



KPMG LLP

1-2 Dorset Rise
London EC4Y 8EN
United Kingdom

Tel +44 (0) 20 7311 1000
Fax +44 (0) 20 7311 3311
DX 38050 Blackfriars

Noëlle Rawe



Our ref

Contact Peter Terry

See my attached Comments

22 May 2008

Dear Noëlle

We are writing to you to confirm the outcome of your modified grievance hearing. An independent panel made up of Kate Holt, a Senior HR Manager and me, a Partner, met in order to discuss a grievance which you raised under KPMG's formal grievance procedure.

My 17.01.08 Grievance

The nature of your grievance was:

- You felt that KPMG had used "underhand" tactics to force you out of the firm
- You believed KPMG had monitored you inside and outside work, including your IT use
- You alleged you had been bullied, harassed and victimised by KPMG
- You felt you were stonewalled by KPMG, particularly in respect to your data subject access request

At the hearing, we considered in detail all the evidence collated by an independent investigating officer. On the basis of this I can confirm that it has been decided that your grievance should not be upheld. The reasons for this decision are as follows:

- We feel that there is no evidence to suggest that KPMG bullied, harassed or victimised you. We feel that KPMG went to great lengths to support you during your personal difficulties.
- We feel that KPMG was indeed right to restrict your internet access due to you contravening the firms IT policy.
- We feel that the firm was acting in accordance with its legal duties and responded correctly in respect to the data subject access request.

22 May 2008

I would like to confirm that we have highlighted a couple of learning points to HR in respect to the withdrawal of your internet access:-

- We have recommended that in future cases the technical issues of restricting access are explored prior to withdrawing an individual's access.
- We also believe that KPMG should have made it more clear to you that the only reason you did not face disciplinary action was their overriding concern for your health and wellbeing.

I would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this letter by signing, dating and returning the enclosed copy to me immediately.

I did NOT

Signed: _____

Date: _____

Yours Sincerely

Peter Terry

Partner

1. 'The response'

The 'response' from [KPMG](#)'s partner, Peter Terry, amounts to an overall GET LOST! message, as well as LIES...

...as KPMG had already done in its [19.07.07](#) 'response' to my [09.07.07](#) Subject Access Request ([section 7 KPMG page](#)),...

...and CONTINUED to do in its: **(1)**- [PACK OF LIES Defence](#) ([section 14](#)) to my [03.04.08](#) Claim ([section 12](#));

(2)- [31.07.08](#) 'response' to my [01.07.08](#) Subject Access Request ([section 15.1](#));

(3)- [22.08.08](#) 'response' to my [01.07.08](#) Request for information ([section 15.2](#)).



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



Taking the points in roughly the order in which they are in the letter – and referring to the sections on the [KPMG page](#), as well as to my [17.01.08](#) Grievance:

Reference to my Grievance	<i>"You felt that KPMG had used "underhand" tactics to force you out of the firm"</i>
KPMG's 'reply':	?????
My position:	Stated under Header 7 of my Grievance , as well as in the introduction. ABSOLUTELY! It started at the 13 Feb 07 meeting with Peter Bassett, Global Advisory Executive partner, and Human Resources (HR) partner for my group, and Jeanette Dunworth, Lead Human Resources Business Manager Infrastructure - as related throughout my Grievance , and from section 3 on the KPMG page .

Reference to my Grievance	<i>"You believed KPMG had monitored you inside and outside work, including your IT use"</i>
KPMG's 'reply':	?????
My position:	'Interesting' that KPMG did NOT address this - either. Of note: Likewise, KPMG FAILED to address this in its PACK OF LIES Defence (posted on 17 Jun 08) to my 03.04.08 Claim in the Stratford Employment Tribunal , although, admittedly, I had partly summarised several events together, under para.32 of my Claim. (I have added my Comments to the Defence). However, they were quite comprehensively detailed in my Grievance. <i>"monitored me inside work"</i> : ABSOLUTELY! Header 9 of my Grievance ; sections 5 and 6(3) on KPMG pg . <i>"and outside of work"</i> . I did NOT say that. Header 9.3 of my Grievance, I reported <i>"an obsession with what I do outside of work"</i> - sections 6(3) & 8.4 KPMG pg.

However, I did state that KPMG was monitoring my website: **Header 9.2** of Grievance.


What I did NOT reveal (and only did in 2015 at the time of launching [the KPMG page](#)) is that **McGrigors**, a firm of solicitors previously associated with KPMG had, as demonstrated in [this slide](#): in **Mar 07**, looked at **84 pages of my website** while, in **Apr 07**, it looked at **37 pages**.

