

ORIGINAL EMAIL

From: Bassett, Peter R
Sent: 24 April 2007 09:10
To: Rawé, Noëlle
Cc: Hughes, Ceri
Subject: FW: Confidential
Importance: High
Sensitivity: Confidential

TRANSLATION: Now we've ALL had our temporary quota of sadistic kicks, we are going to reconnect you to the network.

(NOTE that the attached letter FALSELY claims that "[I was] informed on 30 Mar 07 that my access to the internet and intranet [i.e. internal sites] would be restricted". To make this claim PROVES that KPMG had been intent on stopping me from doing my work...which is exactly what it did- over a 24-DAY period!)

Noelle,

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.

Please would you print out and sign the attached letter? I'm afraid I shall not be in the office today, but please let me know if you have any queries on this.

Kind regards
Peter

SEE ATTACHED LETTER



Letter to Noelle
Rawe.doc

I RETURNED IT – SIGNED – WITH MY [25.04.25-13h45](#) email

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



From: [Bassett, Peter R](#)
Sent: 24 April 2007 09:10
To: [Rawé, Noëlle](#)
Cc: [Hughes, Ceri](#)
Subject: FW: Confidential
Importance: High
Sensitivity: Confidential

PETER BASSETT: [KPMG PARTNER AND KINGPIN EXECUTIONER IN MY CASE.](#)

CERI HUGHES: my line manager, KPMG Director and henchwoman in my case

Noelle,

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,...

“while IT cannot put in place the necessary arrangements” = A COVER UP (1) for their DELIBERATELY cutting me off the network for 24 DAYS – as is glaringly obvious in the attached letter:

“you were informed that your internet and intranet access would be restricted.”

NO! At the 30 Mar 07 meeting (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 (section 11 [KPMG pg](#)); (3)- para.8 of my [03.04.08](#) Claim against KPMG):

“Because of [\[Andrew David\] Ladsky](#) [FALSE, MALICIOUS] communication [to [KPMG](#) against me] (2) 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. 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 attached 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.**

(1)- COVER UP (repeated in a follow-on email of **01.05.07-10h00** email from IT that had the same objective). Note that during Part 1 of my so-called 'performance appraisal' with my line manager **Ceri Hughes**, on **09.10.07** (I secretly recorded) **(*)** (recording under **section 8.1 KPMG pg**), when I raised it, she replied (lines 130-135):

"it was a mistake, you were meant to have intranet access.

It was unfortunate, regrettable, and something that we should and would wish to avoid, but nevertheless it did happen.

There is nothing more that I can do, or anyone else can do to change that'

"A mistake" - by KPMG, one of the leading IT consultancies!

(Henchwoman **Ceri Hughes** was always ready to assist KPMG in any way she could. Other example: 'her' highly threatening letter to me of **14.12.07**).

(*) I only revealed this in 2015, at the time of launching the **KPMG page**.

(2)- As in the case of other communications from Ladsky to KPMG, they did NOT show me the communication: a **26.03.07** letter (includes my Comments) (discussed under **section 3.5 KPMG pg**). I had to battle with KPMG to finally get this highly redacted version – 7 MONTHS LATER (**section 7 KPMG pg**)

My access to the sites had only been resumed the day before: **23.04.07-11h34** email from Abhi Anand, IT.

= 24 DAYS AFTER HAVING ME CUT OFF FROM ABSOLUTELY ALL THE SITES! e.g.

- my exchange of emails with **Jeanette Dunworth, HR**, **between 30 Mar and 5 Apr 07**: **This is very upsetting...it makes me feel like I am 'a criminal...it makes me think that it is I, the victim, who gets treated as though I am the criminal'**;
- my **11 Apr 07-9h49 email to Hannah-Maria Talbot**;
- my **17.04.07-10h44** email to Serena Patching, IT, capturing many printscreens as examples of the sites I could not access;
- my **17.04.07-16h59** email to Patching returning a spreadsheet she had asked me to fill in, in which I identified many other sites I could not access – and stated: **"For more than two weeks**

now, I feel totally cut-off”.

During that time, the thoroughly evil, morally depraved, perverse monsters had been getting their sadistic kicks from seeing me sobbing uncontrollably at my desk from 2 Apr 07 onwards, for the best part of April – **section 4.1 KPMG pg**, 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**).

They had been getting their sadistic kicks – **while having ABSOLUTE KNOWLEDGE that I was an innocent victim of organized crime** – as KPMG’s previously associated firm of solicitors, **McGrigors**, had looked at **121 pages of my website in March and April 2007**. (NB: I only revealed this evidence at the time of launching the **KPMG pg** in 2015).

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**; my **14.02.07** Draft Notes of the meeting) - 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 I quoted above in this document,...

...and as I reported in my **09.07.07** SAR; **Header 4** of my **17.01.08** Grievance; **para.8** of my **03.04.08** Claim.

