involved in the surveillance I believed to be instigated by the State: there was clearly no point doing that either.

152. I felt under siege, a prisoner, from this constant invasion of my privacy which affects all of my daily activities. I also felt totally abandoned, with nowhere to turn to for help. I am a woman, on my own, law-abiding, who has done *nothing* wrong. Yet, I am being hounded and persecuted as though I were a terrorist, treated as though I were a criminal, instead of what I am: the victim of crime.

153. From buying new software, realised a photograph I had taken was of better quality than I thought. It decided me to report the harassment to the First Defendant. I thought: it won't be able to turn me down with that evidence. It will have to investigate my complaints. The police has a duty to protect me from harassment.

154. On [4th October 2010](#), I visited the First Defendant's station of [Chelsea Police](#) in order to report suffering what I described as 'racially aggravated

Dictionary definition of 'investigate':
"carry out a systematic or formal inquiry into (an incident or allegation) so as to establish the truth"

harassment' from a man on 20th and 27th July 2010. Because of what had happened with my 2002 complaint, to ensure that the First Defendant captured all the facts, I compiled my evidence in [a document, supported by photographs](#), listed the legislation I believed to have been breached, and endorsed the document with a Statement of Truth. I stated my belief that this man had been put up to it by ADL. I refer to **Exhibit 9** of my [14th June 2011 Reply to the First Defendant's Defence](#). The photographs included: of the man on [20th and 27th July 2010](#) and of the car he was driving clearly showing the number plate and make of the car.

155. The First Defendant's officer, PC Giles, told me that she could not see any evidence of racial harassment. I replied that I briefly explained this on [page 3 of my document](#), while showing it to her: (i) ADL claims to be Jewish; (ii) it was clear from his [2007 complaint](#) against me, that ADL used my Franco-German origin as a motive for his complaint; (iii) this is also obvious from the First Defendant's e-mails of [16th](#) and [20th March 2007](#) to my website Host, in which it branded me a "Nazi".
156. The First Defendant's officer said she would file my report as "*an Intelligence Report*". In reply to my asking what this meant, she said: "*If it happens again, we will have this information on file*". As I insisted on filing a complaint, she replied: "*But you followed him*", to which my response was: "*Damn right I followed him. I recognised him from one week previously. I was determined to get evidence. Had I come here without this evidence, your automatic reaction would have been to dismiss my complaint, as well as label me as mad*".
157. After a repeat of the above exchange, the First Defendant's officer said to me, in a challenging tone: "*You say here that you "feared for your safety"*". To this I replied: "*Yes, when a man follows me, and then circles around me as I am stationary: I fear for my safety*". As I noted earlier, I have had a death threat hanging over my head since June 2009. Of note, under [paragraph 19 of its 30th June 2011 Application](#) the First Defendant states: "*PC Giles did not accept*

the Claimant's account that she had feared for her safety". How would she know how I felt?

158. I returned to [Chelsea police](#) on [8th October 2010](#). I [re-submitted my 4th October document](#), in which I changed the word 'complaint' to 'crime report'. I also submitted [another 'crime report'](#): against a man who had been following me over a period of 4 hours on [30th June 2010](#), and had made it very clear that he was doing this. I reported that he had also been harassing me previously. Likewise, I included photographs of the man in my report. I refer to **Exhibits 10** and **11**, respectively, of my [14th June 2009](#) Reply to the First Defendant's [Defence](#).
159. After making another visit to Chelsea police, as told, I again returned on [16th October 2010](#). By then I felt extremely angry and frustrated at the way I had been treated considering that I was a victim of crime – and a taxpayer. I decided that, if I was finally able to talk to somebody, I would record the conversation. I spoke to the First Defendant's officer, PC Giles. I refer to **Exhibit 6** of my [14th June 2011](#) Reply to the First Defendant's [Defence](#), which is [my transcript of the conversation](#). During this conversation, the First Defendant's officer repeated her initial reasons for not pursuing my complaint.
160. The first reason was that I had "*followed the man*". I replied as I had done on 4th October, above. (I noted in [my Reply](#) to the First Defendant's Defence that it had denied saying this to me).
161. The second reason was that I had "*not supplied evidence of racial harassment*". To my saying that it was, the First Defendant's officer replied: "*You can't prove that though, can you?*" To this I replied: "*Yeah, because you are not talking to him. So, of course, because that's very inconvenient evidence: Oh dear! I followed him! My God, I come back with photographs and a number plate. That's very annoying evidence for [the police](#) and for [Ladsky](#). Isn't it? Because it's much better to pass me off as mad*". I kept asking: "*Why aren't you talking to that man?*" and highlighting the fact that I