= KPMG HAD ABSOLUTE KNOWLEDGE of my personal situation.

"including your IT use". ABSOLUTELY! I reported events under **Header 9.1** of my Grievance; **section 6(2)** [KPMG pg](#).

WHY have these as the 2nd point – and NOT address them? (I placed them at the end of my Grievance), when there were far more important points to be addressed.

ANSWER: Because it was taking place!

Reference to my Grievance	<i>"You alleged you had been bullied, harassed and victimised by KPMG"</i> (1)
KPMG's 'reply':	 <p>1. <i>"We feel that there is no evidence to suggest that KPMG bullied, harassed or victimised you"</i> (2)</p>

My position: KPMG repeated this under **para.4** of its [Defence](#).

(1)- *"bullied, harassed and victimised"* – In [my 17.01.08 Grievance](#), I used these terms in the **Summary**, and under **Headers 4.4, 4.5, 6, 6.3, 6.4, 7 and 9** – reporting events that very clearly endorsed my assessment.

(2)

- When you **look at the content of my Grievance**, captured in detail on the [KPMG pg from section 3](#), including **sections 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 9.1 to 9.7**;
- **read the transcripts** of my so-called 'performance appraisal' (*) with: **(1)**- my line manager **Ceri Hughes**, on [09.10.07](#); **(2)**- **Peter Bassett, partner, and Kathy Woodhouse, HR**, on [24.10.07](#) (*)
- **listen to the recordings** on the [KPMG pg](#) under **sections 8.1 and 9.1** respectively...

...**WHO IS LYING: KPMG OR I** – when it claims: *"there is no evidence to suggest that KPMG bullied, harassed or victimised you"*?

It is an absolutely - undeniable – FACT that KPMG did this to me. Hence, this assertion is **FALSE**.

(*) As in the case of the evidence re. [McGrigors](#), I only revealed my recordings at the time of launching the KPMG pg, in 2015.

NOTE that [KPMG](#) / on its behalf, its 'brothers': [Andrew David Ladsky](#) / others in

the [Jewish-Freemason 'Brotherhood' \(Persecution # 6\)](#) - **approached 'my' (then) private doctor** (who is Jewish, ['like Ladsky'](#)...and Peter Bassett?) to:

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

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

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


Within less than half an hour of ‘the consultation’ he was trying to get me locked up in a mental institution ([section 13\(3\) KPMG pg](#))...thereby continuing with KPMG’s attempts, the previous year, to have me ‘officially certified’ as ‘suffering from mental issues’ (more on this below).

The motive behind doing this? **So that KPMG could then 'safely' deny my claims** – and have me out of the way for good:

- this **22 May 08** rejection of my [17.01.08](#) Grievance ([section 11 KPMG pg](#));
- its [PACK OF LIES Defence](#), in which it demanded that my [03.04.08](#) Claim be “**struck out**”.

(NOTE that [Ladsky](#) also stood to gain from this: re. his (2nd) fraudulent claim against me of [27.02.07](#): I had to serve [my Witness Statement](#) in [West London County Court](#) 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]*”).

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

Reference to my Grievance	“You alleged you had been bullied, harassed and victimised by KPMG”	
KPMG’s ‘reply’:		2. “We feel that KPMG went to great lengths to support you during your personal difficulties”
My position:	KPMG repeated this under paras 4(a), 11 and 12(a) of its PACK OF LIES Defence . FALSE - Cue to laugh out loud...from shock and disbelief at the depth of	

KPMG's moral depravation.

= KPMG CONTINUING with its Machiavellian ploy of covering up the impact on me of the criminal actions it had taken against me from Feb 07 - by (among other) FALSELY claiming that "[I had] brought my personal issues to work, letting them affect me, and thus impact on others":

[KPMG pg](#): section 3.3, Comment 5(A); section 8.1, lines 66-79; section 9.1, including lines 768-772; section 9.4, entailing fabricating a so-called 'feedback' on 'my performance': [05.08.07](#) email 'from' 'a colleague' Finbarr Geaney.

Against the claim that "[I had] let [my] personal problem affect [me] at work", literally, 'from one day to the next, at the end of Mar 07': [Bassett, lines 263-264](#) - consider what had been taking place in my personal life over the previous weeks – including an illegal [16.02.07](#) threat of "**bankruptcy and forfeiture**" ([definition of forfeiture](#)), followed by a [27.02.07](#) fraudulent claim against me (above): section 5 [KPMG pg](#) – which, evidently, 'I had not let impact on my work'.

