



See my attached Comments

Ms Noelle Rowe



(NB: On the same day, I also sent a 24.07.16 letter to 'the faith leaders' et.al. who, like Alison Saunders, claimed to "condemn hate crimes". The only 'response' was a 08.08.16 fraudulent 'reminder' of £47,250 from the Martyn Gerrard racketeers); (the demand contains my Comments). (It also leads to the conclusion that the men nominated henchwoman Alison Saunders to 'reply' to my letter).

28 July 2016

Why omit her name? To avoid the 'get lost' sticking to her?

Dear Ms Rawe,

Specify! To Alison Saunders, Director of

Thank you for your letter of 24 July 2016 to the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS).

It may assist if I explain the role of the CPS. The CPS is responsible for reviewing and, where appropriate, prosecuting most criminal cases in England and Wales following an investigation by the police. The CPS is also responsible for providing legal advice to the police about cases. The CPS is not an investigative body and cannot investigate allegations of crime.

1

2

3

If you believe a criminal offence has been committed you can report the matter to the police or other investigative body so that an appropriate course of action can be taken. I note your concerns about the police but I cannot comment on them. If you wish to complain to the Metropolitan Police you should raise your concerns with their Professional Standards Department, or the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC). Their email address is as follows: enquiries@ipcc.gsi.gov.uk.

4

5

I hope this is of assistance.

Yours sincerely,



B Mansfield
Parliamentary and Complaints Unit

6



[If the linked docs don't open, try with ]

My comments on the 28 July 16 'reply' 'from' Alison Saunders

Ref
1

"The CPS is responsible for reviewing and where appropriate, prosecuting most criminal cases in England and Wales **following an investigation by the police**"

"The CPS is **also responsible for providing legal advice to the police about cases**"

What the [Crown Prosecution Service \(CPS\) website](#) stated – in early August 2016:

"What we do

The Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) is the principal prosecuting authority for England and Wales, acting independently in criminal cases investigated by the police and others.

The CPS:

- **decides which cases should be prosecuted** – keeping them all under continuous review;
- **determines the appropriate charges** in more serious or complex cases – **advising the police during the early stages of investigations**;
- **prepares cases** and presents them at court – using a range of in-house advocates, self-employed advocates or agents in court; and
- **provides information, assistance and support to victims** and prosecution witnesses.

In helping deliver justice across England and Wales, through **prosecuting crime independently** and effectively, the CPS provides leadership within a criminal justice system that is undergoing significant reform.

Our mission

Our mission is **to deliver justice through the independent and effective prosecution of crime**, fostering a culture of excellence by supporting and inspiring each other to be the best we can.

We will be independent and fair

We will prosecute independently, **without bias** and will seek to deliver justice in every case.

We will behave professionally and strive for excellence

We will work as one team, always seeking new and better ways to deliver the best possible service for the public. We will be efficient and responsible with tax-payers' (sic) money.

It is clear from this that, among other, the CPS exerts a very strong influence on the police.

In fact, for example, in the context of the 'peers for cash scandal' ([My Diary 2009](#)), the media reported that, "*after consulting with the Crown Prosecution Service, the police decided against conducting an investigation of the 'cash-for-amendments affair'*" [amendments to legislation].

That it had "*carefully reviewed the allegations*" and said that "*because it was far from clear how criminal law applies to peers*".

The CPS works in such 'close collaboration' with the police and, indeed “**as one team**” - that it actually works with it, **in the same building**: e.g. the [21.02.11](#) letter to me from **Jay Sarmotta, Borough Crown Prosecutor** - that gives [Chelsea police station](#) as the address.

(NB: This is the police station from which, for example, **PC Neil Watson** sent me the malicious, threatening [27.01.03](#) letter, telling me, in effect, that I had better shut up and not challenge 'dear Mr [Andrew David Ladsky](#)', or “*there may be further consequences*” (**proof Ladsky drives activities at Jefferson House: [CKFT-Intro](#)**).

Ignoring my [11.02.03](#) reply in which I asked for evidence – in writing - of the accusations against me, Watson proceeded with filing a pack of lies, equally unsupported so-called “**crime report**” against me, in which he also lied by claiming *falsely* that: I had “*not responded*”; he had “*attended [my] address and left note for suspect to call me*”.

