

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



MAIN POINTS

See [KPMG's 22.05.08 PACK OF LIES 'response'](#) (includes my Comments)

- 1 Summary and conclusions .....4
- 2 Introduction.....5
- 3 At the 13 February 2007 meeting I was reprimanded by Peter Bassett for using my work computer to send emails to the media about my website. Also, for looking at my website, and 'apparently' *"sending notification of the relaunch of my website to other websites"*. My staying very late in the office was also commented upon .....5
- 3.1 Peter Bassett said to have no intention of issuing me with notes of the 13 February 2007 meeting, leading me to issue my own notes for Peter and Jeanette Dunworth's comments. Peter described my notes as *"not an accurate account of what was discussed"* .....5
- 4 At the 30 March 2007 meeting it was decided to immediately stop my access to the Internet *"to protect me and KPMG"* following (what I was told at the time) an accusation made against me by Mr Andrew Ladsky that my website ([www.leasehold-outrage.com](http://www.leasehold-outrage.com)) *"contains anti-Semitic comments"* .....7
- 4.1 In spite of this major action taken against me – that involved HR – I was not issued with notes of the 30 March meeting .....7
- 4.2 Not only was my access to the Internet cut-off, my access to the majority of the internal sites was also cut-off - leading to my being practically unable to perform my work.....8
- 4.3 On 24 April 2007 I was asked to sign a letter agreeing to be barred from using the Internet. On meeting this condition, my access to internal sites was resumed on 25 April 2007 .....10
- 4.4 In spite of my continuously highlighting my plight, I was left to endure lack of access to the internal sites for nearly one month, causing me an enormous amount of distress and torment such that I ended-up getting medical treatment and took time off my annual leave .....11
- 4.5 My being cut-off from accessing the sites made me feel like a pariah, very isolated, and was a degrading, demeaning and humiliating experience as, in an attempt to do my work, I had to ask colleagues to look up information for me. This has continued ever since as my access to the Internet continues to be cut-off, contributing to a whispering campaign about me.....13
- 4.6 After 25 April 2007 I could access the Internet, leading to anguish when I inadvertently did so .....13
- 4.7 My access to the Internet appears to have been physically cut-off sometime in September 2007. In the process it has stopped my access to two 'permissible' sites...14
- 4.8 The outcome of barring me from accessing the Internet means that I have been unable to perform part of my tasks.....14
- 4.9 In August 2007, my being 'allowed' to access the Internet on the condition that I use a spare computer confirmed my perception that the true motive in imposing the draconian measure against me in April 2007, including letting me suffer a whole month of anguish and distress, is to humiliate and demean me. Concurrently, I

	cannot help perceiving it as ‘punishment’ for ‘daring’ to stand-up and fight for my rights against a rogue landlord and his equally rogue aides .....	14
5	My 9 July 2007 Subject Access Request under the Data Protection Act 1998 was met with stonewalling from KPMG Compliance, leading me to have to go into battle to determine what Mr Andrew Ladsky had communicated about me to KPMG – which fuelled my perception that KPMG was ‘siding’ with him against me.....	15
5.1	At the 13 February 2007 meeting I was not told that Mr Andrew Ladsky had contacted KPMG, thereby denying me the opportunity to defend myself against his accusations .....	17
5.2	At the 30 March 2007 meeting I was also denied the opportunity to defend myself against accusations made against me by Mr Andrew Ladsky. Why? .....	17
5.3	Is the withholding, during the meetings, of all but one of the accusations made against me by Mr Ladsky the reason why Peter Bassett did not want to have notes of either meeting?.....	18
6	My performance appraisal process amounts to harassment, bullying, discrimination and victimisation over a period of three and a half months, eventually resulting in an assessment I view as the ‘last straw’.....	18
6.1	I was made to endure a 10-week wait before finally having what turned out to be ‘part 1’ of my performance appraisal on 9 October 2007. The delay, said to have been caused by “ <i>waiting to hear from HR</i> ” in relation to what I wrote in the last section on my form, turned out to be untrue, as my comments were totally ignored .....	19
6.2	My being made to miss the official deadlines for completion of the process – with its ensuing financial penalty - caused me to suffer ongoing anguish and distress .....	20
6.3	On three occasions during my 9 October 2007 ‘part 1’ performance review, Ceri Hughes threatened to end the meeting if I persisted on raising the events that had taken place. She proceeded with imparting failings against me I disagree with. Having led me to believe that my appraisal would take place ‘the KPMG Way’, fifty five minutes into the meeting, she announced that she was ending it on the ground of needing “ <i>to go to another meeting</i> ” .....	21
6.4	Contrary to what had been agreed with Ceri Hughes, the completion of my performance review did not take place by the end of the week, leading me to perceive events as a continuation of the harassment and bullying tactics intended to torment me, demean and humiliate me.....	24
6.5	With part of my performance appraisal review still outstanding by close of play on 12 October 2007, and no confirmation that the deadline had indeed been further extended, I opted to send an email to Jeanette Dunworth, HR, on 15 October to report events .....	25
6.6	The outcome was a change of appraisers from Ceri Hughes to Peter Bassett and Kathy Woodhouse, leading to ‘part 2’ of my appraisal being conducted on 24 October 2007 i.e. nearly three months after I had filed my appraisal form on the system – and one week later than the ‘absolute deadline’ for completing the performance appraisal process.....	25
6.7	While attendance by Kathy Woodhouse at ‘part 2’ of my performance appraisal was positioned as “ <i>ensuring a fair and independent assessment</i> ”, I view the meeting as a	

continuation of fabricating failings against me which, while disagreement on these was recognised, nonetheless resulted in my being assessed overall as '8-NI': "Your overall performance does not meet the requirements and immediate improvement is required". And this assessment was made in the context of describing my work as being "of very high quality" .....25

6.8 I retained the hope that, post the 24 October 2007 meeting, consideration of my replies during the meeting would lead to a change of position on my overall assessment rating of '8-NI'. When, as a result of chasing, my form was finally returned to me two weeks later, on 8 November 2007 – the position had clearly remained unchanged. This was 'the final straw' for me .....31

7 Contrary to the assertions made, events demonstrate that KPMG wants me to leave and that, instead of saying it, resorted to highly underhanded tactics to force me to leave .....33

8 As to the offers of help and assertions of being "concerned" about me, considering the treatment I have been made to endure since February 2007, I have come to view them as KPMG 'beating me up' on the one hand, and offering to attend to my wounds on the other. Furthermore, as having the ulterior motive of finding something to use against me .....34

9 There are numerous other events I view as instances of discrimination / victimisation / harassment / bullying / invasion of my privacy .....37

9.1 It is evident that everything I do on my computer is closely monitored .....37

9.2 There has been a number of 'interesting' coincidences, suggesting that my telephone conversations are also closely monitored – as well as, it would appear, my website .....37

9.3 There has been an 'obsession' with what I do outside of work, often disguised under the "concerned about you" 'trump card'. I view what has taken place as harassment, bullying and invasion of my privacy .....38

9.4 I perceive my being made to hotdesk as being motivated by an intention to humiliate and demean me, as well as make my working conditions difficult .....40

9.5 There are other incidents ..... 40

I believe that the facts stated in this document are true.

I signed it, and stated the date

1 **1 Summary and conclusions**

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



2 Since the early part of 2007, I perceive myself as having been subjected to treatment that  
3 amounts to harassment, bullying, discrimination and victimisation.

4 Having denied me the opportunity to defend myself against false accusations made against me  
5 by Mr [Andrew Ladsky](#), the landlord/person fronting the ownership of the block where I own a  
6 leasehold flat, [KPMG](#) proceeded to take action against me. For nearly one month, this action  
7 prevented me from performing the majority of my work and had a devastating impact on me.  
8 Some curtailment of my ability to work has continued as a result of being banned from accessing  
9 the Internet at the end of March 2007.

10 Instead of acknowledging what took place – in spite of my persistently raising the need to do so  
11 – I perceive that failings have been fabricated against me as a means of covering-up events,  
12 and as excuses for going back on my “realistic target” of being promoted to senior manager this  
13 year.

14 Events lead me to the perception that KPMG is ‘siding’ with Mr Ladsky against me. Firstly, the  
15 initial failure to communicate to me the accusations made against me by Mr Ladsky and the  
16 subsequent attempt by Compliance to deny me access to his communications about me to  
17 KPMG.

18 Secondly, the fact that, in August 2007, I was ‘allowed’ to access the Internet on the condition  
19 that I use a spare computer. (The ban imposed on me - that entailed making me sign a letter of  
20 agreement - is not computer dependent).

21 I perceive that I have endured treatment that cannot be regarded as acceptable under the  
22 implied terms of my contract of employment. (Some is also against KPMG policies and Values).  
23 My allowing this to happen is due to the ‘huge amount of credit’ accumulated by KPMG in my  
24 esteem since joining the firm in 1997.

25 The assertions, yet again repeated at the beginning of January 2008 that KPMG wants me to  
26 stay are most definitely not supported by events. These events demonstrate that KPMG wants  
27 me to leave and that, instead of saying it, resorted to highly underhanded tactics to force me to  
28 leave. This causes me to feel a breach of trust and confidence.

29 The outcome of my performance appraisal is the ‘last straw’. I can no longer allow myself to be  
30 subjected to abuse, and believe that the situation allows me to consider myself as having been  
31 constructively dismissed.

32 I was looking forward to staying at KPMG and being promoted to senior manager. My work is  
33 described as being of “very high quality”, and I am perceived as having very good knowledge  
34 and understanding of KPMG and of the Advisory business, as well as undisputed business  
35 understanding. Hence, ingredients that would allow me to continue on adding value to the firm.

36 Considering my age and the limited market in which my expertise can be applied, the implication  
37 of losing my job at KPMG (through no fault of my own) means that I have no chance of finding a  
38 similar position. I intend to pursue compensation for my anticipated financial loss.

39 **2 Introduction**

40 This document relates events that have taken place since the beginning of 2007. (The extent of  
41 detail is attributable to the fact that I have maintained a comprehensive diary of events since  
42 February 2007, as well as kept copies of emails).

43 Abbreviations:

- **PB:** Peter Bassett, HR Partner for my group
- **KW:** Kathy Woodhouse, “independent” HR contact for [‘part 2’ of my performance appraisal](#)
- **CH:** Ceri Hughes, my Line Manager
- **HMT:** Hannah-Maria Talbot, stand in HR contact for Jeanette Dunworth
- **JD:** Jeanette Dunworth, HR contact for my group
- **SP:** Serena Patching, IT support

44 **3 At the 13 February 2007 meeting I was reprimanded by Peter Bassett for using my**  
45 **work computer to send emails to the media about my website. Also, for looking at my**  
46 **website, and ‘apparently’ “sending notification of the relaunch of my website to other**  
47 **websites”. My staying very late in the office was also commented upon**

48 On **12 February 2007** PB asked me whether I could attend a “half-hour catch-up meeting” the  
49 following day. I replied affirmatively and asked what I needed to prepare. “Nothing” was the  
50 reply. After 10 minutes I went to his office, saying “I can’t stand the suspense. Can you please  
51 tell me what you want to discuss tomorrow”. Reply: “It’s just a catch-up meeting”

52 **13 February 2007** – When PB came to get me from my desk, I expected that would be just him  
53 and I and that we were going to meet in his office. However, as I started to move from my desk,  
54 he told me that the meeting was taking place on the 5<sup>th</sup> floor (we were located on the lower  
55 ground floor in Salisbury Square). To this I replied: “that sounds serious!”

56 As we are about to reach the 5<sup>th</sup> floor in the lift, **PB said that he had asked somebody from HR to**  
57 **attend the meeting**. The HR person, JD, was already in the room when we arrived. I had not met  
58 her before. **The situation felt to me like an ambush**. (See below for what took place)

59 [CH was not informed](#) of this meeting and I did not get the chance to tell her as I did not know  
60 what the meeting was about. I contacted her in the middle of the afternoon to say that [I was](#)  
61 [leaving the office](#) and would also be taking the morning off as annual leave. **I was extremely**  
62 **upset by the manner in which the meeting had been handled**. This, added to relating my  
63 desperate situation during the meeting, had led me to be unable to control the tears. (I checked  
64 into a hotel, the only place I could go to feel secure).

The 13 Feb 07 meeting and related events are discussed under <b>sections 3.1 to 3.3</b> . <a href="#">KPMG pg</a>
---

65 **3.1 Peter Bassett said to have no intention of issuing me with notes of the 13 February**  
66 **2007 meeting, leading me to issue my own notes for Peter and Jeanette Dunworth’s**  
67 **comments. Peter described my notes as “not an accurate account of what was**  
68 **discussed”**

69 **14 February 2007** – As, in reply to my question, **PB said that he was not going to issue notes of**  
70 **the meeting**, I decided to capture my own. As I wrote in my notes: “Peter replied that I would not

71 *be getting a note, as it was not a formal warning. That, as he had said in the meeting, if I*  
72 *continued, then the next time would be. Given that if such meeting were to take place, the*  
73 *meeting on 13 February would be referred to, I wish the events to be recorded”*

74 I also told PB *“The only thing that was missing from the situation yesterday was a pair of*  
75 *handcuffs”* I was still feeling very emotional about it. As I added *“I have nothing to reproach*  
76 *myself”*, I could barely control the tears and left his office.

77 *My version of what took place* during the meeting is captured in the document *“[Summary of 13](#)*  
78 *[February 2007 meeting with Peter Bassett and Jeanette Dunworth, HR](#)”*<sup>1</sup>

79 *“My version”* as, when I sent my document to PB and JD for their comments on [20 February](#)  
80 [2007](#), as an attachment to an email, and cc'd CH<sup>2</sup>, *PB replied* on [7 March 2007](#)<sup>3</sup> that what I  
81 captured is *“not an accurate account of what was discussed”*.

82 Comparing my notes and his email of 7 March it can be seen that I captured his points:

- 83 (1) I had been using my KPMG computer to send emails to the media;
- 84 (2) I had been using my computer to look at my website;
- 85 (3) I was staying in the office very late;
- 86 (4) the repeated offer to use the WellBeing service.

87 In his 7 March 2007 email, PB also wrote *“there have been occasions when you relaunched your*  
88 *Web site and sent notification of the relaunch to other Web sites...which have lead to KPMG’s*  
89 *address appearing on those sites”* *I do not remember doing this.*

90 In relation to *sending emails to the media*: although I did write prominently on the emails that  
91 they were *“[sent in my personal capacity and not in my capacity as an employee of KPMG](#)”*, I  
92 recognise that, (while I had a desperate need at the time), I should not have done this as it made  
93 a connection with KPMG.

94 Against that, *I hold the view that I have not done anything that brings shame on KPMG*. Indeed, I  
95 believe that any fair minded, reasonable person looking at my website would endorse my  
96 position that my conduct since 2002 in relation to my personal problem actually reflects [KPMG’s](#)  
97 [Code of Conduct and Values](#): throughout I have acted with integrity, e.g. (for as long as I could) I  
98 refused to be treated differently from the other residents in my block by ‘striking a deal’; I have  
99 spoken against breaches of legislation and regulations, and I held, and continue to hold my  
100 ground in spite of repeated pushback and rejections, etc. *The irony is that it is my behaving in*  
101 *this manner that has led to my current situation.*

102 *In [my notes of the meeting](#) I also captured*: (1) the manner in which the meeting was handled;  
103 (2) my providing an overview of my situation, including fear for my safety when I am in the flat –  
104 leading me to stay late in the office; (3) in reply to the offer of contacting WellBeing, my  
105 repeating (as I done on 6 August 2006 during a meeting with HR) that talking endlessly about  
106 my situation was of no help to me whatsoever, what I required was action and I simply could not

---

<sup>1</sup> [07.02.14\\_DRAFT\\_Events\\_Peter\\_Bassett\\_HR](#)

<sup>2</sup> [07.02.20\\_2PBassett\\_JDunworth\\_ccHughes\\_my\\_Notes\\_13Feb07\\_meet](#)

<sup>3</sup> [07.03.07\\_Peter\\_Bassett\\_follow-up\\_my\\_notes\\_of\\_13\\_Feb\\_meeting](#)

107 see how KPMG could help. Nonetheless, because of the pressure placed on me, I agreed to set-  
108 up a meeting with WellBeing.