- had supplied ample information for her to do that. I maintained my position that I had been subjected to [harassment](#).
162. The third reason was: *“On the information that you’ve given me it was not sufficient enough for a crime report to be put on. That’s why an intelligence report was put on”*. As with the first time round, considering the evidence I had supplied, I could not believe my ears that a police officer was saying this to me. How much more evidence did the police need to act? (I noted in [my Reply](#) to the First Defendant’s Defence that it had also denied saying this to me).
163. With my anger level going up several notches, I asked the First Defendant’s officer: *“Under which rule of law do you consider yourself entitled to discriminate against me?”*. In response to her denials, I attempted to quote the fact that [in 2003 and 2007](#) the police had had no problem filing immediately a *“crime report”* against me on the basis of totally unsupported accusations against me by ADL, and had done this without ever contacting me. ‘Attempted’ as the First Defendant’s officer kept cutting me to shut me up by saying: *“I did not deal with that”*; *“That’s up to the officer at the time”*; *“I don’t know the details about that”*; *“I don’t know anything about that”*; *“I have nothing to do with that; this is a separate matter”*. I was feeling extremely angry, frustrated, humiliated and debased by the attitude of the police. I viewed it as a continuation of the discrimination I had been subjected to [since 2002](#) in the course of all of my contacts with the First Defendant.
164. As evidenced by the conversation, the First Defendant’s focus was on the [20th and 27th July 2010 man](#), not on the [30th June 2010 man](#). It reinforced my belief that the former had been put up to it by ADL, and that the latter was a police informant.
165. My [asking to speak to the First Defendant’s supervisor](#) led me to go, [that evening](#), to the First Defendant’s other station of [Kensington](#). I was told that the officer I needed to talk was not in. I opted to wait. During the course of my conversation with the 2 officers on duty, I mentioned the false *“crime*

reports” held against me by the police. One of the officers looked on a computer and, after 2-3 minutes, called his colleague over, and said, pointing to the computer screen: “*Read that!*”. Their expression suggested to me that it was highly damaging data against me. I wondered what it said. Their reaction brought on feelings of extreme anger, as well as tears I barely managed to fight back as, [until 2002](#) i.e. in my previous 33 years in this country, I had *never* had any dealings with the police. The *only* reason I have ended-up on the police systems is because [ADL, that evil, greed-ridden monster decided to steal from me](#). And, while the First Defendant has “*No crime report against Mr Ladsky*” (I refer to the First Defendant’s letter of [23rd April 2002](#) at page 7 under Exhibit **KDR 4**) - it holds 2 false so-called “*crime reports*” against me – his victim. At one point, I was no longer able to hold back the tears from sheer frustration and anger at being treated in that way. After c. 1 hour, I decided to leave. It was suggested that I come back the following day, as “*he’ll be in*”.

166. As told, I returned to the First Defendant’s station of [Kensington police](#) on [17th October 2010](#). I was again told that the officer I wanted to see was not in. I explained that this visit made it my 7th to the police, and that I wanted to talk to somebody. The officer on duty phoned [Chelsea police](#). After c.30 minutes, an officer arrived saying that he was “*today’s Supervisor*”. What followed was a near replay of what took place with the First Defendant’s officer on 4th and 16th October 2010 - with the following additions:

- (1) Stating to not doubt my claims that I am being followed.
- (2) In relation to my reports of harassment, the First Defendant’s officer said: “*We have to capture everything that is reported, but not unlawful information against people; that’s a breach of the [Data Protection Act](#)”* In light of the fact that the First Defendant holds 2 “*crime reports*” against me that are full of false accusations and opinions of me, I concluded that he was having fun, and viewed his comment as a ‘spit in the face’.