It is also the station for which the then Met Commissioner, Sir Paul Stephenson, *lied* in his [31.05.11](#) Defence to my [19.04.11 Queen's Bench Division](#) Claim against the police et.al. – by *denying* what I had been told by **PC Belky Giles**, in the context of my 7 vain attempts, in Oct 10, to get the police to act on my well documented reports of [stalking and harassment](#) by two men ([1st man](#) ; [2nd man](#)) ([police # 6](#)).

I was able to prove the lie, as I had secretly recorded the conversation. I provided the evidence with my [14.06.11](#) Reply to parts of the Defence - by supplying, to each of the 3 Defendants, as well as to the court, a CD-ROM with a recording of the conversation, as well as [a transcript](#). (I *did* report these events in my 24 July 16 letter to Alison Saunders) (End 'NB').

There are other examples of criminal, corrupt conduct by this police station...as it was being “*advised [on site] by the CPS*” e.g. [Overview # 16 & # 17](#)). (See also Comments under # 3, below).

Ref
2

“The CPS is not an investigative body and **cannot investigate allegations of crime**”

This is a typical '[Frustrate and discourage tactic](#)' ([header 2](#)) – I have been at the receiving end of [many, many times before](#).

There is no need “to investigate”, as I provide / define the location on [my website](#) of the *irrebuttable, black-on-white evidence* against the various parties, including **specifying the actual breaches of various Acts – with many of these breaches defined as criminal offences = justifying prosecution. (Recall also that I copied Alison Saunders on my [24.07.16](#) letter to 'the faith leaders', in which I provide other examples).**

As can be seen from e.g. my above documents, as well as under Comment # 3 - it does *not* require being a lawyer or a genius to arrive at the conclusions.

And that is the problem for the CPS: I have the irrebuttable evidence! Hence, best come up with this laughable excuse to 'justify' ignoring the evidence.

On [page 1 of my letter to her](#), I asked: “**how will you react when heinous hate crimes are perpetrated by individuals in the public sector** – as has and continues to happen to me?”



After (so far) 15 years of being treated by the British state like a piece of dirt, a non-entity who does not have the right to have rights – I, of course, *knew* how she would react – and wanted to prove it:

immediately close rank with her criminal tribe members: her mates and

Establishment ([My Diary # 2.5](#)) masters = institutional closing of ranks = the mutual protection society (see [Overview # 7](#))

Thereby also proving Alison Saunders' double standard (like that of the ['faith leaders' et.al.](#)): that when it concerns "hate crimes" committed by her tribe members v. by 'the little people': she condones (¹) the former, and condemns (²) the latter.

An example (reported on [the Media page](#), under Crown Prosecution Service, and under [Rifkind-Notes](#)) that demonstrates this very clearly is the conduct of the CPS, in 2016 i.e. under Alison Saunders, in relation to the Libyan rendition victims, Abdel Hakim Belhaj and Sarni al-Saadi:

"[MI6 gets off scot-free over rendition of suspected Islamists to Libya](#)", The Guardian, 9 June 16

"Following the Libyan revolution, a March 2004 letter from Mark Allen [now a 'Sir'], who was then "head of MI6 counter-terrorism operations, to Moussa Koussa, Gaddafi's intelligence chief, was found among documents in Moussa's office destroyed by Nato bombs."

"In it, Allen trumpeted MI6's role in the operation"

"[Libya renditions should put UK spies firmly under the spotlight](#)", The Guardian, 21 June 16 - An article by [Cori Crider](#) who "heads the abuses-in-counterterrorism team at Reprieve..."

"...the Crown Prosecution Service said [*] that a 28,000-page dossier from the police is "insufficient evidence" to charge the British official most involved – MI6's former director of counterterrorism, Sir Mark Allen."

"While my clients were being tortured in Libya, Allen moved from MI6 to oil firm BP, which went on to win lucrative contracts after [Tony Blair's](#) deal in the desert with Gaddafi."

(*) "[CPS says there is insufficient evidence to charge Sir Mark Allen over 2004 abduction of former dissidents and families](#)", The Guardian, 9 Jun 16.

"The CPS had confirmed that it did not believe there were grounds for launching legal action against "the suspect" described only as a public official" [Note! The CPS withholding Allen's name]

"There had been speculation that the former foreign secretary Jack Straw [*] could face charges. That prospect now seems to have disappeared."

"[Rendition victims challenge decision not to prosecute MI6 officer](#)", The Guardian, 11 Sep 16

"[The] lawyers [of the victims]...denounced the CPS' decision as "see no evil; hear no evil"..."

