

## ORIGINAL EMAILS

From: Rawé, Noëlle Sent: Fri 30/03/2007 10:21  
To: Bassett, Peter R  
Cc: Dunworth, Jeanette  
Subject: RE: Follow-up meeting

Peter, Jeanette

Yes, I can make this time

Kind regards  
Noëlle Rawé  
Tel: . . .  
[Pitching Toolkit](#)

---

**From:** Bassett, Peter R  
**Sent:** 30 March 2007 10:08  
**To:** Rawé, Noëlle  
**Cc:** Dunworth, Jeanette  
**Subject:** Follow-up meeting

Noelle

Please could we meet for a further follow-up meeting with Jeanette at 12 noon today? I have booked SSQ 233 for this.

Kind regards  
Peter

**Peter Bassett**  
Global Advisory Executive Partner

**From:** [Rawé, Noëlle](#)  
**Sent:** 30 March 2007 10:21  
**To:** [Bassett, Peter R](#)  
**Cc:** [Dunworth, Jeanette](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Follow-up meeting

Peter, Jeanette

Yes, I can make this time  
Kind regards  
Noëlle Rawé

---

**From:** Bassett, Peter R  
**Sent:** 30 March 2007 10:08  
**To:** Rawé, Noëlle  
**Cc:** Dunworth, Jeanette  
**Subject:** Follow-up meeting

Noelle

Please **could we meet for a further follow-up meeting with Jeanette at 12 noon today?** I have booked SSQ 233 for this.

(If the linked documents don't open, try with:



(NB: The only prior meeting that had taken place with [Bassett, partner and Dunworth, HR](#) was on 13<sup>th</sup> Feb 07 – in relation to which, Bassett had REFUSED to issue me with notes (section 3.2 [KPMG page](#)).

My issuing these [Draft Notes](#), because of what he had told me during the meeting, had clearly not been expected as, in 'his' [07.03.07](#) email, Bassett described them – falsely - as "*not being an accurate reflection of what took place*" (sections 3.2 and 3.3 KPMG page)).

At 10h21 (above email), I replied that I could. However, I wondered what was there "to follow-up" as, during the 13 Feb meeting, Bassett had said: "should there be any further abuse of KPMG's IT systems this could result in formal proceedings taking place". I had NOT "[made] any further abuse of the IT systems"

Because:

- (1) my Draft Notes of the 13 Feb 07 meeting had thrown a spanner in the works;
- (2) under **Plan B**, [the 'brothers' \(Persecution # 6\)](#) in the [Kensington-Notting Hill police mafia](#) had then failed, in mid Mar 07, to get the closure of my website ([police # 3](#))...

...what they then had in store for me was a concocted '**Plan C**': a **PACK OF LIES**, highly vicious, defamatory [26.03.07](#) letter from the '[Dear Brother](#)' (Persecution # 6) [Andrew David Ladsky](#) – which they did NOT show me. (In fact, after a drawn out battle, [KPMG](#) only supplied me with a highly redacted version of it with its [05.10.07](#) correspondence i.e. **7 MONTHS LATER**).

As **what was said at the meeting was NOT recorded** – and, 2<sup>nd</sup> time round, I did not produce my own notes, because I did not want to yet again, be called a liar, in addition to the [KPMG page](#), I recorded events in / under:

- my [09.07.07](#) Subject Access Request (**section 7** [KPMG page](#));
- **Header 4** of my [17.01.08](#) Grievance (**section 11**);
- **paras 8 and 9** of my [03.04.08](#) Claim against KPMG in the [Employment Tribunal](#);
- under **lines 25-45** of my [05.08.08](#) letter to [ACAS](#) (**section 16**).

Kind regards  
Peter

Peter Bassett  
**Global Advisory Executive Partner**