

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

(Home Office)

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

1 (By 'Special Delivery')

2 Claim: [RCJ's Queen's Bench Division – HQ11X01471](#)

3 22nd August 2011

4 Dear Madam,

Further to the [9th August 2011](#) Order from [Master Eyre](#) dismissing all of [my claim](#) against the [Home Office](#) – [with costs](#) - please find herewith enclosed NatWest cheque # 1513 for £5,000.00.

£5,000 to get confirmation that the Home Office approves of the [Metropolitan Police Services \(MPS\)](#) acting above the law for the sake of protecting and assisting [Andrew David Ladsky \(ADL\) in his fraudulent activities](#), as well as [joining forces with him](#) in taking retaliatory action against me – [his victim](#) – for 'daring' to stand-up to him and his supporters for my rights.

In the remainder of this letter, I refer to: (i) my [19th July 2011](#) Witness Statement in response to the MPS' [30th June 2011](#) Application to strike out my [19th April 2011](#) claim – as WS1; (ii) my [19th July 2011](#) Witness Statement in response to the Home Office's [7th July 2011](#) Application to strike out my claim – as WS2, followed by the paragraph/s number.

In my [2nd June 2010](#) Section 10 Notice which, like all my other requests, was ignored by the MPS, in breach of the [Data Protection Act 1998 \(DPA\)](#) and of my rights under [Article 8](#) of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights, [Kensington, Chelsea and Notting Hill police](#) have, and continue to aid and abet the processing on the police system of 2 "crime reports" against me ([2003](#) and [2007](#)) that are a web of false, unlawful, unfair, highly malicious and vicious accusations against me and opinions of me – in connivance with ADL.

In relation to conniving, I refer to, among others, the trickery in describing ADL as my "neighbour" – in the [2002](#) report in spite of my identifying him as [the landlord](#), and in the context of his [2003](#) and [2007](#) so-called 'complaints' against me, in relation to the answer to the question: 'How is the suspect known to the victim?'. As the MPS is well aware, ADL "knows" me because [he is the landlord](#) – as I explained in [WS1-18-20](#). (He took over the headlease in 1996¹. The freehold was taken over in 1997²).

The benefit of this trickery? Obvious: to anybody not familiar with, among others, the 4th Principle of the DPA: "(a) having regard to the purpose or purposes for which the data were obtained and further processed, the data controller must take reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of the data" (not to mention the Code of Conduct comprised under the [Police \(Conduct\) Regulations](#)) – the MPS can use the "neighbour" description as the excuse for not challenging ADL on any of his false, malicious, vicious accusations against me and opinions of me.

¹ [21st November 1996](#) letter from [Laytons solicitors](#) that the headlease interest had been transferred from Acrepost Ltd to [Steel Services Ltd](#) – an "associated company of Acrepost Ltd"

² [27th March 1997](#) letter from [Martin Russell Jones](#)

Reduced during 'hearing' from £5,388

I wrote:
- A similar [22.08.11](#) letter to [the MPS](#) enclosing cheque for £8,478 following [FULL OF LIES Master Eyre's Order of 09.08.11](#)
- A more detailed [13.09.11](#) letter to [the IPCC](#) enclosing cheque for £3,703 following [Master Eyre's Order of 29.07.11](#)

1 Of great importance: in addition to the police, these “*crime reports*” are accessible by a host of parties
2 e.g. law enforcement agencies, courts, central and local government, etc.

3 Based on what [the MPS](#) has ‘deemed me to be allowed’ to see so far, using some of the entries in the
4 “*crime reports*”, I imagine the MPS’ script to internal and external parties with access to the reports - who
5 are unaware of the truth - to go along the following lines – which I contrast with the facts, and in the
6 context of which I refer to [WS1](#) and [WS2](#):

7 “She an anti-Semite, hell bent on a vendetta against a poor, innocent man, Mr Ladsky, who is
8 Jewish, and is her neighbour. Look at the evidence here in the [2003](#) and [2007](#) reports, the
9 answer to the question: ‘How is suspect known to victim?’: “*Neighbour*”. And look here in the
10 2007 report: “*Victim considers himself intimidated*”

→Fact: re. “*neighbour*”: as detailed above; re “*intimated*”: this is hilarious considering what ADL has done, as well as [instigated](#) against me (and fellow leaseholders) through his stable of aides [since 2002](#).