KPMG repeated this false, highly vicious, cruel and perverse accusation under para.11 of its [PACK OF LIES Defence](#). (I object to these accusations very forcefully, because doing my utmost at work was extremely important to me).


As to my assessment of KPMG's so-called "*support*" – as I wrote under Header 8 of [my Grievance](#) (and captured under section 5, [KPMG pg](#)):

"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"

I most categorically assert that KPMG throwing its 'health services' at me from Feb 07 until May 07, when it finally got the message that I was not going to bite on one of the hooks, (I summarised events in the [08.05.07](#) email from BUPA Wellness at KPMG) - had the very sinister objective of having me 'officially' 'certified' as 'suffering from mental issues' – section 5.2 [KPMG pg](#).

(It is a typical response from the despotic English Establishment when faced with 'little people' 'like me' who 'dare' rock the boat by exposing its wrongdoings – which, in my case, includes downright criminality).

Reference to my Grievance	???	(Covered under Header 4)
KPMG's 'reply':		"We feel that KPMG was indeed right to restrict your internet access due to you contravening the firms IT policy"
My position:	KPMG repeated this under para.4(b) and 7 of its PACK OF LIES Defence .	

FALSE – As a cover-up ploy, KPMG is mixing DELIBERATELY the 13 Feb and 30 Mar 07 meetings: Headers 3.1 and 4 of my [17.01.08](#) Grievance; paras 5, 7, 8, 9 and 33(2) of my [03.04.08](#) Claim.

My use of IT was raised at the 13 Feb 07 meeting ([section 3.2](#)) - **NOT** at the 30 Mar 07 meeting ([section 3.4](#)).

ALL that I was told by Jeanette Dunworth, HR, at the 30 Mar 07 meeting was:

“Because of Mr [Ladsky](#)’s communication claiming that “your website contains anti-Semitic comments” [1] [2] it has been decided that to protect you and KPMG, it would be best you no longer have access to the Internet”

(Para.4 of my [17.01.08](#) Grievance; paras 8 and 9 of my [03.04.08](#) Claim)

(1)- [Andrew David Ladsky](#)’s [criminal activities \(e.g. Extortion\)](#) are challenged, as well as exposed so, automatically, as ‘[a Jew](#)’ (in name only): he pulls the “*anti-Semite card*’ out.

(2)- At the 30 Mar 07 meeting, **Bassett and Dunworth** did NOT show me the communication. I had to battle to finally get this highly redacted version of [Ladsky](#)’s [26.03.07](#) letter to KPMG – 7 months *later* ([section 7 KPMG pg](#)) (more on this below).

I also stress that **Bassett and Dunworth did NOT issue me with notes of the 30 Mar 07 meeting – para.4.1** of my [17.01.08](#) Grievance; under [section 3.4 KPMG pg](#) I list other documents in which I reported this.

As to the **13 Feb 07** meeting during which my use of KPMG’s “*IT systems*” was raised ([section 3.2 KPMG pg](#)): the accusation is **FALSE**.

As discussed under [section 3.2, Comment 5](#) on [KPMG pg](#); **lines 187-264** of my [05.08.08](#) letter to [ACAS](#) - what I did *most definitely* did NOT warrant cutting off my access... **6 WEEKS LATER** (!!!) - to the internet...

...as well as to ALL the internal sites for 24 DAYS; and then Peter Bassett, partner, [making me sign a 23 Apr 07 letter](#) ‘agreeing’ to be barred from using the internet (I returned it on [25 Apr 07](#)) – **sections 3.4, 4, 4.1 and 4.2** KPMG pg.

KPMG doing this to me was just a front for starting to take action against me – as ‘RETRIBUTION’ on behalf of [its ‘brothers’, Ladsky, judiciary, police, politicians, etc \(Persecution # 6\)](#) who were incandescent with rage at having their corrupt, criminal actions exposed on [my website \(Overview # 19\)](#)...

...(para.4 of my [03.04.08](#) Claim; lines 249-252 (and 80-84) of my [05.08.08](#) letter to ACAS)...

...and because: (1)- public sector projects are a source of millions of £s for KPMG: media [KPMG pg \(*\)](#); (2)- it is a pillar of the Establishment and benefits from its blindness and amnesia [in relation to some its work](#).

Note that following my [01.07.08](#) Subject Access Request, KPMG REFUSED to

provide me with the evidence in support of its accusation - claiming, under para.10 of its [31.07.08](#) letter that “[its IT] report was commissioned by the firm’s General Counsel and is subject to legal privilege” ([section 15.1](#)).