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**)

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

I also highlight the fact that the **ban on my usage of the internet extended to the KPMG.com sites**: I was taken off from dealing with external 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.

But, I was enjoying the work (for which I was particularly suited: [lines 370-372 of 09.10.07](#) meeting) = 'a good reason to have me taken off'!

I also highlight that, in spite of playing a very active part in my being also cut-off from the KPMG.com sites – **including being copied** on this email, as well as on my [25.04.07-13h45](#) email with which I returned the signed letter - **5 MONTHS LATER**, in her [03.09.07-09h50](#) email to me, **Hughes** wrote:

"I think that you can assume that KPMG's internet site is not a forbidden area."

(= when it suited her needs, I was 'deemed' to have access! My reply is attached to her email)

TRANSLATION of the excuse they had been using – AND CONTINUED TO USE – for barring me from accessing the internet (discussed above i.e. the claim that *"to protect me and KPMG, it would be best that I no longer have access to the internet"*):

- To punish you for '**daring**' to stand-up against – and expose - organized crime by our '**brothers**' (Persecution # 6): [Andrew David Ladsky and his gang of racketeers](#) ; [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. ([Case summary](#) ; [Résumé de mon cas](#))...

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

As I reported in my documents, **they did NOT provide me with a copy of Ladsky's "communication"**. KPMG only supplied me with a highly redacted version of Ladsky's [26.03.07](#) letter – **7 MONTHS LATER**, as part of [a pack](#), after it made me go into a 3-MONTH battle following my [09.07.07](#) Subject Access Request – **section 7** [KPMG pg.](#)

OF NOTE: **there were more communications from Ladsky that KPMG failed to tell me about** – as evidenced under **para.6** of its [PACK OF LIES Defence](#) that refers to alleged communications from Ladsky *"in October 2006 and January 2007"*. **It was news to me.**

Of course, following my [01.07.08](#) Subject Access Request in which I asked to be supplied with a copy, in its [31.07.08](#) 'response', KPMG refused, claiming (falsely): *"This information would not be your personal data; satisfied you have been provided with the correct material"* (**section 15.1** [KPMG pg.](#)).

What KPMG did to COVER-UP its criminal actions against me that had, among other, impacted on my ability to work?

During **PART 1** of my so-called 'performance appraisal' meeting with **my line manager, Ceri Hughes, on 09.10.07** (I secretly recorded; recording under **section 8.1** [KPMG pg.](#)) (among other) she **FALSELY accused me** of **"letting my personal problem interfere with my work"**: [lines 61-68](#).

During **PART 2** with **Peter Bassett, partner, and Kathy Woodhouse, HR, on 24.10.07** (I, likewise, secretly recorded – recording under **section 9.1** [KPMG pg.](#)), **they CONTINUED TO IGNORE** the criminal actions they had taken against me, **AND COVERED THEM UP**,...

...by (among other) continuing to use their fabricated story they had one of 'my colleagues', **Finbarr Geaney**, capture in 'his' [05.08.07](#) 'feedback on my performance': [lines 188-244; 367-](#)

[392; 734-737](#); section 9.4 [KPMG pg](#) - that the way I felt from Apr 07 “was NOT KPMG’s fault”, but “[MY] fault for letting my house problem affect me” – [lines 375-379](#):

Me: “**Yeah, but he assumed that it was “my house problem”. Right?”**”

[Peter Bassett](#): “**Okay, but I mean, we don’t need to discuss what was behind it”**”

“**Whether it was caused by one thing or another, isn’t really the issue”**”

Of course not! Let’s “not discuss what is behind it”: [Peter Bassett and his henchwomen and henchmen, Ceri Hughes, Jeanette Dunworth, HR, IT staff, etc,](#) morally depraved, repulsive, gutter ploy to cover-up THE TRUE REASON: the criminal actions they took against me...

...(see [Protection from Harassment Act 1997](#) ; lines 286-307 of my [05.08.08](#) letter to [ACAS](#)) (section 16) - from Feb 07 onwards to please the dear ‘brothers’, [Andrew David Ladsky](#) et.al. in the [Jewish-Freemason ‘Brotherhood’ \(Persecution # 6\)](#).

- NOTE that KPMG repeated this FALSE accusation in its [PACK OF LIES Defence](#) (includes my Comments) (section 14 [KPMG pg](#)) to my [03.04.08](#) Claim in the [Stratford Employment Tribunal](#) (section 16) – under para.11 - stating:

“The Respondent believes that the Claimant has been unable to disentangle her “personal issues” from her work and that as a result her performance has suffered”

See my reply in e.g. my [05.08.08](#) letter to [ACAS](#), line 148 to my Comments after line 180 (the ‘points’ in brackets refer to paras in my [03.04.08](#) Claim))

What else was KPMG doing behind this?