§21 of my
29.08.11
Wit. Stat.

13 “You can see in the [2007](#) report, it’s written: “*he stated that Ms Rawé is Franco-German and is
14 well aware that he is Jewish*”

15 →Fact: I did not know he said to be Jewish until the MPS sent its unlawful, racist, xenophobic e-mails of
16 [16th March](#) and [20th March 2007](#) to my website Host: [WS1 - 49 and 58](#). By contrast, ADL knew my origin:
17 the [2003](#) report describes my nationality as “*German or French*”.

- Elderly Resident
- Resident Associat
- Other Residents
- Resident K

(Assuming that the [2002](#) report is shown - given that it contains ‘inconvenient’ evidence of my and [other residents](#) reporting suffering harassment from ADL): “*Look here how she refused to accept that the anonymous phone calls were made by somebody else*”

21 →Fact: I maintain my position that [the MPS](#)’ assertion that the resident was responsible for the
22 anonymous phone calls does not stack up: [WS1 - 24\(2\)\(3\)\(4\)](#). And the entries under [26/03/2002-13h23](#)
23 [and 08/04/02-14h32](#) that were blocked in the [July 2009](#) version I had at the time of writing my Witness
24 Statement (the MPS supplied me with the latest version on [22nd July 2011](#)), provide further support to my
25 position.

Section 9 of my [30.08.11](#) Appeal Application: para.10 of my [17.10.11](#) Request: my [29.08.11](#) Suppl. Witness Stat

26 “Look at the [2003](#) report, how, totally unprovoked she swore at poor Mr Ladsky”. (Quoting from
27 Master’s Eyre’s [9th August 2009](#) Order): “*Look at “the most disgusting and undignified language
28 she used towards him and she said it without the least sign of shame*”

29 →Fact: On coming out of the Jefferson House ‘concentration camp’, I saw ADL standing by the lift, but
30 pretended to not see him. ADL told me: “*Better luck next time*” followed by a sarcastic laugh. I assumed
31 he was referring to the impending [Tribunal hearing](#) and that he had it ‘sewn-up’: [WS1 - 34](#). (My
32 assessment [proved to be correct](#): [WS1 - 42 and 64](#)).

33 Feeling very angry by what I had been subjected to over the previous 12 months (e.g. ongoing
34 harassment; threat of forfeiture in [October 2002](#); [fraudulent claim filed against me \(and fellow
35 leaseholders\)](#) in November 2002, and in total disregard of the [Tribunal](#)’s directions³) - and knowing that
36 [ADL was behind all of this](#), I did reply as stated in the report. To this I add the fact that, 3 weeks
37 previously, as I was coming out of my flat, ADL was standing by the door. He told me, with a lot of venom
38 in his voice: “*I am going to get you this year!*”: [WS1 - 34](#)

39 As to [Master Eyre](#)’s comment: “*without the least sign of shame*”, I responded to this ([7th August 2011](#))
40 that, while I did not recall being asked at the [29th July 2011](#) hearing whether I felt “*ashamed*”, had I been

³ [Court of Appeal case: Daejan Properties v London Leasehold Valuation Tribunal](#): LVTs only had jurisdiction to determine service charges that were still unpaid. ADL claimed during the 29th October 2002 pre-trial hearing that he was “*just a tenant*”

1 asked, I would have replied: “As ashamed as ADL who held Her Majesty’s [Tribunal](#) and [courts](#) in utter
2 contempt by lying and getting [his aides](#) to also lie to them repeatedly, making false accusations against
3 me to the police, threatening me with [forfeiture](#) if I did not pay a [fraudulent demand](#)” – to which I now
4 add: “and as “*ashamed*” [as those who have – and continue to help him do this](#)”.