109 I sent CH my draft notes of the 13 February meeting on [Sunday 18 February](#) and we met the  
110 following day to discuss. I 'think' that she then followed-up with HR.

111 **4 At the 30 March 2007 meeting it was decided to immediately stop my access to the**  
112 **Internet "to protect me and KPMG" following (what I was told at the time) an**  
113 **accusation made against me by Mr Andrew Ladsky that my website ([www.leasehold-](#)**  
114 **[outrage.com](#)) "contains anti-Semitic comments"**

115 **On 30 March 2007** I was asked by PB to attend a "further follow-up meeting" with him and JD [at](#)  
116 [12h00](#)<sup>4</sup>.

117 Unlike at the 13 February meeting, JD did the talking. She informed me that Mr [Ladsky](#) had  
118 approached KPMG claiming that my website "contains anti-Semitic comments" – and that he  
119 was "very persistent".

120 I said that two weeks previously [Kensington & Chelsea police](#) had contacted my website host  
121 making the same false claim (\*). While the police did not reveal the identity of the complainant,  
122 the connection was now obvious. During the meeting, I related the events with the police and  
123 offered to supply the emails sent by the police to my website host – which I did after the meeting  
124 (to PB). (For follow-up on these emails, see section towards the end of this document "...a  
125 number of 'interesting coincidences...")

126 (\*) In its initial email to my website host of [16 March 2007](#), K&C police implied that I had  
127 committed a crime – without providing any evidence in support. As a result of being challenged  
128 by my website host who replied "Are you aware that there are laws against making false  
129 accusations?", in its second email of [20 March 2007](#) the police backed down saying "If you are  
130 unable to close the site down I will let the victim know as **there is nothing we as a police force**  
131 **can do except class it as a racist incident**" – while still not providing any evidence in support  
132 of its accusation. The reason for this is simple: it is not true that my website contains anti-Semitic  
133 comments.

134 JD said that because of Mr [Ladsky's communication](#) it had been decided that, "to protect me and  
135 KPMG, it would be best that I no longer have access to the Internet" **NOTE !!!!**

136 Still very trusting of KPMG, as well as concerned that Mr Ladsky had brought his long-standing  
137 vendetta against me to KPMG, at the meeting, I did not challenge the rationale of the decision,  
138 and nor did I ask to see the communication received by KPMG from Mr Ladsky. (I was not  
139 offered to see it).

### Section 3.4 [KPMG pg](#)

140 **4.1 In spite of this major action taken against me – that involved HR – I was not issued**  
141 **with notes of the 30 March meeting**

142 I considered doing as I had done for the 13 February 2007 meeting i.e. write my own notes and  
143 send them to PB and JD for their comments. However, considering that PB had assessed my

---

<sup>4</sup> 07.03.30\_2PeterB\_Jeanette\_Dunworth\_ok\_12h\_Follow-up\_meeting

144 notes of the 13 February 2007 meeting as “not an accurate account of what was discussed”, I  
145 saw no point doing this. I did not want to be, yet again, portrayed as a liar.

However, in addition to this Grievance, I captured what took place:

- in my [09.07.07](#) Subject Access Request ([section 7 KPMG pg](#));
- [para.8](#) of my [03.04.08](#) Claim against KPMG ([section 12](#)) in the [Stratford Employment Tribunal](#) ([section 16](#))

146 **4.2 Not only was my access to the Internet cut-off, my access to the majority of the**  
147 **internal sites was also cut-off - leading to my being practically unable to perform my**  
148 **work**

149 By the time I returned to my desk, my access to the Internet had been cut off. In the process, my  
150 access to the majority of our intranet (internal) sites had likewise been cut-off. As my work  
151 requires constant access to the intranet sites, it made it practically impossible for me to work.

152 As evidenced by the numerous emails below, I repeatedly highlighted my plight over a period  
153 spanning 30 March to the end of April, pressing for a resolution. I first raised this with JD as PB  
154 had told me during the 30 March meeting that she was my main point of contact

155 [30 March 2007 – 15h46](#)<sup>5</sup> – My email to JD, cc'd PB “Just left you a voicemail. I can't access the  
156 Intranet part of our Global Advisory services...”

157 [31 March 2007 – 9h40](#)<sup>6</sup> – Email from JD: “I will take this forward with the appropriate person”

158 [2 April 2007 – 10h11](#)<sup>7</sup> – My email to JD, cc'd PB: “In the process of wanting to forward a  
159 KPMG.com enquiry to somebody in the Netherlands, I have tried to access the internal Global  
160 Advisory site and got the following: ‘Error: Access is denied’ ”

161 [5 April 2007 – 10h37](#)<sup>8</sup> – My email to JD, cc'd PB: “It is nearly one week and nothing has been  
162 done to address my inability to access various sites.

163 “Example 1: today’s KNews, I tried to access the link at the end of the article “KPMG’s Clear  
164 Desk Policy” – and got: “Forbidden – you were denied access because: Access denied by  
165 access control list.

166 ...This is very upsetting as every time it happens it makes me feel like I am ‘a criminal’. The  
167 messages e.g. “Access denied by access control list” add to this perception.

168 I come in in the morning with the mindset of forgetting about my case for the day. Every  
169 occurrence of this reminds me of it, makes me think that it is I, the victim, who gets treated as  
170 though I am the criminal. Of course, at the rational level, I know that this is not the case. But, at  
171 the emotional level, after five years of being treated – by external parties - as though I am the  
172 criminal, instead of what I am: the victim, I have a very heightened sensitivity to this i.e. this is  
173 what it makes me feel like.

---

<sup>5</sup> My 30 Mar 07–15h46 email – 07.04.05\_10h37\_2\_JDunworth\_NoAction\_feel\_like\_criminal

<sup>6</sup> 31 Mar 07– 9h40 email from JD - Same as above

<sup>7</sup> My 2 Apr 07- 10h11 email to JD - Same as above

<sup>8</sup> My 5 Apr 07– 10h37 email to JD - Same as above

174 So please, **can you put pressure on getting this addressed ASAP.**”

175 [5 April 2007 – 13h14](#)<sup>9</sup> – Reply from JD: “I am really sorry but **this is now with Global IT and we**  
176 **have asked for a response as quickly as possible**”

177 [5 April 2007 – 13h21](#)<sup>10</sup> – My reply: “Thanks Jeanette. I am going to take the rest of the day off.  
178 **Hopefully, this will have been sorted by next week**”

179 [10 April 2007 – 10h28](#)<sup>11</sup> – My email to JD, cc'd CH: “To let you know that **the situation is the**  
180 **same**, as you can see from the below examples”

181 (NB: I included printscreens of the messages I received from trying to access the internal sites.  
182 For the KWorld home page “**We are unable to authenticate your user name or password**”. For  
183 the Global Advisory home page: “**Error: Access denied**”, etc.)

184 [10 April 2007 – 12h08](#)<sup>12</sup> – My email to HMT, cc'd JD, CH, forwarding her my 10h28 email to  
185 JD. “I sent the below email to Jeanette...the automated reply...suggests you as contact during  
186 her absence.

187 *I don't know whether you are familiar with my situation. As you will see from the below trail of*  
188 *emails, Jeanette said to have contacted Global ITS – but no action has yet been taken. Below is*  
189 *the latest example (to be added to the below examples I sent earlier on today) when I tried to*  
190 *access the link for the Global RAS Academy course.*

191 **I can't work like that. This is in addition to getting very upset by this**”

192 [10 April 2007 – 16h14](#)<sup>13</sup> – Email from HMT: “I will look into this and get back to you as soon as  
193 I am able”

194 [11 April 2007 - 09h27](#)<sup>14</sup> – My email to HMT, cc'd JD, CH, to report that “**There has been no**  
195 **change in the situation**”. I included printscreens showing examples of the internal sites I could  
196 not access: Global Advisory, Services, markets, sales sites, any parts of the FAS site, the  
197 KWorld homepage, etc.

198 [11 April 2007 - 12h09](#)<sup>15</sup> – My email to CH thanking her for contacting HMT stating: “She said  
199 she had been in touch with IT yesterday. **Apparently, they need to write a rule to allow me**  
200 **access to the Intranet, while excluding the Internet**. They told Hannah-Maria that they would get  
201 back to her today. She said that she would let me know as soon as she has heard back”

202 [17 April 2007 - 10h44](#)<sup>16</sup> – i.e. **one week later**, and **by then, more than two weeks since 30**  
203 **March**. My email to Serena Patching, IT support, cc'd JD, CH, PB, to report that “**there has been**  
204 **no change whatsoever in the situation**”. I supported this by capturing the printscreen of 22 intranet sites.

---

<sup>9</sup> 5 Apr 07– 10h37 email from JD - Same as above

<sup>10</sup> My 5 Apr 07 – 13h21 email to JD - Same as above

<sup>11</sup> 07.04.10\_10H28\_2Dunworth\_10\_days\_my\_access\_ALL\_sites\_cutoff

<sup>12</sup> My 10 Apr 07–12h08 email - 07.04.11\_09h49\_2HMT\_still\_no\_action\_by\_IT\_for\_access

<sup>13</sup> 07.04.10\_16h14\_HMT\_will\_pursue\_unable\_internet\_access

<sup>14</sup> My 11 Apr 07– 9h27 email - 07.04.11\_09h49\_2HMT\_still\_no\_action\_by\_IT\_for\_access

<sup>15</sup> 07.04.11\_9h55\_2CHughes\_no\_access\_feel\_shld\_pack-up\_and\_leave

<sup>16</sup> 07.04.17\_10h44\_2SP\_still\_unable\_access\_majority\_sites

205 [17 April 2007 – 15h40](#)<sup>17</sup> – Email from SP attaching a spreadsheet for me to complete identifying  
206 the sites I can access.

207 [17 April 2007 – 16h59](#)<sup>18</sup> – My reply to SP: “What I sent you earlier on was only a sample. In the  
208 attached (spreadsheet), I have included another 20 examples. But this hides a lot more I cannot  
209 access... It would be easier to define what I can access rather than what I cannot access –  
210 which is very little. More than two weeks now that I feel totally cut-off.”

211 [18 April 2007 - 12h26](#)<sup>19</sup> – My email to SP, cc'd Sophie Ellis (IT), JD, Abhi Anand (IT), CH, to  
212 report that “earlier on this morning I was able to access the KWorld home page, as well as the  
213 Global Advisory home page. (I did not try others, to avoid the risk of yet again seeing these  
214 horrible messages “Forbidden access”, “you have been denied access”, “you are not on the  
215 approved list of contacts”, etc. that make me feel as though I am a criminal). Well, this was  
216 short-lived, as these horrible messages have yet again appeared when I tried to access the  
217 KWorld home page and the Global Advisory home page a few minutes ago”

218 [23 April 2007 - 11h34](#)<sup>20</sup> – Email from Abhi Anand to me and Sophie Ellis that IT has “granted  
219 access to the Internet for Noëlle now. Noëlle, Please could you log off & login back to your  
220 computer & check the Internet / Intranet access”

221 As further evidenced by this email, my access had, by then, been cut off for more than three  
222 weeks.

223 [23 April 2007 - 11h38](#)<sup>21</sup> – I reply to Abhi Anand and Sophie Ellis, cc'd SP, JD and CH “I  
224 understand from Peter Bassett that I am meant to be agreeing to something. Can you please let  
225 me know what I am meant to do?”

**Sections 3.4 and 4 [KPMG pg](#)**

226 **4.3 On 24 April 2007 I was asked to sign a letter agreeing to be barred from using the**  
227 **Internet. On meeting this condition, my access to internal sites was resumed on 25**  
228 **April 2007**

229 [24 April 2007 - 9h10](#)<sup>22</sup> – Email to me from PB, cc'd CH: “As I mentioned to you yesterday, it  
230 has been agreed that while IT cannot put in place the necessary arrangements, your intranet /  
231 internet access will be restored, subject to your signing a letter in which you undertake not to go  
232 outside the permitted sites”

233 With this, PB attached the letter for me to sign. Among others, it states that “on 30 March 2007,  
234 you were informed that your internet and intranet access would be restricted” This is not correct,  
235 only my access to the Internet was mentioned. Why should I be restricted from accessing the  
236 intranet sites – which are internal? I did not bother to highlight this (the rest of the letter shows  
237 confusion on the use of the terms).

NB: Actually, they had DELIBERATELY cut me off the internal sites as well.

<sup>17</sup> 07.04.17\_15h40\_SP\_attchg\_spreadsheet\_for\_input

<sup>18</sup> 07.04.17\_16h59\_2SP\_many\_more\_cannot\_access\_(spreadsheet)

<sup>19</sup> 07.04.18\_12h26\_2SP\_Temporary\_access\_now\_again\_denied

<sup>20</sup> 07.04.23\_11h34\_AA\_that\_I\_now\_have\_Intranet\_access

<sup>21</sup> 07.04.23\_11h38\_2IT\_JDunworth\_before\_reboot\_what\_meant\_2agree\_to

<sup>22</sup> 07.04.24\_09h10\_KPMG\_Peter\_Bassett\_askg\_me\_sign\_ltr\_barred\_internet

238 [24 April 2007 – 9h34](#) <sup>23</sup> – My email to PB, cc'd Ceri: "I will scan the signed form and send it to  
239 you. My usage of the Internet being limited to Webex means that somebody else needs to deal  
240 with the kpmg .com enquiries right away... I will also need a point of contact for sites I am  
241 unable to access".

242 "For example, in relation to training for my priority core skills e.g. 'Making an impact'" With this I  
243 supplied a printscreen of the 'List of links – influencing – useful websites' from the 'My training'  
244 website.

245 [25 April 2007 - 13h45](#) <sup>24</sup> – Before sending this email to PB and CH to which I attached the letter  
246 I was asked to sign, I highlighted to PB the issue of how I would be able to access the online  
247 training sites. He became somewhat irritated, telling me that I would need to go through CH in  
248 order to put a case forward (as evidenced in my email) and told me to "sign the letter!". Once I  
249 had handed the signed letter to him, he could not hide his satisfaction, leading me to perceive  
250 him as though he was walking away with a trophy.

251 [1 May 2007 - 10h00](#) <sup>25</sup> – Email from SP, Abhi Anand, Sophie Eijs, cc'd JD, CH, stating: "Please  
252 could you confirm that you are able to access all the Global Intranet websites you require to  
253 complete your work and have no Internet access? We completed some changes to your account  
254 late last week and want to confirm that access to the various intranet websites remains?"