(*) An example that is particularly pertinent: at the time that ‘the dear brother’ [Andrew David Ladsky](#) filed, yet again, another fraudulent claim against me in Feb 07 ([Overview # 11](#)), that led me to go into another drawn out battle with [West London County Court](#)...

...- [in its Apr 07 internal newsletter](#), KPMG announced that it “[had] just been engaged on a non-competitive basis to help design the structure and business model for the new ministry of justice” - replacing the then [Department for Constitutional Affairs](#).

Reference to my Grievance ??? ([Headers 3 & 4](#))

KPMG’s ‘reply’:



“We also believe that **KPMG should have it made it more clear to you that the only reason you did not face disciplinary action was their overriding concern for your health and wellbeing**”

My position:

FALSE - Another VERY SICK LIE by KPMG...to which (as per above) you can only laugh in shock and disbelief at the depth of its moral depravation.

Peter Bassett, partner, (who *refused* to issue notes of the 13 Feb 07 meeting) wrote in ‘his’ [07.03.07](#) ‘response’ to my [14.02.07](#) Draft Notes of the meeting: “...**at this time bringing it to your attention the firm would not be taking any further action. However, should there be any further abuse of KPMG’s IT systems this could result in formal proceedings taking place**” ([section 3.2 KPMG pg](#)).

I repeat: **(1)**- my usage of “*KPMG’s IT systems*” for personal matters was raised **only** at the **13 Feb 07** meeting; **(2)**- *post* the meeting, I did NOT do this again.

I also add that, **until that meeting took place, I had been feeling great**, as: **(1)**- one week earlier, I had returned from a very good holiday in France; **(2)**- on my return, I discovered that I had an invaluable ally: my website Host, HostDime, who – without telling me – over the previous weeks, had been very courageously fighting off the threats from Ladsky and his solicitor, Jeremy Hershkorn, in their hell-bent determination to get the closure of my website ([Portner and Jaskel # 2](#)).


Of note: with the aim of justifying its actions against me, by the time of its [PACK OF LIES Defence](#), KPMG had, under **para.7**, escalated that to: “**could potentially lead to dismissal**”.


When you look at [what KPMG did to me over a 10-month period](#), it is glaringly obvious that it was **NOT** “*concerned about my health and wellbeing*”.

In fact, I most categorically assert that its “**overriding concern**” was to **destroy me** – [section 5.2 KPMG page](#).

The ploy in stating that was to endorse KPMG's very sinister Machiavellian plan of putting the responsibility on me for the way I felt from end Mar 07 onwards – as *a direct result* of the criminal actions it took against me.

Hence, its “offers of help”, were a KEY part of the ploy – Header 8 of [my Grievance](#); section 5 [KPMG page](#).

Reference to my Grievance	“ You felt you were stonewalled by KPMG, particularly in respect to your data subject access request ”	
KPMG's 'reply':		“ We feel that the firm was acting in accordance with its legal duties and responded correctly in respect to the data subject access request. ”
My position:	<p>FALSE – as KPMG DID “stonewall me”: Header 5 of my Grievance; and it DID BREACH the Data Protection Act 1998 - section 7 KPMG pg.</p> <p>= KPMG engaged in the psychological harassment tactics of: 'Controlling information'- Header 1.14; 'Deception to prevent exposure'- Header 4; 'Frustrate and discourage'– Header 2.</p> <p>Further, as came to light under para.6 of its Defence to my 03.04.08 Claim, it had also failed to provide me with other communications from its 'dear brother', Andrew David Ladsky. I discuss this on the KPMG pg under section 7 Comment 3, and section 3.2.</p> <p>As I reported: under lines 14-16 of my 17.08.08 letter to ACAS, and in my 02.09.08 letter to the Stratford Employment Tribunal (section 16 KPMG pg) - KPMG then CONTINUED to DENY me access to the alleged 'evidence', in the context of my second Subject Access Request, dated 01.07.08 (section 15.1).</p>	


KPMG		“ we have highlighted a couple of learning points to HR in respect to the withdrawal of your internet access ”
My position	<p>“A couple of learning points” = Taking ANY opportunity to continue with the criminal psychological harassment regime, as well as deny it.</p> <p>“To HR” - It was Peter Bassett, partner, who was dictating the moves to Jeanette Dunworth, HR.</p> <p>(1)- How about “HR” (and Peter Bassett) NOT providing me:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ at the 13 Feb and 30 Mar 07 meetings, with evidence of the accusations made against me by Andrew David Ladsky, ■ NOR with notes of the meetings? <p>Headers 5.1 & 5.2 of my Grievance; sections 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 & 3.5 KPMG pg.</p> <p>(2)- How about “HR” FAILING to ensure that what I reported on pages 22 & 23 of my Performance Appraisal form was <i>actually</i> taken into consideration during</p>	

my so-called 'performance appraisal' meeting on [09.10.07](#), and on [24.10.07](#) – *in spite of my [15.10.07](#) email to Jeanette Dunworth, "HR"?*