5 “And it was not the first time she was doing this. Oh no! Poor Man, what he was enduring in
6 silence! Look here in the [2003](#) report, he said she had done that before: “*at least 3-4 times since*
7 *November 2002*”. And look here, it’s true: we recorded it as a “*Substantiated Offence of*
8 *Harassment*” – and – we confirmed it in the [2007](#) report by stating: “*it shows Ms Rawé used to*
9 *swear at Mr Ladsky when seeing him in the communal area*”

10 →Fact: Not true. The objective of this false claim was to make a “*Substantiated Offence of Harassment*”
11 stick against me: [WS1 - 35](#). (Under the [Protection from Harassment Act 1997](#) the same offence must
12 take place on at least 2 occasions). This “*Substantiated Offence*” was recorded on [25th January 2003](#).
13 Hence, *before* contacting me, as the first I heard of the ‘complaint’ was in a threatening, intimidatory,
14 bullying letter from [the MPS](#) dated [27th January 2003](#) – signed “*Crime Investigator*”: [WS1 - 7, 30 and 33](#).
15 As to the ‘recycling’ of the false accusation from the 2003 report into the 2007 report – in spite of my
16 being “*Eliminated*” - it is discussed in [WS1 - 80 and 82](#).

17 “Look here in the [2003](#) report, the poor man said: “*the reasons she behaved like that towards*
18 *him was because she believed him to be behind the company that sent the bill for the*
19 *refurbishment of the block and she did not want to pay her share of it*”. It proves that this awful,
20 racist woman also defaults on her contractual obligations. And look here what he said in the
21 [2007](#) report: “*The reason why the victim believes he has become a target for abuse on the web*
22 *site is that the victim was involved with the business who was carrying out the repairs and*
23 *improvements that were paid for with the service charge*”

24 →Fact: as detailed above, re. [ADL being the landlord and key driver of all the activities in relation to](#)
25 [Jefferson House](#). As with all the other false, malicious, vicious accusations, the MPS failed to challenge
26 ADL, including failing to ask him for documentary evidence in support of his claim.

27 “Look here at the faxes “*she sent to the local housing department and the leasehold valuation*
28 *tribunal*” accusing the poor man of “*theft and fraud*”

29 →Fact: This is not true – and can be seen from the faxes in question: [24th October 2002](#) fax to
30 [Kensington & Chelsea housing](#); [24th October 2002](#) fax to the [Tribunal](#): [WS1 - 39](#). ‘Interestingly’, the MPS
31 had blocked out “*fraud*” from the report it sent me in [July 2009](#).

32 “As you can see here, we wrote her a letter to “*warn her about her behaviour*”. She did not
33 respond. And we certainly tried very hard to contact her. See here in the report, we even “*went to*
34 *her home to leave her a note*”. We still did not get a response from her. You see, that’s how she
35 treats us, the police”

36 →Fact: It is not true that I did not respond. While I viewed the [27th January 2003](#) letter as an attempt to
37 intimidate me, at the same time I laughed at [the MPS](#) for having no sense of the ridicule: [WS1 - 31](#), and
38 opted to ignore the letter. However, following the MPS’ [6th February 2003](#) chaser letter, I sent an [11th](#)
39 [February 2003](#) letter asking for “*precise detail – in writing – of the accusation against me*”. Not only did I
40 not receive a reply, on the day it received my letter, the MPS closed down the report: [WS1 - 32](#). As to
41 “*leaving a note*”: this is equally not true: [WS1 - 43](#).

42 “As you can see in the [2007](#) report, because “*she did not want pay the service charge*”, and “*to*
43 *seek compensation and retribution*”, she launched [a website](#)”.

