

ORIGINAL EMAIL

You replied on 23/04/2007 11:38.

From: Anand, Abhi
To: Ellis, Sophie (Temp); Rawé, Noëlle
Cc: Patching, Serena; Dunworth, Jeanette; Hughes, Ceri
Subject: RE: Temporary access - now again denied

Sent: Mon 23/04/2007 11:34

Hi Sophie,

As advised, We have granted access to Internet for Noelle now.
Noelle, Please could you log off & login back to your computer & check the Internet / Intranet access...

Regards,
- Abhi

From: Rawé, Noëlle
Sent: 18 April 2007 12:26
To: Patching, Serena

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



From: [Anand, Abhi](#)
Sent: **23 April 2007 11:34**
To: Ellis, Sophie (Temp); [Rawé, Noëlle](#)
Cc: Patching, Serena; [Dunworth, Jeanette](#); [Hughes, Ceri](#)
Subject: RE: **Temporary access - now again denied**

Hi Sophie,

As advised, We have granted access to Internet for Noelle now.

“As advised” BY WHOM? [Peter Bassett – et.al. in KPMG](#) and related [Jewish-Freemason ‘Brotherhood’ \(Persecution # 6\)](#) because they had had their (temporary) quota of sadistic kicks?

Noelle, Please could you log off & login back to your computer & check the Internet / Intranet access...

Regards,
- Abhi

After 24 DAYS! (BUT: they kept ensuring a continuation of getting their sadistic kicks!)

I was cut off from ALL THE SITES on 30 Mar 07 (section 4 [KPMG pg](#)) e.g.

- my exchange of emails with Jeanette Dunworth, HR, between [30 Mar and 5 Apr 07](#);
- my [17.04.07-10h44](#) email to Serena Patching, KPMG IT, containing numerous printscreens;
- my [17.04.07-16h59](#) email to Patching, returning a spreadsheet she had asked me to complete – continuing to emphasise that **I could NOT access ANY of the sites I needed to do my work, and ended-up having to ask people to do things for me** (thereby fulfil the objective of demeaning me, making me feel like a pariah)...

...and leading me to write: **“For more than two weeks now, I feel totally cut-off.”**

HOWEVER: as discussed under e.g. **Header 4** of my [17.01.08](#) Grievance (lines 134-135), at the 30 Mar 07 meeting with Peter Bassett, partner, and Jeanette Dunworth, HR (**section 3.4**

[KPMG pg](#)), Dunworth told me:

"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 longer have access to the internet" (*)

Hence, I immediately [replied](#) asking what I needed to do.

(*) TRANSLATION: To punish you for '[daring](#)' to stand-up against – and expose - organised crime by our '[brothers](#)' (Persecution # 6): [Andrew David Ladsky and his aides](#) ; [the judiciary](#) (KPMG was in the process of carrying out [a project for the Ministry of \(In\)Justice](#)); [the police](#); [politicians](#); [the 'regulators'](#) ([Overview # 7](#)), etc., etc. ([Case summary](#) ; [Résumé de mon cas](#))...

...as I stated under e.g. **Header 4.9 of my [17.01.08](#) Grievance)**

IN FACT:

KPMG DELIBERATELY CUT ME OFF FROM THE NETWORK – FOR 24 DAYS i.e. cutting off my access not only to the Internet, but also to the internal sites:

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 quoted above - and 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; **para.8** of my [03.04.08](#) Claim.

WHY restrict my access to the intranet i.e. the internal sites? (as I stated under **lines 233-236** of my [17.01.08](#) 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.**

The evil, sadistic, perverse monsters had getting their kicks from seeing me sobbing uncontrollably at my desk from 2 Apr 07 onwards, for the best part of April - **section 4.1 KPMG**

[page](#), as well as:

- headers 4.4 and 4.5 of my [17.01.08](#) Grievance (section 10.2 [KPMG pg](#));
- paras 9 and 10 of my [03.04.08](#) Claim against KPMG (section 12);
- lines 87-129 of my [05.08.08](#) letter to [ACAS](#) (section 16).

NOTE that, in its [PACK OF LIES Defence](#) (section 14):

- under paras 4(b), 6, 7 and 12(b) (extracts below) - as a COVER-UP ploy - KPMG DELIBERATELY mixed the 13 Feb 07 meeting at which my usage of "KPMG's IT systems" was raised (sections 3.2 and 3.3 [KPMG pg](#)) - with the 30 Mar 07 meeting (section 3.4 [KPMG pg](#), under which I discuss this)...

...as, what I was told on 30 Mar 07, by Jeanette Dunworth, HR, is as quoted above.

Hence, KPMG's claims in its [PACK OF LIES Defence](#) – under:

"Para.4(b) - *the Respondent was right, to restrict the Claimant's internet access due to her contravening the Respondent's IT policy*"

"Para.6 - *...the Respondent decided to restrict the Claimant's access to the internet as a precautionary measure.*"

"Para. 7 - *This was not the start of or indeed any part of a campaign of victimisation but in fact a way of avoiding implementing the disciplinary procedure for the Claimant's serious breach of the IT policy which could potentially have led to the Claimant's dismissal.*"

"Para.12(b) - *the Respondent believes that it was necessary to restrict the Claimant's access to the internet following the Claimant's abuse of the Respondent's IT systems and the threat of legal action from Mr Ladsky.*"

...amount to claiming that it cut off my access (in fact, to ALL the sites) **6 WEEKS after it raised the matter with me!**

(NOTE that KPMG also made *the same claim* in its [22.05.08](#) 'response' (includes my Comments) to my [17.01.08](#) Grievance – section 11 [KPMG pg](#))

Desperate to CONTINUE getting their sadistic kicks, they FAILED to take action until 23 Apr 07 (section 4.2 [KPMG pg](#)).

Of course, in its [PACK OF LIES Defence](#), under para.12(2), KPMG DENIED that "*it had caused me extreme distress*".

I highlight the fact that the **ban on my usage of the internet extended to the KPMG websites**: I was taken off from dealing with enquiries: my [24.04.07-09h34](#) email to Bassett and Hughes; [25.04.07-15h28](#) reply from Hughes – **even though the role limited my contacts to within KPMG.**

What was KPMG doing behind this?

Demonstrating its unbelievable level of moral depravation ...it was 'ever so kindly' "*offering*" me access to its "*health services*" e.g.

- **4 hours** after my above emails: [05.04.07](#) email from **Nuffield Proactive Health** "*offering*" me a

"Health & Wellbeing Assessment"

And [KPMG](#) kept pushing other of its "*specialists*" at me – trying to get me to bite on one of the hooks – **section 5 [KPMG pg](#)**; my **summary in the [08.05.07](#)** email from **BUPA Wellness KPMG** (that includes references to other events)...

...while, of course, CONTINUING to subject me to **[Criminal Psychological Harassment](#)** – **in order to achieve its VERY SINISTER objective: [section 5.2 \[KPMG pg\]\(#\)](#)**; my Comments in my **[14.02.07](#)** Draft Notes of the 13 Feb meeting with Peter Bassett and Jeanette Dunworth.

From: Rawé, Noëlle

Sent: **18 April 2007 12:26** [**copy**]

To: Patching, Serena

Cc: Ellis, Sophie (Temp); Dunworth, Jeanette; Anand, Abhi; Hughes, Ceri

Subject: RE: **Temporary access - now again denied**