

kpmg

For the benefit of the KPMG partner, I redacted the text.

## File note

Meeting 6 November 2002 at 11.45 am

Present: Noelle Rawe  
Tony Fry

The partner supplied me with these notes at the time.

While it had not done it in 2007 (KPMG # 7) following my 09.07.07 Subject Access Request (the 05.10.07 pack it finally sent me)...  
...with its 31.07.08 'reply' to my 01.07.08 SAR (KPMG # 15.2), it supplied me with these (redacted) 02.11.02 notes of its meeting with Ladsky (They include my Comments, with detail of events)

See my Comments on the next page

I explained to NR that we have now decided how to deal with Mr Ladsky and also how to proceed in respect of NR herself.

I said that I would do a note of this meeting and let her have a copy of it afterwards. I explained that NR's actions had been very stupid and must not recur. She must ensure that she did not use a KPMG fax header, headed notepaper or send e mails from KPMG, the latter has standard wording at the bottom of each e mail being sent externally which related back to KPMG. NR said that she quite understood this and knows that she had acted stupidly.

I said that we would take no further formal action but the we did view the incident very seriously. We were basing the decision on the following:

- We continue to trust her;
- She appears to have been entirely open and honest with us;
- As soon as it was clear that there was an issue last week she endeavoured to sort it out immediately, by going to Practice Protection and sending out a letter along the lines they had drafted;
- We were taking account of her record of employment with us.

I gave NR an indication of what was in the draft letter to Mr Ladsky, being the facts of what had happened as we understand it, confirming our view that the correspondence was entirely personal and not connected with KPMG, confirming we were considering what to do internally in respect of this issue, but [REDACTED].

I stressed to NR the importance of trying to maintain her health through this and not putting more strain on herself than necessary. I said that she was welcome to speak to anybody in KPMG be it in Human Resources, a Partner or someone else if she felt that this would help, for which she was grateful. She said that she was considering going to a lawyer as she felt that she had ten pieces of evidence which linked Mr Ladsky with the ownership of the block of flats. [REDACTED]

By way of conclusion I reconfirmed that we did view this seriously, [REDACTED]. NR said that she was extremely sorry for all the time, effort and expense she had caused KPMG. [REDACTED]

kpmg



**A professional, decent KPMG partner, with integrity = at the opposite end of the spectrum from Peter Bassett in 2007.**

**In 2002**, I was immediately informed and asked for 'my side of the story'.

The communications were open, honest and above all - I was treated with respect and consideration

= an approach consistent with the **KPMG Values and Dignity at Work.**

**(In 2007, Bassett** did NOT provide me with evidence of **Andrew David Ladsky's** accusations against me...

...and treated me as though I were a criminal (**KPMG # 3 & 4**)...

...IN SPITE of having *absolute knowledge* that I was a victim of organized crime by the Ladsky mafia:

e.g. KPMG's previously associated firm of solicitors,

**McGrigors, had looked at 121 pages of my website during Mar-April 2007)**