44 →Fact: Not true. The reality is that ADL did not expect me to challenge his [fraudulent](#) demand and action
45 in the [Tribunal](#): [WS1 - 70](#). As crystal clear on [my website](#), I launched it because:

1 (i) in spite of my accepting ("[for the sake of bringing this dispute to an end](#)") ADL's [21st October 2003](#)
2 offer for £6,350: [WS1 - 63](#) (v the £14,400 demanded in [July 2002](#) and in the [29th November 2002 claim](#):
3 [WS1 - 42\(1\)](#)) - even though I did not legally owe this amount either: [WS1 - 63](#) - 3 months after the
4 Consent Order was endorsed by the court on [1st July 2004](#), ADL had the [managing agents](#) send me
5 another invoice for £14,400 in [October 2004](#). This was followed by [another one](#) 3 weeks later, repeating
6 the demand. Hence: as though no offer had been made, accepted, paid and endorsed by [the Court](#): [WS1](#)
7 [- 63](#)

8 (ii) [all of my subsequent complaints](#) against his aides were dismissed by their 'professional' body.

9 Outcome: I battled [for 5 years before launching my website](#) - as a cry for help, out of utter despair.

10 (Quoting from [Master Eyre's Order](#)): "*That website is no more than a sustained tirade against Mr.*
11 *Ladsky and his supposed allies*"

12 →Fact: In my [7th August 2011](#) reply to the Draft Order, I asked: "*Does "a tirade" mean relating events –*
13 *with 'black on white' evidence in support?*"

14 "What did she do? (Quoting from [Master Eyre's Order](#)): "*She at first referred to Mr. Ladsky and*
15 *his allies as "pigs and monkeys."* Can you believe that? As you can see in the [2007](#) report, poor
16 Mr Ladsky said that "*the words relate to terms used by the Nazis to refer to Jewish people during*
17 *the holocaust*". She is of Franco-German origin. Look here in the report, it says: "*There are a*
18 *number of sections which are alleged to be of a racial nature and numerous references by name*
19 *to the victim...*". (Quoting from [Master Eyre's Order](#)): "*Mr. Ladsky, not very surprisingly in view of*
20 *what he says is his racial background took offence, and complained*"

21 →Fact: Not true. The context in which I used these terms is very clear from my website: to refer to the
22 individuals who were – unlawfully - hounding me, tracking me, monitoring me: [WS1 - 70 and 77](#).

23 "She is not just an anti-Semite, but a typical Nazi who also hates anybody not white. See the
24 evidence here on the [Classification page](#): "*A web page has been created which is alleged to*
25 *contain anti-Semitic, anti-black, anti-Asian pictures and text*", and here: "*The specific remarks*
26 *and pictures complained about are contained throughout*" Look, it's true, we classified the report
27 as a "[Substantiated Racial Incident](#)"

28 →Fact: Not true. To this day, [the MPS](#) has not provided any evidence in support of its accusations: [WS1](#)
29 [- 68 and 71](#).

30 "Look here what the [2007](#) report states: "*there is a lot of slanderous comments on the site mainly*
31 *directed at Mr Ladsky but also at Kensington & Chelsea police and even [MPs](#), the [Prime Minister](#)*
32 *and [Deputy Prime Minister](#). Also against [solicitors](#) and many others*"

33 →Fact: Not true. To this day, the MPS has not provided any evidence in support of these accusations:
34 [WS1 - 78](#)

35 I would like to know: what is 'the story' if e.g. the Surveillance Commissioner asks to have a look at my
36 website? How will he be stopped from seeing all the black-on-white evidence the police has turned a
37 blind eye to: [false accounting; fraud; harassment](#); etc.?

38 "We contacted the website host but, as you can see in the report, we did not get a response. (Or,
39 as [Master Eyre wrote in the Order](#)): "[Made] *unsuccessful attempts to get the web-host's co-*
40 *operation...*"

41 →Fact: Not true. In the report, (in addition to not capturing the content of its initial e-mail of [16th March](#)
42 [2007](#) in which it wrote: "*I am the police officer dealing with this crime*") the MPS did not capture my
43 website Host's replies, and nor did it capture the fact that it responded - because these e-mails are

1 'inconvenient' for the MPS' purposes: [WS1 - 51 and 52](#). As my website Host asked – in vain - for
2 evidence in support of the accusations, it cannot be stated that it *“failed to cooperate”*: [WS1- 51, 54, 56](#).

3 Given that – contrary to [Master Eyre's assertion in his Order](#) that “[the MPS] *took up the matter with [me]*”
4 - the MPS never contacted me at any point in time: [WS1 - 49 and 58](#), I would like to know what is ‘the
5 story’ if e.g. the Surveillance Commissioner asks: What did she say when you contacted her?

