

Following a **09.04.09** acknowledgment, in his **23.04.09** 'reply' Rifkind claimed that he "could not do anything"

Noëlle Rawé – 24 March 2009
Page 1 of 30

The Rt. Hon. Sir Malcolm Rifkind, M.P.
Kensington & Chelsea Conservatives
1a Chelsea Manor Street
London SW3 5RP

Ms Noëlle Rawé
[]
[]

(By 'Special Delivery')

**But, I continued to battle - which would have added to his sadistic kicks: his 'get lost!' were leading me to waste a lot more of my time and money arguing against them; my 19.10.09 letter to him summarising my experience with him, and his 23.10.09 'response'. He finally succeeded in the rejection of my complaint: the 2nd 'get lost': 29.07.10 'from' the Parliamentary Ombudsman= him - PHSO # 2
Snapshots: Doc library # 1.9 and # 1.10**

1 24 March 2009

2 Dear Sir

3 **MY EVIDENCE – FOR YOU TO TAKE ACTION**

4 I acknowledge receipt of your letter of 11 March 2009 in reply to mine of 7 March 2009 in which you tell
5 me "As matters stand, I believe you have exhausted your options; the only advice I can offer, however, is
6 that if you have new evidence you should take legal advice".

7 Considering (1) the content of my letter; (2) the fact that you state in your opening paragraph that you
8 have "carefully read" my "detailed letter"; (3) the role of an MP vis-à-vis his Constituents - I find your
9 comments extremely shocking.

10 At the start of my 7 March 2009 letter, I wrote:

11 "As my MP, I would like to meet with you to discuss how you will help me – a law-abiding, British
12 taxpayer (who has so far paid an estimated £500,000 in tax in this country):

13 1. Get the police and the Court Service perform as per their mandate, ensuring that the
14 perpetrators of criminal acts against me are brought to justice as, to date, by aiding and abetting
15 their c. £500,000 fraud –and concurrent fear tactics - both have demonstrated that they perceive
16 themselves to be at their service, at the exclusion of mine.

17 2. Get redress for the horrendous and very traumatic treatment, as well as financial loss I have
18 suffered at the hands of West London County Court over a period of three years (20 months +
19 16 months).

20 3. Get redress from Kensington & Chelsea police for treating me as though I am a criminal, instead
21 of what I am: the victim of crime - and, in the process, using intimidation and harassment tactics,
22 as well as making racist, xenophobic comments against me.

23 4. Determine why I am under surveillance by the police – and put an end to it.

24 5. Get redress from the Leasehold Valuation Tribunal (LVT) for the traumatic treatment and
25 financial loss it has caused me to suffer by failing to perform its remit"

26 (NOTE: The events captured in this letter and the supporting evidence are contained on my website
27 www.leasehold-outrage.com)

Snapshots of events with the tribunal and courts, under kangaroo courts

28 The following sections and page reference are:

29	1	'You and your MP' - House of Commons - Factsheet M1 – 2008	2
30	2	Parliamentary Ombudsman – Principles of Good Practice in Government	2
31	3	What the Leasehold Valuation Tribunal (LVT) did in 2002 - 2003 – and since	3
32	4	What West London County Court (WLCC) did:	6

1	4.1	In 2002 - 2004	6
2	4.2	In 2007 - 2008	7
3	5	What Wandsworth County Court did in 2004:.....	9
4	6	“If I have new evidence”?!?!	9
5	7	How HMCS ‘Customer Service’ ‘handled’ my complaints	9
6	7.1	24 August 2004 reply to my 29 June 2004 ‘cry for help’ to Lord Falconer of Thoroton	10
7	7.2	Replies to my 13 November 2007 complaint	12
8	7.3	Parliamentary Ombudsman’s view of Good Complaint Handling and Remedy	18
9	8	Securing <i>my right</i> of access to justice and redress through the Court Service	19
10	9	What Kensington & Chelsea police did:.....	20
11	9.1	In 2002	20
12	9.2	In 2003	24
13	9.3	In 2007	25
14	9.4	Securing redress and <i>my right</i> to demand that the police acts as per its mandate	26
15	10	Conclusions	27
16	10.1	What treatment is in store for the journalists who expose far more shocking evidence?	29

17

18 **1 ‘You and your MP’ - [House of Commons](#) - Factsheet M1 – 2008**

19 ***“If your problem is a matter for which Parliament or central government is responsible... then***
 20 ***you should contact your Member of Parliament”***

21 *“How does your MP deal with your problems?”*

22 *“...there is a number of methods available to try to resolve the matter:*

- 23 • *A letter from your MP to the relevant department or official will often provide a solution*
- 24 • *Your MP may decide to take matters a stage further by writing to the Ministry involved*
- 25 • *Your MP may make an appointment to see the Minister personally”*

26 *“If some essential procedure has been missed out i.e. **if there has been maladministration**, your*
 27 *MP may be able to take your case to the [Parliamentary Ombudsman](#) (also called the Parliamentary*
 28 *Commissioner for Administration). The Ombudsman is sometimes able to resolve such cases where*
 29 *there has been administrative incompetence **but can only be approached via your MP, you***
 30 ***cannot approach the Ombudsman directly”***

31 Concise Oxford English Dictionary definition of ‘maladministration’: ***“Manage or administer badly or***
 32 ***dishonestly”***

33 **2 [Parliamentary Ombudsman](#) – Principles of Good Practice in Government**

34 The following is from the Parliamentary Ombudsman Annual Report 2007-08. It lists the *“Principles of*
 35 *Good Administration”* as:

- | | |
|--------------------------|---|
| 1. <i>Legality</i> | 1. <i>Getting it right</i> |
| 2. <i>Flexibility</i> | 2. <i>Being customer focused</i> |
| 3. <i>Transparency</i> | 3. <i>Being open and accountable</i> |
| 4. <i>Fairness</i> | 4. <i>Acting fairly and proportionately</i> |
| 5. <i>Accountability</i> | 5. <i>Putting things right</i> |
| | 6. <i>Seeking continuous improvement</i> |

1 The report lists the same six, right hand side principles for “Complaint handling” and “Remedy”.

2 It reports that, “In 2007-08, the Office of the Parliamentary Ombudsman handled:

- 3 • 152 complaints against HM Court Service
- 4 • 100 complaints against the Tribunals service
- 5 • 25 complaints against the Ministry of Justice”

6 I believe that any fair minded, reasonable person with integrity would agree with me that what I related in
7 my letter to you of 7 March 2009, demonstrates, at the overall level, **serious breach of mandate and**
8 **concurrent gross breach of trust by “central government departments”**, and at the lower level, a
9 catalogue of, at best, **very serious “maladministration” – justifying your referring the detail of my**
10 **case in relation to the tribunal and the courts to the [Parliamentary Ombudsman](#) for the purpose**
11 **of redress – as well as for ensuring that appropriate action is taken against the various**
12 **individuals to prevent them from inflicting the same treatment on others.**

13 **In relation to ensuring that, when dealing with my case, the Court Service and the police perform**
14 **as per their stated mandate – to raise this with the respective ministers, Rt. Hon. Jack Straw, MP,**
15 **Justice Secretary and the Rt. Hon. Jacqui Smith, Home Office Minister. And, in the case of**
16 **obtaining redress from the police, to also raise this with Mrs Smith – as my experience with the**
17 **Police Complaints Authority makes it abundantly clear that, currently, I do not stand a chance.**

18 This letter contains extracts from my 7 March 2009 letter to you – identified by references in brackets:
19 P[x] = page number; L[x] = line number, as well as additional information for the purpose of
20 completeness of events. Hence, this letter can be passed on ‘as is’ to the relevant parties.

