

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

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

Office of Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis
Scotland Yard
Broadway
London SW1H 0BG

Chief Superintendent Mark Heath, Borough Commander
[Kensington Police Station](#)
72 & 74 Earls Court Road
London W8 6EQ

(By 'Special Delivery')

Forgot to write 'FYI / cc'. Included him for the sake of transparency.

Nick Harding Esq.
Chairman
Independent Police Complaints Commission
90 High Holborn
London WC1V 6BH

1 17 March 2011

For unbelievable COLLUSION, CORRUPTION and LIES see section on the [London High Court](#)

2 IMPORTANT LEGAL NOTICE – LETTER OF CLAIM

Should be: 'Pre-action letter'

3 Dear Sirs

4 This letter is to inform you that I intend to file a claim against you / your Office in the High Court at the
5 latest by Thursday 14 April 2011 for the reasons detailed in this letter.

6 Enclosed with this letter are my [28 May 2009](#) Subject Access Request to the Police ¹; [2 June 2010](#)
7 [s.10 Notice](#) under the Data Protection Act 1998 (DPA) ² and [supporting document](#) ³ – sent to Chief
8 Superintendent Mark Heath, [Kensington Police, also covering Chelsea police station \(KCP\)](#).

9 This Letter of Claim details the main documents on which I intend to rely. A bundle of [49 documents](#) in
10 support of my demands was supplied to Jenna Neville, Police Public Access Office (PAO), with my [13](#)
11 [August 2009](#) reply to the "crime reports". I enclose the list of the documents supplied ⁴

12 In the spirit of the CPR Pre-Action Protocol, this Letter of Claim provides comprehensive detail,
13 including of relevant legislation – comprised under:

14	1 "Crime Reports".....	2
15	1.1 "Crime report" CR:5604102/02.....	2
16	1.1.1 Legislation.....	3
17	1.2 "Crime report" CR:5602261/03.....	3
18	1.2.1 Legislation.....	5

¹ My 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request to the Police

² My 2 June 2010 s.10 Notice under the Data Protection Act 1998, to Chief Superintendent Mark Heath

³ Supporting 67-page document to the s.10 Notice

⁴ List of documents supplied to Jenna Neville, Police Public Access Office, with my 13 August 2009 reply to the "crime reports"

1	1.3	“Crime report” CR:5605839/07	5
2	1.3.1	Legislation.....	8
3	1.4	Police Public Access Office	9
4	1.5	Chief Superintendent, Kensington & Chelsea Police	9
5	1.5.1	Legislation.....	10
6	1.6	Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis; Secretary of State for the Home Department	11
7	1.6.1	Legislation.....	11
8	1.7	Directorate of Professional Standards.....	11
9	1.7.1	Legislation.....	12
10	1.8	2 June 2010 s.10 Notice under the DPA.....	13
11	1.8.1	Legislation.....	13
12	1.9	Damages – “Crime reports”	15
13	2	The Independent Police Complaints Commission	16
14	2.1	Legislation	16
15	2.2	Damages	19
16	3	Kensington and Chelsea Police - October 2010	19
17	3.1	Legislation	21
18	3.2	Damages	21
19	4	Surveillance by the State since the Summer of 2005.....	22
20	4.1	Legislation	23
21	4.2	Damages	24
22	5	In summary, my demands are:	24
23	6	Full written answer within 21 days.....	27

24

25 **1 “CRIME REPORTS”**

26 My [28 May 2009](#) Subject Access Request under the DPA 1998, to the PAO, led to my receiving three
 27 "crime reports": (i) [CR:5604102/02](#); (ii) [CR:5602261/03](#); (iii) [CR:5605839/07](#).

28 The below, numerous, major contraventions of the DPA are the outcome of KCP police officers'
 29 connivance and collusion with [Andrew David Ladsky \(ADL\)](#), my landlord, aiding, abetting and procuring
 30 the commission of the offences against me under the DPA - as well as under other statutes - with the
 31 objective of assisting, as well as covering up ADL's fraudulent activities.

32 **1.1 “Crime report” [CR:5604102/02](#)**

33 This "crime report" requires numerous rectifications, additions and erasures to comply with the DPA -
 34 as summarised on pages 2 and 3 of my [2 June 2010 s.10 Notice](#), and detailed on pages 1 to 21 of the
 35 [supporting document](#).

36 [DC DR Adams, DC SP Crockett and DI P Webster](#) went out of their way to protect ADL's crime of
 37 harassment against me (aimed at attempting to stop me from challenging his scam) and to discredit my
 38 complaint by: using bullying tactics; covering-up evidence with fabrications, including using one of my
 39 fellow leaseholders to take the blame for some of the anonymous phone calls; processing materially
 40 false, inaccurate, misleading data; failing to record key events and evidence (faxes, letters,

1 conversations, [my complaint to the Police Complaints Authority](#) and '[cry for help](#)' (in vain) to the
2 Metropolitan Police Authority, and related correspondence).

3 Further evidence of KCP's collusion with ADL: during 2001-02, at least four of my fellow leaseholders
4 reported, to KPC, suffering harassment from ADL. (In relation to two of them, this is corroborated by an
5 [11 October 2001](#) letter to [each](#), from ADL's solicitor, Ayesha Salim, [CKFT, London NW3 1QA](#)). In reply
6 to my raising this in my [2 April 2002](#) letter, in his [23 April 2002](#) letter DI P Webster claimed: "*No crime*
7 *report has been reported to this police borough regarding Mr Ladsky...*"

8 Failure by KCP to take action against ADL by failing to charge him for committing offences of
9 'Harassment' against me, and 'hate crimes', motivated by 'race' (see para.1.3, 2007 "*crime report*"), and
10 'targeted because of vulnerability' (see last paragraph of para.1.8.1) – as, at the time of my complaint,
11 in addition to the anonymous phone calls, I also reported other instances of harassment by ADL / very
12 clearly carried out on his instructions. Hence, offences under:

13 1. Protection from Harassment Act 1997: s.1(1), (2)- 'Prohibition of harassment'; s.2- 'Offence of
14 harassment'; s.4(1),(2),(4)- 'Putting people in fear of violence'; s.7(1),(2),(3A)- 'Collective
15 harassment'.

16 2. Crime and Disorder Act 1998: s.32(1)- 'Racially or religiously aggravated harassment' (see
17 para.1.3 for supporting evidence).

18 1.1.1 [Legislation](#)

19 **DPA 1998:**

- 20 ■ s.4(4)- Failure to comply with the data protection Principles
- 21 ■ Sch.1, Parts 1 and 2 - Principles:
- 22 ■ First Principle - Wilful and reckless failure to apply standards of: (1) lawfulness; (2) fairness
- 23 ■ Second Principle - Wilful and reckless processing of data for unlawful purposes
- 24 ■ Third Principle - Wilful and reckless failure to process: (1) adequate data; (2) relevant data
- 25 ■ Fourth Principle - (1) Wilful and reckless processing of false data - knowing how the data would be
26 processed; (2) Failure to capture accurate data.
- 27 ■ Seventh Principle - Failure to ensure that employees processing data, of which I am the data
28 subject, did not breach my rights under the DPA.

29 **Police (Conduct) Regulations 1999 - Reg.4 Code of Conduct**

30 Being improperly beholden to ADL in the discharge of their duty; lack of fairness and impartiality;
31 favouritism of ADL and unreasonable discrimination against me; abuse of authority; failure to perform
32 their duty; failure to oppose improper conduct; discreditable conduct. (My [4 August 2002](#) letter to Sir
33 Toby Harris, then Chair of the MPA: "*...my dealings with the police in recent months, has led me to*
34 *totally - and for ever - lose my confidence in the British police*")

35 Failure by KCP's Chief Superintendent to ensure his officers' compliance with the Regulations, as well
36 as with other legislation.

37 1.2 ["Crime report" CR:5602261/03](#)

38 This so-called "*crime report*" has been unlawfully processed against me by PC 206BS Neil Watson,
39 Crime Investigator, as "*Offence of Harassment*", at the obvious behest of ADL who made malicious
40 and slanderous accusations against me in order to achieve this objective. As evidenced by the
41 summary on pages 3 and 4 of my [2 June 2010 s.10 Notice](#), and detailed on pages 23 to 38 of the
42 [supporting document](#), this report should have never been filed.

1 The report demonstrates KCP's collusion with ADL by: totally failing to investigate his accusations and
2 claims - achieved in part by falsely describing him as my "*neighbour*", thereby saving him from having
3 to explain, and hence avoid capturing 'inconvenient' information that would discredit his 'story' and
4 accusations against me; processing materially false, inaccurate, misleading data; failure to refer back
5 to my 2002 complaint (which KCP failed to record properly) as it would undermine ADL's fabricated
6 claims and accusations.

7 Further evidence of collusion with ADL: (1) KCP's first contact with me was a malicious [27 January](#)
8 [2003](#) letter from PC 206BS N Watson threatening me with "*charges of harassment...as this initial*
9 *complaint has been fully recorded by the police*". It was followed by a [6 February 2003](#) chaser letter.
10 (2) PC Watson ignored my (recorded) [11 February 2003](#) reply asking for "*precise detail – in writing of*
11 *the accusations against me*" - thereby denying me the right to defend myself against the accusations;
12 (3) He lied in the so-called "*crime report*" by stating that I had not responded to him.

13 This data is highly prejudicial to my rights and legitimate interests. Consequently, the police cannot –
14 legally – justify continuing to process any of it. It must therefore be totally destroyed.

15 The processing of this data is also a source of great distress and anxiety given:

- 16 1. The processor of the data.
- 17 2. The purpose for which it is being processed (to use against me at a later date) (confirmed in e.g.
18 October 2010 – see para.3).
- 19 3. The Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) recommendation of holding information about an
20 individual on the police systems until the individual reaches 100 years of age - with the added
21 implication that the data will be processed by a multitude of individuals (e.g. 2007 "*crime report*"
22 reopened in 2009 – see para.1.3).
- 23 4. The very substantial risk of, yet, further contraventions of my rights, as well as further substantial
24 damage through reprocessing of the unlawful data (as has already happened in the 2007 "*crime*
25 *report*" – see para.1.3)
- 26 5. The risk that the data will be stolen - as the police has shown that it cannot ensure security.

27 The objective of this so-called "*complaint*" against me and follow on actions by [KCP](#) was to intimidate
28 me and lead me to stop challenging ADL's [7 August 2002](#) application to the [London Leasehold](#)
29 [Valuation Tribunal](#) to "*determine the reasonableness of the demanded global sum of £736,000*". (The
30 outcome of the 2003 hearings was a reduction of £500,000 this sum (incl. the £144k contingency
31 fund)). (In breach of the [LVT's directions](#) [^], ADL bullied many of my fellow leaseholders into paying,
32 by filing a [29 November 2002 claim](#) in [West London County Court](#) against [14 flats, including mine](#)).