255 [1 May 2007 - 10h27](#) <sup>26</sup> – My reply: "In terms of accessing internal sites, I have not come across  
256 one that I could not access. In terms of external Internet sites: for test purposes, I have just tried  
257 the BBC weather website and it opened up. As I know that I am barred from accessing any  
258 external sites: I have NOT been doing it"

#### Section 4.2 [KPMG pg](#)

259 **4.4 In spite of my continuously highlighting my plight, I was left to endure lack of**  
260 **access to the internal sites for nearly one month, causing me an enormous amount**  
261 **of distress and torment such that I ended-up getting medical treatment and took**  
262 **time off my annual leave**

263 This was an extremely traumatic time for me principally because the messages I was getting  
264 when trying to access the internal sites made me feel as though I was a criminal. My perception  
265 of injustice was unbearable: I am NOT the criminal. [I am the victim of crime.](#)

266 Yet, I saw myself as being punished, discriminated against and further victimised [for 'daring' to](#)  
267 [stand-up for my rights](#) – this time by [KPMG](#). And this was happening because of the 'say-so' of a  
268 party, to my knowledge, external to KPMG: Mr [Andrew Ladsky](#), my 'attacker' of six-year  
269 standing, desperately trying to get [my website](#) closed down because it exposes in great detail –  
270 and with a massive amount of 'black on white evidence' in support – the scam that he and his  
271 aides implemented to defraud residents. (In [February 2007](#) Mr [Andrew Ladsky](#) had also filed  
272 another [fraudulent claim](#) against me [in court](#)).

<sup>23</sup> [07.04.24\\_9h34\\_2PBassett\\_need\\_handover\\_KPMG.com\\_training\\_URLs](#)

<sup>24</sup> [07.04.25\\_13h45\\_2\\_KPMG\\_Bassett\\_CHughes\\_signed\\_ltr\\_barring\\_me\\_Internet](#)

<sup>25</sup> [07.05.01\\_10h27\\_2SP\\_can\\_access\\_internal\\_sites\\_know\\_barred\\_external](#)

<sup>26</sup> Ditto

273 I captured my feelings in e.g. my [10h37 email of 5 April 2007 to JD](#), cc'd PB; my [12h08 email of](#)  
274 [10 April 2007 to HMT](#), cc'd JD, CH; my [12h26 email of 18 April 2007 to SP](#), cc'd CH.

275 I felt, and still feel the injustice even more acutely because KPMG has been aware of my  
276 situation since 2002. (It had led to my being transferred to a non-client facing role until my  
277 situation was resolved). (PB knew about my situation as I had provided an overview during the  
278 13 February meeting, and had captured it in [my notes of the meeting](#). (Notes he assessed as  
279 "[not an accurate account of what was discussed](#)")

NOTE that, in addition, Bassett et.al. in KPMG had ABSOLUTE KNOWLEDGE of the criminal actions against me by [Ladsky and his gang of racketeers](#) – and their very active supporters in the [police](#) and [judiciary \(Kangaroo courts\)](#) – as (among other) KPMG's previously associated firm of solicitors, **McGrigors**, had looked at [121 pages of my website during March-April 2007](#). (See also, below, **lines 1140-1152**).

(As in the case of my secretly recording my so-called 'performance appraisal' meetings (Headers 6.3 and 6.7, below), I only revealed that I had this evidence, in 2015, when I launched the [KPMG page](#) on my website).

280 I could not, and still cannot help feeling that my website host who does not know me believes in  
281 me and backs me up, whereas KPMG that has known me for 10 years and is aware of the  
282 history was 'siding' with Mr [Ladsky](#) and, by implication, his aides, against me. 'Siding' with him  
283 because I 'dare' to stand-up for my rights, refusing to pay him monies I do not owe. (Since then,  
284 the events in relation to my Subject Access Request have further reinforced this perception).

285 I have been in tears at my desk practically every day during that period i.e. throughout April, at  
286 times sobbing uncontrollably, feeling extremely distraught. (This was witnessed by my  
287 colleagues: [§<], [§<] and [§<]).

288 In the first week, starting 2 April 2007, I found it so difficult to cope with that practically every day,  
289 I ended-up leaving the office, taking time off as annual leave: I took four and half hours on the  
290 Monday, three and half hours the next day, three and half hours two days later, and another two  
291 hours on the Friday.

#### Section 4.1 [KPMG page](#)

292 (NB: At my request – I was compensated for the time in late June, when CH told me to charge  
293 the time i.e. two days, under "[compassionate leave](#)". Given the circumstances, I found the  
294 choice of code rather ironic. As I was stranded where I was due to flooding, I was allowed to  
295 charge an additional two days under the same "[compassionate leave](#)" code)

296 By mid-April I saw my doctor who [prescribed tranquilisers](#). Later on I saw a psychologist to help  
297 me sort out my emotions. I was constantly close to tears, often unable to hold them back. His  
298 assessment was that what I was going through was like a double bereavement: perceptions of  
299 being let down by both, the system and KPMG. The way I expressed the treatment at work was  
300 that it had "[shaken me to the bone](#)"

NOTE that KPMG was so concerned that I might have recorded conversations that it / on its behalf, its 'brothers': [Andrew David Ladsky](#) / others in [the Jewish-Freemason 'Brotherhood' \(Persecution # 6\)](#) got 'my' doctor to ask me whether I had done it. (Needless to say that I did not tell him that I had).

They also got him to do other things: (1)- lie that I had not seen him one year previously (in Apr 07), when he had prescribed me an anti-depressant and tranquilisers: my [10.04.08](#) letter to him;

(2)- he then used the excuse to *not* give me a referral to a psychiatrist – for the purpose of ‘mitigating my loss’ in relation to my Claim against KPMG.

Discussed under **section 13** [KPMG pg.](#)

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, who could not wait to get me locked-up (**section 13(3)** KPMG pg).

**The motive behind doing this** – by KPMG that summarised [its ‘Values’ as “Above all, we act with integrity”](#)? So that it could then ‘safely’ deny my claims:

- its [22.05.08](#) dismissal (includes my Comments) of my 17 Jan 08 Grievance (i.e. this document) (**section 11** KPMG pg);
- its [PACK OF LIES Defence](#) (includes my Comments) in which it demanded that my [03.04.08](#) Claim (**section 12**) in the [Employment Tribunal](#) (**section 16**) be "**STRUCK OUT**".

(NOTE that **Ladsky also stood to gain from it**: re. his (2<sup>nd</sup>) 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”).

301 **4.5 My being cut-off from accessing the sites made me feel like a pariah, very isolated,**  
302 **and was a degrading, demeaning and humiliating experience as, in an attempt to do**  
303 **my work, I had to ask colleagues to look up information for me. This has continued**  
304 **ever since as my access to the Internet continues to be cut-off, contributing to a**  
305 **whispering campaign about me**

306 [Attempting to do my work in April 2007 entailed the need to ask colleagues](#) (junior and more  
307 senior to me) [to look up information for me](#). In addition to being a humiliating, degrading and  
308 demeaning experience, I was concerned that I was bothering them. This added to my anguish  
309 and distress as I wanted to get on with my work. I [felt extremely isolated: a pariah who had](#)  
310 [committed some unspeakable crime](#).

311 There have also been occasions when colleagues have supplied me with a link to an external  
312 site to look at. Eventually, [I ended-up telling them that I am barred from accessing the Internet. It](#)  
313 [helped fuel rumours / a whispering campaign behind my back](#).

314 The feeling of [being treated like a pariah, of being victimised, discriminated against, humiliated](#)  
315 [and demeaned by being treated differently from my colleagues](#) has, not surprisingly, continued  
316 ever since – as [my access to the Internet has, of course, continued to be cut-off](#).

317 **4.6 After 25 April 2007 I could access the Internet, leading to anguish when I**  
318 **inadvertently did so**

319 The outcome of reinstating my access to the internal sites meant that I could also access the  
320 Internet. It was a source of a lot of anguish as I had several occasions during the course of my  
321 work when, contrary to appearances, a link supplied on one of the internal sites took me to an  
322 external site. Every time, when I realised what was happening, I immediately closed down the  
323 link.

e.g. my [08.08.07-10h19](#) email to Ceri Hughes

324 **4.7 My access to the Internet appears to have been physically cut-off sometime in**  
325 **September 2007. In the process it has stopped my access to two 'permissible' sites**

326 It seems that my being physically cut-off from the Internet took place sometime in September. I  
327 realised this when clicking on links on the internal sites – not knowing that they connected to  
328 external sites. On doing this, it returns the Websense screen. This also includes the [South](#)  
329 [African firm internal site](#).

I reported to CH on [3 Sep 07](#), that it included my being barred from accessing the kpmg.com sites – which she KNEW, as she had been copied on all the emails (**section 4 KPMG pg**), and, in her [07.04.25](#) email to me and Bassett, had *agreed* to my being cut off.

330 While the 24 April 2007 letter I was asked to sign by PB specifically states that I am allowed to  
331 access the Webex site (interactive conference calls), on [21 November 2007](#) I was unable to join  
332 a call (on SharePoint) due to being denied access by Websense. I had been able to join these  
333 calls in the past. My colleague assumed this to be due to the call being set-up on global Webex,  
334 instead of the UK Webex facility. Given my current situation, I did not bother reporting it. I see no  
335 point doing this.

**Line 330 - Error:** should be the '23' Apr 07 letter 'from' Jeanette Dunworth, HR (= Peter Bassett) – which Bassett attached to his [24.04.07-09h10](#) email to me asking me to sign it. I did this and returned it the following day attached to my [25.04.07-13h45](#) email to Bassett and Hughes.

336 **4.8 The outcome of barring me from accessing the Internet means that I have been**  
337 **unable to perform part of my tasks**

338 This includes, for example, in the context of reviewing the industries and services intranet sites.  
339 Being focused on delivering high quality work, it distresses me to not be able to complete my  
340 tasks properly.

341 **4.9 In August 2007, my being 'allowed' to access the Internet on the condition that I use**  
342 **a spare computer confirmed my perception that the true motive in imposing the**  
343 **draconian measure against me in April 2007, including letting me suffer a whole**  
344 **month of anguish and distress, is to humiliate and demean me. Concurrently, I**  
345 **cannot help perceiving it as 'punishment' for 'daring' to stand-up and fight for my**  
346 **rights against a rogue landlord and his equally rogue aides**

347 On [8 August 2007](#)<sup>27</sup>, CH asked me to review competitors' websites for their use of new media  
348 asking me to use a spare computer. I wrote back saying that, while I was barred from using the  
349 Internet, I had inadvertently discovered that I could still access the Internet from my computer.  
350 Hence, did she nonetheless want me to use her spare computer? She replied affirmatively.

351 As, on 30 March, I was told that the reason for banning me from accessing the Internet is "to  
352 protect me and KPMG", surely, the same ought to apply when using a spare computer. I could  
353 not see the difference.

354 Considering that, since April, I was being treated like a child who cannot be trusted when using  
355 my own computer, why was I trusted when I used a spare computer? In addition, I had been  
356 made to sign a letter on [25 April 2007](#) barring me from accessing the Internet. The ban is not  
357 computer dependent.

---

<sup>27</sup> 07.08.08\_10h04\_CHughes\_askg\_when\_lwant\_spare\_comp

358 It leads me to feel that, since 30 March 2007, a perverse game is being played intended to  
359 cause me distress, humiliation and demean me.

360 As the spare computer was kept in CH's desk, the harassment included my having to ask for the  
361 computer on a daily basis (of course, in front of all my colleagues). As the project amounted to  
362 several days of work, the same process was therefore repeated. On occasions, when CH was  
363 away and a secretary was sitting at her desk, it meant that I had to ask her for access to the  
364 computer.

365 Furthermore, being logged under CH's name, meant that I could not access my emails and  
366 consequently had to switch computer several times during the day in order to access them. Of  
367 course, I had to do the same thing in order to send emails. The perversion extended to asking  
368 me whether I had seen such and such email. (CH asked me to sort out another logging name,  
369 but fell short of taking the necessary steps – which, as I understood, required getting the spare  
370 computer updated)

Discussed under **section 6(4) [KPMG pg](#)**

371 The outcome of this discrimination was to make my working conditions even more difficult and  
372 further isolated me.

373 I cannot help perceiving the treatment I have been subjected to as 'punishment' for 'daring' to  
374 stand-up and fight for my rights (and that of other residents) against [a rogue landlord and his](#)  
375 [equally rogue aides](#). By then, I had received a reply from KPMG Compliance following my  
376 Subject Access Request I perceive as amounting to stonewalling.

'Punishment' I view as being accurately described as [criminal psychological harassment](#)  
(Persecution # 1) ; [extracts from a Canadian website](#).

377 **5 My 9 July 2007 Subject Access Request under the Data Protection Act 1998 was met**  
378 **with stonewalling from KPMG Compliance, leading me to have to go into battle to**  
379 **determine what Mr Andrew Ladsky had communicated about me to KPMG – which**  
380 **fuelled my perception that KPMG was 'siding' with him against me**

381 By the end of June 2007, I had the strong feeling that, among others, I was being ostracised. As  
382 with the last six years of the absolutely horrendous, sheer, utter hell I have been made to  
383 endure, the root cause is Mr [Andrew Ladsky](#). I felt that he has totally ruined my life, cost me the  
384 best part of my life savings, and was now going to cost me my job.

385 I decided to determine what Mr Ladsky had said about me to [KPMG](#). Specifically, the evidence  
386 he had supplied in support of his accusation that my website "contains anti-Semitic comments" –  
387 which was the sole reason given to me at the 30 March 2007 meeting for barring me from  
388 accessing the Internet.

389 On [9 July 2007](#) I sent a 'Subject Access Request' to PB<sup>28</sup> requesting to be provided with copy of  
390 communication from Mr Ladsky in which he made the accusation against me, stating, among  
391 other: "I have the right to defend myself against this false accusation and I am concerned that  
392 my Internet access has been impeded as a consequence of malicious conduct on the part of my  
393 landlord"

394 PB replied the following day that he had forwarded my email to Compliance. This was followed  
395 by a letter from Compliance, dated [19 July 2007](#)<sup>29</sup> [I view as stonewalling](#).

396 With some delay, I sent my [31 August 2007](#) reply<sup>30</sup> on 3 September. In this letter, [I challenge](#)  
397 [Compliance's position for refusing to provide me with any communication from Mr Ladsky](#).

398 Compliance replied one month later, in a letter dated [5 October 2007](#)<sup>31</sup>. The only evidence of  
399 communication from Mr Ladsky to KPMG in 2007 are a letter from him dated [26 March 2007](#)<sup>32</sup>,  
400 and a few words from a conversation between him and KPMG's General Counsel on [9 February](#)  
401 [2007](#)<sup>33</sup>

402 (NB: I was also supplied with a letter to KPMG, dated [28 November 2002](#), from [Cawdery Kaye](#)  
403 [Fireman & Taylor](#), one of Mr [Ladsky](#)'s solicitors (and [one to me](#) of the same date). They relate to  
404 my sending [a fax on KPMG headed paper](#) to [Kensington & Chelsea housing department](#) and to  
405 the [Leasehold Valuation Tribunal](#) in connection with [a service charge demand](#) in which I had  
406 written that, being based in the [British Virgin Islands](#), "[Steel Services could siphon-off – at this](#)  
407 [stage - £750,000 from the residents](#)". (The [28 November 2002](#) letter identifies Mr [Ladsky](#) as  
408 being connected with Steel Services). (I was subsequently vindicated on my position that the  
409 [service charge demand was a scam, leading to leaseholders being defrauded of very substantial](#)  
410 [sums of monies](#)).

411 As I pointed out in my [24 October 2007](#)<sup>34</sup> reply, [over 50%](#) of Mr Ladsky's letter of [26 March](#)  
412 [2007](#) [has been blocked out](#). Compliance replied in its [14 November 2007](#)<sup>35</sup> letter that [the parts](#)  
413 [blocked out relate specifically to KPMG, not me](#).

