

ORIGINAL EMAIL

From: Rawé, Noëlle
To: Hughes, Ceri
Cc:
Subject: Hannah-Maria has phoned me...

Sent: Wed 11/04/2007 12:09

...no doubt as a result of your contacting her. Thanks a lot.

She said she had been in touch with IT yesterday. Apparently, they need to write a rule to allow me access to the Intranet, while excluding the Internet. They told Hannah-Maria that they would get back to her today.

She said that she would let me know as soon as she has heard back.

Kind regards
Noëlle Rawé

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



From: [Rawé, Noëlle](#)

Sent: **11 April 2007 12:09**

To: [Hughes, Ceri](#)

Subject: **Hannah-Maria** [[my previous day's email, at 09h49](#)] **has phoned me...**

...no doubt as a result of your contacting her. Thanks a lot.

She said she **had been in touch with IT** yesterday. **Apparently, they need to write a rule to allow me access to the Intranet, while excluding the Internet.** They told Hannah-Maria that they would get back to her today.

She said that she would let me know as soon as she has heard back.

OF NOTE: **On 24 Apr 07** once [Peter Bassett, partner](#), had [made me sign a letter](#) 'agreeing' to be barred from accessing the internet, they finally restored my access: Bassett's [24.04.07-9h10](#) email:

"As I mentioned to you yesterday, it has been agreed that while IT cannot put in place the necessary arrangements, your intranet / internet access will be restored, subject to your signing a letter in which you undertake not to go outside the permitted sites"

"while IT cannot put in place the necessary arrangements" = **A COVER UP** that would 'support' KPMG's claim that it had been trying 'ever so hard' to resolve 'the issue'. (It was followed by a [01.05.07-10h00](#) email that had the same objective)...

...as **KPMG had DELIBERATELY CUT ME OFF FROM THE NETWORK FOR 24 DAYS** (section 4 [KPMG page](#)).

The **23 Apr 07** letter issued 'by' [Jeanette Dunworth, HR \(= Peter Bassett\)](#) that Bassett asked me to sign (I returned with my [25.04.07-13h45](#) email) – states:

"...following a meeting attended by you, Jeanette Dunworth and me on 30 March 2007, you were informed that your internet and intranet access would be restricted."

NO! On 30 Mar 07 (section 3.4 [KPMG pg](#)) Jeanette Dunworth, HR, **mentioned ONLY the internet** – (as I reported: (1)- in my [09.07.07](#) Subject Access Request (section 7 KPMG pg);

(2)- under lines 134-135 of my [17.01.08](#) Grievance):

“Because of [Andrew David] Ladsky [FALSE, MALICIOUS] communication [to KPMG against me] claiming that “your website contains anti-Semitic comments” it has been decided that, “to protect you and KPMG, it would be best you no longer have access to the internet”

WHY restrict my access to the intranet i.e. the internal sites? (as I stated under lines 233-236 of my Grievance).

To claim that this is what I was told would prove that KPMG had been intent on stopping me from doing my work...which is exactly what **‘The Best Company to Work for’ DID** - over a **24-DAY** period! A FACT it ADMITTED in [the letter](#):

“Since then you have been unable to access the external internet or the global intranet”; [= the internal sites]

“in order to enable you to carry out your day to day work” ;

“decided to reinstate your access solely for the purposes of allowing you to do your job”

...providing an **UNDENIABLE ADMISSION** that **KPMG HAD DELIBERATELY PREVENTED ME FROM DOING MY WORK – FOR 24 DAYS.** ([23.04.07-11h34](#) email).

See my Comments on [my exchange of emails with Jeanette Dunworth, HR, between 30 Mar and 5 Apr 07.](#)

Meanwhile, they ALL continued getting their sadistic kicks e.g. [my 17.04.07 email](#) (Yep! 6 days after the above email!).

Kind regards
Noëlle Rawé