[^ LVT
booklet](#)

33 Other evidence of ADL's determination to "*get me*" (as he told me on 3 January 2003), and make me
34 pay whatever he decided I should pay him:

- 35 ■ [4 February 2003](#) malicious, threatening letter from [Ayesha Salim, CKFT](#), in which she repeated the
36 false accusations made by ADL to [KCP](#), and claimed that the [£14,400 'service charge' demand](#)
37 was "*properly due*". In fact, on [21 October 2003](#), ADL, through [CKFT](#), made me "*an offer for*
38 *£6,350*". (In spite of a [court-endorsed Consent Order](#), three months later, ADL asked his
39 'managing' agents, [Martin Russell Jones](#), to send me [another demand for £14,400](#)).
- 40 ■ Three months previously: the [7 October 2002](#) letter from [Lanny Silverstone, CKFT](#), threatening me
41 with "*forfeiture, costs and contacting my mortgage lender*" (in the name of a non-existent company)
42 if I failed to immediately pay the £14,400.

1 ■ One month later, ADL asked Lanny Silverstone to send me a [28 November 2002](#) malicious letter,
2 falsely accusing me of making libellous comments against ADL, and threatening proceedings if
3 compensation was not paid. I totally ignored the diktats. The demands were not enforced.

4 Yet again, failure by [KCP](#) to take action against ADL by:

5 1. Failing to charge him for committing, yet again, an offence of 'Harassment' against me (as detailed
6 above under the [2002 "crime report"](#)).

7 2. Failing to charge him under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998: s.32(1)- 'Racially or religiously
8 aggravated harassment'.

9 3. Failing to charge him under the Criminal Law Act: s.5(2)- 'Penalties for giving false information' - for
10 wasting police time by making false accusations against me.

11 1.2.1 [Legislation](#)

12 **DPA 1998**

13 As per 2002 *"crime report"*, above, with the addition of:

14 ■ Breach of s.2(g) False accusation of my committing an offence of *"Harassment"*

15 ■ First Principle - Wilful and reckless failure to apply standards of: (1) lawfulness; (2) fairness - by
16 failing to have regard as to the reliability of the data - and through concurrent failure to meet at
17 least one of the conditions under: Sch.2, processing of personal data; Sch.3 processing of
18 sensitive personal data.

19 ■ Fourth Principle - (1) Wilful and reckless processing of false data, including false sensitive personal
20 data; (2) Wilful and reckless failure to take reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy and reliability
21 of the data obtained.

22 **Criminal Procedure and Investigations 1996, Code of Practice under Part II**

23 e.g.3.5- *"In conducting an investigation, the investigator should pursue all reasonable lines of inquiry,
24 whether these point towards or away from the suspect..."*

25 **Police (Conduct) Regulations 1999 - Reg.4 Code of Conduct**

26 (As per above for the 2002 *"crime report"* – including failure by KCP's Chief Superintendent to ensure
27 his officers' compliance with legislation - including the Police Conduct Regulations)

28 1.3 ["Crime report" CR:5605839/07](#)

29 This *"crime report"* was started by stating: *"Anti-Semitic racial incident; Hate crime Race and Religion"*.

30 The following additions were then made:

31 19/03/2007 - pg 26: *"Current position: The Racial Crime Directorate has determined no crime
32 made out; therefore this should be classed a racial incident and nothing more"*; pg 27: *"Crime
33 reclassified to no crime unconfirmed"*; Pg 9: *"Suspect eliminated"*

34 20/03/2007 - pg 19 – *"Current status: U undetected crime"*

35 17/08/2008 - *"CR Re-Opened, previously marked as Complete"*

1 17/02/2009 - "The branch Flags 'FH', 'RJ', 'RS' were present in this crime report. As a result of
2 the introduction of the new 'DV/Hate Crime' tab on the General Information screen today, there
3 are now associated fields ('HateCrimeReligion', HateCrimeRace') on the new tab and those
4 have been selected"

5 The processing of this so-called "crime report" against me is unlawful. As evidenced by the summary
6 on pages 4 to 6 of my [2 June 2010 s.10 Notice](#), and detailed on pages 39 to 67 of the [supporting](#)
7 [document](#), this report should have never been filed.

8 Yet again, falsely describing ADL as my "neighbour", as a ruse to justify the failure to probe him on his
9 false claims and accusations, this so-called "crime report" is a web of totally unsupported accusations,
10 in part endorsed by [KCP](#), added to other false accusations by KCP e.g. that my website contains "a lot
11 of slanderous comments also directed at K&C and even MPs, the Prime Minister and DPM. Also
12 against solicitors and many others" - accusations that are therefore malicious, false, libellous - and
13 consequently unlawful - as KCP never provided any evidence in support.

14 This data is highly prejudicial to my rights and legitimate interests. Consequently, the police cannot –
15 legally – justify continuing to process any of it. It must therefore be totally destroyed.

16 The data is also a source of great distress and anxiety – for the reasons detailed above, under the
17 2003 "crime report".

18 This "crime report" is, yet again, the outcome of KCP officers' blatant collusion with ADL:

19 1. KCP failed to contact me – at any point in time - thereby totally denying me the right to defend
20 myself against the numerous false, malicious and libellous accusations. As glaringly obvious, this
21 provided free rein to KCP and ADL to record whatever they wanted on the police systems.

22 The only contact was through my then employer, KPMG, on 26/27 April 2007, three days after I
23 gave prominence to the events on my website (www.leasehold-outrage.com). The message was:
24 "The police is not going to pursue it. Isn't that good news?"

25 2. Posing as an unscrupulous investigating officer, by stating "I am the police officer dealing with this
26 crime", in his malicious, libellous email of [16 March 2007](#) to my website Host, TDC Simon J
27 Dowling of the 'Community Support Unit', demanded the immediate closure of my website by, as
28 evidenced by his statement, (falsely) implying that I had 'committed a crime'.

29 Without providing any supporting evidence, he falsely claimed that, on my website, I used the
30 words "pigs" and "monkeys" as "used by the Nazis against Jewish people" - thereby implying that I
31 am a "Nazi". Three days later, on 19 March 2007, on pg 26 of the "crime report" S Dowling
32 entered: "The Racial Crime Directorate has determined that there is no crime made out therefore
33 this should be classed as a racial incident and nothing more". Hence, S Dowling sent his 16 March
34 2007 email - before - determining internally whether 'his' assessment was correct.

35 3. My website Host replied to S Dowling: "Are you aware that there are laws against making false
36 accusations?"

37 4. In his [20 March 2007](#) email reply, S Dowling backed down by stating "there is nothing we as a
38 police force can do except class it as a racist incident" - while still not providing any evidence in
39 support.

40 5. Having implied in his 16 March 2007 email that I am a "Nazi", he confirmed his view by stating that
41 I am "franco-german in origin and so would be aware of the terms pigs and monkeys used during
42 the Nazi regime" and that "Obviously the victim has picked up on this as he is Jewish".

1 S Dowling further attempted to bully and intimidate my website Host by asking in his email: "*who*
2 *deals with any complaints about websites in the US and I'll pass this on to the victim*".

3 6. On the "*crime report*", S Dowling *failed* to record my Host's reply to his 16 March 2007 email, as
4 well as his 20 March email response.

5 7. On 19 March 2007, S Dowling, recorded on pg 26 of the "*crime report*": "*I am still trying to get the*
6 *website closed down*".

7 8. Playing into ADL's hand, S Dowling and PC 474BS K O'Brien recorded, in the "*crime report*",
8 malicious comments as to my mental health, by stating that I am "*suffering from mental issues*";
9 "*extremely paranoid*" – and endorsing their 'assessment' by stating that "*social services have been*
10 *contacted*".

11 9. Failure to refer back to my [2002 complaint](#) against ADL (which KCP failed to record properly), as it
12 would undermine ADL's 'story' - while recycling some of his false, malicious, unlawful accusations
13 against me in the 2003 "*crime report*" of: "*harassment of [ADL]*"; that I "*used to swear at [ADL]*" -
14 with the aim of further portraying him as the 'poor innocent victim', and give some weight to his
15 malicious, slanderous accusations against me.

16 As clearly demonstrated by the above, the objective of the 2007 so-called "*complaint*" against me by
17 ADL, and follow on actions by KCP, was to scare my website Host into closing down my website
18 [www.leasehold-outrage.com](#) (launched in despair, after five years of facing a gigantic wall of blind
19 eyes and deaf ears) - because it reports chapter and verse of my case since 2001. Hence, it covers
20 ADL, his aides, and various public and private sector parties who very clearly do not like having a
21 mirror held to their face, as it reflects their fraud, corruption, or their failure to perform their legal remit,
22 often amounting to malpractice / collusion / corruption / fraud - and all want retribution, including KCP
23 as evidenced by events, more recently in October 2010 (see para.3).

24 Further evidence of this so-called "*complaint*" being part of the retribution by ADL - et.al:

My [05.10.06 letter](#) to Portner
asking for evidence

25 1. Using another solicitor, [Jeremy Hershkorn, Portner and Jaskel, London W1U 2RA](#), in [October](#)
26 [2006](#), ADL succeeded in getting my website closed down by threatening my then website host with
27 proceedings for defamation and costs. In January-February 2007, he attempted to repeat this over
28 the course of several weeks with my current website Host - and failed.

29 2. In his [16 February 2007](#) letter, J Hershkorn unlawfully threatened me with "*bankruptcy*
30 *proceedings, forfeiture and costs*" if I failed to immediately pay the sum of £8,937 to "*Rootstock*
31 *Overseas Corp*" – a company I had never heard of.

32 3. Having failed to bully me (my [25 February 2007](#) reply), ADL asked J Hershkorn to file, yet another -
33 fraudulent - [claim against me](#) in [West London County Court](#). Turning a blind eye to, among other,
34 [my repeatedly emphasising in documents](#) I served in court that the claim had two company names,
35 both claiming to be my 'landlord', each represented by a different firm of solicitors ([Portner](#) and
36 [CKFT](#)), and each claiming a different amount of money from me - my Litigant in Person's 16-month
37 battle with Portner and the [WLCC judges](#) resulted in a [6 June 2008 Notice of Discontinuance](#) of
38 "*ALL of the claim*" against me (following my [3 June 2008 Witness Statement](#)).

39 4. Concurrently, ADL was phoning my then employer KPMG, making his typical malicious,
40 slanderous accusations against me.

41 5. When S Dowling failed, in March 2007, to bully my website Host into closing down my website,
42 ADL sent a [26 March 2007](#) letter to KPMG - continuing to make his malicious, libellous accusations
43 against me - including stating that I am "*a racist*". Hence, if there was any doubt about it: proving

1 that ADL is "the victim" and "particular person" S Dowling referred to in his [16](#) and [20 March](#) 2007
2 emails to my website Host.

3 Yet again, failure by [KCP](#) to take action against ADL by:

4 1. In the process of 'looking at [my website](#)', 'very conveniently' 'failing to note' the numerous,
5 undeniable, 'black on white' evidence of criminal offences committed against me (and my fellow
6 leaseholders) by ADL / instigated under his instructions.