I wonder: were they references to some agreement at some [Masonic lodge? \(Persecution # 6\)](#)

Events discussed under [section 7 KPMG pg](#)

414 In my [24 October 2007](#) letter I pointed out that, as JD had said at the 30 March 2007 meeting  
415 [that Mr Ladsky was "very persistent", I expected other communication to have been received](#)  
416 [from him](#). In its 14 November 2007 letter Compliance replied that Mr Ladsky had "[sent the same](#)  
417 [letter to several people in KPMG](#)"; "[other calls had been taken from him, but no notes were](#)  
418 [captured](#)".

So, aside from the skeleton [9 Feb 07](#) notes, "[no notes](#)" were made of what Ladsky had said  
about me! How very convenient! In failing to do that, with which law was KPMG complying with?  
That of [the Jewish-Freemason 'Brotherhood' \(Persecution # 6\)](#)?

The same law it applied by *failing* to issue notes of the 30 Mar 07 meeting, and was planning on  
doing for the 13 Feb 07 meeting – had it not been for my issuing the [Draft Notes](#).

YEP! KPMG definitely does NOT believe in recording notes of events...and further attempts to  
ensure there is no evidence by enlisting a doctor to ask a patient whether she has recorded  
conversations ([section 13 KPMG pg](#)). YEP again: that's the KPMG that summarised [its 'Values'](#)  
[as "Above all, we act with integrity"](#)!

<sup>29</sup> [07.07.19\\_KPMG\\_initial\\_reply\\_2\\_my\\_Subject\\_Access\\_Request](#)

<sup>30</sup> [07.08.31\\_2KPMG\\_Compliance\\_meet\\_Subject\\_Access\\_Request](#)

<sup>31</sup> [07.10.05\\_KPMG\\_attaching\\_ltrs\\_Ladsky\\_CKFT\\_notes](#)

<sup>32</sup> [07.10.05\\_KPMG\\_attaching\\_ltrs\\_Ladsky\\_CKFT\\_notes](#)

<sup>33</sup> [07.10.05\\_KPMG\\_attaching\\_ltrs\\_Ladsky\\_CKFT\\_notes](#)

<sup>34</sup> [07.10.24\\_2KPMG\\_Compliance\\_explain\\_blocked\\_quantity](#)

<sup>35</sup> [07.11.14\\_KPMG\\_reply\\_2\\_my\\_24Oct07\\_why\\_blocked\\_no\\_other](#)

419 The initial stonewalling by Compliance fuelled my perception that KPMG was 'siding' with Mr  
420 Andrew Ladsky against me.

421 **5.1 At the 13 February 2007 meeting I was not told that Mr Andrew Ladsky had**  
422 **contacted KPMG, thereby denying me the opportunity to defend myself against his**  
423 **accusations**

424 What I was not told at the time of the 13 February 2007 meeting is that two working days  
425 previously, on 9 February 2007, KPMG's General Counsel had taken a phone call from Mr  
426 Andrew Ladsky. The notes of the conversation I was supplied with read: "[The] woman is  
427 reckless. [She is] clinically unwell. [Ladsky is] looking for [KPMG] to stop her using KPMG  
428 [systems]. [NR has] been updating her website, inciting breach of the peace"

429 Why was not I informed of this at the 13 February 2007 meeting? Among others, Mr Ladsky is  
430 falsely accusing me of "updating my website" using my KPMG computer. (See next point)

OF NOTE: There were more communications from Ladsky that KPMG withheld from me – as  
it alleged under para.6 of [its PACK OF LIES Defence](#): "in October 2006 and January 2007".

431 **5.2 At the 30 March 2007 meeting I was also denied the opportunity to defend myself**  
432 **against accusations made against me by Mr Andrew Ladsky. Why?**

433 From the partial communication I finally received from Compliance, Mr Ladsky had in fact made  
434 more accusations than just saying that my website "contains anti-Semitic comments" (The only  
435 thing that was said to me at the 30 March 2007 meeting).

436 Among others, in his 26 March 2007 letter, he claims that I was using "KPMG's internet services  
437 to work on my website". During the 9 February 2007 call he accused me of "updating my  
438 website" using my KPMG computer.

439 These accusations are false.

440 I had my personal computer in the office, which I used to work on my website, and had a  
441 Vodafone 3G card to connect it to the Internet.

442 "Working on my website" and then "update it" i.e. release updates on the Internet, requires  
443 having over 2,000 files on my computer – at the same time - (examples include c. 900 PDF  
444 documents and over 300 visuals) – and then perform synchronisation between my computer's  
445 hard drive and my website host server in order to update my website.

446 As KPMG had evidently been looking at what I had done with my work computer, it would have  
447 been able to see that this was not the case. Hence, there could not have been any records of  
448 my "updating my website using KPMG [systems]".

KPMG KNEW that I would NOT been able to "work on [my] website" – and "update it" – using its  
IT systems. Discussed under [section 3.5 KPMG pg](#)

OF NOTE - In [its PACK OF LIES Defence](#) ([section 14 KPMG pg](#)) to my [03.04.08](#) Claim  
([section 12](#)), under [para.6](#), KPMG stated that it "obtained an IT report on [my] use of [its] IT  
systems". However, following my [01.07.08](#) Subject Access Request, in its [31.07.08](#) 'response',  
it refused to supply me with a copy, claiming "legal privilege" ([section 15.1](#)).

449 To my knowledge, Mr [Ladsky](#) is external to KPMG. How can he therefore make these  
450 accusations? Was he asked? Has somebody within KPMG been feeding him false information?

451 In the same way that this accusation had not been communicated to me at the 13 February 2007  
452 meeting, it was, yet again, not communicated to me at the 30 March 2007 meeting. Why not?

453 These are accusations against me. I have the right to defend myself against them – especially in  
454 light of the fact that action was taken against me by KPMG as a result of these accusations i.e.  
455 barring me from using the Internet.

456 Mr Ladsky also wrote that the police was in contact with my website host “*who confirmed that*  
457 *they are dealing with a racist incident*”. This too was false given that, (as detailed above under  
458 the 30 March 2007 meeting), one week before Mr Ladsky’s letter of [26 March 2007](#), the police  
459 had backed down when challenged by my website host saying “*there is nothing we as a police*  
460 *force can do...*”.

461 Yet again, what Mr Ladsky had written was not communicated to me at the 30 March 2007  
462 meeting. Why not? Why was I denied the opportunity to defend myself against this spurious  
463 claim?

464 Not telling me about these accusations, while nonetheless imposing a very draconian measure  
465 against me, combined with the fact that I had to battle with Compliance to obtain ‘part’ of Mr  
466 Ladsky’s communication to KPMG, reinforces in me the perception that KPMG has been ‘siding’  
467 with Mr Ladsky against me. I am extremely shocked by this realisation.

468 A number of points can be made about Mr Ladsky’s other accusations / comments.

469 Worthy of note is that Mr Ladsky did not highlight my claims that fraud and other acts classified  
470 as criminal actions under English / UK legislation have been instigated [by him / his aides](#).

471 **5.3 Is the withholding, during the meetings, of all but one of the accusations made**  
472 **against me by Mr Ladsky the reason why Peter Bassett did not want to have notes**  
473 **of either meeting?**

474 Seeing that at the 13 February and 30 March meeting, PB and JD did not communicate to me  
475 the majority of the accusations made against me by Mr Ladsky, leads me to view this as the  
476 main reason for not wanting / not issuing me with notes of the meetings.

477 **6 My performance appraisal process amounts to harassment, bullying, discrimination**  
478 **and victimisation over a period of three and a half months, eventually resulting in an**  
479 **assessment I view as the ‘last straw’**

480 In my 10 years at KPMG I have never had a performance appraisal process handled in such an  
481 appalling manner.

482 I view what took place as amounting to harassment and bullying and, in my being treated so  
483 differently from my colleagues, as discrimination and victimisation.

More specifically: I view it as [criminal psychological harassment \(Persecution #1\)](#)

484 What took place is, among others, against KPMG's policies comprised in the '[Guidelines for](#)  
485 [Performance Management 2007 – Managing for Excellence](#)'<sup>36</sup>

486 **6.1 I was made to endure a 10-week wait before finally having what turned out to be**  
487 **'part 1' of my performance appraisal on 9 October 2007. The delay, said to have**  
488 **been caused by "waiting to hear from HR" in relation to what I wrote in the last**  
489 **section on my form, turned out to be untrue, as my comments were totally ignored**

Discussed under **section 8** [KPMG pg](#)

490 [22 June 2007](#) – Email from CH<sup>37</sup> to members of her team reminding us that the performance  
491 appraisals needed to be completed by 30 August, and the goals for the coming year set by the  
492 end of September. (A policy email on [29 June 2007](#)<sup>38</sup> confirmed the deadlines)

493 [2 July 2007](#) – i.e. one week later, CH sent me an email<sup>39</sup> stating: "suggest that you start looking  
494 through your other business goals and identify other areas that you might need to address prior  
495 to year end. I know you did some work on your development planning last week, which is good,  
496 but you need to make sure you can give a clear account of progress in all areas of the form"

497 [26 July 2007](#) – Having asked me during the day how I was getting on with the preparation of my  
498 form, in the evening CH sent me an email<sup>40</sup> asking me to send her my performance appraisal by  
499 [1 August](#) (i.e. log it on the system), in preparation for my review scheduled for 7 August.

500 [27 July 2007](#) – I reply to CH's email of the previous day<sup>41</sup>. Seeing that she expected me to  
501 include feedback from others, I reminded her of what I had told her on 19 July, namely that my  
502 being put on projects that entailed working solo meant that I had little opportunity to get feedback  
503 from others. I also noted what she had said about my getting feedback on "my impact on others"

504 [30 July 2007](#) – CH asked to speak to me in a meeting room. In an angry, aggressive tone, she  
505 said that she did not like my email of 27 July, "being quoted on what I said on 19 July". I found  
506 her reaction most interesting, added to the fact that she called me into a meeting room to tell me.  
507 What was the 'big secret'?

508 What have I written in my email to trigger this reaction? Reporting that the solo nature of a lot of  
509 my work for a large part of the year had limited my opportunities for interaction with others, and  
510 therefore the opportunity to get feedback? I had already captured this in a previous email to CH.  
511 This left quoting her comment about "my impact on others" when I spoke to her on 19 July.

512 Her reaction confirmed my suspicion that something was being 'cooked' against me.

**IT PROVED to me** that Ceri Hughes – with, very clearly, Peter Bassett, 'the HR Partner' – et.al.  
in KPMG, and most probably beyond in the [Jewish-Freemason 'Brotherhood' \(Persecution # 6\)](#) –  
WERE THE AUTHORS of the [05.08.07](#) so-called 'feedback on my performance' 'from' 'my  
colleague' **Finbarr Geaney (section 9.4 KPMG pg)**.

See how they implemented their very sick, Machiavellian plan during Part 2 of my so-called

<sup>36</sup> [07.xx.xx\\_KPMG\\_guidelines\\_perfo\\_mgt\\_\(extracts\)](#)

<sup>37</sup> [07.06.22\\_CHughes\\_2team\\_must\\_complete\\_perfo\\_end\\_August](#)

<sup>38</sup> [07.06.29\\_policy\\_ratings\\_perfo\\_apprs\\_and\\_goals\\_2B\\_cmpltd\\_31Sep](#)

<sup>39</sup> [07.07.02\\_CHughes\\_\(2\\_me\\_only\)\\_goals\\_must\\_show\\_progress\\_all](#)

<sup>40</sup> [07.07.27\\_2CHughes\\_will\\_do\\_perfo\\_which\\_4\\_fdbck\\_what\\_said\\_19July](#)

<sup>41</sup> [07.07.27\\_2CHughes\\_will\\_do\\_perfo\\_which\\_4\\_fdbck\\_what\\_said\\_19July](#)

'performance appraisal' meeting on [24.20.07](#): lines 188-244; lines 367-392; 734-737.

513 I told CH that I repeated what she had said in light of her expectation that I get feedback from  
514 others and reemphasised the point that *"I have not had sufficiently substantial dealings with  
515 others to seek their feedback"*. I explained that, since the beginning of the year, I had been in  
516 contact with, literally, hundreds of people throughout the global network, but it had been limited  
517 to the exchange of emails.

518 CH suggested I get feedback from attendees at the KM event in March 2007 as I *"played a key  
519 part in its success"*. I viewed this as an unrealistic suggestion as only she and close colleagues  
520 are in a position to give feedback on what I have done. (Not enough interaction with the others to  
521 warrant getting feedback). I nonetheless contacted one of the people for whom I had also done  
522 some other work – so as to give the person more opportunity to feedback on my performance.  
523 (Not surprisingly, I never got a reply)

524 I also contacted [Finbarr Geaney](#), a colleague in my immediate team, and Denise [X] (feedback  
525 covered below under 'part 2' of my performance appraisal on 24 October 2007).

526 **1 August 2007** – I filed [my performance appraisal](#) on the Dialogue system. In the last section  
527 of the appraisal, 'Year-end – Self-assessment' I wrote that I had *"managed to achieve my  
528 objectives in spite of the very distressing conditions under which I have had to work for half the  
529 year to date"*. I then related the main events that have taken place this year.

530 **6 August 2007** – CH told me that she was cancelling my performance appraisal, scheduled for  
531 the following day, as she had forwarded my form to HR due to what I wrote on the form. She  
532 said *"It's alright; there is plenty of time to do this"*. This amounted to a significant change of tune  
533 considering the pressure she placed on me to file my performance appraisal.

## 534 **6.2 My being made to miss the official deadlines for completion of the process – with its** 535 **ensuing financial penalty - caused me to suffer ongoing anguish and distress**

536 Worried about the approaching [31 August deadline](#) for completing the performance appraisals,  
537 in the **third week of August**, I asked CH when my performance appraisal would take place. She  
538 replied that she had not heard back from HR but there was *"still plenty of time to do it as the  
539 deadline had been extended"*.

540 During the **second week of September** I again reminded CH that my performance appraisal  
541 was still outstanding, and got the same reply i.e. that she had not heard back from HR.

542 In light of the policy emails we had received ([29 June](#)<sup>42</sup> and [21 September 2007](#)<sup>43</sup>) about **30  
543 September being the "final deadline for filing goals to ensure eligibility for salary/bonus review  
544 consideration"**, in the **last week of September**, I again asked CH when my performance  
545 appraisal meeting would take place.

546 Not surprisingly, considering the financial penalty for non-completion of the process by the  
547 stated deadline, I was getting extremely worried about the delay.

548 **W/c 1 October 2007**, for the fourth time, I asked CH about my performance appraisal.

549 It finally led her to send me, on **3 October 2007**, a meeting request for **9 October**, at 16h00.

<sup>42</sup> [07.06.29\\_policy\\_ratings\\_perfo\\_apprs\\_and\\_goals\\_2B\\_cmpltd\\_31Sep](#)

<sup>43</sup> [07.09.21\\_policy\\_email\\_review\\_by\\_12\\_Oct\\_goals\\_by31Oct\\_penalty](#)

550 On [9 October 2007](#) CH informed me that the meeting room had been changed. I looked on the  
551 meeting room booking system: the [room was booked for 1.5 hrs i.e. until 17h30](#)<sup>44</sup>.

552 By then, a total of ten weeks had gone by since I filed my performance appraisal on the Dialogue  
553 system on 1 August 2007. Adding to my anguish and distress were:

554 The message in the [5 October 2007](#) internal newsletter<sup>45</sup>: *“Functional management teams and  
555 PMLs are now working through the process of determining individual salary and bonus awards  
556 and this will be confirmed to you in week commencing 22 October”*

557 The [5 October 2007](#) policy email<sup>46</sup> stating: *“As previously communicated in K-News (internal  
558 newsletter) and via email, if you do not have your year-end review for 2006/2007 recorded in the  
559 Dialogue system by 12 October 2007, you are not eligible to receive any bonus award for the  
560 2006/2007 financial year”*

561 **6.3 On three occasions during my 9 October 2007 ‘part 1’ performance review, Ceri  
562 Hughes threatened to end the meeting if I persisted on raising the events that had  
563 taken place. She proceeded with imparting failings against me I disagree with.  
564 Having led me to believe that my appraisal would take place ‘the KPMG Way’, fifty  
565 five minutes into the meeting, she announced that she was ending it on the ground  
566 of needing “to go to another meeting”**

I secretly recorded the [09.10.07](#) meeting; recording under **section 8.1** [KPMG pg. Sections 8.2 and 3](#) relate to the meeting.