21 **3 What the Leasehold Valuation Tribunal (LVT) did in 2002 - 2003 – and since**

**See summaries at
top of LVT page**

22 1) It failed to perform its remit which it defined as “...in accordance with Section 19(2B) of the Landlord
23 and Tenant Act 1985. The application is for the Tribunal to determine the reasonableness of the
24 refurbishment and repairs work proposed by the applicants at a cost of £736,206” - by not including
25 a summary of the impact of its determination on the global sum demanded - and the Head of the
26 LVTs twice refused my request to address this major failing (P3, L37-45)

27 (Its remit is further confirmed, for example, in the 21 July 2003 letter it sent to Mr Lanny Silverstone,
28 Cawdery Kaye Fireman & Taylor, Mr Andrew Ladsky’s solicitor “It is not the duty of the Tribunal to
29 assess the particular contribution payable by any specific tenant but only to determine the
30 reasonableness, or otherwise of the service charges as a whole to go on the service charge account
31 from which no doubt you can assess the proportion for that particular tenant”)

32 2) It failed, over a four-month period, to supply me (and my fellow leaseholders) with the – critical -
33 supporting enclosures it had received with the 7 August 2002 application by ‘Steel Services’ (P2,
34 L37-41). The enclosures included a partially costed version of ‘the works’. This failure continued at
35 the 29 October 2002 pre-trial hearing when we, leaseholders, were all clamouring for a copy of a
36 priced version of the works (P3, L1-3). The outcome was that I continued to suffer anxiety and
37 distress, as well as waste my time writing endless letters chasing the information, and spent –
38 unnecessary - costs.

39 3) In breach of their rights, it failed to inform some of my leaseholders of the 7 August 2002 application
40 by ‘Steel Services’ – thereby denying them the right to challenge the application (P2, L37) – and
41 hence, the sum demanded of them.

- 1 4) It proceeded with the 7 August 2002 application on the basis of a lease that is materially different
 2 from mine as one of the clauses – unbelievably - states “*liability for...service charges – to be*
 3 *determined by and at the sole discretion of the Lessor*” (P2, L38-41). As the tribunal had not supplied
 4 me with the appendices, I did not know – and only found this out later.
- 5 5) It waited more than two months to inform me (and my fellow leaseholders) of the application; and it
 6 waited another two days to inform us of a pre-trial hearing on 29 October 2002 – thereby limiting the
 7 ability to attend due to the short notice (P2, L42-44) (During this ‘delay’ Mr Ladsky’s aides, Ms Joan
 8 Doreen Hathaway, MRICS, Martin Russell Jones, and Mr Lanny Silverstone, Cawderly Kaye Fireman
 9 & Taylor were threatening me (and some of my fellow leaseholders) with legal proceedings, forfeiture
 10 of my flat, and costs (P2, L25-30))
- 11 6) It failed to take action when I informed it that – against the very specific instructions it had given me
 12 (and my fellow leaseholders) to NOT PAY the service charge demand – ‘Steel Services’ had
 13 nonetheless filed a claim against me (and 10 of my fellow leaseholders) in West London County
 14 Court on 29 November 2002. (P3, L16-22) – resulting in the same action being pursued concurrently
 15 under two separate jurisdictions - both part of the English legal system. Its reply was in effect “*not*
 16 *our problem*” (and West London County Court held the same position) – leaving me, a Litigant in
 17 Person, with nowhere to turn to for help.

18 I believe that any fair minded, reasonable person with integrity would agree with me that the above fits
 19 the description of ‘maladministration’: “**Manage or administer badly or dishonestly**” – with
 20 particular ‘black on white’ evidence of the latter.

21 To these I will now add: **See LVT page for summaries: Events; Breaches of the law;
 Overall outcome on me**

- 22 7) It repeatedly ignored my letters (and those of my fellow leaseholders) that, in breach of our statutory
 23 rights, we had not been provided with evidence in support of the July 2002 service charge demand.
- 24 8) It repeatedly ignored my highlighting non-compliance by the ‘managing’ agents, Martin Russell
 25 Jones, with the directions the LVT had set at the 29 October 2002 pre-trial hearing – which meant
 26 that I was not provided with the information necessary to challenge the application and could not
 27 comply with the deadline set by the tribunal for the leaseholders to take various actions.
- 28 Yet, the note at the bottom of its 29 October 2002 pre-trial direction reads “*Failure to comply with*
 29 *these directions may result in prejudice to a party's case. In particular, failure to provide evidence as*
 30 *directed may debar the defaulter from relying on such evidence at the hearing. In the case of the*
 31 *applicants this could result in dismissal of the application*”
- 32 9) In spite of knowing that I (and fellow leaseholders) had not been supplied with the information to
 33 which we are legally entitled – and taking no step to ensure we were supplied with it – the tribunal
 34 refused to postpone the 5 February 2003 hearing. It therefore implied that I am a liar and a cheat.
- 35 10) Its refusal forced me to employ a surveyor, a solicitor and a barrister – and led to the first day of the
 36 substantive hearing being postponed to 13 March 2003 “*in the interest of justice*” (This is captured
 37 under point 16 of its 17 June 2003 report). Why had there not been ‘justice’ before?
- 38 11) Since 2003, the LVT has placed on its online database, accessible by the public, a summary of the
 39 case that contains a scurrilous statement against me “*following delay caused by adjournment*
 40 *requested by Respondent*”. As blatantly obvious from the above, the “*adjournment*” was caused by
 41 *the tribunal*.

1 I also add: (1) as the tribunal wrote under point 64 of its 17 June 2003 report I was "*within my rights*
2 *to challenge the application*" by 'Steel Services'; (2) I did not stop Mr Andrew Ladsky from
3 proceeding with the works. The reason he did not, is because he did not know how much he would
4 be able to extract from the leaseholders. (This is also evidenced by the fact that, in spite of the
5 repeated claims for "*urgent need of repairs*", he waited until 2 August 2004, the day that the last
6 valiant leaseholder capitulated in Wandsworth London County Court, to have his puppets, Martin
7 Russell Jones, announce the start of the works (P4, L12-18))

8 Of course, this entry has been very 'convenient' for Mr Ladsky and his aides – added to the fact that
9 the tribunal failed to perform its remit by not stating the impact of its determination on the global sum
10 demanded - making it, among others, impossible for my fellow leaseholders to challenge the service
11 charge demand. And, in spite of my request, the tribunal failed to amend its entry (P4, L3-5)

12 12) While the LVTs are promoted by the government as a forum where "*there is no need for professional*
13 *representation*", the persistent blind eye and deaf ear attitude forced me to employ a solicitor,
14 barrister and surveyor – at a total cost of £28,000 – and a further £1,800 to determine the impact of
15 the tribunal's determination on the global sum demanded.

16 13) The LVT has caused me yet more - unnecessary - costs as a result of refusing to include a summary
17 of the impact of its determination on the global sum demanded as it led me to have to battle with
18 Cawdery Kaye Fireman & Taylor until July 2004 – and well beyond, in 2007-08, because of the
19 second fraudulent claim against me for which the LVT determination is relevant.

20 14) The LVT has caused me an unbelievable amount of torment, anguish and distress. I went through
21 absolute, sheer utter hell because of this tribunal. I have continued to go through this horrendous,
22 very traumatic hell – all because it refused to perform its remit (P5, L11)

23 15) The LVT has cost me over 250 hours of my life – and a lot more as a result of refusing to include a
24 summary of the impact of its determination on the global sum demanded.

25 Likewise, I believe that any fair minded, reasonable person with integrity would agree with me that the
26 above fits the description of '**maladministration**': "***Manage or administer badly or dishonestly***" –
27 **with particular 'black on white' evidence of the latter – including duplicity ¹ and collusion ² with**
28 **'Steel Services' aka Mr Andrew Ladsky, and his aides.**

29 While I am very tempted to use the word 'corruption' as the key factor behind events with the Leasehold
30 Valuation Tribunal, currently, I do not have the evidence to support the dictionary's first definition of the
31 word: "*acting dishonestly in return for money or personal gain*". However, I am sure that any fair minded,
32 reasonable person with integrity would agree with me about using the word in the context of the second
33 definition: "*morally depraved*".

