

Mrs/Ms Julia Chittenden

[Ms Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé](#)

Lawyer

[IPCC](#)

90 High Holborn
London WC1V 6BH

I wrote a similar, less detailed letter of:

- [22.08.11](#) to [the MPS](#) enclosing £8,478 cheque following [Master Eyre's FULL OF LIES 09.08.11 Order](#)

- [22.08.11](#) to the Home Office enclosing £5,000 cheque following [Master Eyre's 09.08.11 Order](#)

- I subsequently filed a [30.08.11](#) Appeal Application against [the MPS Order](#). [Justice Lang refused it: 06.10.11 Order](#).

- I submitted a [17.10.11](#) (comprehensive) Request for Oral Hearing of my Application for Permission to appeal. In this I repeated my position, as well as cited legislation and case law. At the 24.10.11 'hearing' [Justice Mackay refused my Application: 24.10.11 Order](#). He subsequently [refused](#) to state his Reasons in the Order.

1 (By 'Special Delivery')

2 13th September 2011

3 [Queen's Bench Claim Ref: HQ11X01471](#) – [Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé](#) v. [Independent Police](#)
4 [Complaints Commission](#) (2nd Defendant) and Others

5 Dear Madam

6 CHEQUE FOR £3,703.00

7 I acknowledge receipt of your 'Recorded Delivery' letter dated [8th September 2011](#), enclosing
8 a sealed copy of [Master Eyre's](#) Order dated [29th July 2011](#) – following my asking for it in my
9 'Recorded Delivery' letters of [15th August](#) and [31st August 2011](#), and leaving two messages
10 on your voicemail (6th September at 10h30; 8th September at 15h38).

11 In your [9th August 2011](#) letter you informed me that you had reduced your costs from
12 [£4,083.00](#) to £3,703.00. I therefore enclose cheque NatWest # 1516 for this amount.

13 With my 15th August 2011 letter, I copied you on my [7th August 2011](#) letter to Master Eyre, in
14 which I wrote in relation to the Order he granted you:

15 *"As to your Order in relation to the Second Defendant, following the Application*
16 *hearing also on 29th July 2011, you state: "3. The only reason that the Claimant gives*
17 *for not having followed that route is that it would have cost £70,000"*

18 *"During the hearing, I also stated that as I did ('not') (omitted in my original letter) have*
19 *£70,000 to spend on lawyers, I opted for the legitimate option of submitting a [Section](#)*
20 *[10 Notice under the Data Protection Act 1998](#). But this alternative also proved to be in*
21 *vain, as my Notice was ignored. This is captured under paragraph § 110 of my [19th](#)*
22 *[July 2011](#) Witness Statement in response to the Second Defendant's Application"*

23 It was indeed a legitimate option as I was acting as per my statutory rights. Rights 'your
24 caseworker' Matthew Johnson had opted to totally disregard ([22nd February](#) and [2nd March](#)
25 [2010](#) letters), preferring to side with [Detective Inspector Crispin Lee, Directorate of](#)
26 ['Professional Standards' of the Metropolitan Police Service \('MPS'\)](#). Indeed, he regurgitated
27 DI Lee's diktat ([21st January 2010](#) letter, posted 2 weeks later, by truly amazing coincidence,
28 on the day that my [2nd February 2010](#) letter was delivered to the Met Commissioner) that the
29 MPS had the right to ask for dispensation from addressing my complaint because "[it was]
30 *more than 12 months after the alleged conduct without good reason*" and I had "*made [it] only*
31 *because [I had] been unable to obtain the result [I] desire[d] through [the MPS Public Access](#)*
32 [Office](#)".

33 →Fact: Aside from the fact that, contrary to the implication, the MPS Public Access Office is
34 *not* exempt from compliance with the [Data Protection Act 1998 \('DPA'\)](#), the 12-month

1 deadline comes from [Regulation 3\(2\)\(a\) of the Police \(Complaints and Misconduct\)](#)
2 [Regulations 2004](#). It is *totally irrelevant* subordinate legislation as it has absolutely *nothing* to
3 do with the DPA.

4 →Fact: The DPA does not specify a time limit for a data subject to do this. I repeated this
5 point on page 7, point 7.1, of my [18th February 2010](#) letter to DI Lee, on which [I copied the](#)
6 [IPCC](#): “Where, in the [Data Protection Act 1998](#), does it specify a time limit for a data subject
7 to seek – and obtain – an end to the processing of data that is false, unlawful, misleading,
8 scurrilous, libellous, biased, corrupted, incomplete in some very significant aspects – as well
9 as obtain correction of the data to ensure that it is “fair, lawful and accurate?”.

10 And, like the MPS or, probably more accurately: on the order of the MPS - ‘your’ caseworker
11 tried to get rid of me by telling me in ‘his’ [2nd March 2010](#) letter to approach the Information
12 Commissioner. In the light of my experience, I assume you were all salivating at the prospect
13 of having more fun if you managed to keep me on the treadmill (on which, by then, the MPS
14 had kept me for 6 months) (my 1st reply to the “*crime reports*” was dated [13th August 2009](#),
15 including [bundle of 49 supporting documents](#)). I contend that, in particular, the ploy was to
16 make me lose the deadline for filing a claim for breach of my rights under the European
17 Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms 1950 (as set out
18 in Sch.1 to the [Human Rights Act 1998](#)). (Ensuring that complainants miss statutory
19 deadlines for compensation is another IPCC tactic evident from cases reported in the media).

20 →Fact: The 1998 Act does not require approaching the Information Commissioner. Even if I
21 had approached the Commissioner, I could still have commenced legal action under [s.7\(9\) of](#)
22 [the Act](#) – as confirmed in *R. (Lord) v Secretary of State for the Home Department* [2003]
23 EWHC 2073 (Admin), at [16].