(I only revealed that I had done this at the time of launching the KPMG page on my website, in 2015). (I draw your attention to my Comments, after **line 300**, above, that KPMG / its ‘brothers’ on its behalf had tasked ‘my’ doctor with asking me (in vain) whether I had done this).

567 CH started the meeting by explaining the areas that would be covered: my goals and  
568 performance against these; skills and behaviours; career development i.e. the areas included in  
569 the form – and hence the standard approach for conducting a performance review I am used to  
570 since joining KPMG in 1997.

571 **Fifty five minutes into the meeting**, CH announced that she *“should have mentioned this before”*,  
572 but she had to stop in order to go to another meeting. By then, we had only discussed the goals  
573 section.

574 She said that she would ask a secretary to schedule another meeting by the end of the week to  
575 complete my appraisal. As she was planning to be in Canary Wharf (where I am located) on the  
576 Friday, this could *“provide the opportunity”*.

577 Never in my 10 years at KPMG have had my appraiser do this to me.

578 Page 5 of the [Guidelines for Performance Management 2007](#) states, among other: *“You should  
579 allow sufficient time for the meeting e.g. two hours, and ensure priority in your diary”*

<sup>44</sup> [07.10.09\\_perfo\\_meet\\_bkg\\_of\\_room\\_shows\\_1.5hr](#)

<sup>45</sup> [07.10.05\\_KPMG\\_Europe\\_nwsrm\\_promo\\_salary\\_increase\\_Oct](#)

<sup>46</sup> [07.10.05\\_policy\\_reminder\\_12Oct\\_4\\_perfo\\_appr\\_penalty\\_no\\_bonus](#)

580 I captured [my own notes](#) of the meeting <sup>47</sup>

As stated in my Comments on the previous page, I did NOT tell KPMG that [I had recorded the meeting](#) (recording under **section 8.1 KPMG pg**). Hence, what I supplied with my Grievance was a much reduced version.

The below events are covered under **sections 8.1 to 8.3 KPMG pg**.

581 **Comments from CH** (which she also captured on [my performance appraisal form](#) <sup>48</sup> - except the  
582 first one)

583 • That I had *"let my personal problem come into my work life"*.

584 I argued that it was not true. That it was KPMG that had opted to let it come into my work life.  
585 That by the time of my mid-year appraisal (end of March), in the preceding six weeks, [I had been](#)  
586 [threatened with bankruptcy proceedings](#) and of having the flat taken away from me unless I paid  
587 an unjustified service charge demand; had [a claim filed against me](#) in [court](#) for the amount of this  
588 [fraudulent demand](#); [the police](#) had made [false accusations against me to my website host](#), and  
589 had branded me as [a "Nazi"](#).

590 At mid-year, no comment was made about my *"letting my personal problem come into my work*  
591 *life"*. **Why? Because I did not then, and nor have I subsequently.** For me work is my 'safe  
592 heaven', 'my escape' from my personal problems. Concentrating on my work allows me to forget  
593 everything else.

594 As I wrote in my [performance appraisal](#): *"While by mid-year, I was suffering greatly from events*  
595 *taking place in my private life (unlawful threat of bankruptcy, fraudulent claim filed against me,*  
596 *false accusations, etc.), I nonetheless opted to leave this out of my mid-year performance*  
597 *appraisal. Being at work and concentrating on it gave me the possibility to forget about my*  
598 *problems. I can no longer leave this out of the equation as my personal situation has entered my*  
599 *work life and has led to events that have impacted on my ability to perform my work, as well as*  
600 *my wellbeing"*

601 (NB: **The intention to make this claim against me had been 'cooked' for some time.** See below:  
602 'part 2' of my appraisal on 24 October 2004, as well as section on my perceptions on *"the offers*  
603 *of help"*)

604 • **That I am** *"not proactive"*, that **she expects** *"a manager of my seniority and experience to run*  
605 *with things"*, *"to take the initiative"*, *"drive things forward"*, to be *"appropriately assertive"*

606 Of note: CH voiced these perceived failings against me in the context of **"this year"**.

I emphasised "this year" because her (and later, Bassett and Woodhouse's) false, highly vicious, cruel, malicious and perverse accusations against me were diametrically opposed to the feedback I had received at KPMG [in the previous 9 years](#).

607 This came, firstly, in the context of my stating on the form that [I had been unable to fully](#)  
608 [complete two of my goals](#) (in relation to the industries and services) [due to issues outside of my](#)  
609 [control, namely actions, decisions required by others](#). [CH fought me on these, blanking out my](#)  
610 [replies](#).

<sup>47</sup> 07.10.09\_my\_notes\_perfo\_appr\_part1\_with\_CHughes

<sup>48</sup> 2006-07\_My\_KPMG\_Performance\_Appl\_filed\_Dialogue\_on\_1Aug07

611 It included challenging me on my argument that my role needed to be defined, to which she  
612 replied “it’s up to you to define it”. I challenged this on the basis that I could not define my role  
613 “in a complete vacuum”.

614 My view is that since May I was being ostracised, marginalised, purposely ‘kept out of the loop’. I  
615 could tell that a lot of what was going on was not being communicated to me.

616 I was able to provide evidence of this in November. It occurred during a conversation with CH  
617 who said that there had been “a lot of changes in the industry leaders”<sup>49</sup> It proved that I had  
618 been missed out on communication, as well as vindicated the reasons I had stated on my  
619 appraisal form for being unable to take one of my goals any further: identifying the appropriate  
620 contact to get buy-in and commitment to drive the work on their sites; determining plans and  
621 current resources, etc. (I explained this again in my [22 November 2007](#) email to CH<sup>50</sup>)

622 Secondly, CH criticisms came in the context of my raising the fact that, in relation to all the  
623 substantial projects on which I had been working since May 2007, I had not been told about  
624 follow-up actions – in spite of my asking for the information. When I gave her examples, she  
625 replied that she was “very busy”. Hence, it was up to me to persist.

626 As CH voiced these failings against me in the context of “this year”, how are the following  
627 explained?

628 • My success in jointly project managing the Global KM event in March 2007, attended by c.  
629 100 people, which led CH to write on [my performance appraisal at the interim](#): “Noëlle’s  
630 involvement with the conference in March was hugely useful to the event and she played a  
631 key role. I am personally very grateful for the efforts that she put in...”

632 Achieving this certainly required being “proactive”, “running with things” and “appropriately  
633 assertive”

634 • The fact that no comment of the kind was made at my mid-year appraisal. Did I ‘suddenly’  
635 transform from April 2007 into a “non-proactive”, timid person, unable to take the initiative?

636 Any fair minded, reasonable person who has had dealings with me / is aware of what I have  
637 done [since 2002](#) in relation to my personal problems (let alone during the rest of my life), would  
638 laugh out loud on being told that I am perceived as “not being proactive”, lacking in confidence,  
639 “initiative” and drive.

640 My perception that these failings were being ‘fabricated’ against me was further reinforced  
641 during ‘part 2’ of my performance appraisal on [24 October 2007](#) – as covered below.

642 CH refused point blank to acknowledge that the actions taken against me had affected my ability  
643 to work. On three occasions she threatened to end the meeting if I insisted on raising them. She  
644 did not reply to my question as to who would discuss it if she was not going to do it herself. At  
645 one point, when I raised what took place in April 2007, she said: “how about the other 11 months  
646 of the year?”

## Section 8.1 [KPMG pg](#)

<sup>49</sup> 07.11.07\_2PBassett\_KW\_JD\_CH\_form\_not\_rtrnd\_industries\_nt\_informed

<sup>50</sup> 07.11.22\_11h44\_2CHughes\_need\_plan\_priorities\_4Industries

647 Having said to me in early August that she had sent my form to HR due to what I captured in the  
648 last part of it, CH then attributed the subsequent delay in setting-up my review to HR not getting  
649 back to her.

650 What was the point of sending the form to HR, given that, 10 weeks on, what I had written on the  
651 form was being totally ignored? My answer to this is: to torment me, humiliate and demean me.  
652 I view what took place as amounting to harassment, abuse of power, discrimination and  
653 victimisation.

To which I add: [criminal psychological harassment \(Persecution # 1\)](#); [extracts from Canadian website](#).

654 Why is KPMG refusing to recognise that the actions it took against me have impacted on my  
655 ability to perform my work i.e. my contractual obligations?

656 In relation to [the quality of my work](#), at year-end, CH assessed it ([on my form](#)) as being of “very  
657 high quality”; “impressive attention to detail, along with [a] capacity to process large amounts of  
658 information”.

659 CH made similar comments during the [9 October 2007](#) meeting, including assessing my work on  
660 a project as being “a superb piece of work, done very quickly, and very useful”

661 **6.4 Contrary to what had been agreed with Ceri Hughes, the completion of my**  
662 **performance review did not take place by the end of the week, leading me to**  
663 **perceive events as a continuation of the harassment and bullying tactics intended**  
664 **to torment me, demean and humiliate me**

665 As, by **Thursday 11 October** I had not been contacted about another meeting, at [09h32](#) <sup>51</sup> I  
666 sent an email to CH to report it. I also wrote that the consequence of this was that [I would now](#)  
667 [miss the final deadline of 12 October](#) (policy email of [5 October 2007 – 15h49](#) <sup>52</sup> stating that  
668 [failure to meet this deadline would result in not being eligible to receive any bonus award](#)).

669 CH replied at [10h54](#) <sup>53</sup> “Unfortunately my diary is completely committed at the moment and I  
670 have not been able to schedule any additional meetings. However, we have until next week to  
671 complete your appraisal, so please do not be concerned that we will miss the deadline of  
672 tomorrow. As soon as I am able to schedule the appointment to complete the discussion I, or  
673 Ruth, will be in touch with a suggested time. I will be in Canary Wharf for part of tomorrow, so I'll  
674 see you then”

675 I replied at [11h10](#) <sup>54</sup> that “I have not seen any communication that the deadline had been further  
676 postponed”

677 **Friday 12 October 2007** – In the morning, when CH was in Canary Wharf, I asked her to supply  
678 me with a copy of the communication she was referring to. She said that she had been told by  
679 HR. I repeated my request to be supplied with a copy of the communication. CH left Canary  
680 Wharf around lunchtime. By the end of the day I had not received anything from her.

<sup>51</sup> 07.10.11\_9h32\_2CHughes\_I\_have\_not\_been\_cntctd\_other\_meet

<sup>52</sup> 07.10.05\_policy\_reminder\_12Oct\_4\_perfo\_appr\_penalty\_no\_bonus

<sup>53</sup> 07.10.11\_10h54\_CHughes\_diary\_full\_exntsn\_till\_nxt\_wk

<sup>54</sup> 07.10.11\_10h54\_CHughes\_diary\_full\_exntsn\_till\_nxt\_wk

681 I perceived these events as a continuation of the bullying and harassment through abuse of  
682 power intended to torment me, demean and humiliate me.

683 **6.5 With part of my performance appraisal review still outstanding by close of play on**  
684 **12 October 2007, and no confirmation that the deadline had indeed been further**  
685 **extended, I opted to send an email to Jeanette Dunworth, HR, on 15 October to**  
686 **report events**

687 In my [15 October 2007](#)<sup>55</sup> email to JD, on which I cc'd CH, I reported what had taken place in  
688 terms of the process since 22 June 2007.

689 I also related part of what had taken place at the [9 October 2007](#) meeting with CH, including my  
690 stating my objective at the beginning of the meeting as: "getting clarity on my position at KPMG".

691 [JD replied at 17h40](#) (contained in the above email) that she would "look at the points I raised".  
692 She also wrote that the deadline for filing the performance appraisals had been extended to  
693 [Friday 19 October](#) "for you and a number of employees who have not been able to complete the  
694 process".

695 [I replied at 18h05](#) (contained in the above email) "What I am looking for is honesty. What has  
696 taken place is totally unlike Ceri whom I have always perceived as highly professional. This  
697 includes following the KPMG policies on performance appraisal 'to the letter'"

Discussed [section 9 KPMG pg](#)

698 **6.6 The outcome was a change of appraisers from Ceri Hughes to Peter Bassett and**  
699 **Kathy Woodhouse, leading to 'part 2' of my appraisal being conducted on 24**  
700 **October 2007 i.e. nearly three months after I had filed my appraisal form on the**  
701 **system – and one week later than the 'absolute deadline' for completing the**  
702 **performance appraisal process**

703 [17 October 2007](#) – email from CH<sup>56</sup> saying she met with HR and that in light of my email to HR  
704 on [15 October](#) "we feel that it is not appropriate for me to continue the discussion". That "HR  
705 have advised that I discuss this with Peter Bassett and we jointly identify who can finalise this  
706 process with you". She added that she anticipated this to be done "next week, due to diaries".

707 [19 October 2007](#) – email from JD<sup>57</sup> that "Peter Bassett has confirmed that he will be taking this  
708 forward..." Also that "a member of the HR department will also attend the meeting to ensure that  
709 your appraisal is finalised in a fair and independent way"

710 [24 October 2007](#) – 'Part 2' of my performance appraisal took place with PB and KW (see  
711 below).

712 By then, 12 weeks i.e. three months had elapsed since I had entered my form on the system -  
713 and I had missed the 'absolute deadline' for completion of the appraisal process.

714 **6.7 While attendance by Kathy Woodhouse at 'part 2' of my performance appraisal was**  
715 **positioned as "ensuring a fair and independent assessment", I view the meeting as**

<sup>55</sup> [07.10.15\\_10h05\\_2JDunworth\\_handling\\_of\\_my\\_perfo\\_appr\\_cc\\_CHughes](#)

<sup>56</sup> [07.10.17\\_12h33\\_CHughes\\_pulling\\_out\\_my\\_perfo\\_2\\_discuss\\_PBassett](#)

<sup>57</sup> [07.10.19\\_14h57\\_JDunworth\\_PBassett\\_Other\\_will\\_do\\_rest\\_my\\_perfo](#)

716 a continuation of fabricating failings against me which, while disagreement on these  
717 was recognised, nonetheless resulted in my being assessed overall as '8-NI': "Your  
718 overall performance does not meet the requirements and immediate improvement is  
719 required". And this assessment was made in the context of describing my work as  
720 being "of very high quality"

721 As an introduction, I vehemently object to my overall [performance rating of '8-NI'](#) and regard it as  
722 'the last straw' as I view it as highly unfair and unjust because based on a false assessment of  
723 my performance.

724 I captured [my notes of the meeting](#) <sup>58</sup> The main points voiced by PB and KW were captured on  
725 my form – including about "my impact on others" – which is related to CH's comment during the  
726 [9 October 2007](#) meeting that I "had let my personal problem come into my work life".

727 Below are the main points of the meeting.

As in the case of the [09.10.07](#) meeting with Hughes, I also secretly recorded the [24.10.07](#)  
meeting with Bassett and Woodhouse (recording under **section 9.1** [KPMG pg](#)). Hence, what I  
supplied to KPMG with my Grievance was a much reduced version.

The below events are covered under **sections 9.1 to 9.7** KPMG pg.