7 2. Failing, yet again, to charge ADL for committing, yet again, an offence of 'Harassment' against me,
8 and 'hate crime', motivated by 'race', and 'targeted because of vulnerability' as his so-called
9 "complaint" against me was part of his ongoing campaign of harassment since 2002. (For detail of
10 legislation: Protection from Harassment Act 1997 and Crime and Disorder Act 1998, see the 2002
11 "crime report", para.1.1). In the process, failing to follow the ACPO's 'Hate Crime Manual', and the
12 Crown Prosecution Service specific 'Guidance on the prosecution of hate crime'.

13 3. Failing, yet again, to charge ADL for wasting police time by making false accusations - an offence
14 under the Criminal Law Act: s.5(2)- 'Penalties for giving false information'.

15 **1.3.1 [Legislation](#)**

16 **DPA 1998**

17 Breaches of the Act, as per the 2003 "crime report", para.1.2.1 - except re. s.2:

- 18 ■ s.2(e)- False allegations about my 'mental health or condition'
- 19 ■ s.2(g)- False accusation of my committing a "Racist" act; any other accusations of my having
20 committed an offence.

21 **Criminal Procedure and Investigations 1996, Code of Practice under Part II**

22 e.g. 3.5- "In conducting an investigation, the investigator should pursue all reasonable lines of inquiry,
23 whether these point towards or away from the suspect..."

24 **Malicious Communications Act 1988**

25 s.1(1),(2A),(3)- 'Offence of sending letters etc with intent to cause distress or anxiety'

26 **Communications Act 2003**

27 s.127- 'Improper use of public electronic communications network'

28 **Protection from Harassment Act 1997**

29 s.1(1),(2)- 'Prohibition of harassment'; s.2- Offence of harassment'; s.7(1),(2),(3A)- 'counselled
30 conduct'.

31 **Crime and Disorder Act 1998**

32 s.32(1)(a)- 'Racially or religiously aggravated harassment' (linked to s.2 Protection Harassment).

33 **Police Reform Act 2002**

34 s.38(5A), (5B), 6(a)- 'Police powers for police authority employees'; s.38A- 'Standard powers and
35 duties of community support officers'; Sch.4- 'Powers exercisable by police civilians', Part 1-
36 'Community support officers'; Sch.5- 'the standard powers and duties of a community support officer'.

1 s.36(4)(a)(b)- Failure by KCP's Chief Superintendent to appoint "a suitable person capable of
2 effectively carry out his designated functions"

3 **Police Act 1996**

4 s.90- 'Impersonation, etc.' of a police officer.

5 **Police (Conduct) Regulations 2004 - Reg.3 Code of Conduct**

6 (As per the detail included under the 2002 "crime report", para.1.1.1 - as the 2004 Code of Conduct is
7 the same as under the 1999 Regulations. It includes failure by KCP's Chief Superintendent to ensure
8 his officers' compliance with the Police Conduct Regulations, as well as other legislation).

9 **Metropolitan Police Service's policy (stated on S Dowling's [16 March 2007](#) email)**

10 *"It is the policy of the MPS that: MPS personnel...must not use MPS systems to author, transmit or*
11 *store documents such as electronic mail (e-mail) messages or attachments: containing racist,*
12 *homophobic, sexist, defamatory, offensive, illegal or otherwise inappropriate material".*

13 **1.4 Police Public Access Office**

14 Following receiving the three "crime reports", in my (38 pg) [13 August 2009](#) reply I raised objections to
15 numerous parts of the reports - as briefly detailed above. I supported my demands for rectifications,
16 additions and erasure of the data by supplying a 101 page bundle of [49 evidential documents](#). In
17 addition to reiterating the questions in my [28 May 2009](#) Subject Access Request, as none had been
18 answered, I added other questions in relation to the "crime reports".

19 The [25 August 2009](#) 'response' from Jenna Neville, PAO, was dismissive, arrogant and contemptuous
20 – stating "I have forwarded your concerns on to the Investigating Officer who will if he feels necessary
21 update the report... If this is completed I will forward you a updated version...I can confirm after making
22 enquiries there is no further information we can provide you".

23 I sent a (38 pg) [20 September 2009](#) reply to J Neville. As a means of emphasising my rights, I captured
24 extensive extracts from the DPA, as well as from documents issued by the Information Commissioner. I
25 followed this by labouring the points in my 13 August 2009 letter, as well as challenged the claim of
26 "having no further information" to provide me with.

27 **1.5 Chief Superintendent, Kensington & Chelsea Police**

28 J Neville's 'response' led me to also send a [20 September 2009](#) letter to Chief Superintendent Mark
29 Heath, stressing that his station is not exempt from compliance with the DPA, other legislation, and the
30 police standards of performance. I asked "as Head of K&C police: what are you going to do in the face
31 of this litany of outrageous, gross misconduct?" I warned that "if this proves necessary, I will issue legal
32 proceedings as per my rights under s.14 of the DPA 1998". With the letter, I enclosed a copy of my [13](#)
33 [August](#) and [20 September 2009](#) replies to the PAO, and of its [25 August 2009](#) letter.

34 In his dismissive, arrogant and contemptuous [22 September 2009](#) 'reply' on behalf of M Heath, Steve
35 McSorley (who failed to reveal that he was the Head of Kensington police Professional Standards),
36 wrote: "you have quite clearly expressed your concerns about accuracy to Jenna Neville... As you
37 quite rightly point out, the Information Commissioner may serve an enforcement notice if he considers
38 the Data Protection Act is breached and if you are dissatisfied with her response I would suggest you
39 contact the Information Commissioner".

40 In my [8 October 2009](#) reply, highlighting my awareness of his role, I challenged S McSorley for failing
41 to take any notice of the content of my 13 August and 20 September 2009 replies to the PAO, and of

1 my 20 September 2009 letter to M Heath - in spite of his stating in his 22 September letter that I had
2 "quite clearly expressed [my] concerns about accuracy". I copied M Heath on the letter.

3 I also sent an 8 October 2009 letter to M Heath, asking "Do you endorse the treatment I have and
4 continue to be subjected to by Kensington & Chelsea police?" Capturing extracts from the Equality and
5 Human Rights Commission website, I asked for his assistance.

6 Lack of response from M Heath and S McSorley led me to send [both](#) of them a chaser letter on [11](#)
7 [November 2009](#).

8 In his [20 November 2009](#) 'reply', S McSorley dismissed all my accusations of "gross misconduct by
9 KCP officers", and stated that he was "satisfied that the crime reports represent an accurate account of
10 what police were told at the time even if you do not agree with what was said by third parties.
11 Consequently, I will not be contacting your website host, nor will I be making any alterations to the
12 various crime reports unless enforcement notice is served by the Information Commissioner".

13 **1.5.1 [Legislation](#)**

14 **DPA 1998**

15 Wilful, reckless and malicious endorsement of the numerous breaches of the Act

16 **Police (Conduct) Regulations 2008**

17 Failure to act with integrity, and abuse of position; failure to respect my legislative rights; failure to act
18 with fairness and impartiality by siding with KCP officers, and by extension, with ADL; failure to abide
19 by police Regulations; failure to perform their duty by not challenging improper, unlawful conduct by
20 KCP officers; acting in a manner that discredits the police service - further reinforcing my utter disgust
21 of the police.

22 [Home Office Guidance](#): e.g.

23 Introduction- "Those entrusted to supervise and manage others are role model for delivering a
24 professional, impartial and effective policing service... they must demonstrate strong leadership and
25 deal with conduct which has fallen below the standards in an appropriate way"

26 1.14- "Police officers do not knowingly make any false, misleading or inaccurate oral or written
27 statements or entries in any record or document kept or made in connection with any police activity"

28 1.26 and 1.27- "Police officers act with fairness and impartiality. They do not discriminate unlawfully or
29 unfairly [and]... carry out their duties... in accordance with current equality legislation. In protecting
30 others' human rights, they act in accordance with Article 14 of the European Convention on Human
31 Rights"

32 1.78- "Police officers are expected to uphold the Standards of Professional Behaviour in the police
33 service by taking appropriate action if they come across the conduct of a colleague which has fallen
34 below these standards. They never ignore such conduct"

35 [IPCC 'Statutory Guidance to the police service and police authorities on the handling of](#) 36 [complaints'](#)

37 #603, pg148- "The IPCC expects that professional standards departments will make clear to other
38 parts of their force carrying out the practical handling of complaints what standards must be achieved.
39 Chief Officers should support their professional standards departments in setting and maintaining
40 these quality standards across the force"

1 1.6 Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis; Secretary of State for the Home Department

2 In despair, I had sent a [28 November 2009](#) 'cry for help' to Sir Paul Stephenson, Met Commissioner
3 and Alan Johnson, then Home Secretary, in which I related not only recent events in relation to the
4 "crime reports", but also my experience with KCP since 2002 - amounting to crystal clear evidence that
5 this local police station operates like a fiefdom, totally out of control. To support my demand for their
6 assistance, I supplied both of them with a copy of all the exchange of correspondence to date, starting
7 with my 28 May 09 Subject Access Request, or a total of 11 enclosures (representing over 100 pages).

8 As, by the time of my 28 November letter to P Stephenson and A Johnson I had not received the 20
9 November letter from S McSorley, I sent them another letter, dated [2 December 2009](#). Quoting S
10 McSorley's reason for refusing to make amendments to the "crime reports", I wrote: "What a very
11 damning indictment! It certainly IS "reasonably expected" of the police to investigate third party claims,
12 including obtaining supporting evidence. And it IS likewise "reasonably expected" of the police to do
13 this BEFORE accusing an individual of having committed criminal actions". I also drew a list of
14 conclusions from M Heath's failure to meet my demands - from which any fair minded, reasonable,
15 professional person could be in no doubt whatsoever that M Heath is very seriously failing to manage
16 his officers, and thus very seriously failing on the criteria of "efficiency" and "effectiveness". My being at
17 the receiving end of such outrageous conduct by [KCP since 2002](#), leads to the conclusion that it is the
18 norm at KCP - and therefore, very clearly against public interest.

19 The Home Office replied on [23 December 2009](#) that "The Home Office and its ministers are not able to
20 act as an avenue of appeal, and have no power to influence or intervene in any investigations".

21 1.6.1 [Legislation](#)

22 Failure by the Met Commissioner to take action against M Heath (who is under his control: **Police Act**
23 **1996**, s.9(A)1) - for turning a blind eye to his officers' gross misconduct (Reg.3(1) of the **Police**
24 **(Conduct) Regulations 2008**), or gross incompetence (Reg.4(1) of the **Police (Performance)**
25 **Regulations 2008**) - including very clearly holding the view that they are at liberty to ignore:

- 26 1. Parliament-endorsed Police Regulations issued by the Home Office regarding (i) Conduct; (ii)
27 Performance; (iii) Complaints and Misconduct; (iv) supporting Home Office Guidance to the
28 Regulations.
- 29 2. Policing plans – issued by the Home Office, as well as plan written by / contributed to by the Met
30 Commissioner (s.6A of the 1996 Act) - plans he has a statutory duty to ensure are implemented -
31 s.9A(2) of the 1996 Act: "...the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis, (2) In discharging his
32 functions... shall have regard to the local policing plan issued by the Metropolitan Police Authority
33 under section 8"
- 34 3. As well as other legislation, such as the DPA 1998, Human Rights Act 1998, Malicious
35 Communications Act 1988, Protection from Harassment Act 1997, etc.