24 So, in terms of the sick comment in ‘your’ [22nd February 2010](#) letter: “*and investigating your*
25 *complaint now would likely cause an injustice*” – for the sake of protecting rogue elements at
26 [Kensington, Chelsea and Notting Hill police](#), and by extension, [Andrew David Ladsky](#) (‘ADL’),
27 the evil, greed-ridden, sadistic crook [who controls](#) the [Jefferson House ‘concentration camp’](#),
[11 Basil Street, London SW3 1AX](#), where I have my leasehold flat – [you, the IPCC](#), as a
result of [failing to do your job](#), have caused me injustice, horrendous distress, loss of more
than one year of my life, and huge costs.

[s.10\(1\)\(c\)](#)
[of Police](#)
[Reform](#)
[Act 2002](#)

31 The above events are covered in my [19th July 2011](#) Witness Statement in response to your [7th](#)
32 [June 2011](#) Application to strike out my [19th April 2011](#) claim. The exchange of
33 correspondence is captured under [§ 97-108](#) and the consequences of your blindly following
34 [the MPS’](#) diktat are detailed under [§ 109-111](#). This Witness Statement replaced mine of [27th](#)
35 [June 2011](#) as I realised that a witness statement should not refer to the law, nor include the
36 type of statements I made. However, I absolutely stand by everything I wrote – and endorsed
37 with a statement of truth.

38 Clearly, it is not enough that you get paid taxpayer money to do a job, to get you to do it, we,
39 taxpayers, have to pay thousands of £ out of our taxed income to employ lawyers to file an
40 application for [judicial review](#). Evidently, [you, the MPS](#), and by extension the [Home Office](#),
41 are relying on the fact that relatively few people have the means to do this.

42 It is costing me [£3,703.00](#) (plus my costs), to get confirmation of numerous media reports that
43 the IPCC ‘watchdog’ is in fact the police’s ‘poodle’. Hence, no change relative to your
44 predecessor, the Police Complaints Authority, you replaced in 2004.

1 And it cost me [£5,000.00](#) (Master Eyre's Order of [9th August 2011](#)) (plus my costs), to get
2 confirmation that the [Home Secretary, Teresa May](#), approves of the [IPCC's conduct](#) and, like
3 her predecessor, Alan Johnson, who ignored my letters of [28th November 2009](#), [2nd](#)
4 [December 2009](#) and [2nd February 2010](#), approves of [the MPS conduct](#) in my case. Proof? In
5 spite of all the evidence the Home Secretary has been supplied with in the context of my [19th](#)
6 [April 2011](#) claim (as all my documents had to be served on all the parties):

7 1. my [14th June 2011](#) Reply to the MPS' [23rd May 2011](#) Defence in which I provided
8 irrefutable evidence (recording of the [16th October 2010](#) conversation and [transcript](#)) that
9 the MPS lied – under a statement of truth – by falsely claiming, under para.40 of its
10 Defence that “PC Giles did not accuse [me] of “*following the man*”; “*She... did not state*
11 *that [my complaint] would be filed as an “intelligence report”* (because I had “*not provided*
12 *sufficient evidence*”);

my [19th July 2011](#) Witness Statement in response to the MPS' [30th June 2011](#) Application
to have my claim struck out. (I refer to this below as ‘**WS1**’);

my [19th July 2011](#) Witness Statement in reply to your [30th June 2011](#) Application to have
my claim struck out. (I refer to this below as ‘**WS3**’); 7th

17 4. my [19th July 2011](#) Witness Statement in reply to the Home Office's Application of [7th July](#)
18 [2011](#) to have my claim struck out. (I refer to this below as ‘**WS2**’);

19 5. the numerous documents that backed-up my position...

20 ...[the Home Secretary has taken no sanction](#) against:

21 1. you - as I am being made to pay your costs;

22 2. the MPS, namely [Chief Superintendent Mark Heath, Kensington & Chelsea police](#) who, in
23 breach of my rights under the [DPA](#) and of my rights under [Article 8](#) of the European
24 Convention, ignored my [2nd June 2010](#) Section 10 Notice, in the same way that he
25 ignored all my previous demands under the DPA – with the outcome that, at the date of
26 writing, [Kensington, Chelsea, Notting Hill police](#) and other parties in the MPS – in
27 connivance with ADL - continue to aid and abet the processing on the police system of
28 the [2003](#) and [2007](#) “*crime reports*” that are a web of false, unlawful, unfair, highly
29 malicious and vicious accusations against me and opinions of me, and a [2002](#) report that
30 is, in many parts, also a work of fiction. And, in spite of doing this, as a result of the [9th](#)
31 [August 2011](#) Order from [Master Eyre](#), I have been made to pay the MPS [£8,478.03](#). To
32 this must be added my costs.

33 I am [appealing](#) against this latter Order I view as highly unjust and wrong – and copied you on
34 my initial reply to Master Eyre of [7th August 2011](#). In line with your [February-March 2010](#)
35 evidently [Home-Office](#)-approved stance, the implication of [the Order](#) is that [the MPS](#) is free to
36 act above the law for the sake of assisting and protecting ADL in [his fraudulent activities](#), as
37 well as [join forces with him](#) in taking retaliatory action against me – his victim – for ‘[daring](#)’ to
38 [stand-up to him and his supporters for my rights](#). In other words: you have [ALL](#) pinned your
39 colours to the Andrew Ladsky mast. WHY?

40 In relation to ‘conniving’ with ADL, I refer to, among others, [Kensington, Chelsea and Notting](#)
41 [Hill police](#)’ trickery in describing him as my “*neighbour*” – in the [2002](#) report in spite of my
42 identifying him as [the landlord](#), and in the context of his [2003](#) and [2007](#) so-called ‘complaints’
43 against me, in relation to the answer to the question: ‘How is the suspect known to the

Re. ‘serving’
my Witness
Statements:
[my 19.07.11](#)
[letter to the](#)
[court](#)

1 victim?'. As they are well aware, ADL “knows” me because [he is the landlord](#) as I explained in
2 [WS3 § 18-21](#). (He took over the headlease in 1996¹. The freehold was taken over in 1997².
3 These documents are on my website [www.leasehold-outrage.com](#)).