34 In addition, the Leasehold Valuation Tribunal has also failed on the Principles of Good Complaint
35 handling defined by the [Parliamentary Ombudsman](#) – as detailed under header 2, above – thereby
36 denying me access to redress. Hopefully, the Parliamentary Ombudsman will have better luck than me –
37 including recommending taking disciplinary action against the individuals, as well as steps to prevent this
38 from happening to others (I know from talking to leaseholders in other blocks that it does).

My Diary 22 Nov 08

¹ Concise Oxford English Dictionary:

Duplicity: "*deceitfulness*"

² **Collusion:** "*secret or illegal cooperation in order to cheat or deceive others*"

1 **4 What West London County Court (WLCC) did:**

2 **4.1 In 2002 - 2004 Summaries**

3 1. It proceeded with the 29 November 2002 claim in spite of having absolute knowledge that the
4 Leasehold Valuation Tribunal had very specifically told me (and my fellow leaseholders) to NOT PAY
5 the 'service charge' demand until the tribunal had issued its determination – causing me an untold
6 amount of torment, anguish and distress (P3, L4-12; 16-28)

7 2. It proceeded with the claim in the absolute knowledge that, contrary to the particulars of claim, the
8 lease supplied with the claim was *not* "representative of all the leases" (P3, L30-31). (The lease
9 supplied had the same materially different clause as that supplied to the tribunal).

10 3. It proceeded with the claim on the basis of a statement of truth endorsed by the 'managing' agents –
11 which is not the appropriate party. The consequence of this is that the claimant 'Steel Services'
12 "could not rely on the contents of the statement of case as evidence" (P3, L32-36) Yet, WLCC
13 proceeded with issuing various orders against me and my fellow leaseholders, which included orders
14 to pay 'Steel Services', as well as judgements against my fellow leaseholders (P3, L23-28)

15 4. It repeatedly ignored my communicating the fact that 'Steel Services' had not implemented the LVT
16 determination of 17 June 2003 (P4, L6-7). And, as the LVT: (1) did not perform its remit; (2) placed a
17 biased, inaccurate summary of the case on its public online database - my fellow leaseholders had
18 little chance of defending themselves against the fraudulent claim (P3, L37-45; P4, L1-5, 12-13, 27-
19 39; P5, L1-5)

20 (I tried my best to circulate the findings and their implications to as many of my fellow leaseholders
21 as I could but, of course, by then, many had already been bullied and persecuted into paying the full
22 amount i.e. monies *not* due and payable: 9 out of the 14 flats on the claim had paid the full amount
23 by 31 December 2002; and more from the other 16 flats. In total, the 25 flats had been made to pay
24 £502,000 by 31 December 2003 (P4, L27-39))

25 5. In an Order dated 21 March 2003, WLCC *wrongly* informed me that a Charging Order hearing
26 concerned me - and continued to do so when challenged, maintaining the position for a week -
27 causing me an unbelievable amount of distress and anguish – as well as leading me to incur £750 of
28 costs (P6, L20-22)

29 6. On 31 March 2004, one of the WLCC staff *wrongly* told me that a judgment has been entered
30 against me on 18 March 2004 – leading me to go into battle for at least twenty minutes. In the
31 process, the first court staff treated me like dirt (P6, L23-24)

32 7. Ignoring the instructions from the Royal Court of Justice's Citizens Advice Bureau, WLCC led me to
33 miss the 28 May 2004 hearing – and *wrongly* suspended the claim against me – as it knew that an
34 agreement had been reached (confirmed by Lord Falconer of Thoroton's Office following my 29 June
35 2004 'cry for help'). Even when faced with the evidence, the court staff initially maintained that no
36 hearing had taken place (P6, L25-29)

37 8. In spite of having absolute knowledge that an agreement had been reached with 'Steel Services', in
38 its 9 June 2004 Notice, it *wrongly* informed me that I was "*the Defendant*" in a trial due to take place
39 in Wandsworth County Court on 17 August 2004 - without giving me any detail whatsoever (P6, L30-
40 32)

41 In spite of my repeatedly challenging this - on the basis that an agreement had been reached - the
42 courts' staff continued to maintain this position over a period of five weeks - often displaying extreme
43 arrogance, a patronizing, condescending attitude and, at times, coming across as though they were

1 enjoying my anguish and distress. Eventually, Wandsworth County Court sent me a 23 July 2004
 2 letter stating that I am *"not required to attend"* – and, in the process, attempted to cover-up what it
 3 and WLCC had done by treating me like an illiterate idiot (P6, L33-38)

4 9. To this must be added - unnecessarily - costing me a significant part of my hard-earned life savings
 5 (P6, L39). To be precise, it cost me over £10,000 in legal fees. (While I was a Litigant in Person for
 6 the first eight months following the filing of the claim, WLCC's blind eye and deaf ear attitude forced
 7 me to employ a solicitor and a barrister from August 2003)

8 10. As a result of its very cruel, perverse treatment, West London County Court caused me an
 9 indescribable amount of sustained torment, anguish and distress over a period of 20 months - and
 10 more than 200 hours of my life.

11 4.2 In 2007 - 2008 **Summaries**

12 11. West London County Court proceeded with the 27 February 2007 claim in the absolute knowledge
 13 that TWO NAMES are given for the *"Claimant"*, *"Rootstock Overseas Corp"* and *"Steel Services"* (P9,
 14 L6-7) - both claiming to be my 'landlord' – one of which I had never heard of, and the other, to my
 15 knowledge, had lost control of part of the block.

16 12. It took no action when I raised the issue of the identity of my 'landlord' – hence the issue as to the
 17 identity of the *"claimant"* - and consequently the **issue as to the legality of the claim against me**. It
 18 let me raise this issue a total of **11 times** - over more than one year (P8, L28-31; P9, L15-16)

19 13. In breach of CPR, it accepted the 27 February 2007 claim without a copy of my lease. (Maybe this is
 20 perceived as 'an improvement' on pursuing the 29 November 2002 claim in the knowledge that the
 21 lease supplied with the claim was not representative of my lease?) (P10, L34-36)

22 14. In spite of knowing that there are **TWO 'claimants'** on the claim, that I had never of *"Rootstock*
 23 *Overseas Corp."* - and had repeatedly been questioning the ownership of the whole block - at the 24
 24 August 2007 hearing, Deputy Judge McGovern ordered that I pay £293.70 to *"Rootstock Overseas*
 25 *Corp"* (P9, L39-42) – evidently opting, for reasons better known to himself – to regard it as the
 26 *"claimant"* (P10, L37-39)

27 15. It *falsely* captured in the 3 April 2007 'Notice that Acknowledgment of Service has been filed' that, in
 28 my 22 March 2007 Acknowledgment of Service I had stated 'an intention to defend part of the claim'
 29 – when in fact, I very clearly stated that I *"intend to contest the court's jurisdiction"* (P9, L17-19)

30 16. Over a period of seven months, it required four written requests from me, plus a complaint to HMCS
 31 'Customer Service', to finally obtain a corrected version of the 3 April 2007 Notice (P9, L22-24)

32 17. Other events demonstrating that West London County Court went out of its way to persecute me,
 33 cause me anxiety, distress, anguish and torment:

34 1) Putting me under pressure by posting the 19 April 2007 Order more than one week later, on 27
 35 April 2007, asking me to serve my skeleton argument by 3 May 2007 (P9, L25-28);