36 In addition, turning a blind eye to M Heath's failure to appoint officers, such as Community Support
37 Officers "capable of effectively carrying out their functions" (Police Reform Act 2002, s.38(4))

38 1.7 Directorate of Professional Standards

39 A [3 December 2009](#) letter from Sir Paul Stephenson's Office informed me that my letters of [28](#)
40 [November](#) and [2 December 2009](#) had been forwarded to Inspector Campbell McKelvie, Directorate of
41 Professional Standards (DPS) Customer Service Team.

42 In her [8 December 2009](#) letter (posted 8 days later), the DPS caseworker, Hema Patel, wrote "We are
43 now reviewing your concerns and are identifying the most appropriate person to deal with the issue(s)
44 you have raised. We will then send you the contact details of the person dealing with your complaint".

1 Attaching a one-page copy stating, 'What happens next?' followed by 13 short paragraphs, which she
 2 described as *"an information leaflet explaining the various processes we have for dealing with your
 3 concerns"*, she asked me for a telephone number on which I could be contacted. Having taken delivery
 4 of the letter on 24 December, I replied on the [28th](#).

5 Total silence from the DPS led me to send a [2 February 2010](#) letter to P Stephenson, A Johnson, et.al,
 6 headed *"When am I due to be killed?"* - referring to the death threat I received on 15 June 2009 (*"Enjoy
 7 your life. You don't have long to live"*) - and in relation to which the police took no action. (I raised it in
 8 my [28 November 2009](#) letter to P Stephenson and A Johnson). In this letter, I relate events and state:
 9 *"and THAT is your response Sir Stephenson?!? That is your interpretation of your department's legal
 10 remit? WHY? Are you counting on "my not having long to live"?"*

11 (On [2 February 2010](#), I also sent a 'cry for help' to the then Prime Minister, Gordon Brown, and copied
 12 him on the above 2 February letter. In vain – as my letter was not even acknowledged).

13 In 'his' ['21 January 2010'](#) letter - posted two weeks later on 4 February, hence, day on which my 2
 14 February letter was delivered to P Stephenson's Office - DI Crispin Lee, DPS, stated that he was
 15 *"writing in connection to the complaint you made on 2 December 2009"*. That he had *"reviewed the
 16 issues you raised"* and was *"applying to the IPCC for dispensation because I consider that you made
 17 your complaint more than 12 months after the alleged misconduct without good reason"*. That I *"made
 18 the complaint because you have been unable to obtain the result that you desire through the Public
 19 Access Office; and that given the time elapsed it is impracticable to investigate the issues about which
 20 you are complaining"*. And that *"Until the IPCC has made a decision, no further action will be taken with
 21 your complaint"*. What C Lee - et.al 'behind the scene' - are doing is quoting from [Reg.3\(2\)\(a\) of the
 22 Police \(Complaints and Misconduct\) Regulations 2004](#) – information I did not have at the time.

23 I replied comprehensively to C Lee on [18 February 2010](#), challenging him on his letter in light of his
 24 role. I state that his assessment is *"incorrect"*: my complaint is not *"out to time"* - and referred him back
 25 to the letters from his DPS colleague, S McSorley, who obviously did not hold that view. I asked:
 26 *"Where in the Data Protection Act 1998, does it specify a time limit for a data subject to seek – and
 27 obtain – an end to the processing of data that is false, unlawful, misleading, scurrilous, libellous,
 28 biased, corrupted, incomplete in some very significant aspects – as well as obtain correction of the
 29 data to ensure that it is "fair, lawful and accurate"?* I reminded C Lee that, with my [13 August 2009](#)
 30 reply to J Neville, PAO, I had supplied a bundle of [49 documents](#) in support of my demands. I stated
 31 that I was copying my letter to Nick Harding, Chair of the IPCC.

32 **1.7.1 [Legislation](#)**

33 Page 55 of the Policing London Business Plan 2009-12 states: *"The Directorate of Professional
 34 Standards is responsible for improving professional standards, investigating allegations of
 35 unprofessional or unlawful behaviour by staff; and safeguarding the integrity of the organisation...To
 36 combat information misuse and ensure that the integrity of police information is maintained and
 37 improved"*

38 **DPA 1998**

39 Wilful, reckless and malicious endorsement of the numerous breaches of the Act.

40 **Police (Conduct) Regulations 2008**

41 Failure to act with integrity, and abuse of position; failure to respect my legislative rights; failure to act
 42 with fairness and impartiality by siding with KCP officers, and by extension, with ADL; failure to abide
 43 by police Regulations; failure to perform his duty by not challenging improper, unlawful conduct by KCP
 44 officers, including the local Head of Professional Standards; acting in a manner that discredits the
 45 police service - further reinforcing my utter disgust of the police.

1 **1.8 2 June 2010 s.10 Notice under the DPA**

2 Absolutely determined to stop the police processing, for the rest of my life, data falsely accusing me of
3 having committed “crimes” and, to stop it from further using this data against me - following the
4 rejection of my complaint by the IPCC (see next section), I embarked on lengthy desk research.

5 On [2 June 2010](#), I sent the enclosed (10 pg) s.10 Notice to Chief Superintendent Mark Heath,
6 supported by, the also enclosed, [\(67 pg\) report](#). As can be seen, in this report, I painstakingly captured,
7 line by line the content of the [2002](#), [2003](#) and [2007](#) “crime reports” (as available), and against each
8 entry: (i) entered my objections, reasons - referencing them to my [13 August](#) and [20 September 2009](#)
9 replies; (ii) listed the DPA Principles/s breached; (iii) provided a description of the relevant document/s
10 I had supplied in [my bundle of 49 documents](#), sent in support of my 13 August 2009 reply to the PAO.

11 I used the Notice to, among others, summarise the main points from the attached report. Among
12 others, I also highlighted the fact that none of my questions had yet been answered.

13 I again repeated the warning I stated in my previous correspondence: that if my demands were not
14 met, I would issue proceedings.

15 As per [s.10\(3\) of the DPA](#), I gave M Heath 21 days to reply. He did not, and did not even acknowledge
16 my correspondence.

17 Hence: having totally denied me the right to defend myself against the false accusations, M Heath et.al
18 are determined to keep on processing the unlawful “crime reports” against me. There can only be one
19 reason for this: an intention to use them against me at a later stage. Namely, to ‘put me out of action’
20 (Further confirmed on 17 October 2010 (see para.3) - in addition to TDC Simon J Dowling “*contacting*
21 *social services*”).

22 This outrageous conduct amounts to a continuation of the blatantly intentional and malicious
23 discrimination against me, and of the contemptuous, degrading, debasing and humiliating treatment I
24 have been subjected to [by KCP since 2002](#). It conveys the crystal clear message that – with very
25 obvious high-level-endorsement of its assessment – KCP views me as a piece of dirt, a non-entity who
26 does not have the right to have rights, hence outside the protection of the law, and there to used and
27 abused at will by ADL, his aides, their wide-ranging supporters, including KCP.

28 The lack of response, added to the realisation that the IPCC is very clearly not an avenue for redress,
29 led me to embark on eight months of desk research for the purpose of filing my intended claim.

30 **1.8.1 [Legislation](#)**

31 **DPA 1998**

32 Additional points to those previously covered under the “crime reports”:

33 ■ Under s.10 I have the *absolute right* to prevent processing of data against me that is, to say the
34 least, but using the term of the Act under s.70(2): “*inaccurate: incorrect or misleading as to any*
35 *matter of fact*”.

36 ■ Sixth Principle- Breach by failing to supply information pursuant to my questions in my [28 May](#)
37 [2009](#) Subject Access Request, and in my [13 August 2009](#) reply (repeated in my [20 September](#)
38 [2009](#) letter) in relation to the “crime reports”

39 ■ s.7(1)- Breach by: blocking out extensive parts of the text in the three “crime reports” - as (i) the
40 data is biographical in a significant sense, and (ii) I am the focus of the data; by failing to provide
41 me with the detail of individuals / organisations to which data about me has been communicated -
42 as I have an *absolute right* to know who holds data about me “*in order to have the opportunity to*

1 *remedy errors or false information*” – which, on the balance of probabilities, is highly likely to be the
2 latter; failure to address any of my questions.

3 ■ s.15(2)- Right to ask the court to inspect the unredacted version of the *"crime reports"*, and to
4 *"determine and assess the logic involved in the decision to block the data"*.

5 ■ s.35(2)- Right to *"obtain disclosure for (a) the purpose of, or in connection with, any legal*
6 *proceedings (including prospective legal proceedings - or otherwise necessary for the purposes of*
7 *establishing, exercising or defending legal rights"*. CPR Pt 31, Disclosure, and Article 6 of the
8 Human Rights Act 1998: obligation to disclose not only any material which is in the possession of
9 the police or prosecution, but also any material to which they could gain access.

10 ■ s.7(9)- Right to seek a court order to ensure compliance with my demands – especially in light of,
11 among others, the other offences committed against me in the context of the *"crime reports"*.

12 ■ s.10(4)- Right to get the court to order compliance by the data controller.

13 **Human Rights Act 1998**

14 ■ s.6(1)- *"It is unlawful for a public authority to act in a way that is incompatible with a Convention*
15 *right..."*; s.6(6) *"An act includes a failure to act"*

16 ■ Article 3 – The prohibition of torture - *"No one shall be subjected to...degrading treatment or*
17 *punishment"*

18 The State has an absolute obligation to ensure compliance with this Article.

19 Repeated, wilful, malicious, discrimination, entailing contempt, lack of respect, designed to
20 humiliate and debase the individual has been found by the European Court of Human Rights
21 (ECtHR) to amount to degrading treatment.

22 ■ Article 6 – Right to a fair trial

23 1. *"In the determination...of any criminal charge against him, everyone is entitled to a fair and*
24 *public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal established by*
25 *law"* i.e. criminal charges must be determined at first instance by a court complying with the
26 guarantees of Article 6.1 – and the individual must be given an adequate opportunity to meet those
27 allegations by making representations.