4 Under para.23 of its [Defence, the MPS](#) asserts that “*the effects of this error were negligible*”. I
5 totally disagree with this ([WS3 § 18-21](#)): the impact is major as it has – and continues – to be
6 used as rationale for not challenging / not doubting *any* of ADL’s accusations against me and
7 opinions of me – as exemplified, more recently, by Reason 2 of the [9th August 2011](#) Order.
8 The reason the MPS and supporters want to retain that description? Obvious: because it is
9 the foundation for the content of the fictional reports and they want to use them against me
10 (discussed below).

11 While any decent human being does not need legislation to tell him/her that to process these
12 data is morally wrong...

13 ...→Fact: the 4th Principle of the DPA does state: “(a) *having regard to the purpose or*
14 *purposes for which the data were obtained and further processed, the data controller must*
15 *take reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of the data*”.

16 In relation to the [20th November 2009](#) letter from [Acting Chief Inspector Steve McSorley,](#)
17 [‘Professional Standards’, for my local police of Kensington and Chelsea](#) that: “*With regard to*
18 *the wording of the crime reports, I am satisfied that this represents an accurate account of*
19 *what police were told at the time even if you do not agree with what was said by third parties*”
20 - on page 1 of my [2nd December 2009](#) letter to the then Met Commissioner, Paul Stephenson,
21 and then Home Secretary, Alan Johnson, I wrote: “*It certainly IS “reasonably expected” of the*
22 *police to investigate third party claims, including obtaining supporting evidence. And it IS*
23 *likewise “reasonably expected” of the police to do this BEFORE accusing an individual of*
24 *having committed criminal actions*”. (As [TDC Simon J Dowling, Notting Hill police,](#) did in ‘his’
25 [16th March 2007](#) e-mail to my website Host in which ‘he’ wrote: “*I am the police officer dealing*
26 *with this crime*” – without ever contacting me the owner and author of the website,
27 [www.leasehold-outrage.com](#)). I refer to [WS3 § 48-49](#).

28 →Fact: To the DPA, is added, among other, the Code of Conduct comprised under the [Police](#)
29 [\(Conduct\) Regulations](#), in relation to which, under point 454, page 120, of your ‘[Statutory](#)
30 [Guidance to the Police Service and Police Authorities on the Handling of Complaints](#)’ you
31 refer to the ‘[Home Office Guidance, Police Officer Misconduct, Unsatisfactory Performance](#)
32 [and Attendance Management Procedures](#)’ which states under para.1.14: “***Police officers do***
33 ***not knowingly make any false, misleading or inaccurate oral or written statements or***
34 ***entries in any record or document kept or made in connection with any police activity***”.
35 It could not be any clearer. So, in addition to ignoring statutes, you also ignore your own
36 Guidance and that of the Home Office. WHY? For the sake of assisting and protecting [a](#)
37 [crook](#) - and evidently with the blessings of the [Home Office](#) (as it has turned a blind eye to the
38 evidence I supplied in the context of my claim).

39 Of paramount importance: in addition to the police, these so-called “*crime reports*” are
40 accessible by a host of parties e.g. law enforcement agencies, courts, central and local
41 government, etc.

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](#)

1 Based on what [the MPS](#) has 'deemed me to be allowed' to see so far, using some of the
2 entries in the "crime reports", I imagine the MPS' script to internal and external parties with
3 access to the reports - who are unaware of the truth - to go along the following lines – which I
4 contrast with the facts, and in the context of which I refer to my 3 Witness Statements of 19th
5 July 2011:

6 *"She an anti-Semite, hell bent on a vendetta against a poor, innocent man, Mr Ladsky,*
7 *who is Jewish, and is her neighbour. Look at the evidence here in the [2003](#) and [2007](#)*
8 *reports, the answer to the question: 'How is suspect known to victim?': "Neighbour"*
9 *(under 'Victim Details') And look here, in the 2007 report: "Victim considers himself*
10 *intimidated" (under [15/03/2007-16h14](#), 'Primary Investigation Details: 4')*

11 →Fact: Re. "neighbour": as detailed above. [Re. "intimated": \(i\) this is hilarious](#) considering
12 what [ADL has done](#), as well as [instigated](#) against me (and fellow leaseholders) through his
[stable of aides](#) and [supporters since 2002](#); (ii) this text was redacted in the [July 2009](#) version I
had at the time of writing my [19th July 2011](#) Witness Statement in response to the [MPS' 30th](#)
[June 2011](#) Application; the MPS supplied me with the latest version [on 22nd July 2011](#) –
hence: past filing and serving my Witness Statement. This is another example of (assisted)
MPS' trick to prevent me from challenging this hilarious assertion. The objective of this entry
is obvious: to add weight to the fictional story that 'poor Mr Ladsky' who, quoting from [Reason](#)
[2 of Master Eyre's Order](#): "[I] recently described as "that evil, greed-ridden monster"" - is a
poor innocent, persecuted victim.

21 *"You can see in the [2007](#) report, it's written: "he stated that Ms Rawé is Franco-*
22 *German and is well aware that he is Jewish""*

23 →Fact: I did not know he said to be Jewish until the MPS sent its unlawful, racist, xenophobic
24 e-mails of [16th March](#) and [20th March 2007](#) to my website Host: [WS3 - 48 and 54-55](#). By
25 contrast, ADL knew my origin: the [2003](#) report describes my nationality as "German or
26 French".