(*) My experience with Jack Straw: [summary of my 'cries for help', # 1.8](#)



"See no evil; hear no evil" is an apt description for 'Alison Saunders'... as it is exactly what 'she' is doing in my case.

¹ COED definition of 'condone': "Accept or forgive (behaviour considered wrong or offensive)"

² COED definition of 'condemn': "Express complete disapproval of"

It is a certainty that "[Prosecutions for hate crimes against disabled people surge by more than 40 per cent in a year](#)" – **do not include prosecutions against the state for its hate crimes against disabled people** e.g. (captured in [My Diary 25 Jan 12](#))

Private Eye, # 1405, **13-6 Nov 15**, pg 7 - "*Number crunching: 2,000 Deaths of disabled people after being assessed fit for work by **Iain Duncan Smith's** regime, which he does not consider a resigning matter.*" (1)

Private Eye, # 1406, **27 Nov-10 Dec 15**, pg 37 - "*Fitness to work tests – **Deadly reckoning***"

"Yet more evidence has emerged of the often devastating impact of the government's welfare reforms on those with disabilities..."

...new research from Liverpool and Oxford universities concluded that the government's controversial "fit to work" tests for disabled claimants...were associated with an extra 590 suicides in just three years and 279,000 cases of mental health...

...Ministers continue to claim that any link to suicide or death is "misleading" – even though they received a formal warning in 2010..." (2)

(1)- **Iain Duncan Smith** subsequently resigned, denying his role in the department.

(2)- Add to that what [Private Eye](#) reported (1393, **29May-11Jun15**, pg8):

"In a televised debate [he] denied government's reviews into the unexpected death of benefit claimants – accusing a Green Party representative of making "scurrilous" and "cheap" allegations - even though his own civil servants had already admitted there had been 40 reviews of suicides and nine further benefit-related deaths in the previous year. His department refused to publish the outcome of these cases."

So: as 'true' as his claim post Brexit: "*I never said during the Brexit referendum campaign that exiting the EU would save a weekly £350 million we could then give to the NHS*".

[Private Eye](#) 1422, **8-21July16**, pg 11, has a photograph of him in front of a bus that states, on its side: "*We send the EU £350 per week; let's fund our NHS instead*"

Ref
3

"If you believe a criminal offence has been committed..."

"*If I believe*" (!!!) This comment is from '[the Crown Prosecution Service](#)'! **Look at the evidence** e.g.:

- against the [police: summary \(B\)- Breaches of the law](#) – many of which amount to criminal offences;
- against the [judiciary: kangaroo courts](#) – many of which, likewise, amount to criminal offences e.g.
 - [Queen's Bench Division- Summary of breaches of the law re. my Claim against the police](#);
 - [West London County Court- Summary of breaches of the law](#).

To the above examples under the 'NB' note on page 2 – I add another two:

First example

- Following the fraudulent [29.11.02](#) claim filed against me [and fellow leaseholders](#), in [West London County Court](#), by [CKFT](#), on behalf of "[Steel Services](#)" (= Andrew David Ladsky), I repeatedly informed the court – [in vain](#) – that this action was a very serious breach of process.
- Indeed, as I explained, Ladsky had filed a [07.08.02](#) application in the [then London Leasehold Valuation Tribunal \(LVT\)](#) asking it "*to determine the reasonableness of the global sum demanded*" (e.g. [29.10.02](#) pre-trial hearing directions). As can be seen from these directions, the process was well under way. Two lawyers shared my view: [1st lawyer](#); [2nd lawyer](#).
- Including the contingency fund ('apparently' of £140k), the outcome of the tribunal's hearings was a £500,000 reduction in [the demand](#), or -70% less ([LVT # 4.1](#)).
- The *deliberate failure* by Her Majesty's tribunal to inform many of my fellow leaseholders of the application, added to the trauma of facing a court claim - meant I was *the only leaseholder* who challenged the application ([Overview # 2](#)). I did this because: (1)- I was convinced the demand was fraudulent; (2)- I naïvely believed what the state told me (and makes me pay for through taxes): that the judicial system was there to ensure the implementation of the legislation.
- My fellow leaseholders being unaware of the tribunal's action, and thus findings, meant that the judiciary felt free to – illegally - forge ahead with the claim ([Overview # 3](#)). E.g. it issued [a judgment](#) against one of them *5 months before* the tribunal issued [its report](#). (Many more were also bullied or, more accurately, terrorised into [paying monies that were not due and payable](#)).
- To allow Ladsky to rip off the leaseholders, and in particular, help him fund [his multi-million £ jackpot](#), the tribunal *failed* to perform its legal duty (stated e.g. in [its pre-trial hearing directions](#)) - by *not* providing a summary of the impact of its findings on the global sum demanded.
- In order to fight against [the claim](#), at an additional cost of £1,800 (on top of the £28,000 the tribunal had already cost me), I had to ask my surveyor [to analyse the findings](#). (I communicated them to as many of my fellow leaseholders as I could but, by then, many had caved in).
- To ensure my fellow leaseholders would not challenge the claim, as well as allow Ladsky to charge his tribunal costs to the leaseholders, Her Majesty's tribunal then placed a so-called "[summary of the case](#)" on its online public database that not only libellously blames 'me' for "*a [fictitious] cost increase*" it, of course, *excludes* a summary of the impact of its findings on the global sum demanded ([Summary of case pg](#)).
- It is glaringly obvious that **the global sum** on which the [individual leaseholder's share of the service charges](#) is payable **must**, of course, **be the same for all the leaseholders**.