28 2. *"Everyone charged with a criminal offence shall be presumed innocent until proved guilty*
29 *according to law"*

30 ECtHR's definition of a 'charge' for the purposes of Article 6.1: *"the official notification given to an*
31 *individual by the competent authority of an allegation that he has committed a criminal offence"*;
32 *"Can be constituted by any official act that carries the implication that the individual has committed*
33 *a criminal offence, and likewise substantially affect the situation of the individual"*

34 ■ Article 8 – Right to respect for private life

35 1. *"Everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, his home and his*
36 *correspondence"*

37 2. *"There shall be no interference by a public authority with the exercise of this right except such as*
38 *is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national*
39 *security, public safety or the economic well-being of the country, for the prevention of disorder or*

1 *crime, for the protection of health or morals, or for the protection of the rights and freedoms of*
2 *others”*

3 The State cannot justify the infringement of my Article 8 right as: (1) it is processing data that (i)
4 falsely accuses me of having committed “*crimes*”; (ii) maliciously describes me as “*suffering from*
5 *mental issues*”, and communicating this to social services; (2) doing this for the obvious, malicious
6 purpose of using the data against me at a later stage; (3) failing to give me access to an extensive
7 part of my personal data.

8 ■ Article 14 – Prohibition of discrimination - “*The enjoyment of the rights and freedoms set forth in*
9 *this Convention shall be secured without discrimination on any ground such as sex, race, colour,*
10 *language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, association with a national*
11 *minority, property, birth or status”*

12 This Article is engaged as a result of the violation of my rights under the above Articles. As
13 glaringly obvious, these breaches of my rights are motivated by blatant discrimination.

14 ECtHR’s meaning of discrimination “*a difference in treatment which has no reasonable and*
15 *objective justification*”. This is evidenced by the flagrant difference in the treatment of ADL v the
16 way I have and continue to be treated.

17 I hold the view that the discrimination by the police and other State parties stems from my ‘daring’
18 to stand up and fight for my rights (see latter part of para.1.3 – ‘objective of the 2007 so-called
19 “*complaint*” against me by ADL’), combined with my personal characteristics. Namely, my being
20 perceived as ‘an easy, soft target’: female; single; limited financial means; of ‘no status’ (tenant v. a
21 ‘sacrosanct’ landlord); of foreign origin, including being of part German descent (leading to my
22 being branded a “*Nazi*” by KCP because ADL claims to be ‘Jewish’). In other words: because – ‘in
23 spite of my profile’ - I ‘dare’ to stand-up and fight for my rights.

24 **Police (Conduct) Regulations 2008**

25 Abuse of position; failure to respect my legislative rights; failure to abide by police Regulations; failure
26 to perform his duty; acting in a manner that discredits the police service - further reinforcing my utter
27 disgust of the police.

28 **1.9 Damages – “Crime reports”**

29 Costs of correspondence: £2,214.63 – comprised of: (1) my time (at £9.25 per hour): £2,109.00; (2)
30 printing costs: £48.16; (3) postage costs: £57.47 – plus interest at 8%.

31 In addition:

32 ■ Award of just satisfaction: £10,000 - for breaches of several of my Human Rights, stemming from
33 intentional, malicious discrimination, with the objective of retribution from, and protection of ADL,
34 KCP officers et.al and, in the process, cause me serious distress, anxiety, humiliation and harm –
35 as detailed above.

36 ■ Aggravated damages and/or exemplary damages: £20,000 - for maladministration and/or
37 misconduct in public office and/or misfeasance in public office through: abuse of power;
38 oppressive, arbitrary, unconstitutional conduct, entailing wilful and reckless failure of performance
39 of statutory duty, breaches of numerous statutes, as well as police Regulations; abuse of public
40 trust – with the objective of retribution from, and protection of ADL, KCP officers et.al and, in the
41 process, cause me serious distress, anxiety, humiliation and harm – as detailed above.

42 Both of the above sums i.e. £10,000 + £20,000, to be paid in equal share to: (1) The National Institute
43 for the Blind; (2) Macmillan Nurses Charity.

1 **2 THE INDEPENDENT POLICE COMPLAINTS COMMISSION**

2 In 'his' [22 February 2010](#) letter - i.e. on the day that the IPCC received my [18 February](#) letter – Matthew
3 Johnson, the IPCC caseworker, said to be considering DPS' request for dispensation by repeating DI C
4 Lee's - et.al 'behind the scene' – points: "*The incidents you are complaining of appear to have occurred*
5 *in 2002, 2003 and 2007*", and "*on the grounds of abuse of process (that the complaints procedure does*
6 *not exist in order for crime reports to be amended...) and not reasonably practicable to investigate*".
7 'He' set me a 7-day deadline to respond "*by providing good reasons for the delay in making the*
8 *complaint*". This letter was very clearly intended to set the ground for the 'next instalment'.

9 The 22 February 2010 letter 'from' Matthew Johnson did not reach me until past the deadline. (Steps
10 were taken to ensure this). Exactly one week after 'his' 22 February letter, in 'his' [2 March 2010](#) letter,
11 Matthew Johnson regurgitated the content of the '[21 January 2010](#)' (in fact 4 February) letter from DI
12 Lee - et.al 'behind the scene' - by stating that the IPCC was "*granting the dispensation*" because:

13 *"Based on the information and evidence provided we have agreed that it would not be*
14 *appropriate to investigate because you have not provided a good reason for the delay between*
15 *the incident and the making of the complaint and investigating your complaint now would likely*
16 *cause an injustice"*

17 *"...The IPCC also considers that your complaint is an abuse of the complaints procedure*
18 *because the misconduct complaints system does not exist in order for changes to be made to*
19 *old crime reports"*

20 *"This means the police do not have to investigate this matter"*

21 He concluded by referring me to the Information Commissioner.

22 Contrary to what 'Matthew Johnson' regurgitated 'from' DI Lee, it is abundantly clear that the key issue
23 is the fact that KCP is breaching the DPA requirements by (in addition to capturing the data in the first
24 place), refusing to amend / destroy materially false, inaccurate, inadequate, misleading, libellous data it
25 is processing about me on the police systems. Consequently data that is highly prejudicial to my rights
26 and legitimate interests - and therefore unlawful.

27 It is crystal clear that what KCP, the IPCC, ACPO et.al 'behind the scene' do not like is the evidence I
28 supply in support of my demands. Furthermore, (as previously stated) that there is an intention to use
29 these so-called "*crime reports*" against me at a later stage. Namely, to 'put me out of action' (Further
30 confirmed on 17 October 2010 (see para.3) - in addition to S Dowling "*contacting social services*").

31 **2.1 [Legislation](#)**

32 **Police Reform Act 2002** and subsidiary: **Police Regulations; [IPCC 'Statutory Guidance to the](#)**
33 **[police service and police authorities on the handling of complaints](#)**' (quotes identified in the
34 following by '#X, pgY')

35 This [2 March 2010](#) letter 'from' the IPCC amounts to a flagrant and deliberate failure by the IPCC to
36 perform its statutory duty - as defined under s.10, and various parts of Sch.3, Part 1 of the 2002 Act -
37 with the objective of absolving all the officers concerned, including Chief Superintendent Mark Heath,
38 of any misconduct.

39 1. What I have submitted is a complaint – as defined by s.12 of the 2002 Act.

40 2. My complaint is most definitely not "*out of time*". It is ongoing, as the police is currently processing
41 unlawful data about me on its systems - and it will *remain* current until my demands are met - or I
42 reach the age of 100 years old (ACPO policy).

- 1 3. As abundantly clear from the documents (which Matthew Johnson did not bother to look at) -
 2 added to the fact that I have been forced to engage in this soul-destroying battle since August
 3 2009 (which 'Matthew Johnson' opted to ignore) – I most definitely meet the requirement: *"The*
 4 *member of the public must claim to have been adversely affected by the conduct"* (2002 Act:
 5 s.12(3),(4); #29, pg 24)
- 6 4. Consequently, my complaint is not *"an abuse of the complaints system"*. To claim that it is, and
 7 attempt to bounce me off to the Information Commissioner - amounts to holding the position that
 8 KCP is at liberty to operate above the law of the land. *"An abuse of the complaints system will*
 9 *occur where there has been manipulation or misuse in order to initiate or progress a complaint*
 10 *which, in all circumstances of the particular case, should not have been made or should not be*
 11 *allowed to continue...Each case must however be judged on its merits and no overall rule for these*
 12 *circumstances should be applied"* (#180, pg57)
- 13 5. *"In considering an application for dispensation"*, the IPCC must be provided with, and consequently
 14 have looked at *"copies of any other documents [in addition to the complaint] in the possession of*
 15 *the appropriate authority which is relevant to the complaint"* (#194, pg 6)
- 16 'It follows' that, in addition to the three *"crime reports"*, each amounting to over 30 pages, other
 17 documents that DI Lee 'would have provided' to the IPCC, include my 36-page 13 August 2009
 18 and 38-page 20 September 2009 replies to the PAO; my letters to Chief Superintendent Mark
 19 Heath, Steve McSorley, Sir Paul Stephenson and Alan Johnson - and their correspondence. In
 20 other words: a bundle of over 200 pages. It is abundantly clear from the [22 February 2010](#) letter
 21 'from' Matthew Johnson - day on which he received my complaint – and from 'his' [2 March 2010](#)
 22 near carbon copy letter, exactly one week later - that he did not look at any of these documents.
- 23 6. *"A recordable conduct matter cannot be considered for dispensation"* (#164, pg65)
- 24 7. *"A recordable conduct matter involves a criminal offence or behaviour liable to result in disciplinary*
 25 *sanction that was aggravated by discriminatory behaviour"* (#44, pg28). *"It can come through the*
 26 *expectation that officers and police staff subject to their Standards of Professional Behaviour will*
 27 *report and challenge improper behaviour"* (#46, pg28)
- 28 8. The IPCC has a statutory duty to ensure:
- 29 a. *"The creation and maintenance of public confidence in the police complaints system"*
 30 (2002 Act: s.10(1)(d)). *"A duty which is the basis of its 'guardianship' role"* (#579, pg143)
- 31 b. *"Accessibility of the complaints system"* (2002 Act: s.12(6); #464, pg122)
- 32 c. *"That all complaints concerning the police are properly and professionally handled"* (2002
 33 Act: s.10(1)(c); #8, pg16) – because *"The public expects an effective complaints system*
 34 *(2002 Act: s.10(1)(c)) to hold to account those justifiably complained against (and by*
 35 *implication their employing organisation) for the way in which they deal with the public"*
 36 (#253, pg75)
- 37 d. *"That each complaint, conduct... is assessed in light of its facts and the law that applies to*
 38 *it"* (2002 Act: s.10(1)(c); Annex-B7, pg173)
- 39 e. *"Conduct means actions and decisions or omissions to act or decide. May occur through*
 40 *breach of published code or policy; Human Rights Act 1998"* (#17, pg18)
- 41 f. *"That an investigation into a conduct matter focuses on establishing whether there is a*
 42 *case to answer in respect of misconduct or gross misconduct"* (#298, pg83)

