

## ORIGINAL EMAILS

From: Rawé, Noëlle Sent: Wed 11/04/2007 11:10  
To: Hughes, Ceri  
Cc:  
Subject: RE: Still no action on addressing my lack of access to the majority of the Intranet sites

---

**From:** Hughes, Ceri  
**Sent:** 11 April 2007 10:04  
**To:** Rawé, Noëlle  
**Subject:** RE: Still no action on addressing my lack of access to the majority of the Intranet sites

that's strange, since that is a web-based application.

I'm afraid that due to the fact that Peter and Janette are out, there is probably a reluctance to re-instate access to the intranet without their input, even though it is an error that you do not have access to the intranet. Obviously it is very upsetting for you, but I do not think for one moment that you should read anything more sinister into this. **[NR: Thank you for the reassurance. Yes, it is very upsetting. At least, until a week ago I had the working day during which I could be in a state of relative normality. Not any more. The horrendous nightmare has overtaken every single part of my life]** I suspect that Hannah-Maria may be quite junior, unfamiliar with the sequence of events or waiting to hear from Janette. **[NR: I am sure you are right]**

Ceri

---

**From:** Rawé, Noëlle  
**Sent:** 11 April 2007 09:55  
**To:** Hughes, Ceri  
**Subject:** RE: Still no action on addressing my lack of access to the majority of the Intranet sites

Ceri

Yes, I can. But, seeing this blanket denial of access to sites after more than one week makes me wonder whether I should read in this the message that I should pack up and leave.

Kind regards  
Noëlle Rawé

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



From: [Rawé, Noëlle](#)  
Sent: **11 April 2007 11:10**  
To: [Hughes, Ceri](#)  
Subject: RE: **Still no action on addressing my lack of access to the majority of the Intranet sites**

---

From: Hughes, Ceri  
Sent: **11 April 2007 10:04**  
To: Rawé, Noëlle  
Subject: RE: **Still no action on addressing my lack of access to the majority of the Intranet sites**

that's strange, since that is a web-based application.

I'm afraid that due to the fact that Peter and Janette are out, there is probably a reluctance to re-instate access to the intranet without their input, even though it is an error that you do not have access to the intranet.

**Obviously it is very upsetting for you, [\*] but I do not think for one moment that you should read anything more sinister into this.**

**[NR: Thank you for the reassurance. Yes, it is very upsetting. At least, until a week ago I had the working day during which I could be in a state of relative normality. Not any more. The horrendous**

nightmare has overtaken every single part of my life] I suspect that Hannah-Maria may be quite junior, unfamiliar with the sequence of events or waiting to hear from Janette. [NR: I am sure you are right]

Ceri

(\*) Hughes was playing a double act – as evidenced by what took place subsequently (my 17.01.08 Grievance) - including during my so-called ‘performance appraisal’ meeting with her on 9 Oct 07 (I secretly recorded) (recording under **section 8.1 KPMG page**),...

...when **she refused point blank** to take into consideration the actions taken against me by **KPMG** that had not only prevented me from doing my job, but also had a devastating impact on me – and **threatened me with ending the meeting if I persisted in raising it: lines 47 to 148:**

**CH** - Lines 53-54: “We won’t be focusing on some of the issues you brought up in your form. [end of Performance Appraisal form] around what’s going on in your life outside of KPMG”

**Me** – Lines 57-58: “And the things I have highlighted that have actually impacted on me for half the year. Who will discuss that?”

**CH** – Line 59: “We won’t be discussing it in this meeting”

**Me** – Line 60: “Because that had an impact on me and on my performance”

**CH** – Lines 66-68: “Well, previously,...although you had this awful thing happening to you outside of work, you kept a very distinct line between work and non-work. (\*) As you have demonstrated in this form, now you see the two as criss-crossing, as running [I interrupted]”

**(\*) THIS WAS A FALSE ACCUSATION. IT WAS A KEY PART OF KPMG’s STRATEGY FOR COVERING-UP THE IMPACT ON ME OF ITS CRIMINAL ACTIONS AGAINST ME.**

This accusation was expanded on during the **24 Oct 07** meeting with Peter Bassett and Kathy Woodhouse (**section 9 KPMG pg**) - using the fabricated 05.08.07 ‘feedback’ ‘from’ ‘my colleague’, Finbarr Geaney - that claimed:

*“You have a well known personal legal difficulty with your house. This problem does get you down a lot and it sometimes impacts negatively upon your mood in the office and thus your impact with colleagues” – lines 187-224; lines 188-244; 367-392; 734-737.*

NOTE that **KPMG** repeated this **FALSE** accusation under para.11 of its **PACK OF LIES Defence** (includes my Comments) to my 03.04.08 Claim).