The tribunal *confirmed* this in a [21.07.03](#) letter to racketeer ³ [Lanny Silverstone, CKFT](#).

- Evidence in further support of this obvious fact (I also placed on my website from 2006): 4 months *after* the [LVT report](#): the [21.10.03 'Part 36 Offer'](#) to me from the racketeers that knocked off more than £8,000 from the original demand of £14,400 ([17.07.02](#) demand; [29.11.02](#) claim)...
...- and *8 months later* (the ruffians ⁴) were fighting me like a bunch of demented bloodthirsty hyenas - because they had secured the very active assistance of Her Majesty's tribunal and

³ COED definition of 'racketeer': "A person participating in or operating a dishonest or illegal business, frequently practising fraud, extortion, intimidation, or violence"

⁴ COED definition of 'ruffian': "A violent or lawless person"

court): the [01.07.04](#) Consent Order (my [19.12.03](#) reply to the racketeers saying that I was "accepting the offer for the sake of putting an end to this dispute") (I was dreaming!). (Legally, I did not owe the claimed £6,350 either ([Overview # 5](#))).

Just looking at the above: how do you assess the conduct of Her Majesty's [tribunal](#) and [judiciary](#)? Being the type of person who calls a spade a spade, I describe it as blatantly corrupt, as well as blatantly aiding and abetting fraud = glaring criminal offences ([kangaroo courts](#)).

Outcome on me: to get the £8,000 reduction: Her Majesty's tribunal and court ripped me off of £40,000 of my very-hard-earned life-savings; inflicted 21 months of absolute, sheer utter hell on me ([Overview # 4](#)); *deliberately* left me in the situation of facing a lot more hell since ([Case summary](#)).

Second example

Since the launch of my website in 2006, I have (in addition to the above), been reporting the following (detail under '[Major works # 2](#)):

- "...there is no intention to build a penthouse" ([26.03.03](#) letter to me 'from' [Joan Doreen Hathaway, then MRICS, of the then Martin Russell Jones \(MRJ\)](#));
- "...it was subsequently found that the scheme [the penthouse] was not a viable proposition; there are no plans to build the penthouse" ([04.03.03](#) letter 'from' Hathaway given to the LVT);
- "I am able to categorically state that the Specification makes NO provisions for any construction of an additional floor nor any future requirement in the building to create a penthouse flat" – and
- "...the roof coverings will need to be replaced" (section 4-1.4 of [13.12.02](#) "Expert Witness" report to the LVT, by [Brian Gale, MRICS](#));
- at the start of the works, '[the notice describing "the works"](#)' - stating: "*replacing asphalt roof*" (Brian Gale- [Mansell](#));
- and placed, [on my website](#), the following photographs proving the lies:



Back of Jefferson House in July 02 and...



...in September 2005

How much more evidence of criminality is required?

In addition, [on my website](#), I also placed irrefutable evidence identifying the individual who is driving the multi-criminal activities in the block: [Andrew David Ladsky](#) e.g.

- [11.10.01](#) letter to two of my fellow leaseholders from [his racketeer solicitor, Ayesha Salim, CKFT](#) - stating: "**We are solicitors instructed by Mr Andrew Ladsky**".

