

ORIGINAL EMAILS

From: Bassett, Peter R
Sent: 25 April 2007 13:52
To: Rawé, Noëlle; Hughes, Ceri
Subject: RE: Confidential
Sensitivity: Confidential

Bassett's reply at 13h52

Thanks, Noelle.

Follow up
Please treat this as Confidential.
This message was sent with High importance.

From: Rawé, Noëlle
To: Bassett, Peter R; Hughes, Ceri
Cc:
Subject: FW: Confidential

Sent: Wed 25/04/2007 13:45

Peter

As just discussed, please find attached a signed copy of the below letter you sent me yesterday. I can also give you the hard copy for my file.



07.04.25_Noelle_R
awe_Internet_...

See end of this document for letter

Ceri, in relation to my lack of access to the Internet sites detailed below, or other sites, Peter said that you would need to put forward a business case, and that he was the contact for this.

Kind regards
Noëlle Rawé
Tel: +44 (0) 1273 833333 (April 2007)

From: Rawé, Noëlle
Sent: 24 April 2007 09:34
To: Bassett, Peter R
Cc: Hughes, Ceri
Subject: FW: Confidential
Importance: High
Sensitivity: Confidential

Peter

I will scan the signed form and send it to you.

My usage of the Internet being limited to Webex means that somebody else needs to deal with the **kpmg.com enquiries** right away
– as responding to an enquiry sometimes requires providing a URL (I currently have one outstanding that requires looking at the French site)

– as responding to an enquiry sometimes requires providing a URL (I currently have one outstanding that requires looking at the French site)

I will also need a **point of contact** for sites I am unable to access. For example, in relation to **training for my priority core skills** e.g. 'Making an impact'

List of links

Influencing - useful websites

Keyword

Link	Description
Beat them with their own arguments by Dr. Kevin Nunley	The Honest-to-Goodness Nuts and Bolts of Persuading Customers, Prospects, Bosses, Lovers, and Politicians To See Things Your Way Special Report by America's Small Business Marketing Experts
Business Networking Essentials of Effective Networking by Victor Vidal	The great value of networking affirms that no single person can succeed alone when starting or promoting a small business. Here are the essential principles of effective networking.
Influencing Decision Makers by Illinois Library Association	This brochure contains useful, easy to read information on influencing third parties. It aims to support library advocates in representing the public interest at all levels of decision-making and in the support of legislators who will champion their cause. A university discussion paper. Lengthy, wordy but informative

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

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



Letter to Noelle
Rawe.doc

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!)

Bassett's [24.04.07-09h10](#) email

From: [Rawé, Noëlle](#)
Sent: 25 April 2007 13:45
To: [Bassett, Peter R](#); [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

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



Peter

As just discussed, please find **attached a signed copy of the below letter you sent me yesterday**. I can also give you the hard copy for my file.

<< File: 07.04.25_Noelle_Rawe_Internet_access.pdf >> [See ATTACHED]

By mistake - I used the same email setting: "*Subject: Confidential; Importance: High; Sensitivity: High*" - as Peter Bassett, partner, had done in his earlier email (below) at 9h10.

Bassett was continuing to have a good laugh, as ALL 'my colleagues' KNEW - since **30 Mar 07** (section 3.4 [KPMG pg](#)) that I was 'not allowed' to 'use the internet' e.g.

- **Header 4.5** of my **17.01.08** Grievance (section 11 [KPMG pg](#));
- **para.9** of my **03.04.08** Claim against KPMG (section 12) in [the Stratford Employment Tribunal](#) (section 16).

The decision to cut off my access to the internet (to which they added cutting me off from the entire network for 24 days) was communicated to me at **the 30 Mar 07 meeting** with Peter Bassett and Jeanette Dunworth, HR (see below).

WHAT THEY DID: They DELIBERATELY (1) cut me off as well from ALL the internal sites for nearly ONE MONTH – making it impossible for me to do my work (2)

(1) - ABSOLUTE PROOF that KPMG had done this DELIBERATELY – can be seen in the attached 23 Apr 07 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); **(3)**- para.8 of my **03.04.08** Claim against KPMG (section 12)):

"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"

(*) 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](#)); more on this towards the latter part of this document.

The decision to cut me off had been implemented by the time I returned to my desk.