**Me** – Lines 69-70: “Because of what happened. Because it has invaded my work life. Because it came into my work life. Because KPMG when Ladsky [CH interrupted]”

**CH** – Line 71: “Do you think it is KPMG’s fault it invaded your work life?”

**Me** – Lines 72-73: “Let me finish, please. When Ladsky, apparently came and made accusations against me, right, KPMG then took action against me”

**CH** – Line 74: “Noëlle we are not going to discuss that”

**Me** – Lines 75-78: “Yeah but, which is why I captured it, because, I said, before I had

***not captured it, but now it has invaded my work life, and it has impacted.***

***I have had a month, practically the month of April, without having intranet access; and getting the messages.***

***As I captured in my form, the effect of that on me was absolutely devastating.”***

**CH – Line 79: CH: “And I read that, and I accept what you are saying, but we are not going to discuss it today”**

**Me – Lines 87-88: “... **YES, that’s a fact: it HAS impacted on me. What has happened here has impacted on me – which is not surprising**”**

**CH – Lines 89-91: “Can you not appreciate that this discussion, in the same way as everybody else’s discussion around this document, is how you progressed against your goals, and your performance against your goals”**

**Me – Lines 92-93: “You cannot dissociate the two; the environment under which I have had to perform - which is why I have had to put that in” [at the back of my [2006-07 Performance Appraisal form](#)]**

**CH – Lines 94-95: “But I have to. That has to be the basis that we progress this discussion. And if you don’t agree to that, then I can’t progress the discussion”**

**Me- Line 96: “All I am saying is that it cannot be put aside and ignored”**

**CH – Line 97: “But it has to be; has to be”**

**Me – Line 98: “It has impacted on the way I have worked”**

**CH – Line 99-100: “I would suggest to you that, actually, that’s something we need to address for the future as development [UNBELIEVABLE!]. It can’t impact”**

**Me – Lines 101-102: “It’s not a question of development. It’s just a question of my being treated differently from others”**

**CH – Lines 103-105: “I am not treating you differently...Because you chose, in your Dialogue form, to raise issues that are related to what is going on outside of KPMG”**

**Me – Lines 106-109: “No, I did not. I very specifically say in my form that, at mid-year, I had not put in, even though I was going through absolute sheer utter hell. [Overview # 10, # 11, # 13] I made no reference to it whatsoever in my form. I did not bring it in. And I do specify the reason I am bringing it in is because it has now invaded my work life”**

**CH – Lines 119-120: “This discussion and this document is about your goals, your performance against those goals in KPMG. The two have to be separate”**

**Me – Line 121: “My being deprived of the tools to work with for a whole month, surely [interrupted]”**

**CH – Line 122: “What about the other 11 months?”**

**Me** – 123-125: “*We are going to talk about the other 11 months. I am saying that you cannot cross out the fact that, for a whole month, I was reduced in tears at my desk, getting all these messages making me feel as though I was a criminal. With no intranet access*” [Header 4 of my [17.01.08](#) Grievance; section 4 [KPMG pg](#)]

**CH** – Line 126: “***That’s not something we can discuss today Noëlle***”

**Me** – Lines 127-129: “*But that, what I am saying is that it cannot just be ignored. That is something that has impacted on my performance; because I did not have the tools for starters, never mind anything else*”

**CH** – Lines 130-135: “***We are not going to revisit that. I think that we have discussed this enough times*** [WHEN? She NEVER discussed it – in spite of being copied on my numerous emails reporting endlessly that **I was totally cut off from ALL the sites** e.g. my [17.04.07-10h44](#) email to IT – **FOR 24 DAYS!**]

*Again, I have not been part of the discussion you had with HR* [Ditto about being copied on EVERYTHING] [involving more than 1 party = [a typical criminal psychological harassment tactic: Header 2](#)],

*but I have been assured, or it has been assured to me that it was explained that that was a mistake, that you were meant to have intranet access* [A ‘mistake’, [KPMG](#), ‘the IT specialist’, made last for 24 DAYS! at which point [it made sign a letter](#) ‘agreeing’ to be barred from accessing the Internet].