36 2) Cancelling the 8 May 2007 hearing *"on the grounds"* that it had received a letter from Mr
 37 Ladsky's solicitor's, Mr Jeremy Hershkorn, Portner and Jaskel LLP – and keeping me in the dark,
 38 up to 24 hours before the hearing had been scheduled to take place, by failing to fax me a copy
 39 of the letter, as promised (as the court staff refused to read the letter to me over the phone) (P9,
 40 L29-31)

- 1 3) As the 24 August 2007 hearing was approaching, over a period of seven weeks, it ignored my
2 repeated requests for assistance in getting Portner and Jaskel to comply with its 19 April 2007
3 Order (P9, L32-34)
- 4 4) Having sent me a 27 September 2007 letter, in which it demanded the – unjustified - payment of
5 £1,700 “to file a counterclaim” (I had not made, and could not have made), it ignored my 2
6 October 2007 reply – and subsequent chaser letters (P10, L5-8)
- 7 5) In response to my 13 November 2007 complaint, to justify its 27 September 2007 demand of
8 £1,700, it manipulated what I wrote in my 12 September 2007 Defence (P10, L9-10)
- 9 6) More than three months after the 27 September 2007 demand, on 7 January 2008, it sent me a
10 19 December 2007 Order stating “The Defendant having failed to comply with the Court’s
11 request by letter of 27 September 2007 to pay the Counterclaim fee, the Counterclaim stands
12 struck-out” (P10, L11-13)
- 13 7) In spite WLCC having received my application on 27 August 2008, District Judge Nicholson
14 waited until four hours before the 4 November 2008 Detailed Assessment hearing to issue an
15 Order for the case to be transferred to the Supreme Court Costs Office – claiming “an error by
16 the judge” (P10, L20-25)
- 17 8) It only forwarded my 28 August 2007 application for the tape of the 24 August 2007 hearing to a
18 judge on 14 September 2007 (was it required to be sent to a judge?) – which was the deadline
19 for me to serve my Defence, and continued to be obstructive over the following weeks (P10, L26-
20 27)

21 What must be noted is that this highly vicious, perverse, cruel treatment was taking place in tandem
22 with the equally highly vicious, perverse and cruel treatment by Portner and Jaskel LLP which
23 included, among others, Mr Jeremy Hershkorn threatening me with bankruptcy proceedings,
24 forfeiture and costs immediately before filing the fraudulent 27 February 2007 claim against me (P8,
25 L18-24); ignoring my repeated requests for clarification as to the identity of the “claimant” (P8, L28-
26 31); ignoring my repeated requests for evidence in support of the claim, etc.

27 18. Further evidence that the WLCC staff was also complicit³ in the persecution tactics against me is
28 that, whenever I went to the court – without my saying anything - the court manager (I ‘think’ her
29 name is Debbie Wharton) (she was also around in 2002-04) would look across at the man who was
30 ‘dealing’ with my file – whose desk is hidden from view behind a pillar – and he would come to the
31 counter (P10, L28-31)

32 19. From the time the fraudulent claim was filed against me on 27 February 2007, West London County
33 Court and its ‘partner’, Partner and Jaskel LLP, cost me: over 500 hours of my life; 52 hours of lost
34 income, and numerous other costs bringing the total at 31 January 2009 to £8,675. (Of these, the
35 Supreme Court Costs Office allowed £2,600).

36 I believe that any fair minded, reasonable person with integrity would agree with me that the above fits
37 the description of ‘maladministration’: “**Manage or administer badly or dishonestly**” – with
38 **particular ‘black on white’ evidence of the latter.**

39 As I wrote in my 7 March 2009 “If there was any doubt of collusion between the courts and Mr Ladsky’s
40 solicitors in 2002-04, events with WLCC in 2007-08 provide confirmation” (P9, L4-5)

³ **Complicity:** “the fact or condition of being involved with others in an unlawful activity”

1 In fact, I am very tempted to use the word 'corruption' as the key factor behind events with West London
 2 County Court – but, currently, I do not have the evidence to support the dictionary's first definition of the
 3 word: "*acting dishonestly in return for money or personal gain*". However, I am sure that any fair minded,
 4 reasonable person with integrity would agree with me about using the word in the context of the second
 5 definition: "*morally depraved*".

6 As happened in 2002-04, I went through absolute sheer, utter hell because of the staff and judges at
 7 West London County Court – suffering unbelievable torment, anguish and distress. And this horrendous,
 8 very traumatic treatment lasted for 16 months – until 6 June 2008 when "*All of the claim*" against me was
 9 dropped (P8, L25-27) – although the vindictive actions continued until 4 November 2008 - and beyond to
 10 30 January 2009 at the Supreme Court Costs Office Detailed Assessment hearing.

11 **5 What Wandsworth County Court did in 2004: Summaries**

12 1. It ignored my letters about the 17 June 2003 LVT determination, and the fact that 'Steel Services' did
 13 not implement it – resulting in serious injustice against one of my fellow leaseholders (P3, L23-28).
 14 Although I do not know what has become of this leaseholder, this injustice needs to be addressed so
 15 that disciplinary action is taken, and measures put in place to avoid a repeat.

16 2. In spite of my repeatedly challenging the court staff's assertion that I was "*the Defendant*" in a trial
 17 due to take place on 17 August 2004 – as an agreement had been reached with Cawdery Kaye
 18 Fireman & Taylor in May 2004 - the courts' staff continued to maintain this position over a period of
 19 five weeks - often displaying extreme arrogance, a patronizing attitude and, at times, coming across
 20 as though they were enjoying my anguish and distress. Eventually, Wandsworth County Court sent
 21 me a 23 July 2004 letter stating that I am "*not required to attend*" – and, in the process, attempted to
 22 cover-up what it and WLCC had done by treating me like an illiterate idiot (P6, L33-38)

23 **6 "If I have new evidence"?!?!**

24 And you are telling me in your 11 March 2009 letter "*if I have new evidence*"?!?!

25 **How much more evidence do you require for taking action?**

26 **7 How HMCS 'Customer Service' 'handled' my complaints**

27 In my 7 March 2009 letter, I wrote that, in June 2004, I had sent a 'cry for help' to Lord Falconer of
 28 Thoroton in relation to events with WLCC – and received what amounted to the typical Government reply
 29 I had by then become so accustomed to receiving: the equivalent of a 'GET LOST!' (P10, L40-42)

30 Also, that four years on, the same arrogant, dismissive, patronizing, condescending attitude, absolving
 31 itself of all responsibility and accountability prevails – with WLCC and the Court Service 'Customer
 32 Service' quite clearly closing rank following my 13 November 2007 complaint (P11, L1-3) And that the
 33 reply contained the all too familiar cover-up⁴, misrepresentations⁵, fabrications⁶ and rejection of
 34 responsibility and accountability (P11, L12-13).

⁴ **Cover-up:** "*an attempt to conceal the truth about a mistake or a crime*"

⁵ **To misrepresent:** "*give a false or misleading account*"

⁶ **To fabricate:** "*Invent in order to deceive*"

1 **7.1 24 August 2004 reply to my 29 June 2004 'cry for help' to Lord Falconer of Thoroton**

2 The 23 August 2004 reply to my 29 June 2004 'cry for help' was defiant, arrogant, challenging,
3 patronizing, dismissive, failed to own-up to any accountability and responsibility, covered-up what had
4 taken place – generally by implying that I was illiterate / an imbecile / a liar – and through deceit:

5 1. Re. the WLCC 21 March 2003 Notice of a Charger Order that did not concern me. Reply: it implied
6 that I am a liar by stating *"I am surprised that no one in the Court could inform you what a charging*
7 *order was..."* It falsely claims that I had been informed that the hearing concerned one of my fellow
8 leaseholders – and thereby implies that I am an illiterate idiot who had spent days frantically trying to
9 determine why this Order had been sent to me.

