

## ORIGINAL EMAIL

From: Rawé, Noëlle  
To: Bassett, Peter R  
Cc: Hughes, Ceri; Dunworth, Jeanette  
Subject: Subject Access Request

Sent: Mon 09/07/2007 10:05

STRICTLY PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL

Dear Peter

On 30 March you called me for a meeting with Jeanette Dunworth, HR, and yourself. During the meeting, Jeanette reported that Mr Andrew Ladsky:

- Had approached KPMG claiming that my website, [www.leasehold-outrage.com](http://www.leasehold-outrage.com), "contains anti-Semitic comments"
- That he was "very persistent". In other words, he repeated this claim to KPMG on a number of occasions
- In light of this, "to protect me and KPMG", it had been "decided to cut-off my access to the Internet". This had occurred by the time I returned to my desk. (In the process, I was also cut off from the majority of the Intranet sites; a situation that lasted for nearly one month)

On 24 April you asked me to sign a letter stating (among others) "...under no circumstances should you access the external internet (save for the site [www.webex.com](http://www.webex.com))"

In approaching KPMG – by repeatedly making this claim – Mr Ladsky has repeatedly implied that I have committed an illegal act. My position is that this claim against me is malicious and false i.e. it is **not true** that my website contains anti-Semitic comments, and I am therefore considering taking legal action against Mr Ladsky for libel and defamation of character for this false accusation.

While I understand that KPMG cannot appear to be involved in any way in what is a personal matter between myself and Mr Ladsky, I have the right to defend myself against this false accusation and I am concerned that my Internet access has been impeded as a consequence of malicious conduct on the part of my landlord. I should therefore be grateful if the Partnership would review this situation urgently so that I am not being treated differently from my peer group for a matter that is entirely private and for an allegation that is without foundation.

To date, I have not been provided with copy(ies) of Mr Ladsky's correspondence with KPMG or of any proof or evidence of his claim without which, of course, you would not have chosen to withhold my Internet access.

For the purpose of discussing my options with my legal advisers, I am now making a 'subject access request' under the Data Protection Act 1998 for a copy of all documentation, whether electronic or in hard copy pertaining to me regarding Mr Ladsky's accusations against me including any evidence he may have provided to attempt to substantiate his false accusation against me.

accusations against me including any evidence he may have provided to attempt to substantiate his false accusation against me.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you.

Kind regards  
Noëlle Rawé  
T: 0144 420007 / 0144 420010 / 0144 420011 / 0144 420012

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



(NB: My secondary objective in submitting this Subject Access Request (SAR) was to have a written record of events – as [Peter Bassett, partner, and Jeanette Dunworth, HR](#), had NOT issued notes of the [30 Mar 07](#) meeting – as I captured under [Header 4.1](#) of my [17.01.08](#) Grievance to KPMG.

[Header 5](#) of my Grievance comprises a summary of events re. my SAR.

I discuss it under [section 7 KPMG page](#). KPMG's initial 'response' of [19.07.07](#) was the first of other GET LOST! It led me to get into battle, as evidenced by the subsequent trail of letters.

Note that in its [undated PACK OF LIES Defence](#) (posted on 17 Jun 08), under [para.8](#), KPMG denied that it "*refused to comply with its obligations*"

From: [Rawé, Noëlle](#)  
Sent: 09 July 2007 10:05  
To: [Bassett, Peter R](#)  
Cc: [Hughes, Ceri](#); [Dunworth, Jeanette](#)  
Subject: **Subject Access Request**

STRICTLY PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL

Dear Peter

On 30 March you called me for a meeting with Jeanette Dunworth, HR, and yourself. During the meeting, Jeanette reported that Mr [Andrew Ladsky](#):

- Had approached KPMG claiming that my website, [www.leasehold-outrage.com](http://www.leasehold-outrage.com), "contains anti-Semitic comments"

### **This is NOT true**

[Andrew David Ladsky](#), as well as [his henchmen in the Kensington-Notting Hill police mafia](#) who recorded it in [its so-called "crime report" against me](#) (discussed under [police # 3](#)) did **NOT** produce one iota of evidence in support of their highly vicious, malicious and defamatory accusations against me – because they could NOT quote ANY:

- [26.03.07](#) letter from Ladsky to KPMG (section 3.5 [KPMG page](#)) - I only obtained 7 months later – as, at the 30 Mar 07 meeting, Bassett and Dunworth did **NOT** show me ANY communication from Ladsky in support of their claim);
- [16.03.07](#) email to my website Host, HostDime, from the police (= [the Jewish-Freemason Brotherhood – Persecution # 6](#));
- [20.03.07](#) email from the police to my website Host, following being challenged by my Host, who asked: "**Are you aware that there are laws against making false accusations?**"

- That he was "very persistent". In other words, he repeated this claim to KPMG on a number of occasions

I repeat: Bassett and Dunworth did **NOT** provide me with ANY supporting evidence in support of their claims.

