

## ORIGINAL EMAIL

Follow up  
Please treat this as Confidential.

From: Bassett, Peter R  
To: Rawé, Noëlle  
Cc: Dunworth, Jeanette; Hughes, Ceri; Woodhouse, Kathy  
Subject: FW: Your year end review

Sent: Thu 25/10/2007 08:03

Dear Noelle

Thank you for meeting with us yesterday morning to complete your year-end review. I think it was a very useful opportunity to discuss the last year's performance and compare perspectives.

As we said in the meeting, there are a number of areas where we shall just have to agree to disagree in terms of the review and we shall note those on the Dialogue form. Once we have completed the form we shall send it to you before submitting it to the system.

More importantly we want to focus on the future and agreeing a way forward that not only meets the business needs but also provides you the opportunity to demonstrate fully your capabilities and build your skill base. This will involve agreeing a personal development plan and identifying a coach to help you. We also suggested that regular review against the plan would be important to ensure things are moving forward.

We shall look to set up a meeting between the three of us (you, Ceri and me) to work on this. It may be that this is not possible before the end of October, but we shall ensure this does not impact adversely on payment of any bonus.

kind regards  
Peter

**Peter Bassett**  
Global Advisory

From: [Bassett, Peter R](#)  
Sent: **25 October 2007 08:03**  
To: [Rawé, Noëlle](#)  
Cc: [Dunworth, Jeanette](#); [Hughes, Ceri](#); [Woodhouse, Kathy](#)  
Subject: FW: **Your year end review**  
Sensitivity: Confidential

Dear Noelle

Thank you for **meeting with us yesterday morning to complete your year-end review.**

**“meeting yesterday morning”** refers to **PART 2** of my so-called ‘performance appraisal’ on **24 Oct 07**, with **Peter Bassett**, partner, and **Kathy Woodhouse**, HR – I secretly recorded: [transcript](#); recording under **section 9.1** on the [KPMG page](#).

I think it was a **very useful opportunity to discuss the last year's performance** and **compare perspectives.**

**“very useful opportunity to discuss the last year's performance”**

**TRANSLATION:** For us **TO CONTINUE** to **IGNORE** the criminal actions we took against you, and our deliberately keeping you out of the loop on developments - that prevented you from doing your work - and cover-up what we had done by fabricating failings against you.

**(1)** - Cutting me off from **ALL** the websites for nearly one month – and then barring from using the Internet – including the **KPMG.com sites** – and consequently preventing me from being able to do my work.

During **PART 1** of my so-called ‘performance appraisal’ with my line manager, **Ceri Hughes**, on **09.10.07** (I, likewise, secretly recorded; recording under **section 8.1** KPMG pg), she **point blank**

refused to even discuss the issues I had included in the last part of my [Performance Appraisal form](#) that had seriously affected my ability to work.

(Events are discussed in e.g.:

- my [17.01.08](#) Grievance (that was dismissed by KPMG in its [22.05.08](#) 'response') (section 11 [KPMG pg](#));
- my [03.04.08](#) Claim against KPMG (section 12) in the [Employment Tribunal](#) (section 16) (which, in [its PACK OF LIES Defence](#), KPMG demanded that it be "struck out") (section 14);
- my [05.08.08](#) letter to [ACAS](#), and my [02.09.08](#) letter to the Stratford Employment Tribunal (section 16))

The below quotes (included under section 8.1 [KPMG pg](#)) are also included, among other, under my Comments # 4 on the [08.05.07-13h29](#) email to me from BUPA Wellness at KPMG (section 5 KPMG 'health services'). I am repeating them here: [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*** [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 FALSE 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! But they did! See last part of this document]. 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 – 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 endlessly reporting 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. !***

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

And, of course, **this treatment CONTINUED** during **PART 2**, the [24.10.07](#) meeting with **Bassett and Woodhouse** (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** ([05.08.07](#), 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, highly vicious, cruel and 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**) – 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).