Hence: it had been taken BEFORE the meeting took place = whatever I said during the meeting would be ignored.

Just as well that a 'Human Resources' representative was present at the meeting! HR = the henchmen of management...added to many others – as demonstrated by my experience in KPMG.

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" [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"

REASON for cutting me off the entire network for 24 days and then ask me to sign the letter?

To punish me for **'daring' to stand-up against – and expose - organized crime** by KPMG's **'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**.

(2) - As evidenced by the numerous emails I sent during Apr 07:

- my exchange of emails with Jeanette Dunworth, HR, between **30 Mar and 5 Apr 07** – saying: ***"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 **10.04.07-10h28** email to Dunworth that, ***"10 days, and I still cannot access any site"***;
- my **11.04.07-09h49** email to Hannah-Maria Talbot, KPMG IT, that ***"Still no action on addressing my lack of access to the majority of the intranet sites"***
- my **13.04.07-17h38** email to Dunworth that by then – **DAY 14** – I STILL HAD NO ACCESS
- my **17.04.07-10h44** email to Serena Patching, KPMG IT, that by – **DAY 18** – I WAS STILL BARRED FROM ACCESSING ALL THE SITES.

As also evidenced by the **23.04.07-11h34** email from Abhi Anand, KPMG IT, **it is only on that day that my access was restored = 24 DAYS LATER!!!!**

During that time, the thoroughly evil, 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) in the Stratford Employment Tribunal**;
- my **05.08.08** letter to [ACAS](#), **lines 87-129** and my follow on Comments (the 'points' in brackets refer to paras in my **03.04.08** Claim) (ACAS and [Stratford Employment Tribunal](#)), under **section 16 KPMG pg**).

They had been getting their sadistic kicks – **while having ABSOLUTE KNOWLEDGE that I was an innocent victim of organized crime** – as (among other) 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).

But, desperate to CONTINUE getting their sadistic kicks, **they FAILED to take action – until 23 Apr 07**.

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](#) against my [03.04.08](#) Claim, under **para.12(2)**, KPMG DENIED that *“it had caused me extreme distress”*.

As I reported in my [05.08.08](#) letter to [ACAS](#), under **lines 87-93**:

“[Quoting [para.12\(2\)](#) of KPMG’s ‘Defence’] “KPMG denies that it caused me “extreme distress” for practically the whole month of April 2007 (point 33.5) [of my Claim]

and that it implemented “supervised”, “limited relaxation of the restrictions” on access to the Internet to “allow [me] to continue [my] work and alleviate [my] alleged distress”.

“As I wrote in my [1 July 2008](#) request, the “limited relaxation” took place on [8 August 2007](#) (point 12). Hence, this was more than 4 months after barring me from

During my so-called 'performance appraisal' meetings **THEY POINT BLANK REFUSED TO TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION THE FACT THAT THEIR ACTION HAD PREVENTED ME FROM DOING MY WORK:**

PART 1, with **Ceri Hughes**, on **09.10.07** (I secretly recorded **(*)** – recording under **section 8.1 [KPMG pg](#)**) who threatened me with ending the meeting if I persisted in raising it- **lines 47-109**:

(*) As in the case of the evidence [on McGrigors](#), I only revealed this in 2015, when I launched the [KPMG pg](#).

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, HR (**section 9 [KPMG pg](#)**) - using the fabricated **05.08.07** 'feedback' 'from' 'my colleague', **Finbarr Geaney** (**section 9.4 [KPMG pg](#)**) - 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 187-244; 367-392; 734-737](#)**.

NOTE that **KPMG** repeated this very sick, libellous, highly cruel and vicious accusation under **para.11 of [its PACK OF LIES Defence](#)** (includes my Comments) (extracts below).

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”**

NOTE that they [Hughes, Bassett and Woodhouse] used this and other fabrications ‘to determine’ that ‘my training needs were so dire’, ‘that I needed’... no less than ‘a training coach’ (!!!): [line 817](#) ; [25.10.07-08h30](#) follow-up email from Bassett; sections 9.6 and 9.7 [KPMG pg](#)).

(It makes you wonder how I achieved [the feedback I received from staff and partners in my previous 9 years at KPMG](#) – doesn’t it?)