(They are *the same solicitors* who: **(1)**- filed the fraudulent [29.11.02](#) claim against me - et.al "on behalf of [Steel Services](#)"; **(2)**- [in Oct 02](#), threatened to forfeit my Lease ([take my apartment](#)

[away from me](#)) if I did not “pay immediately” the fraudulent sum claimed of £14,400; (3)- made me the [21.10.03 'Part 36 offer'](#) that knocked off £8,000 from the demand;

(4)- [in Nov 02, Lanny Silverstone, CKFT](#), claiming to have been “**consulted by Andrew Ladsky**” falsely accused me of making “*defamatory remarks about Mr Ladsky*” – and [contacted my then employer, KPMG](#), by stating the same lies against me; etc.)

- The majority of the correspondence from these solicitors states the reference ‘LAD’ (= Ladsky) e.g. [threat of forfeiture](#); [Consent Order](#) (on the last page).
- [03.10.06](#) letter to my (then) website host, from another of Ladsky’s corrupt solicitors, [Jeremy Hershkorn, Portner and Jaskel](#), stating “**We act on behalf of Mr Andrew Ladsky**” – who, with the objective of getting the closure of my ‘inconvenient’ [website](#), made numerous, *totally unsupported*, libellous accusations against me – including stating e.g....

...that “[My] *website contains a significant number of unsubstantiated allegations against our client which are wholly false, clearly highly defamatory and actionable in law.*”

"The site contains suggestions that our client is guilty of criminal activities and fraud all of which are totally unsubstantiated, outrageous and false."

"Our client's reputation has been severely damaged by the allegations that your company has chosen to publish on the internet."

- These *same solicitors* sent me a bogus, and thus illegal [10.02.06](#) “notice of first refusal” (my last reply of [30.04.06](#)) ([Notices # 3](#)), “on behalf” of the same ‘company’ ([‘Steel Services’](#)) that had the fraudulent [29.11.02](#) claim filed against me et.al. by [CKFT](#).
- In Jan 01, **Ladsky** sent me, and fellow leaseholders, [a letter](#) attempting to dissuade us from pursuing a (bogus) “offer” to purchase the headlease.
- In his [05.11.02](#) email to me, the [local Tenancy Relations Officer](#) I had contacted for help, ([Owners identity # 1](#)) reported: “*I have received a telephone call from Mr Ladsky. He has asked for copies of all correspondence that you have sent me*”.
- Numerous letters from the [person who was running the residents association](#), who complained to me, and fellow leaseholders, ([as well as to the local police](#)), of suffering horrendous, sustained harassment from Ladsky; (she was ‘daring’ to interfere with his intended fraud).

(More examples under [CKFT-Introduction](#))

Having placed all this evidence on my website (from Sep 06), I then end-up at the receiving end of [Her Majesty's local police](#) processing so-called “crime reports” against me that e.g.

- Describe Ladsky as “[my] *neighbour*”; the “*vulnerable victim who feels intimidated by [me]*” (!!!); (“[2007 crime report](#)” of “*Confirmed*”; “*Substantiated racial incident*” – “*Anti-Semitic racial incident*”; “*Hate crime- race, religion*”; and in the “[2003 crime report](#)” of “*Confirmed*”; “*Substantiated offence of harassment*”).
- In the [2007 report](#), that “*The reason why the victim [i.e. Ladsky!] believes he has become a target for abuse on the web site is that the victim was involved with the business who was carrying out the repairs and improvements that were paid for with the service charge*”

"About four years ago Mr **Ladsky** organised for refurbishment on the flats...the suspect is still obviously not happy with what Mr Ladsky initiated" [note the contradiction, as I reported in e.g. my [29.08.11](#) Witness Statement to the police].

- Still in the same report, the police claims to have "**No suspicion of false reporting**".
- It also states that the police "Advised victim [i.e. Ladsky] re. civil procedures defamation of character" (you could not make it up!).
- In the previous "[2003 crime report](#)" (against which the police also denied me the right to defend myself – as related earlier on in this document)- it states: "The victim states that the reason why [I am] being like this is because [I] do not want to pay"

"The suspect [me!] seems to think that the victim is behind the company who has sent the letters asking for money"

- Example of 'a reply' (in Nov 09) to my complaint against the content of the "crime reports" – from [Her Majesty's Acting Chief Inspector Steve McSorley, Head of Professional Standards & Performance](#) for [Kensington, Chelsea & Notting Hill police stations](#):