- [Elderly Resident](#)
- [Resident Assoc.](#)
- [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"

31 →Fact: I maintain my position that [DC DR Adams](#)' assertion that the resident was responsible
32 for the anonymous phone calls does not stack up: [WS3 - 24\(2\)\(3\)\(4\)](#). And the entries under
33 [26/03/2002-13h23](#) and [08/04/2002-14h32](#) of the 2002 report that [were blocked in the July](#)
34 [2009 version](#) I had at the time of writing my Witness Statement, provide further support to my
35 position: (i) blatant contradictions as to when the resident is alleged to have admitted making
36 the calls; (ii) the concocted story one is expected to believe that the resident goes 'past the
37 Carlton Tower hotel', which is c.150m from her flat, and thinks: Oh! Why not go in and make
38 another 3 anonymous phone calls to "my friend" ("the victim is a friend", [20/03/2002-13h51](#)
39 [entry](#)). I refer to [WS3 § 24\(4\)\(5\)](#). (I am covering that in my supplementary Witness Statement
40 of [29th August 2011](#), under § 10. Like the rest, I will place it on [my website](#)).

41 *"Look at the [2003](#) report, how, totally unprovoked she swore at poor Mr Ladsky".*
42 *(Quoting from [Master's Eyre's 9th August 2009 Order, Reason 3\(2\)](#)): "Look at "the*
43 *most disgusting and undignified language she used towards him and she said it*
44 *without the least sign of shame""*

1 →Fact: On coming out of the [Jefferson House 'concentration camp'](#), I saw ADL standing by
2 the lift, but pretended to not see him. ADL told me: "[Better luck next time](#)" followed by a
3 sarcastic laugh. I assumed he was referring to the impending [Tribunal](#) hearing and that he
4 had it 'sewn-up': [WS3 § 33](#). ([My assessment proved to be correct: WS3 § 41 and 63](#)).

5 Feeling very angry by what I had been subjected to over the [previous 12 months](#) (e.g.
6 ongoing harassment; [fraudulent demand](#) in [July 2002](#); threat of forfeiture in [October 2002](#);
7 [fraudulent claim](#) filed [against me \(and fellow leaseholders\)](#) in [November 2002](#), and in total
8 disregard of the [Tribunal's](#) directions ³) - and knowing that [ADL was behind all of this](#), I did
9 reply as stated in the report. To this I add the fact that, 3 weeks previously, as I was coming
10 out of my flat, ADL was standing by the door. He told me, with a lot of venom in his voice: "[I](#)
11 [am going to get you this year!](#)": [WS3 § 33](#)

12 As to [Master Eyre's](#) comment: "*without the least sign of shame*", I responded to this ([7th](#)
13 [August 2011](#)) that, while I did not recall being asked at the [29th July 2011](#) hearing whether I
14 felt "*ashamed*", had I been asked, I would have replied: "As ashamed as ADL who held Her
15 Majesty's [Tribunal](#) and [Courts](#) in utter contempt by lying and getting [his aides](#) to also lie to
16 them repeatedly, making false accusations against me to the police, threatening me with
17 [forfeiture](#) if I did not pay a [fraudulent demand](#)" – to which I now add: "and as "*ashamed*" as
18 those who have – and continue to help him in his fraudulent activities, as well as protect him
19 from the legal consequences of his actions by siding [with](#) him – against me".

Summary
outcome my
complaints:
[My Diary 6](#)
[May 2008](#)

20 "*And it was not the first time she was doing this. Oh no! Poor Man, what he was*
21 *enduring in silence! Look here in the [2003](#) report, he said she had done that before:*
22 *"at least 3-4 times since November 2002" ([25/01/2003-13h55](#) entry). And look here,*
23 *it's true: we recorded it as a "Substantiated Offence of Harassment" ('[Classification](#)*
24 *and under the [25/01/2003-14h35](#) entry: "Classification confirmed" - [WS3 § 32](#)) – and –*
25 *we confirmed it in the 2007 report by stating: "it shows Ms Rawé used to swear at Mr*
26 *Ladsky when seeing him in the communal area"* (under [16/03/2007-19h07](#))

27 →Fact: Not true. The objective of this false claim was to make a "*Substantiated Offence of*
28 *Harassment*" stick against me: [WS3 § 34](#). (Under the [Protection from Harassment Act 1997](#)
29 the same offence must take place on at least 2 occasions). This "*Substantiated Offence*" was
30 recorded on [27th January 2003](#). Hence, before contacting me, as the first I heard of the
31 'complaint' was in a threatening, intimidatory, bullying letter from [PC Neil Watson 206BS,](#)
32 [Chelsea police](#), dated [27th January 2003](#) – signed "*Crime Investigator*": [WS3 § 29 -30](#). As to
33 the 'recycling' of the false accusation from the [2003](#) report into the [2007](#) report – in spite of
34 my being "*Eliminated*" - it is discussed in [WS3 § 78 and 81](#).

35 "*Look here in the [2003](#) report, the poor man said: "the reasons she behaved like that*
36 *towards him was because she believed him to be behind the company that sent the*
37 *bill for the refurbishment of the block and she did not want to pay her share of it"*
38 *(under [25/01/2003-13h55](#)). "It proves that this awful, racist woman also defaults on her*
39 *contractual obligations. And look here what he said in the [2007](#) report: "The reason*
40 *why the victim believes he has become a target for abuse on the web site is that the*
41 *victim was involved with the business who was carrying out the repairs and*
42 *improvements that were paid for with the service charge"* (under [15/03/2007-16h14](#))

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*"

[§20 of my 29.08.11 Supp. Witness Statement](#)

This was also blocked in the [July 2009 version](#) I had when I wrote my [19th July 2011](#) Witness Statement. WHY? Obvious: to prevent me from challenging the blatant lies – so that this evidence would not be recorded in my Witness Statement. Sick does not begin to describe [the MPS](#). And that's what you protect?!?! Moral depravation of the lowest order.

Other parts that were redacted are in the [16/03/2007-18h56 entry](#): “About four years ago Mr Ladsky organised for refurbishment on the flats... [the works] Mr Ladsky initiated”. “Initiated” and “organised” contrast significantly with the above implied role of being ‘brought in’ (“involved in the business”) to carry out the works.

