

ORIGINAL EMAIL

From: Hughes, Ceri Sent: Mon 02/07/2007 09:13
To: Rawé, Noëlle
Cc:
Subject: Year end forms

N - I know you are waiting for me to come back to you on the people network evaluation you did. In the meantime I would suggest that you start looking through your other business goals and identify other areas that you might need to address prior to year end. I know you did some work on your development planning last week, which is good, but you need to make sure you can give a clear account of progress in all areas of the form.
Thanks, Ceri

From: [Hughes, Ceri](#) [MY LINE MANAGER, KPMG Director and henchwoman in my case]
Sent: 02 July 2007 09:13
To: [Rawé, Noëlle](#)
Subject: Year end forms

Note that this email is ONLY addressed to me.

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



N - I know you are waiting for me to come back to you on the people network evaluation you did.

Hughes was CONTINUING to play games of ignoring me, deliberately keeping me out of the loop on developments.

REASON? So that during my so-called 'performance appraisal' meetings (I secretly recorded – recordings under sections 8.1 and 9.1 [KPMG page](#)) she, Peter Bassett, partner, and Kathy Woodhouse, HR, would then throw at me as “demonstrating lack of initiative” e.g. (discussed under sections 8.2 and 9.3 KPMG pg):

09.10.07 – with Ceri Hughes - Lines 428 – 465:

CH: “I am thinking again about the work you did around the people networks, the elements of what was present and what was not all of the people networks, using [colleague's] valuations as the model.

That again, the ideal next step for you, or the logical next step that I would have expected you, you personally, and someone in your grade and with experience to do is, when you identified a network, any network that has very few of these elements, that you start talking to them about that, you know, and discussing the fact that they've only got a distribution list and they haven't got anything else, and giving them the example of valuations, or whatever [I interrupted]”

Me: “Again, communications breakdown, because I was waiting that, that. You told me to do a PowerPoint pack”

CH: “And you did! But I did not expect you to think that it was the end point or the break point”

Me: “Okay, well for me, it was the milestone out of which would then come actions from that: what was their response; what did they say; that, I don’t know. What did the service lines leaders say? I don’t know. I thought, you know, that there would there be follow-up. I was waiting for the follow-up to that”

CH: “Okay [sigh]. Well, what I need you to do moving forward is be much more vocal about that”

Me: “Okay”

CH: “Because I don’t want you to be sitting, thinking: I did all that work and I have not heard anything. So, what was that work about?”

Me: “Which is why I have been saying, you know, it’s a huge amount of work”

CH: “And I can understand you feeling that. But what I can’t is why you have not said: I did all that work on the people networks, and did that presentation for you, and there is a lot more that could be done, but I am not doing it because you haven’t given me any feedback”

Me: “Okay”

CH: “And that I think, **actually, it’s a critical point Noëlle.** It will relate later as we talk about skills and behaviours. **It’s something I think that you really need to take on board, because, you, it’s about, it’s the accountability skill or behaviour or competence.**

Where you feel that you’ve done work, you’ve taken ownership for the work that you’ve done, and then it needs to go to the next level. **If you are not feeling that you are not getting that from me or whoever it is, then you need to drive:** well I am not just going to sit here and think about it, I am going to ask: where is it.

And if you ask once and don’t get a satisfactory result, then you ask again you know, or you follow it up more formally. But, you need to make sure that you are not just sitting waiting for someone. And I take your point: you are not sitting there twiddling your thumbs, but you are not waiting for someone to give you feedback when actually that might be the first thing on their mind, you know. In the case of me I think you are continuing to do work in that area.

So, as you say, there is a breakdown in the communication because I am thinking you are doing one thing and you are waiting for me to do another, and time is going on”

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

(In the case of the [24.10.07 meeting – with Peter Bassett and Kathy Woodhouse, HR](#), see my extract of quotes towards the end of my [05.08.08](#) letter to [ACAS](#)).

In the meantime I would suggest that you start looking through your other business goals and identify other areas that you might need to address prior to year end.

I know you did some work on your development planning last week, which is good, but **you need to make sure you can give a clear account of progress in all areas of the form.**

= Preparing the ground!

“**make sure you can give a clear account**”... that I, Peter Bassett and Kathy Woodhouse **WILL THEN TOTALLY IGNORE** i.e. what you wrote in your Performance Appraisal; what you said during your appraisal meetings.

At the end of **my 2006-07 Performance Appraisal form**, I captured “**the context in which I had had to work**” – which was, from Feb 07, horrendous, ongoing **criminal psychological harassment** that impacted on my ability to perform my work – as detailed e.g. in my **17.01.08 Grievance** to KPMG; under **sections 3.4, 4 and 6 KPMG pg.**

WHAT TOOK PLACE at my so-called ‘performance appraisal’:

- During **PART 1** on **9 Oct 07** (recording under **section 8.1 KPMG pg**), **Ceri Hughes**, **refused point-blank to take into consideration the actions taken against me by KPMG** that had not only prevented me from doing my work, but also had a devastating impact on me (**section 4.1 KPMG pg**) – 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 my 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 [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 **FALSE**, highly vicious, cruel and perverse accusation under para.11 of [its PACK OF LIES Defence](#) (includes my Comments).

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 it 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 – Lines 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](#) ‘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”***

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.

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

- During **PART 2**, on [24.10.07](#) (I, likewise, secretly recorded – recording under **section 9.1 KPMG pg**), **Peter Bassett, partner, and Kathy Woodhouse, HR**, did the same thing.

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

...they continued to use their fabricated story they had fed to Finbarr Geaney ([05.08.07](#) email, as reported above) [lines 187-244; 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 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](#) (section 16), line 148 to my Comments after line 180 (the 'points' in brackets refer to paras in my [03.04.08](#) Claim)

- NOTE also 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, demanding that I 'agree' to be barred from using the internet (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! 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](#)). I had to battle with KPMG to finally get this highly redacted version – 7 MONTHS LATER (section 7 [KPMG pg](#)).

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 from IT)

And 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

that it made feel like a 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.

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](#) in the [Employment Tribunal](#) (section 12);
- 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](#).

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,...

...and 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 accessing the Internet on 30 March 2007.**" [section 6(4) **KPMG pg**]

As to deliberately keeping me out of the loop on events, in the dark: well, 'of course', it was 'my fault, for "**not being proactive**"!...

...they then used '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 Peter 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?)