"With regard to the wording of the crime reports, I am satisfied that this represents an accurate account of what police were told at the time even if you do not agree with what was said by third parties"

- Example of 'a reply' from **Detective Inspector Crispin Lee, Police Directorate of Professional Standards** following (among many others) my [18.02.10](#) 'cry for help' to the so-called '[Independent](#)' Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) – captured in his '[22.01.10](#)' application to the IPCC; (date in inverted commas because it is false; he submitted the application 2 weeks later, on 4th Feb 10 - date on which the then Met Commissioner Paul Stephenson et.al. received my [02.02.10](#) letter):

"If the crime reports were to be altered at the complainant's request this would set a new precedent for crime reporting and recording across the UK.

This complaint is therefore an abuse of process."

- Example of 'a reply', (in Mar 02), when I complained to **DC DR Adams, CID**, Kensington police, of suffering [harassment](#) from Ladsky: "[You won't be able to prove a link with Andrew Ladsky](#)".

Many other examples of very damning evidence against the police e.g. [Overview # 13; # 16; # 17; # 15- 'surveillance'; # 18](#) – [summaries of my 'cries for help' and complaints # 4](#).

All three police stations of [Kensington, Chelsea & Notting Hill](#) are covered:

(1)- Pre-filing my [19.04.11](#) Claim, in e.g.:

- my [13.08.09](#) and [20.09.09](#) replies to the police Public Access Office following its sending me the 3 highly redacted packs of lies so-called "crime reports";
- my [02.06.10](#) statutory Notice under section 10 of the [Data Protection Act 1998](#) and [supporting document](#) to the then **Chief Superintendent Mark Heath**, Kensington Chelsea & Notting Hill police - which he *illegally* ignored.

(Following his lead, the Met Commissioner, Home Secretary, IPCC and Queen's Bench judiciaries then *did the same thing* – including at the *pre-action stage*: [QB # 2.1](#)).

(2)- Post-filing my Claim – in e.g.:

- my [19.07.11](#) and [29.08.11](#) Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) Witness Statements;
- my [17.10.11](#) Request for Oral Hearing.

Typically ([kangaroo courts](#)) [Her Majesty's Queen's Bench judiciaries: Master Eyre, Justices Lang and MacKay](#), all suffered from 'sudden attacks' of extreme blindness to my very damning evidence, as well as amnesia about the rule of law.

= Opted to side with [HM's police](#), as well as with [the 'brother' \(Persecution # 6\)](#), [Ladsky and his gang of racketeers](#): pack of lies Orders: [09.08.11](#), [06.10.11](#) and [24.10.11](#).

Considering just the above: how do you describe the conduct of [Her Majesty's police](#)? Among others: unbelievably corrupt; glaringly aiding and abetting criminal activities = criminal offences.

Conclusion: **Anybody who claims that s/he 'cannot see' my very extensively backed-up evidence of very serious wrongdoings, gross misconduct and criminality - is somebody who does not want to see it.**

(Just looking at all the evidence in this document, you can see why, in this "[fantastically corrupt](#)" environment, the sociopaths (⁵) / psychopaths (⁶) in the Ladsky gang and among its "arslikhan" (⁷) lapdogs (⁸) in the courts, the police – et.al. in the state - have been persecuting me non-stop: [Persecution pg](#); [My Diary pg](#)...

...including Her Majesty's police helicopters that massively increased the attacks against me following my 'daring' to rework the legal pages [in 2013 \(top of page summary in My Diary\)](#)...

– hell-bent on "[kill\[ing me\], zip\[ping\] up the bag, and bring\[ing me\] to the morgue](#)" / [My Diary 14 Jun 14](#)). (Message delivered to me 6 years previously: "Enjoy your life. You don't have long to live").

| | |
|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Ref 4 | "...you can report the matter to the police or other investigative body so that an appropriate course of action can be taken. "I note your concerns about the police but I cannot comment on them" |
|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

'[The Crown Prosecution Service](#)' "cannot comment" about criminal conduct by the police!

However, if it concerns one of 'the little people' - **then** its director Alison Saunders is 'able to comment'! ([The Telegraph article](#)).

Yep! That's the (typical) definition of an "unbiased" English public sector department. (One for all, and all for one...including for its hangers-on (⁹) and protégés (¹⁰)).