- (3) In response to my saying that "*the police does hold unlawful crime reports*" against me, he replied: "*You have not been charged with anything; there has been no follow-up. We have to keep information in case you commit an offence and end-up in court*". I replied: "*False information, that's what you are planning on using against me in court?*". I also asked: "*When will you again indulge 'Dear Mr Ladsky' and record another fictitious "crime report" against me and recycle even more of the malicious, false, libellous data from the previous reports?*"
- (4) To my saying that "[Andrew Ladsky is a fraudster](#)", cutting me before I had a chance to explain my statement, the officer replied: "*It's a civil matter*". To this I replied: "*No, [fraud is a criminal offence](#). So, it is a matter for the police*". I had so much anger and frustration that I could not fight back the tears.
167. The officer said that he would "*visit Mr Ladsky*". I never heard from him.
168. I highlight that, throughout my 7 visits to the First Defendant's police stations in October 2010, I wore, over my coat, a [T-shirt](#) stating, in large lettering: "*Victim of fraud and corruption – www.leasehold-outrage.com*". None of the officers ever commented upon it and hence, never asked me about it.
169. As the First Defendant refused to act on my complaints, as detailed above, I have continued to be followed - including by the [30th June 2010 snoop](#). This is detailed under 'Covert surveillance in the UK', under [21st May 2011](#).
170. Under [paragraph 41 of its Defence](#), the First Defendant states if "[I] was dissatisfied with the way the police handled my allegations against Mr Ladsky, the proper course of action [was] for [me] to complain to the [MPS and/or the IPCC](#)". In light of the outcome of my experience with the First, Second and Third Defendants: there was clearly no point my doing that.
171. As it stands, the outcome is that no matter how dire my situation, there is no point my approaching the [First Defendant](#) (nor indeed the [Third Defendant](#)) - unless I want to let myself be subjected to even more humiliation and

discrimination. So, among others, ADL can continue to do whatever he wants to me – in total disregard of the law of the land. It means that, in relation to the 15th June 2009 death threat, “*Enjoy your life. You don’t have long to live*”, every night I go to bed wondering: Is this going to be the night I am going to be killed? And, when I wake up in the morning, realising that I have made it through the night, I ask myself: Is today the day I am going to be killed? And every time I ask myself either of these questions, I also tell myself: and nobody will be prosecuted for it.

Statement of Truth

I believe that the facts stated in this Witness Statement are true.

.....

Noëlle Yvonne Sylvie Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé

Date:

Royal Courts of Justice Group
[Queen's Bench Division](#)
Case Management Section, Room E07
Royal Courts of Justice
Strand
London WC2A 2LL

[Ms N Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé](#)

[]
[]
[]

(By "Special Delivery")

Ref: [HQ11X01471](#) – Noëlle Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé v. Office of Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis; (2) The Independent Police Complaints Commission; (3) The Secretary of State for the Home Department

19th July 2011

Dear Madam / Sir

Please find herewith enclosed:

1. My [19th July 2011](#) Witness Statement – in replacement of my [27th June 2011](#) Witness Statement – in response to the Second Defendant's Application of [7th June 2011](#)
2. My [19th July 2011](#) Witness Statement in response to the First Defendant's [30th June 2011](#) Application
3. My 19th July 2011 Witness Statement in response to the Third Defendant's [7th July 2011](#) Application.
4. Because of previous poor quality of the documents – a replacement of the following Exhibits:
 - a. KDR 4
 - b. KDR 5
 - c. KDR 6
 - d. KDR 7
 - e. KDR 8
5. To these I also add 2 new Exhibits:
 - a. KDR 13
 - b. KDR 14

I am copying the 3 Defendants on the same, by the same post.

I take this opportunity to thank you for sending me, about 10 days ago, an updated Notice of the 29th July Applications hearing, as well as 4 copies of the Second Defendant's Application.

Yours faithfully,

N Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé

Mrs / Ms Helen John
Litigation Group
Treasury Solicitor's Department
One Kemble Street
London WC2B 4TS

(Home Office)

[Ms N Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé](#)

[]
[]
[]

(By "Special Delivery")

Ref: HQ11X01471 – Noëlle Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé v. Office of Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis; (2) The Independent Police Complaints Commission; (3) The Secretary of State for the Home Department

19th July 2011

Dear Madam

I acknowledge receipt of your correspondence dated [13th July](#), of which I took delivery on 17th July.