9 →Fact: as detailed above, [ADL is the landlord and key driver of all the activities](#) in relation to
10 [the Jefferson House ‘concentration camp’](#). As with *all* the other false, malicious accusations,
11 [Kensington, Chelsea and Notting Hill police](#) failed to challenge ADL, including failing to ask
12 him for documentary evidence in support of his vicious claims. The ‘story’ that ADL was an
13 outside party was concocted in order to substantiate the false, malicious accusation of my
14 being ‘a racist’, an ‘anti-Semite’.

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

17 →Fact: This is not true – and is glaringly obvious from the faxes in question: [24th October 2002](#)
18 fax to [Kensington & Chelsea housing](#); [24th October 2002](#) fax to the Tribunal: [WS3 § 38-41](#).
19 ‘Interestingly’, [the MPS](#) had blocked out “**fraud**” from the report it sent me [in July 2009](#).
20 The [2009 version](#) of the report only showed that I “wrote letters accusing the victim of **theft**”.
21 Yet again, it is clear that this part of the entry was blocked to prevent me from challenging it.

See: [Fraud Act 2006](#); [Theft Act 1968](#)

22 “As you can see here, we wrote her a letter to “warn her about her behaviour” (under
23 [12/02/2003-10h44](#)). She did not respond. And we certainly tried very hard to contact
24 her. See here in the report, we even “went to her home to leave her a note” (under
25 [06/02/2003-11h06](#)). “We still did not get a response from her” (under [12/02/2003-10h44](#)).
26 “You see, that’s how she treats us, [the police](#)”

27 →Fact: It is not true that I did not respond. While I viewed the [27th January 2003](#) letter as an
28 attempt to intimidate me, at the same time I laughed at the MPS for having no sense of the
29 ridicule: [WS3 § 30](#), and opted to ignore the letter. However, following the [6th February 2003](#)
30 chaser letter from [PC Neil Watson, 206BS, “Crime Investigator”](#), I sent an [11th February 2003](#)
31 letter asking for “*precise detail – in writing – of the accusation against me*”: [WS3 § 31](#). Not
32 only did I not receive a reply, on the day he received my letter, PC Neil Watson closed down
33 the report (under ‘[Supervision](#)’ – ‘[Completion date](#)’: “[12/02/2003-10h44](#)”). As to “leaving a
34 note”: this is equally not true: [WS3 § 42-43](#).

35 “As you can see in the 2007 report, because “she did not want pay the service
36 charge”, and “to seek compensation and retribution”, she launched a website” (under
37 [15/03/2007-16h14 entry](#)).

38 →Fact: Not true. The reality is that ADL did not expect me to challenge his [fraudulent](#)
39 [demand](#) and [action](#) in the Tribunal: [WS3 § 67](#). As crystal clear on my website, I launched it
40 because:

41 (i) in spite of my accepting (“for the sake of bringing this dispute to an end” - my [19th](#)
42 [December 2003](#) letter to his corrupt solicitors, [CKFT](#)), ADL’s [21st October 2003](#) offer for
43 £6,350: [WS3 § 62](#) (v the £14,400 demanded in [July 2002](#) and in the [29th November 2002](#)

1 [claim: WS3 § 41\(1\)](#) - even though I did not legally owe this amount either: [WS3 § 63](#) - 3
2 months after the Consent Order was endorsed by [the Court](#) on [1st July 2004](#), ADL had the
3 [managing agents](#) send me another invoice for £14,400 in [October 2004](#). This was followed by
4 [another one](#) 3 weeks later, repeating the demand. Hence: as though no offer had been made,
5 accepted, paid and endorsed by the Court: [WS3 § 62](#).

(ii) all of my subsequent [complaints against his aides](#) were dismissed by their 'professional'
body, and when escalated to the [Legal Services Ombudsman](#): [WS3 § 62](#).

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

10 (Quoting from [Master Eyre's Order, Reason 3\(3\)](#)): *"That website is no more than a*
11 *sustained tirade against Mr. Ladsky and his supposed allies"*

12 →Fact: In my [7th August 2011](#) reply to the Draft Order, I asked: *"Does "a tirade" mean relating*
13 *events – with 'black on white' evidence in support?"*: [WS3 § 61](#). I guess that the real issue is
14 my reporting chapter and verse of what happened with the [London Leasehold Valuation](#)
15 [Tribunal in 2002-03](#), West London County Court [in 2002-04](#) and [in 2007-08](#), and with
16 [Wandsworth County Court in 2004](#) – with irrefutable 'black-on-white' evidence in support –
17 which is not to [Master Eyre's](#) liking and that of his peers. [Forgot: Supreme Court Costs Office-30 Jan 09](#)

18 *"What did she do? (Quoting from [Master Eyre's Order, Reason 3\(3\)](#)): "She at first*
19 *referred to Mr. Ladsky and his allies as "pigs and monkeys." Can you believe that? As*
20 *you can see in the 2007 report, poor Mr Ladsky said that "the words relate to terms*
21 *used by the Nazis to refer to Jewish people during the holocaust" ([16/03/2007-18h56](#)*
22 *entry). She is of Franco-German origin. Look here in the report, it says: "There are a*
23 *number of sections which are alleged to be of a racial nature and numerous*
24 *references by name to the victim..." ([15/03/2007-16h14](#)). (Quoting from [Master Eyre's](#)*
25 *[Order, Reason 3\(3\)](#)): "Mr. Ladsky, not very surprisingly in view of what he says is his*
26 *racial background took offence, and complained"*

27 →Fact: Not true. The context in which I used these terms is very clear from my website: to
28 refer to the individuals who were – unlawfully - hounding me, tracking me, monitoring me:
29 [WS3 § 48-49, 54 and 75](#).

30 *"She is not just an anti-Semite, but a typical Nazi who also hates anybody not white.*
31 *See the evidence here on the [Classification page](#): "A web page has been created*
32 *which is alleged to contain anti-Semitic, anti-black, anti-Asian pictures and text", and*
33 *here: "The specific remarks and pictures complained about are contained throughout"*
34 *([15/03/2007-16h14 entry](#)) "Look, it's true, we classified the report as a "**Substantiated***
35 ***Racial Incident**" ("[Classification](#)' page) and under the [20/03/2007-09h07 entry](#) we*
36 *wrote "**Classification confirmed**"*

37 →Fact: Not true. To this day, the MPS has not provided any evidence in support of its
38 accusations: [WS3 § 57, 59, 68 and 69](#).