10 2. Re. my being advised by the staff at West London County Court to *"nonetheless attend the 4 April*
11 *2003 hearing"* which, when I turned-up with my surveyor, we discovered had been cancelled. Reply:
12 *"It's a matter for you whether you attend the hearing...I am sorry you had a wasted journey...advise*
13 *that if in future you need to attend a court hearing, you ring the court a few days before"* (I had
14 phoned the court, the last time on 1 April 2003 i.e. three days before - which was a Tuesday)

15 3. Re. WLCC falsely telling me, on 31 March 2004, that a judgement had been entered against me on
16 18 March 2004. Reply: An implication that I am meant to feel sorry for the 'poor' court staff as *"There*
17 *are 9* (NB: there were 11) *defendants in this case"* (NB: It is not I who took the decision to include 11
18 defendants on the same claim). *"When you speak to court staff it is often difficult for them to know*
19 *what the current position is in relation to you without looking through the whole court file"*. (NB:
20 Judging from my experience and that of some fellow leaseholders, that file was a complete
21 shambles). Outcome: the reply totally ignores what I wrote in my 29 June 2004 letter in which I
22 related how I had been treated by the staff and, in typical style, it washed its hands of accountability.

23 4. Re. WLCC making me miss the 28 May 2004 hearing by failing to send me the Notice – and going
24 ahead with it in spite of the Royal Courts of Justice's Citizens Advice Bureau informing West London
25 County Court that it could not contact me. Reply: *"Although the Court received the letter from the*
26 *RCJ, a hearing cannot simply be vacated once listed.* (NB: But WLCC had no problem cancelling the
27 4 April 2003 hearing). *"It requires the Judge to instruct that the hearing be adjourned before a*
28 *hearing date can be changed. The Judge gave no such instruction for the hearing to be vacated or*
29 *adjourned"* (NB: Not having me at the hearing proved 'extremely convenient' for Cawdery Kaye
30 Fireman & Taylor - which is why the hearing was not cancelled).

31 5. Re. WLCC capturing on the 28 May 2004 Order that the action against me be *"stayed"* when, in fact,
32 it was clear that an agreement had been reached. Reply: *"You ask for the order of 28th May to be*
33 *changed to reflect the agreement, which you have reached. No member of the Court staff can*
34 *comment or intervene in matters that have been before the Court"* *"... In your particular case it is*
35 *acknowledged that an agreement had been reached"* It goes on to state *"If you feel that the Judge*
36 *has made a mistake, the correct procedure for you to follow is to appeal that decision to a Judge at a*
37 *Higher Court"*. So, 'I' have to spend yet more money to go to a higher court to get a mistake – made
38 by a judge – corrected. (I did not do it as, by then, I had spent several years of my life savings).

39 6. Re. WLCC wrongly telling me that I was *"the Defendant"* at a trial set for 17 August 2004. Reply:
40 Putting yet again the blame on the fact that there were *"9 Defendants"* (NB: should be 11), after five
41 lines of padding, on the sixth line it states *"Please note that this is only in relation to the 5th*
42 *Defendant and it is not against you"*. What was the 'Customer Service' explanation for the fact that
43 the 9 June 2004 notice of this hearing *only had* my name on it, and my address – nobody else's?
44 Instead of saying 'we messed up', it replied *"Unfortunately, this can be very confusing as the order*

- 1 *has your name on it and leads you to believe that it relates to you when it actually refers to another*
2 *defendant*". Such is their contempt that, pinned to the wall, and they still won't accept responsibility.
- 3 In addition, that "*the notice was copied for [my] information*" and that "*...orders issued by the Judge*
4 *relating to one defendant has to be copied out to all defendants as to what is happening in the case*".
5 This was another deceitful cover-up as, apart from receiving Orders and Notices falsely telling me
6 that they concerned me, I was *never* copied "*for information*" in relation to my 10 other fellow
7 leaseholders.
- 8 7. Re. WLCC wrongly telling me that no hearing had taken place on 28 May 2004. Reply: "*I am*
9 *surprised that a member of the court staff would inform you that no hearing took place as the notice*
10 *of hearing is clearly marked on the court computer*". Hence, it (yet again) implies that I am a liar.
- 11 8. Re. WLCC sending the wrong tape to the company I had selected to do the transcript of the 28 May
12 2004 hearing – and taking one month to do it. Reply: "*...the court file had been transferred to*
13 *Wandsworth County Court and the staff had difficulty in locating the tapes without the court file*".
14 Firstly: not my problem. Secondly: my case should **not** have been transferred as the Court Service
15 recognised that "*an agreement had been reached*". West London County Court transferred my file
16 because of (at best) its negligence: wrongly identifying me as "*the Defendant*" in the trial set for 17
17 August 2004 in Wandsworth County Court.
- 18 9. Re. my repeatedly communicating to WLCC that the same action was taking place, concurrently in
19 the LVT and that I had asked the court to stay the court action. Reply: can't comment.
- 20 10. Re. the fact that WLCC, as well as Wandsworth County Court, repeatedly ignored my letters about
21 the tribunal's 17 June 2003 determination, and the fact that 'Steel Services' had not implemented it
22 while nonetheless pursuing with the claim. General reply: "*can't comment on action by court / judges*"
- 23 11. Re. the fact that WLCC had issued judgments against some of my fellow leaseholders **before** the
24 tribunal had issued its 17 June 2003 determination. ('Steel Services' cannot charge leaseholders
25 differentially other than on the basis of their share of a global service charge which *must* be the same
26 for all). General reply: "*can't comment on action by court / judges*"
- 27 12. Re. the fact that, by nonetheless proceeding with the 24 June 2003 hearing, WLCC subjected me to
28 double jeopardy – as I had leave of appeal to the Lands Tribunal. General reply: "*can't comment on*
29 *action by court / judges*"
- 30 13. Re. the fact that Cawdery Kaye Fireman & Taylor had filed an application for summary judgement
31 and changed its position at the 26 August 2003 hearing, covering-up its acceptance of my part
32 payment by stating that it had "*made an error*". (It certainly had not. It was trying its luck to force me
33 to pay monies I did not owe). And the judge accepted this without question. General reply: "*can't*
34 *comment on action by court / judges*"
- 35 14. Re. the fact that in my Defence I had stated that the lease supplied with the claim was materially
36 different from mine. Reply: not addressed.
- 37 15. The Head of 'Customer Service' concluded his letter by stating that I felt "*that the system has let me*
38 *down and that I did not receive justice*". That's a gigantic understatement.
- 39 And the horrific nightmare experience was repeated in West London County Court in 2007-08.

See the **summaries** of Events and Breaches of the law, at the top of the page for: West London County Court ; Wandsworth County Court

1 **7.2 Replies to my 13 November 2007 complaint** **WLCC # 18 ; Doc library # 1.7 and # 1.8**

2 The main points of my complaint against West London County Court, (which I addressed to the HMCS
3 Regional Director, Southwark Bridge), are: **Summaries**