***It was unfortunate, regrettable, and something that we should and would wish to avoid*** [cue to laugh out loud], ***but nevertheless it did happen. There is nothing more that I can do, or anyone else can do to change that*** [As we have agreed to say with our dear ‘brothers’ including [Andrew David Ladsky](#) in the [Jewish-Freemason ‘Brotherhood’ \(Persecution # 6\)](#)].

**Me** – Lines 136-137: “***Funnily enough, when I signed the letter, I immediately got the intranet back. It must be the best IT fix ever. I am just mentioning that.***”

**CH** – Line 138: “*What can I say to you? I absolutely was not involved in any of that*”

**Me** – Line 139: “***As my performance appraisal manager, you need to know that...***”

**CH** – Lines 142-143: “*As I said at the beginning, the purpose of this discussion is not to focus on the things that are happening outside of KPMG*”

**Me** – Line 144: “***But that took place inside KPMG***”

**CH** – Lines 145-147: “***Okay, but we are not going to focus on it in this discussion. I need you to understand and accept that before we can go on, because we are going to be talking at cross purposes***”

**Me** – Line 148: “*Well, there we are*”

**NOTE** that the **23 Apr 07** letter issued ‘by’ [Jeanette Dunworth, HR \(= Peter Bassett\)](#) that Bassett asked me to sign in his [24.10.07-09h10](#) email (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, **ONLY mentioned 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] it had been decided that, **"to protect [me] and KPMG, it would be best that [I] 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 – BY CUTTING OFF FROM THE NETWORK FOR 24 DAYS.** ([23.04.07-11h34](#) email from IT)

(NB: For events with [KPMG](#) see:

- my [17.01.08 Grievance](#) to KPMG, and its [22.05.08](#) complete rejection of it (includes my Comments) (section 11 [KPMG pg](#));
- my transcript of my secret recording of my so-called 'performance appraisal' meetings on [09.10.07](#) and [24.10.07](#) (recordings under sections 8.1 and 9.1 KPMG pg);...  
...and note that KPMG knew exactly what my *actual* situation was at the time – as its previously associated firm of solicitors, **McGrigors**, had looked at [121 pages of my website in March – April 2007](#);
- my [03.04.08](#) Claim against KPMG in [the Employment Tribunal](#), and KPMG's **PACK OF LIES Defence** (includes my Comments), in which it demanded that it be "*struck out*";
- my [05.08.08](#) and [17.08.08](#) letters to [ACAS](#), my [02.09.08](#) letter to the Tribunal stating that I wanted to transfer my Claim to the High Court (section 16).

**REMEMBER the ROOT CAUSE for what took place / failed to take place:**

A thoroughly evil, cruel, greed-ridden, vampiric, sadistic, Rachman (\*) crook, [Andrew David Ladsky](#) – deciding he was ‘entitled’ [to make a multi-million £ jackpot](#) - through [extortion](#), [persecution](#), etc. - at my expense (and that of my fellow leaseholders)...

...to which everyone in that army of **henchmen** – including [KPMG](#)

([Case summary](#); [Résumé de mon cas](#)) – said:

**Yes, of course! O’ Great One!**



(\*) Dictionary definition: “*Rachmanism: The exploitation and intimidation of tenants by unscrupulous landlords; 1960’s after the notorious landlord [Peter Rachman](#)*”

---

From: [Rawé, Noëlle](#)

Sent: 11 April 2007 09:55

To: [Hughes, Ceri](#)

Subject: RE: Still no action on addressing my lack of access to the majority of the Intranet sites

Ceri

Yes, I can. But, **seeing this blanket denial of access to sites after more than one week makes me wonder whether I should read in this the message that I should pack up and leave.**

Kind regards  
Noëlle Rawé

---

From: [Hughes, Ceri](#)

Sent: 11 April 2007 09:51

To: Rawé, Noëlle

Subject: RE: **Still no action on addressing my lack of access to the majority of the Intranet sites**

[can you access Dialogue - please check](#)

---

From: [Rawé, Noëlle](#)

Sent: 11 April 2007 09:49

To: [Talbot, Hannah-Maria](#)

Cc: [Dunworth, Jeanette](#); [Hughes, Ceri](#)

Subject: FW: **Still no action on addressing my lack of access to the majority of the Intranet sites**

[see [my email to Talbot](#)]