6 “Look here: it says *“she sleeps with a knife near her bed”*”

7 →Fact: ‘Interestingly’ this was blocked from the [July 2009](#) version I had at the time of writing my Witness
8 Statement. I wonder why. Was it because the MPS did not like the reason I gave on my website for doing
9 this – which undermines its objective in capturing this? The reason for my doing this is at [WS2 - 61](#).

[§23 of my
29.08.11 Wit.
Stat.](#)

“ALL that is contained in the [2007](#) report is true. See here, the report states: *“No suspicion of
false reporting”*”

12 →Fact: Also ‘interestingly’ this categorical statement was likewise blocked in the [July 2009](#) version of the
13 report. The objective in doing this is obvious. This report is a web of false, unlawful, malicious and highly
14 vicious accusations against me with the aim of, among others, providing a rationale for capturing ADL’s
15 and the MPS’ outrageous, malicious, libellous opinions about my ‘mental health or condition’ - with the
16 objective of getting me ‘out of action’ - by contacting social services: [WS1 – 79](#). And these accusations
17 and opinions are just the ones that the MPS deemed I was ‘entitled’ to see, as parts of the reports
18 supplied to me on 22nd July 2011 are still blocked.

19 I guess that in the [2007](#) report: *“She is paranoid”*; *“She thinks the police may be following her as well as
20 numerous people employed by her enemies”*: [WS1 - 72 and 73](#), will be highlighted to parties with access
21 to the MPS database that are unaware that I am under constant surveillance, I refer to [WS2](#) - as a
22 means of adding weight to its ‘assessment’ as to my ‘mental condition’.

23 “This woman is a danger to society. That’s we need to monitor her constantly, including in her
24 flat”.

25 →Fact: I am an asset to society by standing-up to [a crook](#), [his aides](#) and [their supporters](#). Re. my flat
26 being bugged: [WS2 - 40-50](#)

27 “That’s why, as you can see in the [2007](#) report, we captured our belief that she *“may have some
28 mental issues”* and also wrote that we *“contacted social services to see if they are aware of her”*

29 →Fact: The individuals who wrote this, allowed it to be written, and are allowing it to be kept in the report
30 are the individuals with *“mental issues”*.

31 “And when she goes overseas, we also have to go and warn the authorities to make sure they
32 keep her under close watch”

33 →Fact: As per my above reply. Re. being monitored overseas: [WS2 - 115-118](#)

34 And that script is based only on evidence I have so far been ‘permitted’ to see. What other false, highly
35 damaging data is held against me? I refer to e.g. the reaction of the police officer during my visit to
36 [Kensington police](#) on [16th October 2010](#), when he called his colleague over to have a look at the
37 computer and said: *“Read that!”*: [WS1 - 135](#).

38 What has been communicated to e.g. social services, in relation to which, in breach of my rights under
39 the [DPA](#), the MPS has refused to provide me with the contact details?: [WS1 - 85 and 86](#). In light of what
40 I have ‘been allowed’ to see, I can only conclude that what has been kept from me is far more damaging.

41 The likelihood of the above script is also reinforced by:

- 1 ■ [Kensington & Chelsea police](#)'s refusal to investigate my legitimate and well documented complaints
2 of harassment in [October 2010: WS1 - 118-143](#)

Snapshot in My Diary 23 May 10
The implication that the State approves of [ADL also hounding me – working in tandem with State resources: WS2 - 4](#)

- 5 ■ Not asking me about my [T-shirt](#) I wore over my coat, throughout my 7 visits to Kensington & Chelsea
6 police in [October 2010](#) – which states, in large lettering: “Victim of Fraud and Corruption –
7 [www.leasehold-outrage.com](#)”: [WS1 – 140](#)
- 8 ■ Failure to act on my reporting to the MET Commissioner the [15th June 2009](#) death threat (“Enjoy your
9 life. You don’t have long to live”): [WS1 – 143](#)
- 10 ■ A police officer mocking me in the street (I was wearing my T-shirt): [WS2 – 108](#)
- 11 ■ Events since my Pre-action letter of [17th March 2011](#).