- 4 1) Wrongly capturing in its 3 April 2007 'Notice that acknowledgment of service has been filed' that I
5 had stated an 'intention to defend part of the claim' when, in fact, I very clearly stated "*intend to*
6 *contest the court's jurisdiction*" - and failing to send me a corrected version in spite of several
7 requests – starting with my 30 June 2007 letter.
 - 8 2) In its 27 September 2007 letter, giving me a three-day notice to pay £1,700 "*to file a*
9 *counterclaim*" – I did not, and could not have filed - and threatening to have 'my' counterclaim
10 "*struck-out*" if I failed to do this.
 - 11 3) Had I filed a counterclaim, I would have had no means of knowing how much I should be paying
12 (in support of this point, I referred to the online HMCS guide, EX50) – and therefore viewed
13 WLCC's attitude as amounting to "*bullying and intimidation*"
 - 14 4) I asked why it cost somebody £250 to file a (fraudulent) claim against me, whereas I am
15 expected to pay seven times as much i.e. £1,700 to defend myself against it.
 - 16 5) I asked whether the 27 September 2007 letter from WLCC is as per court regulations.
 - 17 6) Failing to reply to my 2 October 2007 letter, in spite of two chaser letters - and, in effect, going
18 into 'silent mode' since its 27 September 2007 letter.
 - 19 7) Rescheduling the 8 May 2007 hearing three-and-half months later – claiming that "*there is only*
20 *one judge in WLCC*" (NB: Clearly a lie e.g. District Judge Ryan issued the 9 April 2008 case
21 management directions, and another judge, District Judge Nicholson, refused my 30 April 2008
22 application to amend the directions to ensure that I would be provided with the information I am
23 legally entitled to in order to defend myself against the (fraudulent) 27 February 2007 claim)
 - 24 8) Sitting on the 19 April 2007 Order until 28 April 2007 - leaving me with only two working days to
25 write and file my skeleton argument.
 - 26 9) A one month delay in sending the tape for transcription to my nominated company, following my
27 28 August 2007 application, and a further delay 'apparently' caused by the court's reviewing
28 process – leading to the transcript being finally available to me ten weeks after the 24 August
29 2007 hearing.
- 30 1. Having first told me in its 15 November 2007 letter that it would "*provide [me] with a full response*
31 *within the next two weeks*", in its 29 November 2007 letter, HMCS 'Customer Service', Southwark
32 Bridge, stated "*we are not in a position to respond to you in full regarding your complaint, as this*
33 *matter is being investigated by the court. We aim to respond to you in full regarding this matter within*
34 *the next two weeks*".
 - 35 2. I replied on 5 December 2007 that "*I find it most interesting that WLCC requires (so far) one month to*
36 *answer what I view as straightforward questions in my 13 November 2007 complaint*". I also pointed
37 out that, "*At the date of writing, I still have not received: (1) A reply from WLCC to my 2 October 2007*
38 *letter. Why not? (2) An amended version of WLCC's 3 April 2007 Order [Notice]. Why not?*" (In this
39 context I (yet again) quoted from the section in the Civil Procedure Rules re. the court's duty to
40 manage cases).
- 41 I also noted the equal 'silent mode' from Portner and Jaskel LLP, since its 26 September 2007
42 correspondence, adding "*Understandably, this leads me to the perception that some 'close*
43 *communication' is taking place between WLCC and the claimant. Not surprisingly, the above leads*

1 *me to perceive what has and continues to take place with WLCC as seriously lacking in*
 2 *transparency. It leads me to wonder whether the motive behind events is to prevent my case from*
 3 *proceeding to a 'proper' hearing".*

4 I followed this by stating that my perceptions were influenced by events that had taken place since
 5 the claim was filed against me on 27 February 2007 (and listed them), as well as events with West
 6 London County Court in 2002-04 in relation to the previous fraudulent claim against me (and
 7 likewise, listed events).

8 I concluded my letter by stating that, in light of all of these events *"I demand that my case is*
 9 *immediately transferred to a court and a judge committed to operating under CPR's 'Overriding*
 10 *Objective' – so that I can exercise my right under the European Convention on Human Rights*
 11 *comprised under the Human Rights Act 1998: Article 6 – "Right to a fair hearing", and Article 13*
 12 *"Right to an effective remedy"*

13 3. In its 10 December 2007 reply, a 'Customer Service Officer', Southwark Bridge, acknowledged my 5
 14 December 2007 letter, apologised for the delay, and stated that he would *"reply within the next two*
 15 *weeks"*.

16 4. It was obvious that games were being played. It led me to send a 'cry for help' to the Rt. Hon. Jack
 17 Straw, MP, Justice Secretary on 11 December 2007 stating, among others, that I was addressing
 18 myself to him as I had asked for my case to be transferred to another court and assumed that the
 19 HMCS 'Customer Service Officer' did not have the authority to carry it out. (The reply, dated 21
 20 December 2007, stated *"We aim to prepare a response by 16 January 2008"*).

21 5. The follow-on letter, dated 20 December 2007, was from the 'Customer Service Officer' stating
 22 *"further to your letter dated 13 November 2007...I am now in a position to respond to the issues you*
 23 *have highlighted"*

24 6. I headed my 27 December 2007 reply *"Confirmation of collusion"*. Reasons, stated in my letter which
 25 I prefaced with: *"not only does your letter not address any of "the issues" I raise in my complaint, it*
 26 *also totally ignores my 5 December 2007 letter in which I "demand that my case is immediately*
 27 *transferred to a court and a judge committed to operating under CPR's 'Overriding Objective"*

28 1) Regarding the demand for payment of £1,700: what I wrote in my 12 September 2007 Defence
 29 *"The Defendant – a Litigant in Person - was served the 27 February 2007 Claim, 7WL 00675, on*
 30 *9 March 2007 – demanding payment of the sum of £10,356.59, comprising £8,937.28 for*
 31 *charges, £1,069.31 of interest, £250 court fee, and £100 of solicitor's costs"...*

32 ...was changed to *"The Defendant - a litigant in person demanding payment of the sum of*
 33 *£10,356.59, comprising £8,937,28 for charges, £1069.31 of interest, £250 court fee and £100 of*
 34 *solicitors fees"*

35 Following this – UNBELIEVABLE - falsification of what I wrote in my Defence, the Officer wrote
 36 *"Once the court totalled the sum of the counterclaim it was £20713.18"* - and gave this as
 37 justification for demanding payment of the sum of £1,700.

38 2) Leaving this aside, I asked why the Officer had not pursued with WLCC the fact that a
 39 £20,713.18 counterclaim required payment of £1,700 *"As it is twice the amount of the claim, how*
 40 *come that it costs seven times as much to file it?"* I also quoted from the HMCS EX50 leaflet that
 41 the cost for filing a counterclaim ranging in value from £15,000 to £50,000 is £360.

- 1 3) I noted that the Officer had not addressed the fact that WLCC had given me a three-day notice to
2 pay £1,700 and had threatened me with having the counterclaim *“struck out”* – which I viewed as
3 *“bullying and intimidation”*
- 4 4) I noted that the Officer had failed to reply to my question as to whether the 27 September 2007
5 letter was *“as per court regulations”*
- 6 5) The explanation for the fact that WLCC had not responded to my 2 October 2007 in spite of my
7 sending two chaser letters was that it *“had been referred to a District Judge. The contents of*
8 *your letter are noted. However it is not the functions of the court to enter into detailed*
9 *correspondence with the parties to litigation about the merits of points taken in pleadings or other*
10 *aspects of the case”*
- 11 My reply to this was *“This is not a reply. It is a pathetic attempt at avoiding providing a reply...”*
- 12 6) I noted that the Officer had failed to address my complaint that, in spite of several requests,
13 WLCC had not sent me a corrected version of its 3 April 2007 Notice.
- 14 7) The reply to my asking why it took WLCC three-and-half months to reschedule the 8 May 2007
15 hearing was *“it was the first available date”*. To which I responded that 24 August 2007 *“was a*
16 *Friday, just before the bank holiday. Hence, a time when many people tend to be away...*
17 *including judges – right?”* (‘Deputy’ Judge McGovern presided over the hearing)
- 18 8) The reason given for the delay in supplying the tape of the hearing following my 28 August 2007
19 application was that *“the tapes were with another transcriber who was preparing another*
20 *transcript for another case that was heard on the same day as your matter. The tapes were then*
21 *forwarded to another transcriber on 1 October 2007”* (NB: Actually, to my nominated company)
22 *“The transcript was then forwarded to the court for approval by the Judge on 14 November 2007*
23 *and was then sent back on the same day to the transcribers”*.
- 24 I replied that, *“While I do not have sufficient knowledge to challenge the reply, not surprisingly, in*
25 *light of the rest of your letter: I do not believe this explanation”*
- 26 9) I concluded by reiterating my demand for the case to be transferred to another court – and
27 copied The Rt. Hon. Jack Straw, MP, as well as the HMCS Area Director, Southwark Bridge, and
28 the individual at HMCS Petty France who acknowledged my 11 December 2007 letter to Mr
29 Straw, on 21 December 2007.
- 30 7. The 2 January 2008 letter from another ‘Customer Service Officer’ at HMCS ‘Customer Service’,
31 Southwark, apologised for not *“supplying you with an adequate response to your concerns”*; and
32 stated that she had asked the WLCC’s *“court manager...for a full report and we will provide you with*
33 *a full response to your letter within the next two weeks”*
- 34 8. The follow-up was a 10 January 2008 letter from the ‘Customer Service Unit’, HMCS Petty France.
- 35 9. I headed my 28 27 January 2008 reply to the 10 January 2008 letter with *“Absolute confirmation of*
36 *collusion”*. Reasons, stated in my letter – which, overall, I view as amounting to more
37 misrepresentations, cover-up, failure to assume responsibility and accountability, arrogantly and
38 patronizingly playing down / trivialising parts of my complaint - are:
- 39 1) Regarding asking for the payment of £1,700, the reply was *“You had not put any limit on your*
40 *counterclaim. In circumstances where the claim or counterclaim is unspecified, the court must*
41 *charge the maximum fee of £1,700”*