Please find herewith enclosed:

1. My 19th July 2011 Witness Statement in response to your [7th July 2011](#) Application.
2. My [19th July 2011](#) Witness Statement – in replacement of my [27th June 2011](#) Witness Statement – in response to the Second Defendant's Application of [7th June 2011](#).
3. My [19th July 2011](#) Witness Statement in response to the First Defendant's [30th June 2011](#) Application.
4. Because of previous poor quality of the documents – a replacement of the following Exhibits:
 - a. KDR 4
 - b. KDR 5
 - c. KDR 6
 - d. KDR 7
 - e. KDR 8
5. To these I also add 2 new Exhibits:
 - a. KDR 13
 - b. KDR 14

I note the current plan to hold the hearing of your Application on 8th or 9th August. As it stands, I am available on both dates.

I take this opportunity to also enclose a copy of the Second Defendant's Application supplied to me by [the Court](#).

Yours sincerely,

N Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé

Ms Jennifer O'Dwyer
Directorate of Legal Services
[New Scotland Yard](#)
Broadway
London SW1H 0BG

[Ms N Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé](#)
[]
[]
[]

(By 'Special Delivery – By 9 a.m.'- 20th July)

Ref: [HQ11X01471](#) – Noëlle Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé v. Office of Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis; (2) The Independent Police Complaints Commission; (3) The Secretary of State for the Home Department

19th July 2011

Dear Madam

Please find herewith enclosed:

1. My [19th July 2011](#) Witness Statement in response your [30th June 2011](#) Application.
2. My [19th July 2011](#) Witness Statement – in replacement of my [27th June 2011](#) Witness Statement – in response to the Second Defendant's Application of [7th June 2011](#).
3. My 19th July 2011 Witness Statement in response to the Third Defendant's [7th July 2011](#) Application.
4. Because of previous poor quality of the documents – a replacement of the following Exhibits:
 - a. KDR 4
 - b. KDR 5
 - c. KDR 6
 - d. KDR 7
 - e. KDR 8
5. To these I also add 2 new Exhibits:
 - a. KDR 13
 - b. KDR 14

On 17th July, I took delivery of a [14th July](#) letter from Martin Bament, in your department, asking me about documents in be included in the bundles. I am copying him on this letter – and provide the following reply:

- Item number 33: this is now replaced by the enclosed, as detailed above under point 2.
- Items number 37- 41: replacement as detailed above.

I note that a bundle of correspondence has been created, from item number 52, which comprises correspondence from the above Exhibits. This bundle needs to include the clean copies as supplied under point 4 above.

To the items must also be added Exhibit KDR 13 and 14, as detailed above.

On the first page of my enclosed [19th July 2011](#) Witness Statement in response to your [30th June 2011](#) Application, I have listed the Exhibits I refer to in the Witness Statement.

I trust you will liaise with Martin Bament on this.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

N Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé

cc. Martin Bament, MPS Directorate of Legal Services

Mr Martin Bament
Directorate of Legal Services
[New Scotland Yard](#)
Broadway
London SW1H 0BG

[Ms N Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé](#)

[]

[]

[]

(By '*Recorded Delivery*')

Ref: [HQ11X01471](#) – Noëlle Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé v. Office of Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis; (2) The Independent Police Complaints Commission; (3) The Secretary of State for the Home Department

19th July 2011

Dear Sir

Thank you for your letter dated [14th July 2011](#).

Please find herewith enclosed a copy of my 19th July 2011 letter to Ms Jennifer O'Dwyer, Lawyer, which contains my reply.

Yours sincerely,

N Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé

Mrs / Ms Julia Chittenden
Lawyer
[Independent Police Complaints Commission](#)
90 High Holborn
London WC1V 6BH

[Ms N Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé](#)

[]

[]

[]

(By 'Special Delivery – By 9 a.m., 20th July')

Ref: [HQ11X01471](#) – Noëlle Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé v. Office of Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis; (2) The Independent Police Complaints Commission; (3) The Secretary of State for the Home Department

19th July 2011

Dear Madam

On 17th July, I took delivery of a [14th July](#) letter from your office located at Sale, M33 6FS asking me for feedback on the proposed bundle for the [29th July](#) Application hearing. As I am issuing new documents, I thought it best to address this correspondence to you.