Headers 6.3, 6.7 and 6.8 of [my Grievance](#); Sections 8.1 to 8.3 and 9.1 to 9.7 [KPMG pg.](#)

(3)- How about "*HR*" holding on to my form for more than 2 months, in the process causing me endless anguish, as I could see from the policy emails that I was missing the deadlines for the completion of the appraisal and goal setting process – that entailed financial penalties? **Header 6.2** of my Grievance; **section 8 [KPMG pg.](#)**

Etc., etc., etc.

KPMG		<i>"We have recommended that in future cases the technical issues of restricting access are explored prior to withdrawing an individual's access"</i>
My position	<p>= Continuing to use THE LIE (that would also look good in its defence against my Claim) that what happened was 'not KPMG's fault' e.g. 24.04.07-09h10 email from Bassett.</p> <p>As my line manager, Ceri Hughes, said "...<i>that was a mistake; you were meant to have intranet access. It was unfortunate, regrettable, and something that we should and would wish to avoid...</i>" lines 132-135; section 8.1 KPMG pg</p> <p>"<i>A mistake</i>" by KPMG – one of the leading IT consultancies!</p> <p>(Henchwoman Ceri Hughes was always ready to assist KPMG in any way she could. Other example: 'her' highly threatening letter to me of 14.12.07).</p> <p>And, 'of course', KPMG 'HAD to cut off my access', 'because I HAD', 'of course', 'committed a very serious breach'! (above).</p> <p>Peter Terry could have added: 'unless we are dealing with somebody like you – as it was extremely satisfying to see you sobbing uncontrollably at your desk for the best of Apr 07': section 4.1 KPMG pg.</p>	

2. My overall conclusions:

A LITANY OF LIES by [KPMG](#) 'in support' of its overall decision to...

... "***not uphold*** [my [17.01.08](#)] grievance" ...

– **of which it ignored most of it:**

- **Header 3** – the 13 Feb 07 meeting (**sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3. [KPMG pg](#)**)
- **Header 4** – the 30 Mar 07 meeting – as the letter *cannot* be regarded as 'an answer' (**[section 3.4](#)**)

- **Header 5** – my not being provided with any evidence of the accusations by Ladsky, as well as alleged ones, at the 13 Feb and 30 Mar 07 meetings ([sections 3.2, 3.4, 3.5 and 4.1](#))
- **Header 6** – the handling of my so-called 'performance appraisal' ([sections 8 and 9](#)).
- **Header 9** – other forms of criminal psychological harassment ([section 6](#)).

In relation to Header 6, KPMG was still cooking its story for its [PACK OF LIES Defence](#) to my [03.04.08 Claim](#).

In [its Defence](#), KPMG also ignored Headers 3 and 5, as well as parts of Headers 4 and 6.

Just as well that

“KPMG [had] a policy of ensuring that work-related grievances are treated in a fair and equitable manner”!

YEP! That's the [KPMG](#) that summarised its 'Values' as: “Above all, we act with integrity”!

No wonder KPMG hooked up with thoroughly evil, multi-criminal ([Extortion Rachman](#) vermin (*) [Andrew David Ladsky](#) from the gutter...

...– who decided he was 'entitled' to make a multi-million £ jackpot at my expense (and that of my fellow leaseholders) (YES! THAT IS THE ROOT CAUSE FOR EVERYTHING!**)...**

...- and that it joined the other 'brothers' (Persecution # 6) in actively assisting him and protecting him...



... 'Birds of a feather flock together'!

(It's very crowded in that bottomless cesspit of moral depravation and of interconnecting caves of corruption in which many from the English Establishment and their hangers-on and cronies reside with their henchwomen, henchmen and flunkies).

(*) I repeat my Comments under [Persecution \(1\)\(4\)](#)

(FOR SURE, my finally reporting this in the public domain [after 8 years](#) (in 2015), is going to translate into A LOT MORE [persecution](#) against me, including many more attacks by [the Establishment \(Persecution # 6\)](#)'s henchmen such as e.g. [Her Majesty's British Transport Police helicopters](#)...

...- because, like [Ladsky and his mafia](#), and their other devoted supporters, [KPMG](#) will ALSO perceive itself as being 'MY VICTIM').