⁵ COED definition of 'sociopath': "A person with a personality disorder manifesting itself in extreme antisocial attitudes and behaviour"

⁶ COED definition of 'psychopath': "A person suffering from chronic mental disorder with abnormal or violent social behaviour; loosely: a mentally or emotionally unstable or aggressive person"; "informal: an unstable and aggressive person"

⁷ "Arslikhan": One of [Private Eye](#)'s unique expressions

⁸ COED definition of 'lapdog': "A person who is completely under the influence of another"

⁹ COED definition of 'hanger-on': "A person who associates sycophantically with another person"

| | |
|--------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Ref 5 | <p>"If you wish to complain to the Metropolitan Police you should raise your concerns with their Professional Standards Department, or Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC)."</p> <p>"Their email address is as follows:..."</p> |
|--------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Alison Saunders and many others at "Rose Court, 2 Southwark Bridge" (see next comment, # 6), must have been rolling on the floor with laughter when writing this.

I emphasise that, on [page 3 of my letter to Saunders](#), I specifically referred to my experience with all these parties. Indeed, regarding the MPS, its so-called 'Professional Standards Department', and the IPCC- I supplied this link: [Overview # 18\(1\)](#). For detail, see [police- header # 5](#).

In the context of my [19.04.11](#) Claim in the Queen's Bench Division – the detail re. the MPS is under [header # 4](#), and re. the IPCC, under [header # 5](#).

As to providing "the email" = another opportunity to add to their sadistic kicks – as I stated that the British state has been monitoring, as well as interfering with **all** my communications since at least 2005 – and provided a location on my website where I discuss this: [My Diary # 2](#).

(I reported numerous examples of this in my [19.07.11](#) Witness Statement to [Theresa May, then Home Secretary: Queen's Bench # 6](#)).

| | |
|--------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Ref 6 | <p>"B Mansfield – Parliamentary and Complaints Unit"</p> |
|--------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|

So, in [the Queen's 2015 speech \(The Guardian\)](#), the "*merging of the existing parliamentary and health service ombudsman*" ["*with the local government and potentially the housing ombudsmen's offices*"] - also entailed putting them under the same roof with the Crown Prosecution Service, as well as with the courts 'complaints department'.

= ALL one happy family who can now even more easily construct their 'get lost' letters to complainants.

See, my legitimate 'cries for help' / complaints - in vain- to:

- (1)- [Parliamentary Ombudsman: summary # 1.10](#);
- (2)- [Local Government Ombudsman: summary # 5.2](#);
- (3)- [the courts and their ministers: summaries under section 1](#).

Note that the CPS address: "**Rose Court, 2 Southwark Bridge, London SE1 9HS**" - is the **same address** as at the time of my 2007-08 complaint against [West London County Court](#) e.g. my [13.11.07](#) complaint; one of the 'replies': [10.12.07](#).

Conclusions

Another one (added to ['the faith leaders' et.al.](#)) I am exposing for her sham comments, as well as blatant siding with, and protection of her criminal tribe members and of their hangers-on and protégés.

¹⁰ COED definition of 'protégé': "A person who is guided and supported by an older and more experienced or influential person"

Of course Alison Saunders shares the same psyche; she would not be in the role if she did not. Another example:

Reported in [Private Eye](#), 1425 – 19Aug-1Sep16, pg 7:

“The anti-arms protesters who blocked entry to last September’s DSEI arms fair in London were arrested, then acquitted in April after arguing in court that greater crimes were going on inside the arms sale show. The judge agreed...” (1)

*“Despite this, **the CPS, determined not to give up without a fight (2)**, has repeated its application to state a case.”*

“In response to its appeal, the judge stated that “unless and until the CPS prepares its application on the basis of what was actually said in my judgment (rather than something they appear to imagine was said) I am simply not prepared to implicitly condone such poor preparation by stating a case on the current application” Ouch!”

(1)- Yes, impartial judges *do* exist. Unfortunately, in the course of 9 court actions ([kangaroo courts](#)) I have *not* come across even one of them. (As the case against the protesters appears to be ongoing, I hope I will not regret saying that this particular judge is fair).

(2)- On [page 4 of my letter to Alison Saunders](#), I included a reference to Theresa May, then [Home Secretary](#), doing the same thing in relation to immigration cases.

(More examples of media reports on the Crown Prosecution Service on the [Media page](#) e.g. ‘Cardiff Three’; Mr Ian Tomlinson; Mr Leonard McCourt; Child sex abuse – and earlier ones at the end of the page on [‘Lawyers and courts’](#)).