39 *"Look here what the 2007 report states: "there is a lot of slanderous comments on the*
40 *site mainly directed at Mr Ladsky but also at [Kensington & Chelsea police](#) and even*
41 *[MPs](#), the [Prime Minister](#) and [Deputy Prime Minister](#). Also against [solicitors](#) and many*
42 *others" ([16/03/2007-18h56 entry](#))*

1 →Fact: Not true. To this day, [the MPS](#) has not provided any evidence in support of these
2 accusations: [WS3 § 76](#).

3 I would like to know: what is 'the story' if e.g. the Surveillance Commissioner asks to have a
4 look at my website? How will he be stopped from seeing all the black-on-white evidence [the](#)
5 [police](#) has turned a blind eye to: [false accounting; fraud; harassment; etc.](#)?: [WS3 § 61-66](#).

6 *"We contacted the website host but, as you can see in the report, we did not get a*
7 *response. (Or, as [Master Eyre wrote in the Order, Reason 3\(3\)](#)): "[Made] unsuccessful*
8 *attempts to get the web-host's co-operation..."*

9 →Fact: Not true. In the [2007](#) report, (in addition to not capturing the content of its initial e-mail
10 of [16th March 2007](#) in which it wrote: "*I am the police officer dealing with this crime*") [Notting](#)
11 [Hill police](#) did not capture my website Host's replies (16th March 2007-21h00 and 20th March
12 2007-17h13), and nor did it capture the fact that [it responded](#) - because these e-mails are
13 'inconvenient' for the MPS' purposes: [WS3 § 51 and 52](#). As my website Host asked – in vain
14 - for evidence in support of the accusations, it cannot be stated that it "*failed to cooperate*".
15 [WS3 § 51-53, 55](#). The response was evidently not liked – and, equally evidently: still is.

16 Given that – contrary to [Master Eyre's assertion in his Order, under Reason 3\(3\)](#), that "[the
17 MPS] *took up the matter with [me]*" - the MPS *never* contacted me at any point in time: [WS3 §](#)
18 [48 and 58](#), I would like to know what is 'the story' if e.g. the Surveillance Commissioner asks:
19 What did she say when you contacted her?

20 *"Look here: it says "she sleeps with a knife near her bed""* (under '[Details of](#)
21 [investigation -15/03/2007-16h14 – 'Primary Investigation Details:5'](#))

22 →Fact: 'Interestingly' this was redacted in the [July 2009 version](#) I had at the time of writing
23 my [19th July 2011](#) Witness Statement. Why was this blocked? Was it because [Kensington &](#)
24 [Chelsea police](#) did not like the reason I gave on my website for doing this – which undermines
25 its objective in capturing this? My reason for doing this is detailed in my [19th July 2011](#)
26 Witness Statement in response to the [Home Office's 7th July 2011](#) Application at [§ 61](#) –
27 basically, the fact that I had concluded that there was no point my contacting my local police
28 for protection. My experience in [October 2010](#) yet again confirmed this.

29 *"ALL that is contained in the 2007 report IS TRUE. See here, the report states: "**No***
30 *suspicion of false reporting"* (under '[Details of investigation' - 15/03/2007-16h14 –](#)
31 [Primary Investigation Details:5'](#))

32 →Fact: Also 'interestingly', [this categorical statement was likewise redacted](#) in the [July 2009](#)
33 [version](#) of the report so that I would not challenge it in my Witness Statement – not that it
34 would have made any difference considering the content of the [9th August 2011 Order](#). The
35 benefit of this categorical statement? The MPS and its supporters can use this web of false,
36 unlawful, malicious and highly vicious accusations against me with the aim of, among others,
37 providing a rationale for capturing ADL's and the MPS' outrageous, malicious, libellous
38 opinions about my 'mental health or condition' - with the objective of getting me 'out of action'
39 - by [contacting social services](#): [WS3 § 77](#). Also, to enlist the cooperation of other parties who
40 have access to its database. [16/03/2007-18h56 entry](#)

41 And these accusations and opinions are just the ones that the MPS deemed I was 'entitled' to
42 see, as parts of the reports supplied to me on 22nd July 2011 are still blocked.

1 I guess that in the [2007](#) report: “*She is paranoid*”; “*She thinks the police may be following her*
2 *as well as numerous people employed by her enemies*”: [WS3 § 70-71 and 77](#), will be
3 highlighted to parties with access to the MPS database that are unaware that I am under
4 constant surveillance, I refer to [WS2](#) - as a means of adding weight to its ‘assessment’ as to
5 my ‘mental condition’.

why

6 “*This woman is a danger to society. That’s ▲ we need to monitor her constantly,*
7 *including in her flat*”.

→ Fact: I am an asset to society by standing-up to [an evil, greed-ridden crook, his morally depraved, corrupt aides and their supporters](#). Re. my flat being bugged: [WS2 § 40-50](#).

“*That’s why, as you can see in the 2007 report, we captured our belief that she “may have some mental issues” and also wrote that we “contacted social services to see if they are aware of her”*” ([under 16/03/2007-18h56](#))

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

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

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

18 And that script is based only on evidence I have so far been ‘permitted’ to see. What other
19 false, highly damaging data is held against me? I refer to e.g. the reaction of the police officer
20 during my visit to [Kensington police](#) on [16th October 2010](#), when he called his colleague over
21 to have a look at the computer and said: “*Read that!*”: [WS3 § 84](#).

22 What has been communicated to e.g. social services, in relation to which, in breach of my
23 rights under the [DPA](#), the MPS has refused to provide me with the contact details?: [WS3 § 85](#)
24 [and 86](#). In light of what I have ‘been allowed’ to see, I can only conclude that what has been
25 kept from me is far more damaging.