Please find herewith enclosed:

1. My [19th July 2011](#) Witness Statement – in replacement of my [27th June 2011](#) Witness Statement – in response to your Application of [7th June 2011](#).
2. My [19th July 2011](#) Witness Statement in response to the First Defendant's [30th June 2011](#) Application.
3. My 19th July 2011 Witness Statement in response to the Third Defendant's [7th July 2011](#) Application.
4. Because of previous poor quality of the documents – a replacement of the following Exhibits:
 - a. KDR 4
 - b. KDR 5
 - c. KDR 6
 - d. KDR 7
 - e. KDR 8
5. To these I also add 2 new Exhibits:
 - a. KDR 13
 - b. KDR 14

In response to the question about the bundle:

- It means that item number 12 needs to be replaced with my [19th July 2011](#) Witness Statement, as detailed above under point 1.
- On the first page of the 19th July 2011 Witness Statement, I have listed the Exhibits I refer to in the Witness Statement.

By the same post, I am copying your Office in Sale, M33 6FS.

Yours sincerely,

N Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé

[Independent Police Complaints Commission](#)

1st Floor
Oaklands House
Washway Road
Sale
M33 6FS

[Ms N Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé](#)

[]
[]
[]

(By 'Recorded Delivery')

Ref: [HQ11X01471](#) – Noëlle Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé v. Office of Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis; (2) The Independent Police Complaints Commission; (3) The Secretary of State for the Home Department

19th July 2011

Dear Madam / Sir

Thank you for your letter dated [14th July 2011](#).

Please find herewith enclosed a copy of my 19th July 2011 letter to Mrs / Ms Julia Chittenden, Lawyer, which contains my reply.

Yours sincerely,

N Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé

Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

6 Raphael Street
London
Greater London
SW7 1DL

O'Dwyer
FRS

Date and Time:	19/07/2011	12:29
Session ID:	7-32154	
Dest:	UK (EU)	
Quantity:	1	
Weight:	1.316	kg
express10	£29.25	
Enhanced Comp	£0.00	£0.00
Total Cost of Services	£29.25	
Posted after Last Collection?	No	
Conditions Accepted?	Yes	
Barcode:	XWUP59655856B	
DESTINATION ADDRESS		
Building Name or Number	Postcode	
8-10	SW1H 0BG	
Address Validated?	Y	

IT IS IMPORTANT THAT YOU RETAIN THIS RECEIPT AS IT IS YOUR PROOF OF POSTING

PLEASE REFER TO SEPARATE TERMS AND CONDITIONS

Go to www.parcelforce.com or call 0844 800 4466 for more info.
I CONFIRM RECEIPT AND ACCEPTANCE OF THE PARCELFORCE WORLDWIDE CONDITIONS OF CARRIAGE

Signature

This is ~~not~~ a VAT Receipt
Thank You

Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

6 Raphael Street
London
Greater London
SW7 1DL

FRS
Challenor

Date and Time:	19/07/2011	12:27
Session ID:	7-32154	
Dest:	UK (EU)	
Quantity:	1	
Weight:	1.319	kg
express10	£29.25	
Enhanced Comp	£0.00	£0.00
Total Cost of Services	£29.25	
Posted after Last Collection?	No	
Conditions Accepted?	Yes	
Barcode:	XWUP59655716B	
DESTINATION ADDRESS		
Building Name or Number	Postcode	
80	WC1V 6BH	
Address Validated?	Y	

IT IS IMPORTANT THAT YOU RETAIN THIS RECEIPT AS IT IS YOUR PROOF OF POSTING

PLEASE REFER TO SEPARATE TERMS AND CONDITIONS

Go to www.parcelforce.com or call 0844 800 4466 for more info.
I CONFIRM RECEIPT AND ACCEPTANCE OF THE PARCELFORCE WORLDWIDE CONDITIONS OF CARRIAGE