1 I replied *"You cannot even agree among yourselves on 'the story' you are going to spin"* – and
2 contrasted this reply with the 20 December 2007 letter (P13, L28-341, above).

3 I concluded this subsection with *"When will you all stop 'digging your hole' – and 'come clean'?"*

4 2) I noted the lack of reply to my question as to whether the WLCC 27 September 2007
5 correspondence that demanded payment of £1,700 was compliant with court regulations – and
6 stated *"It seems to me from CPR Rule 3.1 that the correct form of correspondence should have
7 been an 'order' (3) "When the court makes an order, it may" (a) "make it subject to conditions,
8 including a condition to pay a sum of money into court" (b) "specify the consequence of failure to
9 comply with the order or a condition"* (NB: the 27 September 2007 correspondence contains both
10 'ingredients': demand for payment; threat of striking out the counterclaim if I failed to pay)

11 3) I also highlighted the fact that, having threatened to *"strike out the counterclaim... by 5 October
12 2007"* if I had not paid the £1,700, WLCC waited three months to send me an order stating *"The
13 Defendant having failed to comply with the Court's request by letter of 27 September 2007 to pay
14 the Counterclaim fee, the Counterclaim stands struck-out"*

15 4) The - unbelievable - reply to the fact that since its 27 September 2007 letter WLCC had gone
16 into 'silent mode' was: *"The short answer is that neither you, nor the claimant, have taken any
17 further action since that time"*. Contrast this excuse with the other excuse supplied in the 20
18 December 2007 letter (P14, L6-11, above)

19 I could not control my sarcasm and replied *"So, it's up to me to manage the case? How silly of
20 me: from reading, among others the CPR, I understood that it was the job of the courts to
21 manage cases. As the implication that the Court Service is 'self-service', how about I issue my
22 own judgment as well? I sure like that idea"*

23 5) The next comments were that *"...judicial case management is only invoked when the court is
24 satisfied that it has before it a claim and a valid defence. It is unclear because of the striking out
25 of your counterclaim whether that is the situation with this case, for example, you have made no
26 formal application to reinstate your counterclaim"*

27 My reply to this was: *"What a concoction! Who has determined that my defence is "not
28 valid"...there is no counterclaim "to strike out" for the simple reason that I did not file a
29 counterclaim..."*

30 *... WLCC knows perfectly well that it is impossible for me to file a counterclaim as I do not have
31 the necessary information to do this. What its claim amounts to saying is that: It expected me to
32 file a counterclaim against an unspecified entity (NB: There are TWO names for the "claimant",
33 both claiming to be my 'landlord' – see P7, L12-15, above); for an unspecified amount" (NB: Lack
34 of information to which I am legally entitled, prevented me from determining my liability – if any)*

35 6) Regarding not sending me a corrected version of the 3 April 2007 Notice: it replied that *"it is not
36 necessary for the court to send a copy of it to you since you are already aware of the content. It
37 may be for this reason (NB: This should have been checked with WLCC) that the court may not
38 have responded to your letters, although I believe it would have been helpful if they had sent a
39 letter confirming what they had done"*

40 I replied that *"My obviously knowing what I wrote on the acknowledgment of service is totally
41 beside the point. What matters is what is on record in my file. I have the statutory right to
42 demand that information held about me is correct – and to have this confirmed to me"* (NB: A

1 corrected version of the Notice was finally sent to me on 10 January 2008 i.e. more than six
2 months after my original request – which had been followed by several chaser letters).

- 3 7) Continuing to play down what had taken place, and trivialise my complaint, the ‘Customer
4 Service Unit’ brushed aside the fact that WLCC had wrongly captured in its 3 April 2007 Notice
5 that I ‘intended to contest jurisdiction’, by responding that *“the claimant had been made aware of
6 your correct intention was indicated by their letter to the court of early May...”*

7 I replied *“This is a misrepresentation on two counts”,* as: *“Firstly, in its 1 May 2007
8 letter...Portner and Jaskel wrote “... apart from receiving Notice that an Acknowledgement of
9 Service has been filed by the Defendant dated 3rd April 2007...we have not received anything
10 further from the Defendant or the Court...” Secondly, in the same letter it wrote “Neither have we
11 received a copy of the Defendant’s application to contest the jurisdiction or any evidence in
12 support, nor a copy of the Defendant’s Defence”. You misrepresented what he wrote as you
13 omitted the last part of the sentence “nor a copy of the Defendant’s Defence””*

- 14 8) It claimed that *“the adjournment of the 8 May 2007 hearing would not have been necessary had
15 you filed an application regarding the court’s jurisdiction as you were meant to do under the
16 procedural rules...”*

17 I replied *“I DID file an application contesting the court’s jurisdiction within 14 days of filing the 22
18 March 2007 acknowledgment of service. I titled my 4 April 2007, 20-page document “Application
19 to West London County Court under Civil Procedure Rules (CPR) Rule 11 – Disputing the court’s
20 jurisdiction re. Claim 7WL00675”. (The second part of the title to my document reads “Second
21 application: An Extended Civil Restraint Order against the ‘Landlord’”*

22 And that, *“In my application, I refer to 64 evidential documents. I supplied a copy of these
23 documents as appendices, having them bound together with my 20-page document. Also bound
24 with this document, is a copy of my 22 March 2007 acknowledgment of service, I used as the
25 front cover i.e. placed it as the first page of the document”*

26 I also added that *“On 5 April 2007, the day WLCC received my document, I received a call on
27 the number I provided on my acknowledgment of service. Having determined who I was, the
28 person put the phone down. My ‘sixth sense’ led me to suspect that the caller was from WLCC
29 and that my contesting the court’s jurisdiction was not the expected reply. The fact that WLCC
30 appears to have failed to tell you that I sent a 4 April 2007 application, confirms my suspicion”*

- 31 9) In relation to (yet another) condescending, patronizing comment (for which the author should
32 clearly have checked her facts before making it) that *“The procedure to be followed where an
33 acknowledgement of service indicates an intention to contest the court’s jurisdiction is set out on
34 the form. It makes it quite clear that you must file an application in support of your contention
35 within 14 days of filing the acknowledgment”...*

36 ...I replied that *“Other than stating that an application to contest the court’s jurisdiction must be
37 filed within 14 days of filing the acknowledgment of service, none of the documents I was sent
38 provides guidance to defendants who opt to contest the court’s jurisdiction”. That, because of
39 this, as a Litigant in Person, I had to search the Civil Procedure Rules to try to figure out what I
40 needed to do – and quoted what I had found in my letter. I also highlighted the fact that neither
41 the support notes sent with the claim, nor CPR state that I also needed to serve my application
42 to contest jurisdiction on the ‘claimant’.*

1 10) My request to have the case transferred to another court “so that I can exercise my rights under
2 the Human Rights Act 1998...” was circumvented by the person stating “...I have found no
3 evidence...which suggests you have been denied a fair hearing since the matter has not yet
4 come to a final hearing. I cannot therefore confirm your complaint in this respect”.