Demonstrating its unbelievable level of moral depravation ...it was ‘ever so kindly’ “offering” me access to its “health services” (section 5 [KPMG pg](#)) e.g.

- 4 hours after my [05.04.07-10h37](#) email to Jeanette Dunworth, HR: [05.04.07-15h25](#) 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 [08.05.07-13h29](#) 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.

These so-called ‘offers of help’ KPMG was pushing at me also had the ulterior motive of using them to claim e.g. para.12(a) of its [PACK OF LIES of Defence](#) (section 14 [KPMG pg](#)) to my [03.04.07](#) Claim that:

“the Respondent believes that it went far beyond what could be reasonably expected of an employer in such circumstances in terms of the support it offered”

...thereby also reinforcing its morally repugnant, highly cruel, vicious and perverse LIE that I had “let my personal problem affect me at work”.

(As I pointed out in my [01.07.08](#) Subject Access Request (section 15.1 [KPMG pg](#)), it failed to

define how it did this. However, I concluded that Well Being and the other things it pushed at me from Feb 07 over the following months was what it was referring to).

...**subject to your signing a letter in which you undertake not to go outside the permitted sites.**

As can be seen in the **attached letter**, the sites **I was now** "allowed to access" were "the global intranet [internal sites] (together with www.webex.com)..."

Re. **WEBEX.COM** - as I reported under e.g. **Header 4.7** of my **17.01.08** Grievance, by **Sep 07** **KPMG HAD ALSO CUT OFF my access to this site** e.g. **26.10.07** and **21.11.07** printscreens when I tried to access the site.

Under **lines 330-335** of my **17.01.08** Grievance, I wrote:

*"While the **24 [1] April 2007** letter I was asked to sign by **Peter Bassett** specifically states that I am allowed to access the Webex site (interactive conference calls), **on 21 November 2007 I was unable to join a call (on SharePoint) [2] due to being denied access by Websense**. I had been able to join these calls in the past....**Given my current situation, I did not bother reporting it. I see no point doing this.**"*

(1) – Error; should be '23' Apr; 24th was when Bassett sent it to me to sign i.e. this email.

(2) – Note at **lines 548-553** of my so-called 'performance appraisal' meeting with **Hughes** on **09.10.07** that she had emphasised that "**it [was] important [for me] to be [on these calls]**".

Please **would you print out and sign the attached letter?** I'm afraid I shall not be in the office today, but please let me know if you have any queries on this.

Kind regards **[YEAH! RIGHT!]**
Peter

<< File: **Letter to Noelle Rawe.doc** >>

Note that **the letter was issued 'by' Jeanette Dunworth, Human Resources = Peter Bassett** – to which I add: et.al. in the **Jewish-Freemason 'Brotherhood' (Persecution # 6)**.

Jeanette Dunworth, Human Resources = another one, (with **Ceri Hughes et.al. among KPMG staff**) who supports the findings of **the Stanley Milgram's 'obedience experiments'**...

...- and in particular, the conclusion, 50 years later, that:

"people follow leaders because they see them as representative of an identity that they share;

they don't inflict harm because they are unaware of doing wrong but because they believe what they are doing is right"

From: "**Stanley Milgram taught us we have more to fear from zealots than zombies**", The Guardian, 1 Sep 11

MY OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF ALL OF THEM: THOROUGHLY EVIL MONSTERS.

(I wonder: have Dunworth – et.al. - been getting a 'Happy new year' card from their 'dear friend' and protégé **Rachman Andrew David Ladsky** ever since?)

8 Salisbury Square
London EC4Y 8BB
United Kingdom

Tel +44 (0) 20 7311 1000
Fax +44 (0) 20 7311 3311
DX 38050 Blackfriars
E-mail jeanette. [REDACTED]

Private & confidential

Noëlle Rawé
3 Jefferson House
11 Basil Street
Knightsbridge
London
SW3 1AX

Our ref jd

Contact **Jeanette Dunworth**
020 [REDACTED]

23 April 2007

Dear Noëlle

IT Access

As you are aware, 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. Since then you have been unable to access the external internet or the global intranet. IT have been working to try and allow you access to the global intranet (together with www.webex.com) in order to enable you to carry out your day to day work. This has not yet been achieved although we have been informed by IT that from 30th April 2007 new processes should be in place to make this possible.

In the meantime, we have decided to re-instate your internet and global intranet access. This is solely for the purposes of allowing you to do your job and under no circumstances should you access the external internet (save for the site www.webex.com). KPMG may monitor your internet/intranet use to ensure that you have not accessed any non-work related sites.

Please can you sign and return to me the enclosed copy of this letter to confirm your agreement to your internet and global intranet access being re-instated as described above.

Yours sincerely

Peter Bassett

[REDACTED]

25 April 2007