Signature

This is ~~not~~ a VAT Receipt
Thank You

Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

6 Raphael Street
London
Greater London
SW7 1DL

19th
Banner
to copy on
to O'Dwyer

Date and Time:	19/07/2011	12:22
Session ID:	7-32154	
Dest:	UK (EU)	
Quantity:	1	
Weight:	0.015	kg
Recorded 1st Letter	£1.23	
Total Cost of Services	£1.23	
Posted after Last Collection?	No	
Barcode:	AI1679612856B	
DESTINATION ADDRESS		
Building Name or Number	Postcode	
NEW SCOTLAND YARD	SW1H0BG	
Address Validated?	N	

IT IS IMPORTANT THAT YOU RETAIN THIS RECEIPT AS IT IS YOUR PROOF OF POSTING

PLEASE REFER TO SEPARATE TERMS AND CONDITIONS

We do not pay compensation for money, jewellery or valuables sent by Recorded Signed For. Check delivery at www.postoffice.co.uk or call 08459 272100, quoting your reference number.

This is not a VAT Receipt
Thank You

Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

6 Raphael Street
London
Greater London
SW7 1DL

*1 POC
(North)
2 copy on the
1st attendee*

Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

Raphael Street
London
Greater London
SW7 1DL

TSol

Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

6 Raphael Street
London
Greater London
SW7 1DL

court

Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

FAD: 011008

Knightsbridge
6 Raphael Street
London
Greater London
SW7 1DL

VAT REG No. GB 243 1700 02
Date of Issue: 19/07/2011 12:33
SESSION: 7-32154

Date and Time: 19/07/2011 12:21
 Session ID: 7-32154
 Dest: UK (EU)
 Quantity: 1
 Weight: 0.015 kg

Recorded 1st Letter £1.23

Total Cost of Services £1.23

Posted after Last Collection? No

Barcode: AI1679631056B

DESTINATION ADDRESS
 Building Name or Number Postcode
 OAKLANDS HOUSE M336FS
 Address Validated? N

Date and Time: 19/07/2011 12:32
 Session ID: 7-32154
 Dest: UK (EU)
 Quantity: 1
 Weight: 1.383 kg

Special D by 1 £0.00 £9.05

Total Cost of Services £9.05

Posted after Last Collection? No

Barcode: ZW8416421116B

DESTINATION ADDRESS
 Building Name or Number Postcode
 CASURY WC2B4TS
 Address Validated? N

Date and Time: 19/07/2011 12:30
 Session ID: 7-32154
 Dest: UK (EU)
 Quantity: 1
 Weight: 1.318 kg

Special D by 1 £0.00 £9.05

Total Cost of Services £9.05

Posted after Last Collection? No

Barcode: ZW8416421086B

DESTINATION ADDRESS
 Building Name or Number Postcode
 ROYAL COURTS OF JUSTI WC2A2LL
 Address Validated? N

IT IS IMPORTANT THAT YOU RETAIN THIS RECEIPT AS IT IS YOUR PROOF OF POSTING

PLEASE REFER TO SEPARATE TERMS AND CONDITIONS

We do not pay compensation for money, jewellery or valuables sent by Recorded Signed For. Check delivery at www.postoffice.co.uk or call 08459 272100, quoting your reference number.

This is not a VAT Receipt
Thank You

IT IS IMPORTANT THAT YOU RETAIN THIS RECEIPT AS IT IS YOUR PROOF OF POSTING

PLEASE REFER TO SEPARATE TERMS AND CONDITIONS

Special Delivery is an express next day service for the UK, offering a money back guarantee for delay and compensation for loss and damage to your item. Check delivery at www.postoffice.co.uk or call 08459 272100 quoting your ref number.

This is not a VAT Receipt
Thank You

IT IS IMPORTANT THAT YOU RETAIN THIS RECEIPT AS IT IS YOUR PROOF OF POSTING

PLEASE REFER TO SEPARATE TERMS AND CONDITIONS

Special Delivery is an express next day service for the UK, offering a money back guarantee for delay and compensation for loss and damage to your item. Check delivery at www.postoffice.co.uk or call 08459 272100 quoting your ref number.