- 1 g. *"That a complaint is upheld where the findings show that the service provided by or*
2 *through the conduct of those serving with the police did not reach the standard a*
3 *reasonable person could expect. Any facts on which the judgment to uphold the complaint*
4 *is based must be proven on the balance of probabilities" (#433, pg113; A6, p151)*
- 5 h. *"That in deciding what standard of service a person could reasonably expect, the*
6 *investigator, IPCC and appropriate authority should apply an objective standard of a*
7 *reasonable person in possession of the available facts. They should have regard to the*
8 *Standards of Professional Behaviour, any agreed service standards and any national*
9 *guidance that applies to the matter" (#434, pg114; A6, pg151)*
- 10 IPCC 'Statutory Guidance', Annex A, pg164- 'Definitions of allegation categories and link to
11 Standards of Professional Behaviour':
- 12 F-"Discriminatory behaviour" - *"...Discriminatory behaviour should be thought of in terms of*
13 *treating people differently without justification through prejudice or unfair treatment of one*
14 *person...Discrimination may be committed on the grounds of race...gender..."*
- 15 *"...proven allegations where there is significant detriment or evidence of a repeated*
16 *discriminatory attitude or behaviour require a more serious misconduct consideration"*
17 *(B12, pg174)*
- 18 *"...As a general rule, the law currently requires that, with regard to these strands, a service*
19 *must not exclude, or offer less favourable treatment" (B46, pg181) (NB: Evidently, the*
20 *IPCC perceives itself as being excluded from this requirement, including, compliance with*
21 *the Human Rights Act 1998 – which it is not)*
- 22 G-"Irregularity in relation to evidence /perjury" - *"This includes...allegations of falsehood"*
- 23 H-"Corruption or malpractice" – *"Corruption is the abuse of a role or position held, for*
24 *personal gain or gain for others..."*
- 25 *"...any attempt to pervert the course of justice; corrupt controller, handler or information*
26 *relationships; attempts or conspiracies to do any of the above" (#211, pg65)*
- 27 *"Where necessary, referrals in relation to serious corruption should be made in line with*
28 *the referral of corruption investigations protocol between the IPCC and ACPO" (#213,*
29 *pg65)*
- 30 *"Serious corruption is criminal offence or behaviour which is liable to lead to a disciplinary*
31 *sanction and which, in either case, is aggravated by discriminatory behaviour" (#203,*
32 *pg63; Reg.2(a)(iii) and (iv) of the Police (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2004)*
- 33 Q-"Lack of fairness and impartiality" - *"An example of this would be a failure to treat all*
34 *parties equally where there are allegations and counter-allegations..."*
- 35 S-"Other neglect or failure in duty" - *"This includes allegations with regard to a lack of*
36 *conscientiousness and diligence concerning the performance of duties. This may include*
37 *failure to record or investigate matters..."*
- 38 X-"Improper access and /or disclosure of information" - *"This concerns allegations relating*
39 *to improper disclosure or use of information held for police purposes. This includes misuse*
40 *of police computer systems..."*

1 **2.2 Damages**

2 Costs of correspondence: £10.35 – comprised of: (1) my time (at £9.25 per hour): £4.63; (2) printing
3 costs: £0.77; (3) postage: £4.95.

4 In addition:

5 ■ Aggravated damages and/or exemplary damages: £10,000 - for maladministration and/or
6 misconduct in public office and/or misfeasance in public office through: abuse of power; arbitrary
7 conduct entailing the wilful and reckless failure of performance of statutory duty – as detailed
8 above – conveying the crystal clear message that the door to this last option before issuing court
9 proceedings is very firmly shut in my case.

10 These damages of £10,000 to be paid in equal share to: (1) The National Institute for the Blind; (2)
11 Macmillan Nurses Charity.

12 **3 KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA POLICE - OCTOBER 2010**

13 On 4 October 2010, I visited Chelsea police station in order to report suffering what I describe as
14 'racially aggravated harassment' from a man on 20 and 27 July 2010. To this effect, I supplied [a report](#),
15 in which I recorded events, as well as captured my photographs of the man, including the car he was
16 driving, very clearly showing the make and number plate of the car.

17 PC Belky Giles claimed I did not have evidence of racial harassment, and that I had "*followed the*
18 *man*". She consequently refused to file my report as a 'Crime Report', stating that she would file it as
19 an 'Intelligence Report'. Contrary to her promise, she failed to send me an email.

20 I returned to Chelsea police on 8 October 2010. On being told that she was not there, I left a copy of
21 my first report [I had renamed 'crime report'](#), as well as [another report](#) of suffering harassment by
22 another man, which I also described as a 'crime report'.

23 Having been told that she would be in, on the morning of 14 October 2010, I returned to Chelsea
24 police. CSO Jeff Salvage told me that she would be in the afternoon. I said that I wanted to speak to
25 somebody else, as PC Giles had not done anything in the last 10 days. J Salvage refused my request
26 on the ground that he needed "*to speak to her*".

27 I returned, as suggested, early afternoon on 14 October 2010. Insisting that I "*should talk to PC Giles*",
28 J Salvage told me that she was "*on a training course all day*" and to "*come back at 19h on Saturday*"
29 (16th October).

30 For the fifth time, I returned to Chelsea police, as told, on 16th October, at 19h. PC Giles continued to
31 maintain her position. I challenged her for failing to investigate my reports in spite of having ample
32 information, and asked her: "*Under which rule of law do you consider yourself entitled to discriminate*
33 *against me?*" I stated that it was a continuation of the discrimination by the police since my first contact
34 in 2002; that, while the police refuses to investigate - and file my reports as 'crime reports - it has no
35 problem filing false "*crime reports*" against me on behalf of 'Dear Mr Ladsky'. She denied all knowledge
36 of this and, of course, did not ask me what I was referring to (because she knew).

37 On my asking to speak to her supervisor, she replied that Sergeant Allen (PS 17 BS) was not in, and
38 that the standing supervisor was Inspector Griffiths, at Kensington police.

39 I arrived at Kensington police at 22h00, and was told that Inspector Griffiths was out, "*probably for*
40 *several hours*". I replied that I would wait for a while.

1 Having talked briefly about the purpose of my visit, one of the duty officers looked on the computer. At
2 one point, he called his colleague over and said *"Read that!"* Their expression was as though it was a
3 command/warning from an 'almighty being'.

4 By 23h00 Inspector Griffiths had not returned. It was suggested I *"come back tomorrow"* as *"he'll be in"*

5 I returned to Kensington police at lunchtime on 17 October 2010, and was, yet again, told that
6 Inspector Griffiths was not in. I explained that this made it my seventh visit, and that I wanted to talk to
7 somebody. The officer on duty phoned Chelsea police. After c.30 minutes, Sergeant Avison (59 BS)
8 arrived. What followed was a replay of what took place with PC Giles - with the following additions:

9 1. Stating to not doubt my claims that I am being followed.

10 2. Re. my reports of harassment, Avison said: *"We have to capture everything that is reported, but*
11 *not unlawful information against people; that's a breach of the Data Protection Act"* (In light of the
12 data that KCP is processing against me, I viewed this as 'a spit in your face' comment).

13 3. Re my saying that the police holds unlawful *"crime reports"* against me, Avison replied: *"You have*
14 *not been charged with anything; there has been no follow-up. We have to keep information in case*
15 *you commit an offence and end-up in court"*.

16 4. Re. my saying that *"Andrew Ladsky is a fraudster"*, cutting me before I had a chance to fully
17 explain my statement, Avison replied *"It's a civil matter"*. I challenged him, quoting the example of
18 the Fraud Act 2006.

19 He said that he would *"visit Mr Ladsky"*.

20 In light of this experience, to my conclusions under para.1.8, above, I add the fact that I am living with
21 the stress and anxiety of wondering: which other diktats from ADL is KCP going to comply with next?
22 Will it, as previously, do this without ever contacting me? How much of the unlawful data currently
23 being processed against me by KCP will, yet again, be recycled in a new *"crime report"* in order to
24 'make it stick'?

25 If I had any doubt left, this experience has most definitely confirmed that KCP perceives itself to be at
26 the service of ADL – to the total exclusion of mine. Hence, there is no point my calling KCP if e.g. my
27 life is in immediate danger.

28 Knowing that KCP is not only not going to respond to me, but that it fully approves and supports ADL's
29 conduct - condemns me to being totally at the mercy of ADL:

30 ■ his massively fraudulent so-called 'service charge' demands (an unsupported demand of [£28,000](#)
31 is currently hanging over my head), followed by unlawful threats of forfeiture (so far, twice), of
32 bankruptcy proceedings, as well as fraudulent court claims (so far, twice); [ADL's 'Advisors'](#)

33 ■ his constant, daily surveillance of my movements, directly / through his thugs;

34 ■ his ongoing harassment, persecution, bullying and intimidation tactics, including: death threat; his
35 defamation of my name and of my character through false, malicious accusations, including to the
36 police; malicious leaks and flooding of my flat; cutting off the electricity and hot water in my flat;
37 hosing my windows in the early hours of the morning, etc.

38 Clearly, in light of my experience with KCP since 2002, others in the borough of Kensington & Chelsea
39 who share a similar profile to mine are at a high risk of suffering the same treatment from KCP.

1 **3.1 Legislation**

2 **Human Rights Act 1998**

- 3 ■ s.6(1)- *"It is unlawful for a public authority to act in a way that is incompatible with a Convention*
4 *right..."; s.6(6) "An act includes a failure to act"*

5 Under the doctrine of 'positive obligations', public authorities owe duties to individuals to protect
6 them from the acts of others.

7 To comply with its positive obligations, the s.6(1) duty requires the police to take such positive
8 steps as are necessary to: (1) protect my safety (Article 2 – The right to life); (2) my right to
9 respect for my private life (Article 8) (definition under para.1.8.1) - through effective enforcement of
10 the law i.e. suppression and sanctioning of breaches of such provisions – and an obligation to do
11 this without discrimination on the basis of my personal characteristics (Article 14) (definition under
12 para.1.8.1).

13 The State is also under an obligation to take particular steps to protect certain categories of people
14 who are known to be vulnerable, including women.

- 15 ■ Article 3 – The prohibition of torture - *"No one shall be subjected to...degrading treatment or*
16 *punishment"*

17 The State has an absolute obligation to ensure compliance with this Article.

18 Repeated, wilful, malicious discrimination, entailing contempt, lack of respect, designed to
19 humiliate and debase the individual has been found by the ECtHR to amount to degrading
20 treatment.

21 **Equality Act 2010**

- 22 ■ Breach of s.4- 'The protected characteristics', in particular: s.9(1)(b)(c)- 'Race', and s.11(a)- 'Sex' –
23 as previously explained in relation to my personal characteristics (para.1.8.1, last paragraph).

- 24 ■ s.13(1)- 'Direct discrimination' – due to my protected characteristics.

- 25 ■ s.29(1), 2(c), (4), 5(a)(c)- 'Provision of services' – by failing, as a result of discrimination, to provide
26 me with the service I am entitled to ask for.

- 27 ■ s.112(1)- 'Aiding contraventions' - by the way I was treated by KCP in October 2010 – which is a
28 blatant continuation of the discriminatory treatment I have repeatedly been subjected to by various
29 officers since my initial contact with KCP in 2002.