728 I started by asking for [a summary of what CH had communicated to them](#) following 'part 1' of my  
729 appraisal on [9 October 2007](#). PB said "her view is that your work is of reasonable quality".

730 I corrected him saying that CH had said that my work is of "undeniable high quality; eye for  
731 detail, high level of accuracy". That she had assessed my work on a project (use of new media  
732 by competitors) as being of "superb quality".

733 PB's reply gave me an immediate feel that this meeting was not going to be "fair".

734 Having accepted my reply, PB said that CH is concerned that I "did not achieve a number of my  
735 goals". I agreed she had said this and added that I disagreed with her assessment. I repeated  
736 what I said to CH.

737 PB and KW pursued the same line as CH, attempting to make the "not proactive" label 'stick'  
738 against me. Having explained what I had done, at one point I said "how many times am I meant  
739 to ask Ceri for the outcome of the meetings?"

740 I repeated my view that I was being excluded, cut-off and that there were blocks to my being  
741 able to move on to the next stage of performing my objectives.

742 KW asked me what CH's reply had been when I had said that follow-up was not communicated  
743 to me. I told her that her response had been that she "is very busy". At one point KW asked  
744 what I could have done. I replied: "Ask Ceri the same question every day". It seemed to me that  
745 she did not like the answer. What else could I have done? Go down on my knees and beg?

746 KW said: "might it have something to do with your tenacity, pro-activity, determination?" (She  
747 was clearly following the route taken by CH). I laughed at that saying that she would have a very  
748 hard time proving I lack determination and tenacity.

749 I perceived them as being desperate to make some labels 'stick' against me.

---

<sup>58</sup> [07.10.24\\_my\\_notes\\_perfo\\_appraisal\\_part2\\_with\\_PBassett\\_KW](#)

750 I quoted as example of my ability to establish strong relationship that the day before, a colleague  
751 contacted me from Germany writing as though we had been in regular contact since the time I  
752 was in Germany (seven years ago). I also mentioned another German colleague who, c. two  
753 years ago, wanted me to come to Germany to manage a project because she had been “very  
754 impressed” by the way I had managed a project of which she was a member. I said: “*that’s not*  
755 *the kind of contact and feedback you can associate with somebody who stays in their shell.*  
756 *That’s the impression I am making on colleagues*”

757 To this PB said: “*That was three years ago. We know you have a lot of experience. The concern*  
758 *is what has taken place this year*”.

759 ‘Funny’ how “*this year*”, and more specifically from April 2007, I ‘mysteriously’ transformed into  
760 another person who is not proactive, lacks initiative and determination. I find this very insulting.

761 Not only was this not said at my mid-year appraisal, in the [previous year when PB was my](#)  
762 [performance](#) appraisal manager, his overall assessment was: “*Much of what [Noëlle] does is in*  
763 *the background and goes relatively unnoticed...It was possible to give some profile to this in the*  
764 *summary RAS achievements and surprised a number of senior people in terms of what had*  
765 *been achieved*”

766 What does that show? (Aside from the fact that I do not go about ‘trumpeting’ about my work), it  
767 shows that I do take the initiative, identifying what needs to be done - and that ‘I get on with it!’.  
768 That’s what I am paid for as a manager, and that’s what I do.

769 The facts, as I see them, is that, since April, I have been intentionally excluded and marginalised  
770 – evidently, with the ulterior motive of making the “not proactive” label ‘stick’ against me – and  
771 ultimately use it as one of the reasons for giving me an overall “need development” rating.

772 PB and KW then turned to my “*impact on others*”. (I was waiting for this to come!)

773 They raised it in the context of considering the [feedback from Finbarr Geaney](#)<sup>59</sup>, a colleague in  
774 my immediate team (hence, [who also reports to CH](#)). He wrote: “*You have a well known*  
775 *personal legal difficulty with your house. This problem does get you down a lot and it sometimes*  
776 *impacts negatively upon your mood in the office and thus your impact with colleagues*”

777 Objecting to his assumption, I asked: “*What does he know about my situation? This is pure*  
778 *speculation on his part*”. PB said that Finbarr “*could have saved himself writing this*” As to KW:  
779 “*He says that it’s well known, so you must be talking about it*”, to which I replied: “*No, I don’t. It’s*  
780 *people who talk about me behind my back*”

781 KW asked whether I saw Finbarr’s feedback as fair. I replied that it is his point of view, and read  
782 my reply to Finbarr in which I make it clear that what has been taking place at work has been  
783 impacting on me (contained in the above email).

784 Although I find some of Finbarr’s comments objectionable, among others, telling me what I  
785 should do in my private life, CH’s angry reaction on 30 July 2007 following my capturing in my [27](#)  
786 [July](#) email what she had told me on 19 July 2007 i.e. to get feedback on “*my impact on others*”  
787 led me to suspect that Finbarr’s feedback had been influenced. However, I opted to keep my  
788 thoughts to myself in [my reply to him](#).

---

<sup>59</sup> 07.08.05\_Finbarr\_Geaney\_FABRICATED\_fdbck\_my\_performance

789 At some point I said to PB and KW: *"Have my colleagues seen me in tears at my desk? Oh yes*  
790 *they have, during the whole month of April. And why was I in tears at my desk? Was it due to my*  
791 *'house problem'? No it was not, it was because of the action taken against me by KPMG, getting*  
792 *these horrible messages when I tried to access sites that made me feel as though I was the*  
793 *criminal – added to my personal problem. That's what affected me".*

794 It was clear that PB and KW were pursuing the same line as CH i.e. that I had *"let my personal*  
795 *problem come into my work life". And it was blatantly obvious that none of them wanted to*  
796 *recognise the facts. PB's reply to my relating the horrendous time I had been made to endure*  
797 *during April 2007 was "It has not been the best year for [me]". KW also repeated this. (And*  
798 *whose fault was this?)*

Of course, in [its PACK OF LIES Defence](#), KPMG repeated the same outrageous lie, under **para.11**: ***"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."***

In fact, in total, Woodhouse said this **9 times** (variations of it) during the [24.10.07](#) meeting; they are compiled e.g. at the end of my Comments on the [25.10.07-8h30](#) email from Bassett.

799 Not only were all three not recognising the facts, they were trying to cover-up what had taken  
800 place by fabricating failings on my part – and had been working on this plan for weeks. I find this  
801 very sickening.

802 Against Finbarr's feedback I highlighted the feedback I received [from Denise B](#) (senior  
803 manager/director level) <sup>60</sup> with whom I have had a significant number of contacts in the first  
804 quarter of the year i.e. [from October 2006 to January 2007](#) (as well as members of her team) "I  
805 first met Noëlle, when I took on the project to understand how Global Markets could help  
806 Advisory with their proposals and pitches...Advisory was a bit of a learning curve for the team.  
807 Noëlle, was very giving of her time and her experience, in particular her contacts, her network  
808 and her technical knowledge.

809 She was very cooperative...I felt I could contact Noëlle at any time to test ideas or check my  
810 understanding. Noëlle has a very good technical understanding of many of the vast range of  
811 services we offer and was invaluable in helping translate technical jargon into market speaking  
812 language.

813 She would often deliver much more than was asked and at short notice, in particular she would  
814 suggest easier ways to get information or indeed people to contact. She showed  
815 professionalism, enthusiasm and a positive attitude despite many structural changes ongoing  
816 within Advisory at the time of the project.

817 In terms of making an impact, well I would definitely get in touch with Noëlle again in terms of a  
818 similar situation"

819 To my emphasising Denise's feedback in terms of "making an impact", PB said: "It's only one  
820 comment"

821 At that point KW returned to the feedback from Finbarr saying that she is "concerned about  
822 relationships" i.e. my impact on others / developing relationships. Why was she again focusing  
823 on Finbarr's comment? Surely, "It's only one comment" as well. Why is it that Finbarr Geaney's  
824 feedback appears to have more weight than the feedback from Denise B?

---

<sup>60</sup> 07.07.30\_DB\_fdbck\_my\_YrEnd\_perfo\_appraisal

825 My perception is that Denise's feedback 'threw a spanner in the works'.

826 PB said that he expected somebody of my position to be able to get feedback from more people  
827 – and KW joined him on this. Yet again, I highlighted the fact that I had been made to work solo  
828 on projects. Yes, I had been in contact with hundreds of people during the year but these were  
829 limited to a few emails.

830 (There was another colleague I could have asked for feedback, but she was on long term sick  
831 leave).

832 PB said that CH feels I "should not have been working so much in isolation", that I "should have  
833 had more contact with the team". I replied "I was reviewing 130 sites and sub-sites. How can I  
834 work with other people doing this? Once I had finished reviewing the sites for Forensic and  
835 Corporate Finance I approached the Knowledge managers for their input. I then moved on to  
836 reviewing competitors' usage of new media. How could have I worked with other people doing  
837 this?"

838 To which I will add that CH had certainly not told me to share the work on these projects with  
839 others. She most definitely expected me to do all of it by myself. And one of the motives was  
840 now obvious: to then be able to say what I was hearing at this meeting. This had certainly been  
841 'cooked' for weeks.

**Note that Hughes had given me projects that only I could do:**

[Line 308-311, 9 Oct 07 - Ceri Hughes](#) – "In the pool of resource I have got allocated to me, you are the resource I have allocated to industries, because your strengths are: your attention to detail; your knowledge of the business; your experience as client-facing person; your accuracy; and your commitment to get the job done. You are the perfect person to do all that with service lines and industries"

[Lines 370-372](#) – "...there are a lot of people who say they [understand our services], but they don't...you are one of the few people who has that overview of all the service lines."

How could I "engage the team" in my work? It did not have the necessary knowledge. I sure wish I could have shared some of these massive projects ([pg 7-9 of my form](#)).

842 In relation to the training section, as I went through the self-learning, PB asked "How about  
843 negotiating skills, relationship building, making an impact on others?" I thought to myself: here  
844 we go again!

845 PB said "In relation to my feeling isolated, cut-off, that training courses are good for interacting  
846 with people" I could not believe what I was hearing. They isolate me and then turn it against me,  
847 saying that it is something I need to address through training. I replied: "I don't have a problem  
848 establishing contact with people, and have shown that in my 10 years at KPMG. The issue is:  
849 my not working on tasks that have provided me with opportunity for extended contact"

850 PB asked if "[I am] in the wrong role, maybe it would be best if you were handling projects from  
851 beginning to end?". To which I replied "The service lines and industries are exactly that type of  
852 work. The next step now is to discuss implementation with them"

853 At some point PB asked whether the reason I did not raise with CH my perception of being  
854 excluded was because I did not want to hear the answer. I replied: "One thing I am not is afraid  
855 of people being open and direct with me. In addition, these are part of my objectives"

856 KW picked-up the point saying she was “confused” as I had said “that it is not Ceri’s way of  
857 working” i.e. she is good at communicating with the team, and asked “Why do you think you are  
858 being excluded?”

859 I replied: “I don’t know. You tell me. Why also has Ceri handled my performance appraisal in this  
860 manner? That’s not her way” KW repeated her question, to which I replied “No, I am not going to  
861 second guess reasons for what has taken place”. She insisted, trying to drag something out of  
862 me; saying that “I am highly intelligent”. I refused to reply. She continued to insist.

863 Eventually I said “What has taken place is totally un-KPMG way. I don’t know why. It’s not I who  
864 took the decision to do things that way. Hence, I am wrong the person to ask for an explanation”.  
865 It looked to me as though KW did not like my answer.

866 In relation to the Career Development section I read what I wrote on the form: that “sadly, in light  
867 of what has taken place over recent months my objective of being promoted to senior manager  
868 is not going to be realised. I feel extremely saddened by this”. I add that I am being treated  
869 differently from others e.g. no internet access.

870 PB said “Again it’s your interpretation. There is no reason why you should not keep this as an  
871 objective. That I “must consider the steps [I] should take” He asked “what would it take to gain  
872 back the trust? To move forward?” I replied: “I don’t feel that I am wanted here anymore”.

873 PB disagreed, saying that over the last nine months KPMG has tried to help, including CH. (See  
874 section below for my views on this). He added that as I enjoyed my year in Germany, maybe  
875 there are opportunities as a result of the European merger.

876 To which I replied: “What about the other issues? What has taken place with Ceri is not the Ceri  
877 I know”. KW said something along the line that “maybe Ceri saw that I was sad and wanted to  
878 protect me” (Aside from KW evidently continuing to impart on me that I had “let my personal  
879 problem come into my work life” - is this how what happened can be interpreted? I think not).

880 KW went on to say that I “should have a coach to help [me] with my promotion objective”, while  
881 PB said that I “need to develop a plan for going forward”. I listened, analyzing the elements of  
882 the scheme concocted to support their assessment. Evidently, “this year”, and more accurately,  
883 since April 2007, I have suddenly become ‘so useless’ that no less than ‘a coach’ is deemed  
884 necessary to help me overcome ‘my shortcomings’. How fascinating!

Events discussed under **section 9.6** [KPMG pg.](#)

Bassett repeated this in his [25.10.07 email](#): “...agreeing a personal development plan and identifying a coach to help you.”

885 In relation to the overall performance rating, I rated myself as ‘strong performance’.

886 PB and KW said that because “you have missed performance on some goals”, they were giving  
887 me a [rating of ‘8-NI’](#). PB added “It means you are still entitled to salary review and bonus”.

888 Seeing this assessment as highly unfair and unjust, I again repeated my points, including the  
889 impact of the circumstances on my ability to demonstrate the “skills and behaviours”. PB agreed  
890 that there is a difference of view, and said that “It has not been a good year”. (Yet again I ask:  
891 whose fault is it?)

892 So, while they both agreed on the difference in views, at the end of the day, I get the ‘8-NI’  
893 overall rating – with which I vehemently disagree.

894 I see it as highly unfair and unjust as I consider that it is based on a false assessment of my  
895 performance. The '8-NI' rating reads:

896 "Your overall performance does not meet the requirements and immediate improvement is  
897 required. While you deliver strong performance results, you are not demonstrating KPMG's  
898 Global Values and Skills and Behaviors. It is important that you develop a plan focusing on  
899 changing your behaviour and / or improving your skills and behaviours".

900 Last year, on my performance appraisal, in relation to my stating my ambition "To be promoted  
901 to senior manager in 2006", PB, who was my performance appraiser, wrote: "This is a very  
902 realistic target given Noëlle's experience and capabilities" (as I captured on my [2007](#)  
903 [performance appraisal form](#)).

904 ...and gave me a '5-P' overall assessment rating: "You are consistently achieving strong overall  
905 performance by demonstrating KPMG's Global Values and Skills and Behaviors and delivering  
906 strong performance results. Your contribution is recognized and appreciated" (Same rating as in  
907 previous years)

908 I view CH, PB and KW's assessment and approach as intended to cover-up the actions taken  
909 against me by KPMG - by fabricating failings on my part, and as excuses to go back on PB's  
910 assessment when he was my performance appraisal manager in 2006 i.e. that my ambition to  
911 be promoted to senior manager this year was "a very realistic target". I see their ultimate  
912 objective as forcing me to leave KPMG.