This is not a VAT Receipt
Thank You

	Item Price ex VAT	inc VAT	Total(£)
(S)express10			
1 @	24.37	29.25	29.25
(S)express10			
1 @	24.37	29.25	29.25
SUBTOTAL			58.50
VAT SUMMARY			
Rate	NET	VAT	Total(£)
(S)20.00%	48.74	9.76	58.50
SUBTOTAL	48.74	9.76	58.50

(E)Recorded 1st			
1 @	1.23	1.23	1.23
(E)Recorded 1st			
1 @	1.23	1.23	1.23
(E)Special D by 1			
1 @	9.05	9.05	9.05
(E)Special D by 1			
1 @	9.05	9.05	9.05
(S)=Standard Rate (Z)=Zero Rate (E)=Exempt			
TOTAL DUE TO POST OFFICE			79.06

Cash	FROM CUSTOMER	80.00
Cash	TO CUSTOMER	0.94
BALANCE		0.00

Please retain for future reference

Thank You

Small & Medium Business Corporate & Public Sector



Search

Personal Delivery Payments Stamps & Collecting Shop Occasions Solutions Advice Tools



Home

Home > Track and trace >

Track and trace

Sending tracked mail

Tracking your mail

Top links

Find a postcode

Postal prices

Shop

Track an item

A-Z

Work for us

Customer service

Please enter your 13 character reference
e.g. AA000100019GB

ZW841642108GB

Track item

[How to find your reference number](#)

*Court - 19 June 2011
KXS*



Your item with reference ZW841642108GB was delivered from our WEST CENTRAL LONDON

Delivery Office on 20/07/11

Thank you for using this service.

We can confirm that this item was delivered before the guaranteed time.

The electronic Proof of Delivery may not be available for this item yet. Please allow up to 72 hours after delivery before checking.

[View Proof of Delivery](#)

SENDING
important or valuable mail

TRACKING
important or valuable mail



[Home](#) [Sending](#) [Receiving](#) [About us](#) [My account](#)

Search our site **GO**
Send a parcel **GO**

[Home >](#)

Track & Trace

Proof of Delivery

TIPS



Parcel number: XWUP5965585GB
Part of consignment: XWUP5965585GB
Delivery Postcode: SW1H 0BG
Delivered on: 20-07-2011
Delivered at: 08:32
Signed for by: T SUTCH

[Home](#)
[Track your parcel](#)
[Book a collection](#)
[Arrange a redelivery](#)
[Depot locations](#)
[Price a delivery](#)

Signature:

Sutch

[New enquiry](#)

[Print](#)

[Customer Services](#) | [Royal Mail Group](#) | [Accessibility](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Website terms & conditions](#) | [Conditions of carriage](#) | [Sitemap](#) | [I'm an employee](#)

© Copyright Parcelforce Worldwide 2011. All Rights Reserved



Home Sending Receiving About us My account

Search our site GO
Send a parcel GO

Home >

Track & Trace

IPCC



Proof of Delivery

Parcel number: XWUP5965571GB
Part of consignment: XWUP5965571GB
Delivery Postcode: WC1V 6BH
Delivered on: 20-07-2011
Delivered at: 10:35
Signed for by: MR ROBERTO

- Home
- Track your parcel
- Book a collection
- Arrange a redelivery
- Depot locations
- Price a delivery

Signature:

New enquiry

Print

Customer Services | Royal Mail Group | Accessibility | Privacy Policy | Website terms & conditions | Conditions of carriage | Sitemap | I'm an employee

© Copyright Parcelforce Worldwide 2011. All Rights Reserved

Small & Medium Business Corporate & Public Sector



My Royal Mail

Search

Personal Delivery Payments Stamps & Collecting Shop Occasions Solutions Advice Tools



Home

Home > Track and trace >

Track and trace

Sending tracked mail

Tracking your mail

Top links

Find a postcode

Postal prices

Shop

Track an item

A-Z

Work for us

Customer service

Please enter your 13 character reference
e.g. AA000100019GB

ZW841642111GB

Track item

[How to find your reference number](#)



Your item with reference ZW841642111GB was delivered from our WEST CENTRAL LONDON

Delivery Office on 20/07/11

Thank you for using this service.

We can confirm that this item was delivered before the guaranteed time.

The electronic Proof of Delivery may not be available for this item yet. Please allow up to 72 hours

after delivery before checking.

[View Proof of Delivery](#)

SENDING
important or valuable mail

TRACKING
important or valuable mail

T Sol. 19 Jun 11 - WSS