As a result of my filing a [03.04.08](#) Claim against KPMG in the [Employment Tribunal](#): in its [undated PACK OF LIES Defence](#) (section 14 – [KPMG page](#)), under para.6, KPMG wrote:

**"The claimant's landlord Mr [Ladsky](#) contacted the Respondent in October 2006 making serious allegations against the Claimant."**

**"In January 2007 Mr [Ladsky](#) made further contact with the Respondent and threatened legal action against the Respondent in connection with allegations of libel." (\*)**

As I reported in my [05.08.08](#) letter to [ACAS](#), lines 25-31:

*"This had never been communicated to me. The first time I was told he had approached KPMG was on 30 March 2007 i.e. 5 months after the said initial contact - and it was positioned as being very recent..."*

(\*) "**threatened legal action**" - [KPMG](#) was a spinning 'a story' as a cover-up for its [criminal](#)

[psychological harassment](#) against me...

...– as it did NOT believe for one second the alleged so-called “threats” from Rachman Ladsky - because it KNEW that he did not have a leg to stand on:

- it is my personal website – **NOT** a KPMG website;
- to work on my website and update it I used my personal computer and my personal 3G card (both of which I kept at work i.e. at KPMG)

On the [KPMG page](#), the above is discussed under **section 3.2**.

- In light of this, **“to protect me and KPMG”, it had been “decided to cut-off my access to the Internet”**.

**This had occurred by the time I returned to my desk. (In the process, I was also cut off from the majority of the Intranet sites; a situation that lasted for nearly one month)**

Reported under **Header 4** of my [17.01.08](#) Grievance; **para.8** of my [03.04.08](#) Claim; discussed under **section 3.4** [KPMG page](#).

Examples of emails in which I reported my being totally cut off from the network – which also contain printscreens of the messages I was getting when trying to access the sites:

- [05.04.07-10h37](#) to Dunworth, that also contains emails since 30 Mar 07;
- on DAY 18: [17.04.07-10h44](#) to IT.

And the [23.04.07-11h34](#) email from IT that I had just been reconnected to the network i.e. on DAY 24!

NOTE that [KPMG](#) had **absolute knowledge** of my situation, as (among others) [in Mar and Apr 07, its previously associated firm of solicitors, McGrigors had looked at 121 pages of my website](#).

= Conniving and conspiring with the [Kensington-Notting Hill police mafia](#) – and [multi-criminal Rachman landlord Ladsky \(EXTORTION\)](#) - [KPMG](#) was falling over backwards to help Ladsky punish me for ‘my daring’ to stand up to his and gang criminal activities...

...– and, for [‘my daring’ to expose those in the ‘Establishment’ \(police, judiciary, politicians, so-called ‘regulators’, etc.\) who actively helped him](#). ([Case summary](#))

**On 24 April you asked me to sign a letter stating** (among others) **“...under no circumstances should you access the external internet (save for the site [www.webex.com](#))”**

- Bassett’s [24.04.07-09h10](#) email asking me to sign a 23 Apr 07 letter issued ‘by’ Jeanette Dunworth, HR (= by Bassett - et.al. in ‘the Brotherhood’) (**section 4.2** [KPMG page](#)).
- My [25.04.07-13h45](#) email to [Bassett and Ceri Hughes](#), my line manager - to which I attached the signed letter.

In approaching KPMG – **by repeatedly making this claim** – Mr [Ladsky](#) has repeatedly implied that I have committed an illegal act.

My position is that this claim against me is malicious and false i.e. it is **not true** that my website contains anti-Semitic comments, and **I am therefore considering taking legal action against Mr [Ladsky](#) for libel and defamation of character for this false accusation.**

**That was my intention.** However, in the light of my experience by then with the judicial system of this island-Kingdom ([Overview # 19](#)), and at the time with [West London County Court](#), following Ladsky's (second) fraudulent claim against me ([Overview # 11 and # 3](#)), as well as my initial experience with the **Stratford Employment Tribunal** in May-Aug 08 (**section 16** – [KPMG page](#))...

... – **I came to the conclusion that I did not stand a chance.**

(My being deliberately denied access to justice and redress was yet again confirmed in 2011, when I filed a [19.04.11](#) Claim in [the High Court](#) against the police et.al.: [Overview # 18](#) ; [Kangaroo courts](#))

While I understand that KPMG cannot appear to be involved in any way in what is a personal matter between myself and Mr Ladsky, **I have the right to defend myself against this false accusation and I am concerned that my Internet access has been impeded as a consequence of malicious conduct on the part of my landlord.** I should therefore be grateful if the Partnership would review this situation urgently so that I am not being treated differently from my peer group for a matter that is entirely private and for an allegation that is without foundation.

**To date, I have not been provided with copy(ies) of Mr Ladsky's correspondence with KPMG or of any proof or evidence of his claim** without which, of course, you would not have chosen to withhold my Internet access.

**For the purpose of discussing my options with my legal advisers, I am now making a 'subject access request' under the [Data Protection Act 1998](#)** for a copy of all documentation, whether electronic or in hard copy pertaining to me regarding Mr [Ladsky's](#) accusations against me including any evidence he may have provided to attempt to substantiate his false accusation against me.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you.  
Kind regards  
Noëlle Rawé