- 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!** 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 – AS EVIDENCED BY E.G.**

- 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.
- the [23.04.07-11h34](#) email from Abhi Anand, KPMG IT – that **it is only on that day that my access to the internal sites 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 [Employment Tribunal](#) (section 16);
- 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](#)), are 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 \(point 12\)](#) [section 6(4) [KPMG pg](#)]. Hence, **this was more than 4 months after barring me from accessing the Internet on [30 March 2007](#).**”**

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.

## **(2) - My being deliberately cut out of the loop on information necessary for me to progress with my work**

For extracts of quotes from my [09.10.07](#) meeting with **Ceri Hughes**, see her [02.07.07-09h13](#) email to me.

For the [24.10.07](#) meeting, see my next Comments, below.

As we said in the meeting, **there are a number of areas where we shall just have to agree to disagree in terms of the review** and we shall note those on the Dialogue form.

Oh yeah! **THERE SURE WERE AREAS OF “DISAGREEMENT”** between [me](#), [Peter Bassett and Kathy Woodhouse](#)! E.g. from the [transcript of the 24.10.07 meeting](#) (sections 9.1 to 9.7 [KPMG pg](#)):

**KW** – Lines 64-65: “...*But there were some areas in the business goals that have been agreed that in her view, you had failed to meet*”

**Me** – Lines 66-73: “*In her view. However, my counterargument to that was that this meeting took place. If I had a key role to play, I should have at least been able to attend that part of the meeting. Or, as the project lead, she should have said to me afterwards...*”

*...without any information, she said that I had to ask her...how was I going to know when the meeting took place? How many times am I supposed to ask? I mean, she is the project lead on those.*”

So, for me, I felt: **yes, I was waiting**”

**KW** – Line 76: “*That she expected you to demonstrate more initiative. Would that be fair?*”

**Me** – Lines 77 -86: “**More initiative**, but I mean: **how many times can I ask?**”...when you have meetings...: *if somebody is meant to be playing a key role in some part, you actually include them in the stages before that – and I was not included in that; I was not copied on anything.*



*What were the outcomes? What were the action points? I did not know.*

*So for me, in my defence, I would say: well, okay, I did ask; but how many times am I meant to ask? As a project lead, when I was managing projects, I'd get back to people and tell them what had happened"*

**KW** – Lines 87-88: *"So, in summary then Peter, I don't know if you want to add anything, in summary, I think what we have is a difference of opinion regarding business goal achievements."*

**KW** – Lines 92-98: *"...in her view, she felt that you could have achieved more. Your account is that there were blocks...and it's probably as well to acknowledge this earlier, that there would be elements, as in any appraisal, that we are going to agree to disagree.*

*Are we happy Peter that we agree to disagree?"*

**PB** – Line 99: *"Yeah, as far as I am concerned"*

**KW** – Lines 102-104: *"I think in truth the more important point is that we acknowledge the things that we do agree about, and agree to disagree on the things that we don't agree about"*

**Me** - Lines 105-106: *"When I find myself being cut off and isolated from what is going on, it's rather difficult for me to then be able to perform my activities"*

**Me** - Lines 115-117: *"Again we are back to what I was saying earlier on: that all the work I was doing was actually to prepare before having that meeting with the industries. There was this meeting that was scheduled, which I was not asked to attend."*

**PB** – Lines 262-266: *"...one of the things clearly that Ceri feels is that maybe you should not be working quite so much in isolation, and should have been more engaged with the rest of the team in what you were doing.*

*But, euh, in doing the KM event, clearly you were very active and involved with people. And since, it would seem that you have not been"* [Funny that! How I suddenly transformed overnight into a totally different person!]

**Me** – Lines 265: *"Because I was reviewing 130 sites. How can I work with other people?..."* [Hughes was asking me to do work that only I could do - as she said at [lines 371-372](#): "you are one of the few people who has that overview of all the service lines" Note also Bassett saying this at [lines 275-277](#))

**KW** – Lines 287-288: *"Can you see that about the way you work, or the way that this last year has been. Do you think that it is a fair summary?"*

**Me** – Line 289: *"The nature of the work has been such that it has really isolated me"*

**Me** – Line 296: *"Yeah, but I was being isolated; I was not actually being copied on what was going on."*

**KW** – Lines 297-298: *"Were you being isolated, or were you becoming more isolated, you know. Because it's a little bit of both, isn't it, it seems to me?"*

**Me** – Lines 299-301: *"As I explained earlier on, in terms of the services and the industries, I had done all of this work, I had prepared the slide packs; I wasn't given feedback; meeting took place.*

So, for me, the message was: that I am being cut out.”