913 **6.8 I retained the hope that, post the 24 October 2007 meeting, consideration of my**  
914 **replies during the meeting would lead to a change of position on my overall**  
915 **assessment rating of '8-NI'. When, as a result of chasing, my form was finally**  
916 **returned to me two weeks later, on 8 November 2007 – the position had clearly**  
917 **remained unchanged. This was 'the final straw' for me**

918 On [7 November 2007](#)<sup>61</sup> I sent an email to PB, CH, KW and JD saying: "It is two weeks today  
919 since I have had 'part 2' of my performance appraisal with Peter and Kathy. The Dialogue form  
920 has not yet been returned to me. I want to know the reason"

921 By then I had missed the absolute final deadline for completion of the whole process and was  
922 incurring a penalty, as evidenced by the [22 October 2007](#)<sup>62</sup> policy email "...if you do not have  
923 your agreed goals for the year ahead recorded by 31 October 2007, your bonus will be  
924 postponed until February 2008"

925 The form was returned to me the following day, 8 November, at 10h28<sup>63</sup> The automated  
926 message reads "(Year end review: Individual) Complete your 2006/2007 year-end review – Task  
927 due date: 14 July 2007"

928 One week later, on [15 November 2007](#), PB was chasing me for returning my appraisal form. I  
929 replied<sup>64</sup> "I am considering my reply". (I also sent the email to CH and KW).

---

<sup>61</sup> 07.11.07\_2PBassett\_KW\_JD\_CH\_form\_not\_rtrnd\_industries\_nt\_informed

<sup>62</sup> 07.10.22\_policy\_reminder\_31Oct\_4\_goals\_penalty\_bonus\_Feb08

<sup>63</sup> 07.11.08\_10h28\_Dialogue\_AutoMsg\_form\_returned\_task\_2\_do

<sup>64</sup> 07.11.15\_9h54\_2PBassett\_considering\_my\_reply\_2PerfoForm

930 On [25 November 2007](#), I received another email from [PB](#) asking me whether I had considered  
931 my reply to the Dialogue form. I replied on 27 November that I would be sending it on Monday  
932 i.e. 3 December 2007.

933 During that time I was going through absolute agony. Because of the 'huge amount of credit'  
934 KPMG had accumulated in my esteem since joining the firm in 1997, I could not bring myself to  
935 face the facts.

936 In an attempt to get clarity and objectivity on my perceptions, I spent four days developing a draft  
937 in which I captured what had taken place. On Monday 3 December I set-up an 'off the record'  
938 meeting with a Partner (on 5 December) to discuss my dilemma: I assessed the situation as  
939 "very serious" but, because KPMG had been so supportive of me in the past, I did not want to  
940 kick-start a formal grievance procedure process. I wanted to stay at KPMG, but my situation in  
941 my group had become untenable.

942 (I saw CH on 5 December to explain the reason for the delay in returning my form).

943 Due to Partner diaries, I could not set-up another 'off-the-record' meeting until 18 December  
944 2007 (with another Partner).

945 I felt in a state of limbo, not knowing what to say to CH and PB, as I did not know what the  
946 outcome of the meeting would be, and what I was going to do.

947 It was an agonising time for me as I take my work very seriously. I could not face going to the  
948 office as I had nothing to do. Indeed, from mid November, I found myself being totally  
949 marginalised. Practically a whole week went by without my receiving any direct / indirect  
950 communication from CH.

The reason for the (stepped-up) treatment? I was 'daring' to not fall into their Machiavellian trap.

I am sure that, at the end of the [24.10.07](#) meeting, Peter Bassett thought he had 'got me' – counting on the fact that I was 8 years from retirement, to make me swallow the poisoned pill that would have given him et.al. a freehand to continue abusing me at will i.e. continue feeding their insatiable craving for sadistic kicks.

951 As evidenced by my [21 November 2007](#)<sup>65</sup> email to CH, I considered and took forward all that I  
952 could possibly do. I resorted to offering my help to various colleagues. While all said that they  
953 had a lot to do, they all turned down my offer of help. As I had been sensing for a very long time  
954 by then, information had been communicated to them about me. It was very easy to spot those  
955 in 'the know' v. those who were not.

956 On going to the office on 14 December 2007 I found [an email from CH](#) to which she had  
957 attached [a letter](#) she said to have sent me. (I never received it). She comments on my  
958 "unauthorised absence from work" asking me to return to the office. I gave the letter to the  
959 Partner during the [18 December 2007 meeting](#), explaining the situation. Having said that I had  
960 no work to do, he told me to take the time off until our next meeting in early January, and to  
961 charge my time from 18 December under "compassionate leave"

I had *not* received the (highly threatening) [14.12.07](#) letter because, IN SPITE of my file stating that all correspondence needed to be sent to my PO Box - to ensure that '[Dear Mr Ladsky](#)' could intercept it and see that KPMG was more than ever on his side, Hughes et.al. had sent it to my

---

<sup>65</sup> 07.11.21\_12h24\_2CHughes\_my\_offer\_of\_help\_turned\_down

apartment.

The letter includes my Comments; it is discussed under **section 10.1** [KPMG pg.](#)

962 The next meeting took place on 4 January 2008. The Partner told me that PB did not want me to  
963 leave KPMG and had said that he and CH “had been doing all they could to help”.

964 Over the subsequent days, these assertions yet again kick-started an agonising analysis and  
965 thinking process for me. I did not want to leave KPMG. Were these assertions true?

966 **7 Contrary to the assertions made, events demonstrate that KPMG wants me to leave**  
967 **and that, instead of saying it, resorted to highly underhanded tactics to force me to**  
968 **leave**

969 On four occasions between July 2007 and October 2007 I tried to clarify my position at KPMG,  
970 as I perceived that I was no longer wanted.

971 On 17 July 2007, during a meeting with CH, when I told her my perception that PB “wants me  
972 out”. She replied “I can assure you that this is not the case”

973 On 9 October 2007, at the start of ‘part 1’ of my appraisal meeting with CH, I said that my  
974 objective was “to get clarity on my position at KPMG”. She replied that it was not the purpose of  
975 the meeting. I wanted to get a straight answer to my question as, the fact that it had taken more  
976 than two months to get to this meeting, led me to perceive that the meeting would be a cosmetic  
977 exercise.

978 On 15 October 2007, in my email to JD I wrote “What I am looking for is honesty”. The message  
979 was that the performance appraisal process was continuing as it led to the setting-up of ‘part 2’  
980 of my appraisal.

981 On 24 October 2007 during ‘part 2’ of my performance appraisal, I said “I don’t feel I am wanted  
982 here anymore”. PB disagreed with me, going on to talk about action plan, and salary and bonus  
983 review.

984 Considering the treatment I have been subjected to - just in the context of my performance  
985 appraisal - it is obvious that these claims are not true.

986 As an employer, when you want to retain an employee, you do not completely ignore her  
987 repeated assertions that your actions have impacted on her ability to perform her work - and  
988 proceed to cover them up by fabricating failings on the part of the employee. You do not torment,  
989 humiliate and demean an employee you want to keep. Not only is this kind of conduct against  
990 KPMG policies and Values, it is illegal.

991 Further evidence that the assertions are cosmetic is provided by the following:

992 The 5 October 2007 internal newsletter <sup>66</sup> states: “Functional management teams and PMLs are  
993 now working through the process of determining individual salary and bonus awards and this will  
994 be confirmed to you in week commencing 22 October”

995 This was further confirmed in the 26 October 2007 policy email <sup>67</sup> “Confirmation of salary and  
996 bonus awards – During the past week, your Partner or PML will have spoken to you about your

---

<sup>66</sup> 07.10.05\_KPMG\_Europe\_nwsrm\_promo\_salary\_increase\_Oct

<sup>67</sup> 07.10.26\_policy\_salary\_from\_1Oct07\_and\_bonus\_online

997 salary and any bonus award following this year's review. You can now access confirmation of  
998 your salary (effective from 1 October 2007) and bonus award for the financial year 2006/7 by  
999 clicking here"

1000 No communication of the kind was made to me.

1001 To these must be added my being victimised and discriminated against: being made to sign a  
1002 letter agreeing to be banned from the Internet on a spurious reason (as I was 'allowed' access in  
1003 August 2007 [if I used a spare computer](#)); my being increasingly marginalised and ostracised  
1004 from April 2007.

1005 **8 As to the offers of help and assertions of being "concerned" about me, considering**  
1006 **the treatment I have been made to endure since February 2007, I have come to view**  
1007 **them as KPMG 'beating me up' on the one hand, and offering to attend to my wounds**  
1008 **on the other. Furthermore, as having the ulterior motive of finding something to use**  
1009 **against me**

1010 Having explored the possibilities for assistance from the KPMG staff support services in 2004 /  
1011 05, I concluded that, given my circumstances, KPMG could not help me with my personal  
1012 problem.

1013 In August 2006, in the context of discussing my career objectives, I provided a brief update on  
1014 my situation to PB. At his insistence, I met with the then HR contact.

1015 The person agreed with me that there was nothing that KPMG could do to help me address the  
1016 fundamental issues of my personal problem.

1017 I reported this at the 13 February 2007 meeting with PB and JD when the offer of help was  
1018 raised, saying that talking about my problem was of no help to me, and amounted to upsetting  
1019 me. What I needed was action to resolve my problem – and I could not expect KPMG to help  
1020 me in this. They nonetheless insisted that I contact a WellBeing representative.

Re. my raising my Aug 06 meeting - **Lines 47-51** of [my Draft Notes](#) of the 13 Feb 07 meeting  
with Peter Bassett and Jeanette Dunworth (**sections 3.1 to 3.4** [KPMG pg](#)); [My Diary 8 Aug 06](#).

1021 I met with the representative in February. At her insistence, I spoke to a [Councillor at Well](#)  
1022 [Direct](#). I had a repeat of the reaction I tend to get from British people when I am open and honest  
1023 with my views about the factors that have led to my situation: a perception that I am 'attacking'  
1024 the country / 'attacking' them, leading them to become defensive - hence, making it impossible  
1025 for me to talk about my true feelings.

1026 As KPMG was insistent that I talk to somebody, I booked a session with the psychologist I had  
1027 seen a few times in the previous years. I can talk to him as, among others, he does not have  
1028 difficulty understanding, and accepting my take on events.

1029 As I arrived at the meeting room on 30 March 2007, the WellBeing representative was outside. I  
1030 was asked to meet with her at the end of the meeting. I could tell that she was under 'strict order'  
1031 to secure agreement from me to see somebody – as she was very persistent. This is in spite of  
1032 my telling her my assessment of the contact I had had with Well-Direct, and that, if I needed to  
1033 talk to somebody, the only person I wanted to do this with was with the professional I knew and  
1034 trusted.

30 Mar 07 meeting – covered under **section 3.4** [KPMG pg](#).

1035 I told her "[I am very sick and tired of talking about it, repeating the same thing](#). Talking does not  
1036 help. It's just turning around the pot, not addressing the issue. It's like placing a plaster over a  
1037 huge carbuncle. It does not make it go away. What I need is action, and you and [I know that](#)  
1038 [KPMG cannot get involved in my case](#)"

ACTUALLY...in spite of saying, in 'his' [07.03.07](#) email to me: "[although we are clearly not able to become directly involved in the dispute](#)"...

...I noted in my diary of events that, **on 2 May 07**, when I met Peter Bassett in a corridor, he told me: "[Why don't you bring an end to the dispute and pay the £10,000 demanded in the claim? KPMG could get a lawyer to make this very tight](#)".

I replied: "[I don't owe the £10,000 \[in the 16.02.07 fraudulent claim filed against me in West London County Court by Ladsky-Portner and Jaskel\]](#)" (and was proven right by the fact that, after I had resigned from KPMG, the claim eventually ended with [a 06.06.08 Notice of Discontinuance of "ALL" the claim against me \(Portner # 31\)](#)).

Discussed under **section 3.3** [KPMG pg.](#)

1039 To persuade me to see somebody else, the [WellBeing representative said that there is a](#)  
1040 ["specialist service" within WellBeing, that they can send me to see somebody in Harley Street. I](#)  
1041 [decided to play the game and help her 'tick the box' by going along with the idea.](#)

1042 [I met with the Harley Street person on 10 April 2007.](#) This person turned out to be just a  
1043 [therapist / councillor.](#) Afterwards I reported my assessment to the WellBeing representative: that  
1044 the person ["heard me, but did not listen to me"](#) and provided an example in support. I said that I  
1045 did not want to see anybody, that there was no point KPMG wasting its money; that the only  
1046 solution is for my situation to be resolved.

Discussed under **section 5** [KPMG pg](#) – which includes several other examples of its 'health services' KPMG threw at me between Feb and May 07 (I summarised in the Comments I added to the [08.05.07](#) email from BUPA Wellness at KPMG) – until it finally got the message that I was not going to bite on the hooks.

Its motive was a very sinister Machiavellian plan, typical of the British Establishment for dealing with people 'like me' who 'dare' rock the boat: having them certified as 'suffering from mental issues' – and locked up (**section 5.2** [KPMG pg](#)).

OF NOTE: Following my [01.07.08](#) Subject Access Request to KPMG, in its [31.07.08](#) 'reply' (**section 15.1** [KPMG pg](#)) it claimed (for sure, falsely) that it "[was not provided with a copy of Caplin's report](#)". Also, that it "[did not know Shirley Caplin's qualifications](#)" = KPMG sends its employees to see so-called "specialists" it knows nothing about!

1047 [The expectation that the 30 March 2007 decision would be upsetting is reflected by the fact that](#)  
1048 [the WellBeing representative had been lined up to talk to me.](#) Of course, at the time, this was  
1049 [just in relation to my being denied access to the Internet – not the internal sites – which had a](#)  
1050 [devastating effect on me.](#)

My being TOTALLY CUT OFF HAD BEEN THE PLAN – as evidenced in the letter [Bassett asked me to sign](#) (I returned attached to my [25.04.07](#) email). It states: "[you were informed \[at the 30 Mar 07 meeting\] that your internet and intranet \[internal sites\] access would be restricted.](#)" [Not true](#) about the "[intranet](#)". (Both emails contain my Comments).

1051 [Given my perception of injustice at the draconian measure taken against me in April 2007,](#)  
1052 [added to the fact that I was subsequently 'allowed' to access the Internet in August 2007 \(on the](#)  
1053 [condition that I use a spare computer\), I came to view the offers of help, as well as assertions of](#)

1054 being “concerned” about me as KPMG ‘beating me up’ on the one hand, and on the other  
1055 offering to attend to my wounds.

1056 While I attributed the insistence on my using the KPMG support services to KPMG’s need to  
1057 protect itself, at times I also perceived this insistence as being motivated by an intention to find  
1058 something to use against me. An indication of this relates to events that took place in July 2007.

1059 On 13 July 2007, I attended a meeting at which my ultimate boss from the time I worked in  
1060 Germany was present. Seeing him reminded me of what had taken place with [Kensington &  
1061 Chelsea police](#). I thought to myself “*You are German. How would you react if I told you that, in  
1062 this country, in the year 2007, because I have German blood in me, the police has branded me  
1063 as a Nazi (in addition to making false accusations against me)?*” The thought made me feel  
1064 emotional (the “Nazi” label has upset me greatly) and led me to find it difficult to reply to the  
1065 Partner when he asked me how I was. CH observed this.

1066 CH raised the incident on two occasions. The first time was on 17 July 2007 when she said to be  
1067 “concerned” with what took place at the meeting and said that “[I am] emotionally unstable” She  
1068 then changed this to “emotionally fragile”. (In what way is CH qualified to make this judgement  
1069 against me?).

Discussed under **section 5.1** [KPMG pg.](#)

I repeat my note on the previous page about the British Establishment’s tactic. To this, I add that, as demonstrated by the evidence, it is not short of equally evil, morally depraved, vicious, cruel, perverse henchmen (in this instance, henchwoman) to help it implement it.

1070 She went on to say that “before I was able to keep my personal life out of work, but not any  
1071 more”. I replied that my personal problem had now invaded my work life, leading me to work  
1072 under very stressful circumstances. (I cited the events that had and continued to take place at  
1073 work).