Refers to [Police \(Complaints and Misconduct\) Regulations 2004](#), Reg.3(1) and (2)(a) re. **dispensation**

And in [February-March 2010](#), the [‘Independent’ Police Complaints Commission](#) opted to side with the MPS by ignoring my rights under the [DPA](#) and by [using irrelevant subordinate legislation](#) as ground for dismissing my complaint: [WS1 – 99-108](#). This is another example of the kind of ‘remedy’ placed in front of victims by the [Home Secretary](#). In light of [Mater Eyre’s Order](#): to get the taxpayer-funded IPCC to do its job we, the victims, are expected to incur thousands of £ in legal fees to seek judicial review.

It is blatantly obvious from the blind determination of the MPS and its supporters to retain these unlawful “crime reports” as they are is to use them against me.

- 19 In [WS2](#), I report being hounded, tracked and monitored as though I were a terrorist:
- 20 ■ monitoring and interference with all my means of communications: [8-39](#), including public telephones:
21 [30-33](#);
- 22 ■ bugging my flat: [41-50](#), and covert surveillance in the UK: [51-99](#) that has included approaching
23 medical practitioners I saw: [62-64 and 136](#)
- 24 ■ when I was working, as soon as I left the office: [100-105](#)
- 25 ■ surveillance by local uniform officers: [106-108](#)
- 26 ■ being hounded and harassed by police helicopters: [109-114](#)
- 27 ■ use of covert surveillance overseas: [115-118](#)
- 28 ■ use of covert human intelligence: [119-131](#)

29 Under the [Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000](#), the legally justifiable grounds - in relation to
30 which the surveillance must be assessed as “necessary and proportionate”, are: in the interest of
31 national security; prevention or detection of serious crime; safeguard of the economic well-being of the
32 country; public safety; to protect public health.

33 I know that I have *not*, and I am *not* engaged in any conduct that calls in any of these legal grounds: [19th](#)
34 [April 2011 Particulars of claim – 155 - 164](#). (The one who should be prosecuted is ADL for, among
35 others, engaging in unlawful conduct “resulting in financial gain” – as defined by [s.81\(3\) of the 2000 Act](#)).

36 Hence: what is used as ‘justification’ for ‘the surveillance’ and interception? Obvious: the false, unlawful,
37 malicious “crime reports” from which entries can be fitted under 1 or more of the above categories. And
38 of course, to these, must be added other false, seriously damaging data about me that I have not been
39 allowed to see.

1 It is clearly evident from what I report that, in addition to photographs and/or film footage of me, highly
2 damaging data about me is also being widely circulated in order to secure cooperation. Further, that a
3 large amount of resources are deployed doing this – and have been for several years.

4 'The surveillance' as it is abundantly clear from what I report that it is not surveillance in accordance with
5 the rule of law - but in actual fact: harassment and persecution intended to cause me an ongoing mix of
6 anxiety, distress, fear, inconvenience, blight my life by affecting all my daily activities, cut me off from my
7 contacts – added to the objective of getting me 'out of action' e.g. contacting social services: [WS1 – 79](#);
8 approaching my medical practitioners: [WS2 - 62-64 and 136](#); covert human intelligence: [WS2 – 119-131](#).

9 In summary: it is retribution – and this retribution started *before* I launched my website.

Intro to My
Diary 2009
And 2011

10 For what? [My 'daring' to stand-up to: \(i\) a crook](#) who decided that I (and fellow leaseholders) should pay
11 for the [construction](#) of a [penthouse flat](#) and addition of [3 other flats](#) so that he could make [a multi-million](#)
12 [£ jackpot](#); (ii) [State parties who decided to protect him and assist him](#), and for my 'daring' to stand-up to
13 them et.al. in the professions.

14 Conclusion: 'Dare' to stand-up to [a crook](#) we have decided to protect, and to us, and will persecute you
15 until we have destroyed you.