**KW** – Lines 302-303: “Did you ever asked, or did you ever said, because, again going back to Peter’s point, that proactive thing, saying: you know, I am feeling, I am getting a bit more (?), what can I do?”

**Me** – Lines 304-310: “I asked. I asked what was the outcome, rather than actually bringing in the emotion of ‘how I feel’. I asked Ceri: what’s happening? What has been the feedback, because I did also another one in terms of Global Valuation as well. That again was going to be presented at meetings. And again, you know: nothing.”

As I said, for me, as a project lead, for me, I have managed projects and I have always made sure that I kept in touch with the team, I communicated what had happened. I can show you how I work”

**PB** – Lines 435-446: “I just wondered you know, coming back to the point we were talking about earlier, in terms of solo working and everything else, and feeling isolated, whether, you know, sometimes, training courses is a great way just to get out of the office for a couple of days, and to meet with some other people...”

And that maybe you should consider looking at some of these courses...”

**Me** – Lines 447-448: “I think that I have no problem establishing contact with people, and I have demonstrated that”

**Me** - Lines 452-457: “But, for me, it would be a lot better to be able to really get on with the service lines and the industries. And I have said, I have specified [on my form] that there needed to be senior level management commitment...to be able to do it; that the plan had to be worked out. I cannot just develop things in isolation”

**PB** – Lines 458-463: “Do you think you’re maybe in slightly the wrong role then; talking previously about your project management experience, and everything else like that.

But at the moment, you haven’t got the ability to actually, sort of get a project and manage it...”

**Me** – Line 464: “The industries and the services are the ideal thing for me”

**PB** – Lines 465-466: “Okay, but from what I understood, you don’t feel that you are actually project-managing that, because you are not included in some of the”

**Me** – Lines 467-470: “Well yeah, and that’s exactly what needs to be clarified, because, you know, these were my objectives, and my expectations were: I had done all of that review; I had put together the summary points...then we were going to move on to the next stage, the exciting bit...”

(Lines 520-522: Bassett suggesting that the reason ‘I was not pushing Hughes was because I might have been worried about the answer!)

**Me** – Lines 531-532: “I asked when the meetings were going to take place. Then I asked again: what happened? Then I thought: okay. I got the message...I was not going to be part of that.”

**Me** – Lines 725-726: “Well no, because of what’s been happening. If I don’t feel that I am being part of it. If I feel that I am being cut out. If I feel that I am, you know...”

*And please, you know: I can see things, I can feel them”*

**KW** – Lines 727-729: “So,...how do we draw a line under this year? I think, you know, we will agree to disagree,…”

**KW** – Lines 806-807: “...with regards to this year’s appraisal, I actually think that **there should be quite a quite large ‘agree to disagree’ on various things”**

**PB** – Line 808: “Hum”

**KW** – Line 863: “In terms of performance rating, where did you put yourself?”

**Me** – Lines 864-865: “For me, I put ‘strong performance’”. From what I was thinking: in terms of the quality of my work; it cannot be faulted.”

**KW** – Lines 867-869: “We’ve got these two extremes going on here. There is no doubt that the work that has been produced is of very high quality. But, you’ve got some goals that have been missed because you’ve been waiting for directions”

**Me** – Lines 870-875: “And also because they could not actually proceed,…”

**Me** – Lines 896-897: “...it’s the lack of opportunity I have been able to get, and partly due to the nature and the events that have taken place” (\*)

**PB** – Lines 897-902: “We’ve sort of covered that [\*], and we’ve agreed that there is a difference of views in a number of areas. But, for the sake of the appraisal that we have to do a merit rating, and are now looking at ‘NI-8’...”