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 4.1 [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!** (section 4 [KPMG pg](#))]

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](#) i.e. with this email, '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.e. this 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*”

Ceri Hughes also FALSELY accused me of “***letting my personal problem interfere with my work***”: [lines 61-68](#). More on this in the following paragraphs.

(The henchwoman Ceri Hughes was always ready to assist KPMG in any way she could. Other example: ‘her’ [14.12.07](#) highly threatening letter to me).

PART 2, with Peter Bassett and Kathy Woodhouse, HR, on [24.10.07](#) (I, likewise, secretly recorded – recording under section 9.1 [KPMG pg](#)).

In order TO CONTINUE TO IGNORE the criminal actions they had taken against me ([Protection from Harassment Act 1997](#)), AND COVER THEM UP,...

...they continued to use the fabricated story they had fed to Finbarr Geaney (as reported above): [lines 188-244; 367-392; 734-737](#) - 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](#)) - from Feb 07 onwards to please the dear ‘brothers’, [Andrew David Ladsky](#) et.al. in the [Jewish-Freemason ‘Brotherhood’ \(Persecution # 6\)](#).

- As mentioned above, KPMG repeated this FALSE, highly vicious, cruel, perverse accusation in its [PACK OF LIES Defence](#) (section 14 [KPMG pg](#)) to my [03.04.08](#) Claim in the [Stratford Employment Tribunal](#) (section 16 [KPMG pg](#))– 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))

I also 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.

As I reported under e.g. **Header 4** of my [17.01.08](#) Grievance: at the 30 Mar 07 meeting, they did NOT provide me with a copy of Ladsky's alleged correspondence.

I only got a copy of it - **7 MONTHS LATER** - after KPMG forced to go into a 3-month battle following my [09.07.07](#) Subject Access Request (**Header 5** of my [17.01.08](#) Grievance; **section 7 KPMG pg**).

What KPMG then gave me was this very heavily redacted [26.03.07](#) letter from [Rachman Ladsky](#) – which, from what can still be read, is A PACK OF FALSE, HIGHLY VICIOUS, MALICIOUS, LIBELLOUS ACCUSATIONS AGAINST ME – WHICH KPMG **KNEW WERE FALSE** (letter covered under **section 3.5 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**).

Hence, my position that what took place was the outcome of a very sinister decision between [Peter Bassett – et.al. in KPMG](#) and in the [Jewish-Freemason ‘Brotherhood’ \(Persecution # 6\)](#) to punish me for ‘daring’ to stand up against organized crime (**Case summary** ; [Résumé de mon cas](#)).

(I may be wrong, but I suspect that [Peter Bassett](#) is Jewish – ‘[like Andrew David Ladsky](#)’. From Feb 07 onwards he certainly demonstrated the same extremely sick, vicious, cruel, sadistic, perverse psyche as [Ladsky and his Jewish gang of racketeers](#), as well as their Jewish supporters in [the judiciary \(Kangaroo courts\)](#), etc., etc. – and for whom he fell over backwards to assist).

And, of course, [Bassett and Dunworth](#), ‘Human resources’, NEVER gave me a record of the 30 Mar 07 meeting – **because they did not want to have any trace of it**.

(Re. **my previous meeting with them, on 13 Feb 07** (**sections 3.2 and 3.3 KPMG pg**), when I asked Bassett whether he would issue notes of it, he replied that he would not. I therefore opted to produce **my own Drat Notes I sent them on 20.02.07**).

Clearly not expecting me to do that, ‘Bassett’ (=KPMG lawyers – et.al. in ‘the Brotherhood’?) took more than 2 weeks to respond. In ‘his’ [07.03.07-17h20](#) email ‘Bassett’ wrote:

“I am sorry you felt it necessary to put your version of what was discussed in the meeting into a set of notes”...

...and – FALSELY - claimed:

“I do not believe these to be an accurate account of what we discussed”

As I reported in my [17.01.08](#) Grievance, **lines 82-86**, comparing [my Draft Notes](#) with his email, it can be seen that **I captured his points** (discussed under **sections 3.2 and 3.3. KPMG pg**).