30 **Police (Conduct) Regulations 2008**

31 Breach of the Regulations with the aim of protecting ADL's thug, as well as KCP's surveillance goon
32 by: failing to act with integrity, and abusing their position; failing to respect my legislative rights; failing
33 to act with fairness and impartiality; failing to abide by police Regulations; failing to perform their duty
34 by not challenging improper, unlawful conduct by KCP officers; acting in a manner that discredits the
35 police service - further reinforcing my utter disgust of the police.

36 **3.2 Damages**

37 Costs: £120.25 for my time (at £9.25 per hour) – plus interest at 8%.

38 In addition:

1 ■ Award of just satisfaction / compensatory damages: £5,000 - for breaches of: several of my Human
2 Rights; two of my protected characteristics under the Equality Act - stemming from intentional,
3 malicious discrimination, with the objective of protecting the instigators and perpetrators of the
4 unlawful harassment against me – as detailed above - and, the additional objective of inflicting
5 further retribution on behalf of ADL, KCP officers et.al. and, in the process, cause me distress,
6 anxiety and humiliation.

7 ■ Aggravated damages and/or exemplary damages: £3,000 – for maladministration and/or
8 misconduct in public office and/or misfeasance in public office through: abuse of power; arbitrary,
9 unconstitutional conduct, entailing wilful and reckless failure of performance of statutory duty,
10 breach of statutes, as well as police Regulations; abuse of public trust – as detailed above – with
11 the objective of protecting the instigators and perpetrators of the unlawful harassment against me,
12 and the additional objective of inflicting further retribution on behalf of ADL, KCP officers et.al and,
13 in the process, cause me distress, anxiety and humiliation.

14 Both of the above sums i.e. £5,000 + £3,000, to be paid in equal share to: (1) The National Institute for
15 the Blind; (2) Macmillan Nurses Charity.

16 **4 SURVEILLANCE BY THE STATE SINCE THE SUMMER OF 2005**

17 I know that, (in tandem with ADL's thugs), public authorities have had me under surveillance since the
18 summer of 2005.

19 It was the time when I was battling on all fronts with the so-called 'regulators' et.al in the context of my
20 legitimate complaints against various parties (courts, tribunal, lawyers, housing department,
21 accountants, surveyors, etc.) – leading me to the conclusion that I was perceived as 'a threat, a danger'
22 by / to the corrupt elements in the public authorities and private sector.

23 The surveillance has continued ever since for the purpose of retribution following the initial launch of
24 my website in October 2006. It even takes place when I am overseas (e.g. France 2005, 2007 and
25 2010), including, I believe, sending a 'police-connected' individual 'to set it up', when I was in the US in
26 August 2010.

27 The surveillance also includes monitoring of, and interference with my mobile phones, my post, and my
28 emails, as well as accessing files on my computer.

29 The photographs I have taken of objects, including what appears to be a small antenna in the ceilings
30 of my flat, also lead me to the conclusion that my flat is bugged. I do not know whether the equipment
31 was installed by ADL or by the police. In light of his very long-standing 'preferential treatment' by KCP,
32 and concurrent KCP's treatment of me - I tend to opt for the latter.

33 Extent of the intrusion of the surveillance – and harassment: once, when I gave the goons the run from
34 a department store in Oxford Street, I was tracked down not only by goons, but also by a police
35 helicopter – and made to know about it; on a subsequent occasion, in the same store, when I was in
36 the toilets, a man came in the toilets to check on me. I assumed he wanted to avoid a repeat of my
37 giving them the run.

38 Hence: I am being hounded and monitored as though I were a terrorist.

39 This is a flagrant attack on my human dignity. There cannot be any legally-supported justification for
40 my being treated in this way – in a 'democratic society'. I am the victim of organised crime, not the
41 criminal. In my 40+ years in this country, I have always been a law-abiding individual. Until I was
42 dragged into this horrific, life-destroying experience by ADL in 2002, I had never had any contact with
43 the police or the courts (nor indeed with the other parties I have had to face as a consequence of
44 ADL's and his puppet-aides' actions since 2002).

1 The worst part of it is to know that this is orchestrated by the State and public authorities. And, as
2 made abundantly clear by this surveillance, added to the treatment from KCP et.al - that I am perceived
3 as not having the right to have rights. Hence: I have been ostracised, and placed outside the protection
4 of the law and the State – all because ADL decided he wanted to make a multi-million pound jackpot at
5 my expense (and that of my fellow leaseholders) – and, having once paid him money I did not legally
6 owe, I am not prepared to do this again.

7 This constant surveillance has blighted my life. Among others, to avoid their being also under
8 surveillance, I have cut off ties with all my contacts in the UK – bar individuals who, like me, are fighting
9 for justice and redress – as many also report being subjected to similar treatment.

10 In order to survive, (including avoid being ‘pounced on’, to be ‘put out of action’) (see paras 1.8 and 3.),
11 I have shut down parts of me that are about being a human being. In fact, metaphorically, I died in
12 2002.

13 In addition to the considerable amount of evidence, which includes numerous photographs of
14 individuals I believe were monitoring me, on the 'balance of probabilities' / 'reasonable likelihood', I cite
15 the treatment I have / continue to be subjected to since 2002 by: (1) KCP; (2) other State parties; (3)
16 institutions in the private sector; (4) my last employer (leading me to resign in January 2008); (5) the
17 implicit / explicit 'memorandums of understanding' e.g. Law Society and ACPO; (6) the typical reaction
18 to whistleblowers from the State, public authorities, other institutions and corporations; (7) the
19 experience of other victims of injustice.

20 4.1 [Legislation](#)

21 **Human Rights Act 1998**

22 ■ Article 8 – Right to respect for private life (defined under para.1.8.1)

23 Article 8.1 places a primary duty on the State and public authorities to refrain from interference.

24 To justify surveillance under Article 8.2, it is necessary for the State and public authorities to show
25 that: (a) the activity in question is “*prescribed by law*” i.e. the legal basis must be identified, and
26 established; there is no scope for states to infer grounds for restrictions that are not explicitly
27 stated; and (b) it is “*necessary*” and “*proportionate*”.

28 Under which, ‘legally-supported’, ‘high degree of necessity’, do the State and public authorities
29 justify having me under this highly intrusive, extreme and continuous surveillance – that includes
30 daily monitoring of my movements, monitoring and interference with my mobile phones, post,
31 emails and computer – with the outcome of blighting my life?

32 Concurrent with this, the State and public authorities are processing personal data about me,
33 including photographs, and film footage – that are shown / given to the goons who are following
34 me, monitoring me. Under Article 8, the State has a positive obligation to afford me access to this
35 data - which, no doubt, is in the same vein as the so-called “*crime reports*”.

36 ■ Article 3 – The prohibition of torture - “*No one shall be subjected to...degrading treatment or* 37 *punishment*”

38 The State has an absolute obligation to ensure compliance with this Article.

39 The extreme and continuous surveillance I am being subjected to is degrading, extremely
40 distressing, and a direct attack on my human dignity.

41 ■ Article 14 – Prohibition of discrimination (defined under para.1.8.1, above)

1 This surveillance stems solely from discrimination because I 'dare' to stand-up and fight for my
2 rights (see latter part of para.1.3 – 'objective of the 2007 so-called "complaint" against me by ADL')
3 - combined with my profile (see para.1.8.1).

4 **Equality Act 2010**

- 5 ■ Breach of s.4- 'The protected characteristics', in particular: s.9(1)(b)(c)- 'Race', and s.11(a)- 'Sex' –
6 as previously explained in relation to my personal characteristics, under para.1.8.1.
- 7 ■ s.13(1)- 'Direct discrimination' – due to my protected characteristics.

8 **4.2 Damages**

- 9 ■ Award of just satisfaction / compensatory damages: £10,000 - for breaches of: several of my
10 Human Rights (within the time limitation); two of my protected characteristics under the Equality
11 Act (since 1 October 2010) - stemming from deliberate discrimination, with the objective of
12 retribution on behalf of ADL, his aides and parties in the public and private sector who have / are
13 assisting them in their criminal activities - because I 'dare' to stand-up and fight for my rights and,
14 in the process, intended to cause me distress, anxiety, humiliation, as well as blight my life.
- 15 ■ Aggravated damages and/or exemplary damages: £40,000 – for maladministration and/or
16 misconduct in public office and/or misfeasance in public office through: abuse of power; arbitrary,
17 unconstitutional conduct entailing breach of statutes - with the objective of seeking retribution on
18 behalf of ADL, his aides, and parties in the public and private sector who have / are assisting them
19 in their criminal activities – because I 'dare' to stand-up and fight for my rights and, in the process,
20 cause me distress, anxiety, humiliation, as well as blight my life.

21 The combined sum of £50,000 to be paid in equal share to: (1) The National Institute for the Blind; (2)
22 the Macmillan Nurses Charity.

23 This sum is equivalent to £10,000 for every year I believe I have been under surveillance. It is
24 insignificant contrasted with the costs of having me under surveillance since 2005, as well as the
25 financial incentives given to various individuals for monitoring me / reporting on my movements /
26 interfering with my mobile phones, post, emails, capturing files from my computer, etc.

27 **5 IN SUMMARY, MY DEMANDS ARE:**

- 28 1. The total destruction of "crime report" [CR:5602261/03](#) – entailing destruction on: (i) all computer
29 systems and (ii) all back-up tapes on-site and off-site - to the date the report was first processed;
30 (iii) the hard drive of the computers used; (iv) all computer disks; (v) all USB sticks; destruction of
31 all hard copies of the report.
- 32 2. The total destruction of "crime report" [CR:5605839/07](#) – entailing destruction as per above.
- 33 3. Provide me with official confirmation by the appropriate authority that, for each of the above "crime
34 report", the above steps relating to destruction have been undertaken.
- 35 4. Provide me with the name of all the recipients to whom the 2003 and 2007 "crime reports" data,
36 and related data, has been communicated.
- 37 5. Contact these recipients to: (i) inform them of the total destruction of the data by the police; (ii) ask
38 them to totally destroy the data they were supplied with, as well as any data they have generated
39 as a result of being supplied with the data.
- 40 6. Provide me with official confirmation by the appropriate authority that the above actions have been
41 undertaken in relation to the data recipients.