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

27 ■ [Kensington & Chelsea police](#)’s refusal to investigate my legitimate and well documented 2
complaints of harassment in [October 2010](#) ([20th and 27th July 2010 man](#), clearly [one of ADL’s scums](#);
[30th June 2010 man and previous occasions](#)), I conclude is a police informant: [WS1 § 118 -143](#) – and who, since then, has, of course, continued to hound me
and harass me: [WS1 § 141](#) (Ditto re. [other State parties and ADL’s scums](#)).

The implication that the State approves of [ADL also hounding me – working in tandem with State resources](#): [WS2 § 4](#).

34 ■ Not asking me about my [T-shirt](#) I wore over my coat, throughout my 7 visits to [Kensington](#)
35 [& Chelsea police](#) in [October 2010](#) – which states, in large lettering: “*Victim of Fraud and*
36 *Corruption – [www.leasehold-outrage.com](#)””: [WS1 § 140](#).*

37 ■ Failure to act on my reporting, in my [28th November 2009](#) letter to the Met Commissioner,
38 the [15th June 2009](#) death threat (“*Enjoy your life. You don’t have long to live*”): [WS1 § 143](#).

39 ■ A local police officer mocking me in the street (I was wearing my [T-shirt](#)): [WS2 § 108](#).

[Intro My Diary 2009](#)
– visual headed ‘Layers of protection for crooked landlords’

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

- 1 ■ Events since my Pre-action letter of [17th March 2011](#), including, [the MPS](#) showing the
2 continuation of its utter contempt by not sending me its 23rd May 2011 Defence – until I
3 requested it by letter of [31st May 2011](#). (The MPS posted it to me on [1st June](#)).
- 4 ■ And in [February-March 2010](#), your opting to side with the MPS by ignoring my rights
5 under the [DPA](#) and by using irrelevant subordinate legislation as ground for dismissing
6 my complaint – as detailed earlier.

7 It is blatantly obvious from the blind determination of the MPS and its supporters to retain
8 these unlawful “*crime reports*” as they are that the objective is to use them against me. This
9 was confirmed on [17th October 2010 when Sergeant Avison, Kensington police](#), told me: “*We*
10 *have to keep information in case you commit an offence and end-up in court*”. [WS3 § 81](#). As I
11 replied: “*False information; that’s what you are planning on using against me in court?*”.

12 In [WS2](#), I report being hounded, tracked and monitored as though I were a terrorist:

- [Intro to My Diary 2009](#)
- monitoring and interference with all my [means of communications: § 8-39](#), including public telephones: [§ 30-33](#);
 - [bugging of my flat: § 41-50](#), and [covert surveillance in the UK: § 51-99](#) that has included [approaching medical practitioners I saw: § 62-64 and 136](#);
 - [when I was working](#), as soon as I left the office: [§ 100-105](#);
 - surveillance [by local uniform officers: § 106-108](#);
 - being hounded and harassed [by police helicopters: § 109-114](#);
 - use of [covert surveillance overseas: § 115-118](#);
 - use of [covert human intelligence: § 119-131](#).
- [Snapshot in My Diary 23 May 10](#)

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

26 I know that I have *not*, and I am *not* engaged in any conduct that calls in any of these legal
27 grounds: [19th April 2011 Particulars of claim – paras 155 - 164](#). (The one who should be
28 prosecuted is ADL for, among others, engaging in unlawful conduct “*resulting in financial*
29 *gain*” – as defined by [s.81\(3\) of the 2000 Act](#). But, like the MPS, he is very clearly perceived
30 to be above the law).

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

35 It is abundantly clear from what I report that, in addition to photographs and/or film footage of
36 me, highly damaging data about me is also being widely circulated (e.g. [WS2 § 89 and 87](#)) in
order to secure cooperation. Further, that a large amount of resources are deployed doing
this – and have been for several years. Considering that e.g. [Kensington police et.al. spent](#)
[£5-7 million tracking and hounding one of its own](#), Ali Dizaei, how many millions of £s of
taxpayer money has the State spent so far doing this in relation to me – the law-abiding,

1 [innocent victim of organised crime](#) who has done *nothing* wrong? Meanwhile, hospitals
2 treating children with cancer ask for donations in order to buy equipment; care for the elderly,
3 the handicapped, etc. is being curtailed. This abuse of power is utterly sickening, repulsive.

4 'The surveillance' as it is abundantly clear from what I report that it is not surveillance in
5 accordance with the rule of law - but in actual fact: harassment and persecution intended to
6 cause me an ongoing mix of anxiety, distress, fear, inconvenience, blight my life by affecting
7 all my daily activities, cut me off from my contacts – added to the objective of getting me 'out
8 of action' e.g. contacting social services: [WS3 § 77](#); approaching my medical practitioners:
9 [WS2 § 62-64 and 136](#); covert human intelligence: [WS2 § 119-131](#).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

39 In the light of my experience, I laughed when, this week, during his visit to Russia, David
40 Cameron lectured the Russians by saying that they "*must crack down on state corruption*"
41 and that the "*rule of law is vital*".

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

4 I am copying the Secretary of State for the Home Department on this letter as, relative to a
5 similar letter of [22nd August 2011](#) I sent with my payment of £5,000.00, I have expanded on
6 some of the points.

7 Yours sincerely

8 Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé

Secretary of State for the Home Department
[Home Office](#)
2 Marsham Street
London SW1P 4DF

[Ms Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé](#)

[]
[]
[]

(By 'Recorded Delivery')

13th September 2011

[Queen's Bench Claim Ref: HQ11X01471](#) – Noëlle Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé v. (1) [Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis](#); (2) The [Independent Police Complaints Commission](#); (3) The [Secretary of State for the Home Department](#)

Dear Home Secretary,

I contend that events since my Pre-action letter of [17th March 2011](#) provide irrefutable evidence that you approve of the [Metropolitan Police Service](#), security services, and [Independent Police Complaints Commission](#) totally ignoring my rights, as well as [your own Guidance](#) - for the sake of retaliation for [my 'daring' to stand-up for my rights against a crook, Andrew David Ladsky, who controls the Jefferson House 'concentration camp', 11 Basil Street, London SW3 1AX](#), where I have my leasehold flat, and [his supporters in the State and private sector](#). Further, that you concurrently approve of a large amount of taxpayer money being spent in the pursuit of this unlawful objective.