They were ALL so concerned about the evidence I had that [KPMG](#) / on its behalf, its ‘brothers’: [Andrew David Ladsky](#) / others in the [Jewish-Freemason ‘Brotherhood’ \(Persecution # 6\)](#) -

approached my (then) private doctor (who is Jewish, 'like [Ladsky](#)'...and Bassett?) to:

- determine what evidence I had against KPMG – by getting him to ask me whether “[I had] *recorded [my] conversations at KPMG?*” (**section 13 [KPMG pg](#)**) (Needless to say that I did not tell him), and
- **get him to lie that I had not seen him 1 year previously**, when **[he had prescribed me an anti-depressant and tranquilisers](#)**,
- **a lie he then used as an excuse to not give me a referral to a psychiatrist** – for the purpose of ‘mitigating my loss’ in relation to my Claim against KPMG (**section 13 [KPMG pg](#)**).

Events also detailed in e.g. my **05.08.08** letter to [ACAS](#), **line 94 to my Comments after line 129**; my Comments also captured **under # 4** of the **08.05.07-13h29** email from BUPA Wellness at KPMG.

In May 08, one month after I saw ‘my’ doctor, **the colluding and conspiring** then **extended to the psychiatrist** I had found through a contact.

Within less than half an hour of ‘the consultation’ **he was trying to get me locked up in a mental institution** (**section 13(3) [KPMG pg](#)**)...thereby continuing with KPMG’s attempts, the previous year, to have me ‘officially certified’ as ‘**suffering from mental issues**’: **section 5 [KPMG pg](#)**; summary of events added to the **08.05.07** email from BUPA Wellness at KPMG.

The motive behind doing this? **So that KPMG could then 'safely' deny my claims:**

- its **22.05.08** rejection of my **17.01.08** Grievance (**section 11 [KPMG pg](#)**);
- its **[PACK OF LIES Defence](#)**, in which it demanded that my **03.04.08** Claim be “*struck out*”.

(NOTE that [Ladsky](#) **also stood to gain from it**: re. his (2nd) fraudulent claim against me of **27.02.07**, I had to serve [my Witness Statement](#) by **4 Jun 08**. The outcome of my doing it: it resulted in a **06.06.08** Notice of Discontinuance of “ALL the claims against me”) ([Overview # 11](#)).

Er...YES: That’s the KPMG that had ‘Values’ it summarised as: “[Above all, we act with integrity](#)”!

Ceri, in relation to my lack of access to the Internet sites detailed below [my [24.04.07-9h34 email](#)], or other sites, Peter said that you would need to put forward a business case [!!!!], and that he was the contact for this.

NOTE that [Bassett](#) was expecting my line manager, Ceri Hughes “*to put forward a business case [to justify my getting access to other sites]*” **!!!!!!!**

In her **25.04.07-15h28** email, Hughes replied: “*Other than webex.com, I am not immediately aware of other sites that you need to access*”

“*Other than Webex.com*” -

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

During my so-called ‘performance appraisal’ on **09.10.07** (**sections 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3 [KPMG pg](#)**), **Ceri Hughes** who criticised me for “*not developing contacts*” while, concurrently she was cutting

me off from activities – stressed the importance of “[my being] *on the Sharepoint calls*”: [lines 548-553](#) – i.e. the type of conference calls to which they cut off my access.

= **THEY WERE CONTINUING TO HAVE THEIR FUN**

= **THEY (of course) WERE CONTINUING WITH THEIR [CRIMINAL PSYCHOLOGICAL REGIME](#)**

Kind regards
Noëlle Rawé

As I reported under **lines 248-250** of my [17.01.08](#) Grievance:

“Once I had handed the signed letter to Peter Bassett, he could not hide his satisfaction, leading me to perceive him as though he was walking away with a trophy.”

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](#)*”

My view of the conduct of ‘my [KPMG](#) colleagues’, including in [the ‘health services’](#), of the KPMG partners (associating themselves with [their ‘brothers’ \(Persecution # 6\)](#)), of my doctor, of my acquaintance in East London (*): it 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

(*) To which I add [ALL the other parties](#) involved in one way or another in my case since 2001 – bar the 3 exceptions listed under [Overview # 7](#)

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

EMAIL FROM PETER BASSETT ATTACHING LETTER FOR ME TO SIGN 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

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



Letter to Noelle
Rawe.doc

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

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

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

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