- 1 7. If the above demands are refused:
- 2 a. Issue court proceedings against me.
- 3 b. Provide an unredacted version of both “*crime reports*”.
- 4 c. Provide any other documents that will be used during the proceedings, including data that
5 has been supplied to / provided by other parties / third parties: briefings, correspondence,
6 including any electronic transmission, record of any meetings and of any telephone
7 conversations that have taken place between the police and these parties.
- 8 d. Address all my questions - as summarised on pages 7 and 8 of my [2 June 2010 s.10](#)
9 [Notice](#).
- 10 e. Address my questions in my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request (which were repeated
11 in my 13 August and 20 September 2009 replies) - that require being supplied with copy
12 of relevant procedure, briefings, correspondence, including any electronic transmission,
13 record of any meetings and of any telephone conversations that led to the decision to:
- 14 i. Have TDC Simon J. Dowling contact my website Host - without ever contacting
15 me.
- 16 ii. Have S Dowling contact my website Host – making totally unsupported
17 accusations against me.
- 18 iii. Have S Dowling contact my website Host implying that I had ‘committed a crime’
19 and, in the process, impersonate an unscrupulous investigating officer.
- 20 iv. Have S Dowling back down on his implied accusation that I had committed a crime
21 – while still maintaining that I committed a “*racist*” act.
- 22 v. Allow S Dowling to breach the Metropolitan Police Service Code by accusing me
23 of having ‘committed a crime’, and branding me a “*Nazi*”.
- 24 vi. Communicate the message – about my personal website – through my then
25 employer KPMG that “*The police is not going to pursue it. Isn’t that good news?*”
- 26 8. Ensure that the 2002 “*crime report*” [CR:5604102/02](#) reflects the truth - by making the rectifications,
27 additions and erasures I have identified.
- 28 9. Once carried out, provide me with a copy of the report for review.
- 29 10. Address my questions in relation to the 2002 “*crime report*”, as comprised in my 28 May 2009
30 Subject Access Request, namely: supply copy of briefings, correspondence, including any
31 electronic transmission, record of any meetings and of any telephone conversations relating to me
32 following:
- 33 a. [My complaint against ADL](#).
- 34 b. [My complaint to the Metropolitan Police Authority against KCP](#).
- 35 11. Ensure that my October 2010 reports of harassment are investigated.
- 36 12. Ensure that I am provided with confirmation of this, including crime number reference.
- 37 13. Ensure that the law is effectively enforced against the individuals concerned, and that I am kept
38 informed of this.

(1) [20-27 July 2010 man](#);
(2) [30 June 10 2010 and other occasions man](#)

- 1 14. Take steps to ensure the end of the discriminatory treatment against me by KCP, including the
2 harassment by having me followed and monitored by its officers and local snoops.
- 3 15. Taking steps to ensure the end of the surveillance by the police may include ensuring the removal
4 of the bugging equipment in the ceilings to my flat.
- 5 16. Provide me with official confirmation by the appropriate authority that the above two points have
6 been actioned.
- 7 17. Take steps to ensure the end of my being constantly monitored by:
 - 8 a. other State resources when I am in the UK;
 - 9 b. 'affiliates' of the British State, at its request, when I am overseas.
- 10 18. Take steps to ensure the end of the monitoring and interference with:
 - 11 a. my mobile phones;
 - 12 b. emails;
 - 13 c. post;
 - 14 d. computer.
- 15 19. Provide me with official confirmation by the appropriate authority that the above two points have
16 been actioned.
- 17 20. Ensure that the data the State and public authorities are processing about me for the purpose of
18 the surveillance is totally destroyed (destruction as defined under the first action point, above).
- 19 21. Provide me with an official confirmation by the appropriate authority that it has been actioned.
- 20 22. If refusal to action points 14 to 21: provide detailed reasons and legal basis.
- 21 23. Ensure that the appropriate authorities deal effectively with ADL in relation to the criminal offences
22 he has, and continues to commit against me. (Nobody is above the law).
- 23 24. Payment of my total costs to date: £18,671.07 – comprised of:
 - 24 a. Desk research: £14,511.59 – covering: (1) 28 weeks of desk research of legislation and
25 CPR, at £500 per week: £14,000; (2) law books: £307.00; (2) purchase from TSO: £5.50;
26 (4) 170 hours in internet cafes, at £1 per hour: £170.00; (5) letters to Treasury Solicitor,
27 and to Attorney General to determine lawyer for claim: £10.73; (6) letters to Kensington &
28 Chelsea Crown Prosecution Service to determine implication of s.60 of the DPA: £18.36.
 - 29 b. Costs of correspondence in relation to the "crime reports": £2,229.98 – covering: (1)
30 £2,113.63 for my time (at £9.25 per hour); (2) printing: £48.93; (3) other stationary: £5.00;
31 (4) postage: £62.42
 - 32 c. Cost of my visits to Kensington & Chelsea police: £120.25 (at £9.25 per hour)
 - 33 d. Letter of claim: £1,809.26 – covering: (1) analysis and development time (at £9.25 per
34 hour): £1,752.88; (2) printing: £29.78; (3) postage and stationary: £26.60
- 35 25. Payment of total just satisfaction / compensatory damages and aggravated damages and/or
36 exemplary damages of £98,000 – comprised of: (1) £30,000 in relation to the "crime reports", (2)
37 £10,000 in relation to the IPCC; (3) £8,000 in relation to KCP in October 2010; (4) £50,000 in

1 relation to the surveillance since 2005. The total sum i.e. £98,000, to be paid in equal share to: (1)
2 The National Institute for the Blind; (2) The Macmillan Nurses Charity.

3 26. As to taking actions against the individuals concerned in the police and the IPCC, I leave this up to
4 you – while reminding you that, we, the public have the right to expect that the police and the IPCC
5 will perform as per their statutory duty – and in compliance with related Regulations, as well as
6 other legislation.

7 **6 FULL WRITTEN ANSWER WITHIN 21 DAYS**

8 I expect a full written answer from you within at most 21 days, preceded by an acknowledgment of my
9 letter (as per CPR pre-action protocol).

10 Time limitation considerations mean that I must file my claim at the latest by Thursday 14 April 2011.

11 Yours faithfully,

12 N Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé

Post Office Ltd.
www.postoffice.co.uk

17/03/2011 14:00 TP:12 BP:02 SU: AA
Lower Regent Street FAD: 0540110
11 Lower Regent Street
London
Greater London
SW1Y 4LR

Session Id: 4-790679
Txn Id: 5

Horizon Certificate of Posting
Special Delivery by 1pm

An item addressed as follows:-

Building Name or No: HOME OFFICE
PostCode/Zip Code: SW1P4DF

Barcode Number: ZW7711912936B

Has been accepted here today.

Total Cost Of Services = £5.50

Home Office

Post Office Ltd.
www.postoffice.co.uk

17/03/2011 13:59 TP:12 BP:02 SU: AA
Lower Regent Street FAD: 0540110
11 Lower Regent Street
London
Greater London
SW1Y 4LR

Session Id: 4-790679
Txn Id: 1

Horizon Certificate of Posting
Special Delivery by 1pm

An item addressed as follows:-

Building Name or No: SCOT YARD
PostCode/Zip Code: SW1H0BQ

Barcode Number: ZW7711912806B

Has been accepted here today.

Total Cost Of Services = £5.50

*Met
Comm*

Post Office Ltd.
www.postoffice.co.uk

17/03/2011 14:01 TP:12 BP:02 SU: AA
Lower Regent Street FAD: 0540110
11 Lower Regent Street
London
Greater London
SW1Y 4LR

Session Id: 4-790679
Txn Id: 9

Horizon Certificate of Posting
Special Delivery by 1pm

An item addressed as follows:-

Building Name or No: 7274
PostCode/Zip Code: W86EQ

Barcode Number: ZW7711913026B

Has been accepted here today.

Total Cost Of Services = £5.50

*Kennington
Police*

Post Office Ltd.
www.postoffice.co.uk

17/03/2011 14:02 TP:12 BP:02 SU: AA
Lower Regent Street FAD: 0540110
11 Lower Regent Street
London
Greater London
SW1Y 4LR

Session Id: 4-790679
Txn Id: 13

Horizon Certificate of Posting
Special Delivery by 1pm

An item addressed as follows:-

Building Name or No: 90
PostCode/Zip Code: WC1U6BH

Barcode Number: ZW7711913166B

Has been accepted here today.

Total Cost Of Services = £5.50

IPC

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 money back and compensation for loss and damage to your item. Check delivery at www.postoffice.co.uk or call 08459 272100 quoting your ref number.

For information regarding Royal Mail products and services visit our web site at www.postoffice.co.uk

Withdraw cash over the counter from your bank account at any of our branches(selected banks) It's free and easy

www.postoffice.co.uk/banking

This is not a VAT receipt

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 money back and compensation for loss and damage to your item. Check delivery at www.postoffice.co.uk or call 08459 272100 quoting your ref number.

For information regarding Royal Mail products and services visit our web site at www.postoffice.co.uk

Withdraw cash over the counter from your bank account at any of our branches(selected banks) It's free and easy

www.postoffice.co.uk/banking

This is not a VAT receipt

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 money back and compensation for loss and damage to your item. Check delivery at www.postoffice.co.uk or call 08459 272100 quoting your ref number.

For information regarding Royal Mail products and services visit our web site at www.postoffice.co.uk

Withdraw cash over the counter from your bank account at any of our branches(selected banks) It's free and easy

www.postoffice.co.uk/banking

This is not a VAT receipt

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 money back and compensation for loss and damage to your item. Check delivery at www.postoffice.co.uk or call 08459 272100 quoting your ref number.

For information regarding Royal Mail products and services visit our web site at www.postoffice.co.uk

Withdraw cash over the counter from your bank account at any of our branches(selected banks) It's free and easy

www.postoffice.co.uk/banking

This is not a VAT receipt

02	: 054011
0.00	
5.50	
0.00	
5.50	
0.00	
5.50	
0.00	
22.00	
22.00	
0.00	
ince	

Home

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

Track item

How to find your reference number

Delivered

Home Office

Your item with reference ZW771191293GB was delivered from our SOUTH WEST LONDON Delivery Office on 18/03/11.
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

Send mail in the UK
Send mail overseas

TRACKING
important or valuable mail

It says "Delivered" but it hasn't arrived
My item arrived but the contents were missing
My item arrived damaged
How can I get my item there quicker next time?
Who signed for my item?
What is electronic Proof of Delivery (ePOD)?

Home

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

Track item

How to find your reference number

Delivered

Mel Connors-Konec

Your item with reference ZW771191280GB was delivered from our SOUTH WEST LONDON Delivery Office on 18/03/11.
 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

- Send mail in the UK
- Send mail overseas

TRACKING
important or valuable mail

- It says "Delivered" but it hasn't arrived
- My item arrived but the contents were missing
- My item arrived damaged
- How can I get my item there quicker next time?
- Who signed for my item?
- What is electronic Proof of Delivery (ePOD)?

Home

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

Track item

How to find your reference number

*Kensington
police*

Delivered

Your item with reference ZW771191302GB was delivered from our KENSINGTON Delivery Office on 18/03/11.

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

Send mail in the UK

Send mail overseas

TRACKING
important or valuable mail

It says "Delivered" but it hasn't arrived

My item arrived but the contents were missing

My item arrived damaged

How can I get my item there quicker next time?

Who signed for my item?

What is electronic Proof of Delivery (ePOD)?

Home

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

Track item

How to find your reference number ▶

Delivered

1 PCC

Your item with reference ZW771191316GB was delivered from our WEST CENTRAL LONDON Delivery Office on 18/03/11.
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

Send mail in the UK

Send mail overseas

TRACKING
important or valuable mail

It says "Delivered" but it hasn't arrived

My item arrived but the contents were missing

My item arrived damaged

How can I get my item there quicker next time?

Who signed for my item?

What is electronic Proof of Delivery (ePOD)?