1074 The second time was on 28 August 2007, when CH again said “You are emotionally fragile”.  
1075 This time I explained to her the reason for my reaction on 13 July 2007. She very clearly did not  
1076 like my reply. She said “I say that and now you are going into a rant”. I replied “No! I am telling  
1077 you why I reacted like that”.

1078 Considering what took place subsequently at my performance appraisal, I conclude from this  
1079 that CH was intending to use the incident as evidence in support of the position that I had “let my  
1080 personal problem come into my work life”. Furthermore, that the plan was to portray me as  
1081 “emotionally fragile”.

1082 (For other things that were said at the 28 August 2007 meeting, see below, section  
1083 “...’obsession with what I do outside of work...”)

1084 In February 2007, I had also reported to the WellBeing representative the instances of  
1085 harassment of intimidation undertaken / instigated against me by Mr [Andrew Ladsky](#) and my  
1086 experience (and that of other residents) with the [local police](#). She put me in contact with [Jeremy  
1087 Nelson, head of KPMG UK Security](#). I spoke to him in February. The outcome was an offer to  
1088 accompany me to [Kensington & Chelsea police](#). I did not follow this up, mainly because of my  
1089 extensive first-hand experience with this police station. In addition, I had found [Jeremy Nelson’s  
1090 manner unpleasant](#).

My conclusion on Jeremy Nelson: an ex cop still with strong ties with the police. (More below form line 1137).

1091 **9 There are numerous other events I view as instances of discrimination / victimisation**  
1092 **/ harassment / bullying / invasion of my privacy**

1093 **9.1 It is evident that everything I do on my computer is closely monitored**

1094 During my meeting with CH on 17 July 2007 I reported that since the end of April / early May  
1095 2007, every two-three minutes, and sometimes even more frequently, everything 'jumps' on my  
1096 computer: the icons, files and shortcuts on my desktop. In addition, when typing, in practically all  
1097 types of files, the egg timer on the mouse pointer comes on and flickers for several seconds i.e.  
1098 the document turns into saving mode. What I have typed also flickers making it impossible for  
1099 me to work while this is going on. That it does not happen when I unplug my computer from the  
1100 network.

1101 I told CH attributed this to every key stroke I type being captured. (I checked with an IT expert:  
1102 he agreed with me, and suggested that the software used to do this might be Demon).

1103 Having said that she had "experienced problems with the network", on two-three occasions CH  
1104 said "you can't prove it!" I found this rather telling. She added that "it's very difficult to monitor  
1105 hundreds of people". I perceived the comment as totally irrelevant as this referred to monitoring  
1106 one specific individual – which should not prove a challenge to an organisation like KPMG that  
1107 has a major IT consultancy division.

1108 The following day, CH forwarded me an email<sup>68</sup> from IT saying "This is the case number for  
1109 your flickering screen to be investigated by IT". I found it very odd that she took it upon herself to  
1110 do this, as I can call IT myself (as we all do). Obviously, we had not agreed on her taking this  
1111 action when we had met. Why should a "very busy" director waste her time to make this kind of  
1112 call? (As she said on 9 October 2007, in reply to my saying that she had not been providing me  
1113 with follow-up on my major projects).

1114 The IT person said that there was a problem with the network. When I said that I had been  
1115 experiencing the problem since April, he replied that [nobody had reported this](#).

Discussed under **section 6(2) KPMG pg.**

Where said to be "too busy" on [9 Oct 07: lines 237-238; lines 396-397](#).

1116 **9.2 There has been a number of 'interesting' coincidences, suggesting that my**  
1117 **telephone conversations are also closely monitored – as well as, it would appear,**  
1118 **my website**

1119 **5 April 2007** – At the time I had gone through the first four days of having my access to the  
1120 internet and the internal sites cut-off. I was feeling very distraught and had been in tears at my  
1121 desk every day. At lunchtime, I spoke to a friend on my work line. As I related the horrendous  
1122 treatment I have been made to endure since 2002 in connexion with my personal problem, I  
1123 broke down in tears.

1124 About two hours later, I received a "[KPMG's Health & Wellbeing Assessment Invitation with](#)  
1125 [Nuffield Proactive Health](#)"<sup>69</sup> It was the first time in my 10 years at KPMG that I received this. I  
1126 did not reply.

<sup>68</sup> 07.07.18\_16h50\_CHughes\_reported\_2IT\_flickerikng\_my\_computer

<sup>69</sup> 07.04.05\_15h25\_Nuffield\_offer\_health\_assessment

1127 **8 May 2007** - Before coming to work, I loaded an update on my website. It includes a section in  
1128 which I re-state that I am determined to fight for my rights, for justice and redress, if necessary to  
1129 the death. At some point I address the following message to those I hold responsible for  
1130 preventing me from getting justice and redress “*what will you tell my family and friends when*  
1131 *they say to you: you killed her because...*”.

1132 In the afternoon I received an email from [KPMG Bupa Wellness](#)<sup>70</sup> for “*an occupational health*  
1133 *review*”. I had never heard of this service. I phoned the person asking why it had been decided  
1134 that ‘I need’ this “*assessment*” and what it’s about. Yet again, I needlessly spent time explaining  
1135 my situation. We terminated the conversation by the person extending me an open invitation to  
1136 contact her. (I never did).

As Julie Bennett WellBeing nonetheless kept trying her luck in her [17 and 21 May 07 emails](#), in my [21 May email](#), I wrote that “*I was adapting to the new regime*”...which, for sure, was not the ‘expected answer’.

1137 **27 April 2007** – Background note: at the 30 March 2007 meeting I offered to supply the emails  
1138 sent by [the police](#) to my website host in March 2007. At [PB](#)’s suggestion, on [3 April 2007](#)<sup>71</sup>, I  
1139 forwarded the emails to [Jeremy Nelson](#), Head of KPMG Security.

1140 On 27 April, [Jeremy](#) phoned me to say that he had spoken to [Kensington & Chelsea police](#), and  
1141 that the police “*is not going to take the matter further. Isn’t that good news?*” I laughed at the  
1142 implication that I am supposed to be ‘ever so grateful’ that the police is not going to pursue a  
1143 matter [based on false accusations it concocted against me!](#) As I was quoting what the police  
1144 had written to my website host, saying that [it had backed down](#) on its implying that I had  
1145 committed a crime, [Jeremy kept cutting me](#), saying in an angry, domineering tone that he was  
1146 “*not going to get involved in the semantics*”

1147 Three days previously, on 24 April, on the home page to my website, I had given prominence to  
1148 the action by the police and stated “*At the date of the update of this page, there has been NO*  
1149 *follow-up by Kensington and Chelsea police since*”

1150 I never received any communication from the police confirming what [Jeremy](#) told me. I found it  
1151 very strange that the police considered it sufficient to have the message relayed to me through  
1152 him.

Discussed under [section 3.4 KPMG pg.](#) As reported in my Comments, **after line 279 above**, KPMG was monitoring my website *very closely*.

1153 **9.3 There has been an ‘obsession’ with what I do outside of work, often disguised under**  
1154 **the “concerned about you” ‘trump card’.** I view what has taken place as harassment,  
1155 **bullying and invasion of my privacy**

1156 **From mid April** - Having told [CH](#) that I was renting a room in East London (due to the situation  
1157 in my flat), [she asked me for the address](#). I did not want to tell her as I have supplied a contact  
1158 address to KPMG. She asked me again two-three times over the following days, eventually  
1159 saying that she “*would find out*”. Maybe she did find out, as she stopped asking.

Hughes, the henchwoman, stopped asking because it no longer became relevant – as [the State](#)

<sup>70</sup> [07.05.08\\_13h29\\_2SB\\_what\\_mean\\_occupational\\_health\\_review](#)

<sup>71</sup> [07.04.03\\_2Jerry\\_Nelson\\_Emails\\_received\\_by\\_NoelleRawe\\_from\\_KC\\_police](#)

[goons](#) had tailed me to the address e.g. **para 122** of my [19.07.11](#) Witness Statement to the [Home Secretary, Theresa May](#), re. my [19.04.11](#) Claim against her et.al. in [the Queen's Bench Division](#).

This and other prying into my personal life, as well as reporting on my movements to the goons et.al. are discussed under **section 6(3)** [KPMG pg.](#)

1160 On numerous occasions afterwards, when I was leaving the office, **CH** asked me whether I was  
1161 "going east". Why? **Why should she be interested in where I go outside of office hours?**

1162 **17 August 2007** – I had a [court hearing on the 24<sup>th</sup>](#). **CH insisted I phone her on the day**. I said  
1163 that I would only phone if it was postponed (as it would require that I take another day from my  
1164 annual leave). She then said "if I don't hear from you, I'll phone the police". I found this comment  
1165 most extraordinary and replied "Yeah, well, KPMG has very good contact with the police!" (NB:  
1166 impression I had formed from my contacts with [Jeremy Nelson](#), Head of KPMG UK Security). To  
1167 this she replied "Well, I don't!"

1168 **28 August 2007** – **CH** asked to speak to me in a meeting room. To her question on how the  
1169 hearing went, I replied "confusing" and that it is "all I am prepared to say". **In an authoritarian,**  
1170 **angry tone she said** "You said that you would phone me after the hearing, why did not you do  
1171 it?" I am taken aback by her aggressive manner and wonder why it was so important to her to  
1172 get a call from me to give her my assessment of the hearing. **It gave me the impression that she**  
1173 **had been tasked with getting this information from me**. Eventually she said "Well, you don't have  
1174 to tell me". I thought to myself, absolutely right I don't have to tell you.

See [West London County Court # 11](#) for the collusion, conniving and corruption at the so-called 'hearing'.

KPMG KNEW, [through 'the Brotherhood' \(Persecution # 6\)](#) what had been planned and, to add to their sadistic kicks wanted me to provide feedback immediately after.

1175 At some point **CH** said "Can't you see that I am very worried about you?", "I am concerned".  
1176 "The way you reacted when Bernd asked you how you are (at the 13 July 2007 meeting). You  
1177 are emotionally fragile". **I failed to see the connection with my exerting my right to not tell her**  
1178 **what happens in my private life**.

1179 **For some time, I was viewing the being "concerned" claim as the 'trump card' for finding out what**  
1180 **I do in my own time, what my plans were**. In addition, that the intention was to lead me to open  
1181 up emotionally and this was done with an ulterior motive. (As exemplified previously, my  
1182 perception proved to be correct).

1183 (After the 17 July 2007 meeting with **CH**, I had kicked myself for letting myself be bullied into  
1184 divulging personal information (that had led me to break down in tears). I took the resolution of  
1185 not letting this happen again). **Very clearly, CH did not like my standing up to her, not allowing**  
1186 **her to manipulate me**.

1187 She eventually got flustered, angry and said "I can't cope with that!" i.e. **with the connotation that**  
1188 **she was going to report everything and ask to be rid of me**. She returned to her desk and typed  
1189 furiously for about 15 minutes. We had a meeting scheduled at 16h00 (that had been set some  
1190 time ago). **CH** acted as though nothing happened in the morning. I did the same.

The one who was (to say the least) "emotionally unstable" is clear from the above (added to numerous actions Hughes took against me). On that day, she came across as though she was demented.

1191 **30 August 2007** - The previous day I told CH that I would be taking the day off to prepare my  
1192 document for the court. (I kicked myself for giving out personal information). As I was about to  
1193 leave at the end of the day, CH asked me whether I will "be typing East". Why was she asking  
1194 me that? What has it got to do with her? I replied that I was not sure, and left.

1195 **9.4 I perceive my being made to hotdesk as being motivated by an intention to humiliate**  
1196 **and demean me, as well as make my working conditions difficult**

1197 Under the rationale of having me "close to the team", from the beginning of May 2007 until mid-  
1198 October when I moved to Canary Wharf, I was made to [hotdesk in Dorset Rise](#). At the time, my  
1199 permanent desk was in Salisbury Square, across the road.

1200 I had to change desk practically every day and told where to sit, usually, when I arrived in the  
1201 office. If CH was not around, she would leave orders with junior team members as to where I  
1202 should be sitting. On c. six occasions I had to change desk during the course of the day because  
1203 the permanent occupant arrived leading me to say on one of these occasions that I was being  
1204 made to 'play musical chairs'.

1205 I viewed this as tactics intended to humiliate and demean me.

1206 As the permanent occupants of the desks generally had their phone diverted to voicemail, I was  
1207 unable to transfer mine. It meant that I needed to check my voicemail to determine whether I had  
1208 received calls.

1209 There were also issues with physical comfort e.g. chairs set-up for its permanent occupant.

The principal objectives in making me hotdesk were to: **(1)**- observe whether the criminal psychological harassment regime was getting to me; **(2)**- monitor and report on my movements... as well as pry into my personal life. The opportunity to add to the sadistic kicks was the icing on the cake.

Discussed under **section 6(3)** [KPMG pg.](#) The below events are discussed under **section 6**.

1210 **9.5 There are other incidents**

1211 There were other incidents of [harassment and bullying](#): (1) my being put under pressure for the  
1212 production of a newsletter and then 'kept hanging' for days on end, eventually not being told  
1213 anything on follow-up actions – in spite of my asking; (2) contrary to what I had been led to  
1214 believe, being asked to [populate a site](#) two days after finishing a course on SharePoint; (3)  
1215 personal valuables taken out of locked drawers and placed in boxes, etc.

1216 I am happy to supply all the supporting documents referred to in this document.

1217 Thank you for your time.

1218 - END -

1219 **I believe that the facts stated in this document are true.**

Royal Mail<sup>®</sup>  
recorded 1st or 2nd class

Signed for

Standard postal service with signature and barcode scanning on delivery. Ideal for items you might need to prove were received, like job applications or legal documents

Use **Special Delivery** for guaranteed next morning delivery with the security of barcode tracking throughout and compensation for loss or damage

Write details of where your item is going

Name Eddie Donaldson

Building name or number, and street 8 Salford Square

Postcode (only valid in the UK) F.C.4.Y.P.13.13

Reference DW 1165 2658 2GB

Stick barcode label to top left of package

recorded 1st or 2nd class signed for

Your receipt Keep this for your reference

We do not pay compensation for money or jewellery or other items of value sent Recorded, use Special Delivery instead.

Value of item	£ 3.15
Initials	DN

17. JACOBE stamp  
Post Office  
KNIGHTSBRIDGE LONDON W1T

**For confirmation of delivery...**

Visit our website [www.royalmail.com](http://www.royalmail.com) or call 08459 272100 from 2pm two working days after posting First class, or four working days after posting Second class, and quote reference number.

**To see proof of delivery**

Visit our website [royalmail.com](http://royalmail.com) free of charge or call 08459 272 100 and ask for Proof of Delivery. If contacting Customer Services there will be an extra charge for this service. Remember, the person who signs for your item may not be the person you addressed it to.

**If your item is lost or damaged...**

We'll pay you compensation for the value of your item up to 100 times the price of a basic weight First Class stamp. We do not pay compensation for money, jewellery or other items of value sent Recorded. For a claim form, call 08457 740740 calls charged at local



Post Office Ltd.  
Your Receipt

Knightsbridge 80  
6 Raphael Street  
London  
Greater London  
SW7 1DL

VAT REG No. 243 1700 02  
17/01/2008 10:56  
SESSION : 4-1204623-2

Post Label 1LL  
1 @ 1.40 1.40

TOTAL DUE TO POST OFFICE 1.40

Cash FROM CUSTOMER 1.40  
BALANCE 0.00

PLEASE RETAIN THIS RECEIPT AS PROOF  
OF POSTING FOR ITEMS LISTED BELOW

ITEM NO	BUILDING NAME OR NUMBER	POSTCODE
1	.....	.....
2	.....	.....
3	.....	.....
4	.....	.....

Thank You