16 And there is no remedy available to stop this ongoing persecution. Indeed, assuming that authorisations
17 have been obtained, as well as repeatedly renewed, approaching the [Investigatory Powers Tribunal](#) will
18 not put an end to it as:

- 19 ■ It is not part of a [section 65](#) Tribunal's function to determine the admissibility of the evidence, nor that
20 of the Surveillance Commissioner. Hence: the crime reports - and other data I have not seen - will
21 not be challenged.
- 22 ■ On the usual ground of 'public interest immunity' I will not be shown the data on which the Tribunal
23 based its decision. Hence: I will not be able to challenge it.
- 24 ■ Outcome: based on the false data, the Tribunal will conclude that the interception and surveillance
25 are lawful, and the only thing I will get is a verdict of: *"No determination in my favour"*.

26 In other words: I have no protection whatsoever against the blatant abuse of power. And those with the
27 responsibility for ensuring that the rule of law is observed are endorsing the unlawful conduct.

28 In the words of the PM, David Cameron: if the rioters are *"sick, twisted, morally depraved individuals"* –
29 what does that make the individuals who take taxpayer money, agreeing to do a job in accordance with
30 the rule of law and, instead, do / endorse the above being done to me? In my book: way, way, past *"sick,*
31 *twisted and morally depraved"* – and worse than ADL because they have a duty to protect me and
32 defend me from his unlawful acts.

33 And, again in the words of David Cameron: if a judge is justified in imposing a 4-year prison sentence on
34 2 youngsters who unsuccessfully posted an online message inciting riot - what prison sentence should
35 be imposed on those who are doing the above?

36 At a recent police conference, one of the police' speakers asked the [Home Secretary](#): *"How do you sleep*
37 *at night?"* I ask the same question of the Home Secretary, [the MPS and IPCC](#) parties, and [Master Eyre](#).

38 Yours sincerely

39 N Klosterkötter-Dit-Rawé

Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

HO

Rosebery Avenue
London
Greater London
EC1R 4SQ

Date and Time: 22/08/2011 12:11
Session ID: 8-14218
Dest: UK (EU)
Quantity: 1
Weight: 0.042 kg

Special D by 1 £0.00 £5.45

Total Cost of Services £5.45

Posted after Last Collection? No

Barcode: ZW7035681886B

DESTINATION ADDRESS
Building Name or Number Postcode
TREASURYS SOLICITORS WC2B 4TS
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

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

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

ZW703568188GB

Track item

[How to find your reference number](#)

HO/T Sol cheque
£5,000.00

Delivered

Your item with reference ZW703568188GB was delivered from our WEST CENTRAL LONDON Delivery Office on 23/08/11.

Thank you for using this service.
We can confirm that this item was delivered before the guaranteed time.
You can now see the electronic Proof of Delivery for this item by clicking the button below.

[View Proof of Delivery](#)

Treasury Solicitor's Department
One Kemble Street, London, WC2B 4TS

Ms N. Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawe

DX 123242 Kingsway 6
Switchboard: 0207 210 3000
Direct Lir
Direct Fa
helen.joh

Please Quote: Z1104287/HMJ/A4
Your Reference:

Dated: 25th August 2011

Dear Madam,

**NOELLE KLOSTERKOTTER-DIT-RAWE -V- OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER OF POLICE
OF THE METROPOLIS (1) INDEPENDENT POLICE COMPLAINTS COMMISSION (2) THE
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (3)**

Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of 22nd August, enclosing the remittance amounting to £5,000.00, representing costs awarded to the Home Office client.

I am obliged to you for making the payment so promptly.

It is regretted but I am unable to comment on the information within the 7 pages of your said letter.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely

Yeah, I am 'a lawyer', and, like 'Dear Master Eyre' (*), I 'CAN'T SEE' that the MPS, which comes under the umbrella of my Client, NOR my Client, have done ANYTHING ILLEGAL. (*), and his mates, Justices Lang and Mackay who 'dealt' with my Appeal against his Order: 06.10.11 Order, and 24.10.11 Order following my 17.10.11 Request

HELEN JOHN
For the Treasury Solicitor