

[Ms Caroline Doyle](#)
ACAS
London Region, Floor 22
Euston Tower
286 Euston Road
London NW1 3JJ

(The highlights and boxed text are my subsequent additions, as is the continuous line numbering.

[Ms Noëlle Rawé](#)
[]
[]
[]

What Doyle did after my letters, at the end of Aug 08, i.e. *4.5 months after* receiving my [03.04.08](#) Claim from the tribunal: [08.04.08](#) – was telling me that “*employment tribunals do not deal with claims under the [Protection from Harassment Act](#)” (!!!)*

Events are discussed on the [KPMG page # 16](#)

1 [17 August 2008](#)

2 [Claim: Noëlle Rawé v KPMG LLP – Number 3200 936/2008](#); ACAS ref: 85680

3 (By ‘Recorded Delivery’)

Can't open linked documents? Try with:



4 Dear Ms Doyle,

5 On 8 August 2008, I took delivery of the enclosed [31 July 2008](#) reply from KPMG ¹ to my [1 July 2008](#)
6 Subject Access Request (on which I copied you at the time).

7 Of note:

- 8 • Under point 3, in relation to communications from Mr [Ladsky](#) to [KPMG](#), KPMG states that it is
9 “*satisfied that [I] have been provided with the correct material*”

10 It states that it encloses “*a second copy for completeness*”. This is essentially the same copy I enclosed
11 with my correspondence to you of [5 August 2008](#). ‘Essentially’ as, relative to what KPMG has supplied
12 me with on [5 October 2007](#), an extra page has been added: page 1 of the notes captured by the Partner
13 who met with Mr Ladsky on 4 November 2002. I enclose a copy ²

14 In [its ET3](#), under “*IT Restrictions*”, paragraph 6, KPMG states that [it was first approached by Mr Ladsky](#)
15 [in October 2006](#), and [again in January 2007](#), and that it “*could not ignore these allegations*”. What did Mr
16 [Ladsky communicate about me to KPMG on these occasions?](#) [Why is KPMG still refusing to tell me?](#)

17 I reiterate my points on pages 2 and 3 of my [5 August 2008 letter](#): [KPMG denied me the opportunity to](#)
18 [defend myself against Mr Ladsky's accusations](#). Hence, it did not have proper and reasonable cause for
19 its conduct.

[KPMG \(1\)](#) failed to inform me that [Andrew David Ladsky](#) had approached it “*in Oct 06 and Jan 07*”; [\(2\)](#) it refused to communicate to me the alleged “*allegations*”; yet [\(3\)](#) it claimed that it “*could not ignore [them]*”.

(KPMG was behaving in exactly the same morally depraved way as that of [the Kensington, Chelsea & Notting Hill police mafia](#) that is processing 2 highly vicious, malicious, libellous so-called “*crime reports*” against me following fabricated ‘complaints’ against me by Ladsky - which it did NOT challenge – and in relation to which the police did NOT give me the chance to defend myself against them...

...and even went as far as claiming that it had “*No suspicion of false reporting*” - even though it never contacted me to get my side of the story ([Overview # 13 and # 16](#) ; my [17.10.11](#) Appeal Request in the context of [my 19 Apr 11 Claim against the police et.al.](#)).

Yes, it's the same [KPMG](#) that summarised [its ‘Values’ as: “Above all we act with integrity”!](#)

= [ALL part of the same VERY SICK tribe](#) ([Persecution # 6](#)) that perceives ‘the little people’ who ‘dare’ stand-up to them and their mates for their so-called ‘rights’, as non-entities who do not have the right to have rights, there to be used, abused and tormented at will – BY ALL.

¹ 31 July 2008 reply from KPMG to my 1 July 2008 Subject Access Request

² 4 November 2002 notes of KPMG meeting with Mr Ladsky

20 • Under [point 10, "IT report"](#), KPMG states *"This report was commissioned by the firm's General*
21 *Counsel and is subject to legal privilege"*

22 So, on the one hand, KPMG states in [its ET3](#) that following obtaining *"an IT report relating to [my] IT*
23 *use"*, it *"decided to restrict [my] access to the internet as a precautionary measure"* (*"IT Restrictions"*,
24 paragraph 6) – but *it refuses to supply me with the evidence. Why?*

25 Likewise, *I still do not know how I have committed a "serious breach of the IT policy which could*
26 *potentially have led to [my] dismissal"* (*"IT Restrictions", paragraph 7*).

27 *It supports my position that I have not breached the KPMG IT policy* – as I detailed in my [5 August 2008](#)
28 letter on page 3, lines 1-3, page 5 from line 11 and page 6 up to line 30.

29 Thank you for your time.

30 Yours sincerely,

31 Noëlle Rawé

32 cc. Mr Geoff Saunders, Regional Officer, Unite The Union, 33-37 Moreland Street, London EC1V 8HA -
33 including enclosures



Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

Knightsbridge B0
6 Raphael Street

London
Greater London
SW7 1DL

Date and Time: 18/08/2008 14:47
Session Prefix: 7-2228742
Dest: UK (E.U.)
Quantity: 1
Weight: 0.030 kg

1st Class Letter £0.36
Receipt £0.00
Recorded £36.00 £0.72

Total Cost of Services £1.08

Barcode: DV2169901136B

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

PLEASE REFER TO SEPARATE TERMS AND
CONDITIONS

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

This is not a VAT receipt
Thank You

Royal Mail[®]
recorded

Standard postal service with signature and
barcode scanning on delivery. Ideal for items
you might need to prove were received, like
job applications or legal documents

Use **Special Delivery** for guaranteed next morning
delivery with the security of barcode tracking
throughout and compensation for loss or damage
details of where your item is going

Name: HCA, London Region

Building name, number and street: 20 Cannon Row

Postcode complete in full: NW1 3JJ

Reference: DV 2169 9011 3GB

barcode label to top left of package