**KW** – Lines 903-904: “I think we should put a note on there: again, a difference in the points of view; that both parties have agreed that the most important thing is to move forward”

(\*) “the nature and the events that have taken placed” – I reported in the [last part of my Performance Appraisal form](#) “[were NOT] covered” either during this meeting.

On my form (pg 24), the comments included: “this has not been the best year for Noëlle in a number of ways”.

This was repeated ad-infinitum during the [24.10.07](#) meeting:

[Kathy Woodhouse, HR](#):

1. Line 393: “this has not been your best year; it hasn’t been the happiest year...”
2. Line 646: “It sounds to me like, you’ve had a really difficult year”
3. Line 648: “A really, really difficult year...”
4. Line 664: “it’s not been a happy year for you...”
5. Lines 670-671: “...this has not been the best year...”
6. Lines 698-699: “...I mean, quite honestly, I think, you know, this year it has been tough...”
7. Lines 728-729: “...whatever way, it’s hasn’t been a fantastic year for us, and it won’t have been a fantastic year for you”
8. Line 861: “...it’s not been a great year.”

9. Line 921: "*It's been a bad year*"

Peter Bassett, partner:

10. Line 879-880: "...*it has not been a good year all around*"

– **INSTEAD** of admitting the TRUE REASON behind it: the extremely cruel, vicious, sadistic, perverse actions taken against me by KPMG – they ignored by pushing them under the banner of: "*we will agree to disagree*"

**Once we have completed the form we shall send it to you** before submitting it to the system.

As I reported in my 07.11.07-09h53 email to Bassett, Woodhouse, Hughes, and Jeanette Dunworth, HR – by then i.e. **2 WEEKS LATER** the form had NOT been returned to me.

Note the comment from **Hughes** in her 17.10.07-12h33 email to me: "*it is important that we finalise your appraisal as soon as possible*" (the email includes my Comments).

= **IT WAS A VERY BLATANT CONTINUATION OF THE CRIMINAL PSYCHOLOGICAL HARASSMENT (Persecution # 1)** (extracts from a Canadian website)...

...by Peter Bassett - who had been the kingpin in relation to the actions taken against me since Oct 06 – to please 'the brothers' Andrew David Ladsky et.al. in the Jewish-Freemason mafia (Persecution # 6)

...– **motivated by a very sinister, Machiavellian plan**: section 5.2 KPMG pg; my Comments on my Draft Notes of the 13 Feb 07 meeting with Bassett and Dunworth (he had brought in through the back door) (**sections 3.1 to 3.3 KPMG pg**).

More importantly **we want to focus on the future** and agreeing a way forward that not only meets the business needs but also provides you the opportunity to demonstrate fully your capabilities and build your skill base.

This will involve agreeing a personal development plan and **identifying a coach to help you**. We also suggested that regular review against the plan would be important to ensure things are moving forward.

**YEP! 'My training needs' were 'so dire' that 'I needed' no less than "a training coach"!** Kathy Woodhouse, line 817; sections 9.6 and 9.7 KPMG pg.

**= They had to seal their 'assessment' of 'my training needs' = seal their cover-up of the criminal actions taken against me.**

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?

**We shall look to set up a meeting between the three of us (you, Ceri and me)** to work on this. **It may be that this is not possible before the end of October**, but **we shall ensure this does not impact adversely on payment of any bonus.**

The meeting did not take place because of other events (see from **section 10 KPMG pg**).

"*bonus payment*" – the 22.10.07 policy reminder that stated: "*if you do not have your agreed Goals for the year ahead recorded in the Dialogue system by 31 October 2007, your bonus will be postponed until February 2008*"

kind regards [YEAH! RIGHT!]  
Peter

**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’ ([section 5 KPMG pg](#)), of the KPMG partners (associating themselves with [their ‘brothers’ \(Persecution # 6\)](#)), of ‘my’ doctor ([section 13 KPMG pg](#)), of my acquaintance in East London ([08.05.07-13h29](#) email from BUPA Wellness at KPMG containing my summary of events) (\*): **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.**