[Intro My Diary 2009](#) – visual headed 'Layers of protection for crooked landlords'

I can confirm that (in breach of the rule of law) I – the law-abiding, [innocent victim of organised crime](#), who has done *nothing* wrong – [continue to be hounded, tracked and monitored by State resources](#) as though I were a terrorist, and that, among other, [my post](#) also continues to be intercepted. (I provided you with details in my [19th July 2011](#) Witness Statement in response to your [7th July 2011](#) Application to strike out my [19th April 2011](#) claim).

[Snapshot: My Diary 23 May 2010](#) And [Intro My Diary 2009, Post](#)

In compliance with [Master Eyre's](#) Order of [9th August 2011](#) that granted your Application, with my [22nd August 2011](#) letter to the Treasury Solicitor's Department, I enclosed a cheque for [£5,000.00](#), said to be your costs in relation to my claim. In this letter, I covered a number of points.

In further support of my position in the above first paragraph, I am copying you on my [13th September 2011](#) letter to the [IPCC](#), with which, following [Master Eyre's](#) Order of [29th July 2011](#), I am enclosing a cheque for [£3,703.00](#), said to be its costs - as I have expanded on some of the points relative to my [22nd August 2011](#) letter.

Please, no reply, unless it is to inform me that you have taken action to remedy the outrageous breaches of my rights and injustice I have and continue to be subjected to by your departments.

Yours sincerely

See also the [FULL OF LIES 09.08.11 MPS Order 'from' Master Eyre](#) that resulted in my paying, with my [22.08.11](#) letter to [the MPS](#), [£8,478](#) costs.

As with the above IPCC and Home Office Orders, I have also attached my Comments to this Order.

Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé

Julia.
WC1V 6BH

Secretary A State
SW1P 4DF

Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

6 Raphael Street
London
Greater London
SW7 1DL

IPCC
cheque

Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

6 Raphael Street
London
Greater London
SW7 1DL

(To cc. Ho)
on letter
to IPCC

Date and Time: 14/09/11 14:25
Session ID: 8-555103

Posted after Last Collection? No

BULK BARCODE DETAILS:

ZW8416385936B ✓

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

PLEASE REFER TO SEPARATE TERMS AND
CONDITIONS

This is not a VAT Receipt
Thank You

Date and Time: 14/09/11 14:27
Session ID: 8-555104

Posted after Last Collection? No

BULK BARCODE DETAILS:

AI4913414056B ✓

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

PLEASE REFER TO SEPARATE TERMS AND
CONDITIONS

This is not a VAT Receipt
Thank You

Post Office

Post Office Counters Limited

14/9/2011

07

Voucher No.

RECEIVED with thanks 1 SPECIAL
DELIVERY ref: ZW8416385936B
(w/ to ~~100g~~) £ 5.45

from Ms. KLOSTARKOTTER-DIT-RAWF
for Mrs JULIA CHITIBIDEN (LAWYER)

IPCC 90 HIGH HOLBORN LONDON WC1V 6BH

For
Post Office Use
only

Date Stamp



Additional details e.g. Office Code, Cheque No., Giro Acc No. etc.

Certified

Jenna Nelson

Rank

FINANCE
SPECIALIST

This receipt should be signed in full: initials are not sufficient.

P1091L CB

SD up to 100 gms	5.45	
RM Spd Bulk RSF	0.00	
RSF 1st Large	1.52	
TOTAL DUE TO POST OFFICE	6.97	
Cash		7.00
Cash		0.03
BRILLANCE		0.00
FROM CUSTOMER TO CUSTOMER		

Please retain for future reference

VAT REG No. 88 243 1700 02
Date of Issue: 14/09/2011 14:29
SESSION: 8-555104

Knightsbridge
6 Raphael Street
London
Greater London
SW7 1DL

Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

FAD: 011008

Thank You

Date: 21/09/2011

Our Ref: ZW841638593GB

Royal Mail Customer Service Centre
2 Admirals Way
Doxford International Business Park
SUNDERLAND
SR33XW
Special Delivery 08457 001200
Recorded Delivery 08459 272100
Website: www.royalmail.com
Textphone for the deaf and hard of hearing:
08456 000 606

Dear Dennis

Thank you for contacting Royal Mail regarding a Special Delivery™ item, reference number **ZW841638593GB**.

My investigations into your enquiry have included checking all available service information and I **can confirm that we delivered this item on 15/09/2011.**

I have now taken the following action:

- **Provided a copy of the signature we obtained when we made the delivery**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'ROBERTO', written in a cursive style.

Printed Name: ROBERTO

When using our Special Delivery™ or Recorded Signed For™ services, you can also track the progress or delivery of your item, and even view signatures obtained on delivery, at our website: just visit www.royalmail.com/trackandtrace.

I hope this information resolves your enquiry and concludes this matter. If you have any other queries though, please contact us via the details above.

Ms Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawe

ipcc
independent
police complaints
commission

Reference: HQ11X01471

By Recorded Delivery

20th September 2011

90 High Holborn
London WC1V 6BH

Tel: 020 7166 3000
Fax: 020 7404 0430
Minicom: 020 7404 0431
Email: enquiries@ipcc.gsi.gov.uk
Web: www.ipcc.gov.uk

Dear Ms Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawe,

RE: Noelle Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawe v The Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis and the Independent Police Complaints Commission and the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Claim No: HQ11X01471

I am writing to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 13th September 2011 enclosing a cheque for £3703.00.

Yours sincerely,

Julia Chittenden
Lawyer
For the Director of Business Services