5 My reply was “you appear to not understand the meaning of “so that””, and that “any fair minded,
6 reasonable person who looked at the events with this court would, I am sure, understand my
7 position”

8 The person suggested that, to get the case transferred to another court, I needed to file “a formal
9 application giving [my] reasons and supporting evidence” and that my “application will attract a
10 fee”.

11 I replied that I had sent a 26 January 2008 letter, addressed “To a Judge committed to the
12 concept of Justice, c/o West London County Court” in which I asked for a transfer.

13 (NB: On further exploration, I realised that I needed to complete a form. In addition to, of course,
14 the form not having the option of stating “Because I have no trust and confidence in this court”
15 (evidently, nobody ‘dares’ to challenge a court), I did not know which other court to select. As my
16 experience at the Supreme Court Costs Office on 30 January 2009 demonstrates (my letter to
17 you of 7 March 2009, P9, L8-14), and judges move around, had I been able to secure a transfer,
18 it is likely that it would have been a waste of time, and money – as it is clear from my latest
19 experience on 30 January 2009 that ‘my card is marked’ with the Court Service).

20 11) In relation to my assertion that collusion had taken place, the reply was: “So far as your
21 allegations of collusion are concerned, I have found no evidence whatsoever to support your
22 contention...”

23 I replied “From where I am standing, it looks to me like the ‘severe case of blindness’ that was
24 evident in 2002-2004 is continuing. “No evidence in support of my allegations of collusion”?
25 Whereas before I headed my letters to your Office with “confirmation of collusion”, I am now
26 changing this to “Absolute confirmation of collusion”

27 Among other, I also wrote “Instead of, to this day, all of you ‘aiming your guns at me’, why don’t
28 you turn your attention to the rogue landlord and his equally rogue aides who have so
29 consistently demonstrated that they hold your judiciary in absolute, utter contempt? They have
30 made your courts pursue false claims by providing false evidence – which they endorsed by
31 signing statements of truth – in the process leading your courts to take unjust actions against me
32 and other leaseholders; have lied in an Expert Witness report; have knowingly committed an
33 abuse of process of court; have lied by stating that they have not received documents, etc, etc.
34 Why is it that all of you are ‘blind’ to all that has – and continues to take place?

35 From where I am standing, the fact that, in spite of my endless protests (as reflected in my
36 voluminous amount of correspondence) the harassment and injustice are continuing, I am bound
37 to arrive at just one answer: collusion. What other conclusion can there be?

38 I really wish I could say: this is all due to massive negligence and incompetence. At least, this
39 would give me some hope. But, I cannot bring myself to accept this explanation.

40 You don’t like my honesty, my being very direct? I appreciate that my manner is ‘un-British’ but,
41 it works both ways: provide me with the opportunity to give praise and I will be as equally open

1 and direct in voicing it. You cannot begin to imagine how much I wish I could say: “I have finally
2 got justice and redress – and this is all thanks to...”

3 12) As a result of my providing, in my 5 December 2007 reply, a snapshot of events with WLCC in
4 the context of the 29 November 2002 claim, in relation to:

5 a. WLCC proceeding with the claim in spite of the fact that the statement of truth was endorsed
6 by the inappropriate party (P6, L10-14, above), the reply was: “*whether this represents a
7 serious procedural breach or invalidates the evidence concerned...is again a matter for a
8 judge to decide should you choose to raise the issue. It is unclear whether you took that step
9 or simply raise it now as a further element of your complaint*”.

10 This reply provides, yet again, evidence of the expectation that it is up to the courts’ end-
11 users to manage their claims i.e. take on the role of the staff. I replied that “*it is the duty of
12 the courts to ensure they operate under the ‘Overriding Objective’*”.

13 b. The comment was followed by “*I understand, however, that that particular case was
14 transferred to Wandsworth County Court some time ago*”

15 I view this comment as an attempt to deflect attention away from WLCC.

16 I replied “*I fail to see the relevance of your point: (1) to my knowledge, the courts are not
17 stand-alone franchises; (2) judges move from court to court. My points are supported by the
18 Orders I have been sent “This case may be released to another judge, possibly at a different
19 court*”

20 I copied my reply to the Rt. Hon. Jack Straw, Justice Secretary.

21 7.3 Parliamentary Ombudsman’s view of Good Complaint Handling and Remedy

22 The 2007-08 Annual Report from the Parliamentary Ombudsman states:

23 “*Remedial action is the attempt to restore that sense of human value to those who have been denied
24 it. Principles of Good Administration and Principles for Remedy are different sides of the same coin.*

25 *Principles for remedy* – (NB: same 6 factors for Principles of good administration and good complaint
26 handling)

27 **Our view** of the Principles that should guide public bodies in providing remedies for injustice resulting
28 from maladministration: 1. Getting it right; 2. Being customer focused; 3. Being open and
29 accountable; 4. Acting fairly and proportionately; 5. Putting things right; 6. Seeking continuous
30 improvement

31 *We want public bodies to be fair and take responsibility, acknowledge failures and apologise for
32 them, make amends and use the opportunity to improve their services*”

33 I believe that any fair minded, reasonable person with integrity would agree with me that **the**
34 **performance from HMCS ‘Customer Service’ falls very short of the ‘Good Practice’ principles set**
35 **by the Parliamentary Ombudsman - adding further justification for investigation by Mrs Ann**
36 **Abraham’s Office.**

= A sham! As glaringly obvious from events following my 12.07.09 complaint

1 **8 Securing my right of access to justice and redress through the Court Service**

2 The same WLCC mindset was very clearly in operation at the 30 January 2009 Supreme Court Costs
3 Office. Therefore, when asked whether I would challenge the decision, I replied that I would not – as it is
4 blatantly obvious that ‘my card is marked’ by the Court Service – and has been since 2002.

5 Hence, my request to you at the beginning of my 7 March 2009 letter to:

Overview
Note # 2

6 *“Get the police and the Court Service perform as per their mandate, ensuring that the perpetrators
of criminal acts against me are brought to justice as, to date, by aiding and abetting their c.
£500,000 fraud – and concurrent fear tactics - both have demonstrated that they perceive
themselves to be at their service, at the exclusion of mine”*

10 As detailed in my 7 March 2009 letter to you and in this letter I: **WLCC # 24 ; Doc library # 1.8**

- 11 1) sent a ‘cry for help’ to The Rt. Hon. Jack Straw, MP, Justice Secretary, on 11 December 2007
12 (P11, L9-10); (this letter P13, L16-20)
- 13 2) I copied him on my 28 January 2008 reply to HMCS ‘Customer Service’ (P11, L14-16); (this
14 letter P14, L35 to P18, L20)
- 15 3) I copied him on my 26 January 2008 letter to “A Judge committed to the concept of Justice, c/o
16 West London County Court” (P11, L17-19); (this letter P17, L11-12)
- 17 4) the lack of action led me to write him another letter on 18 February 2008 (P11, L20-24)

18 All of that was in vain, as I continued to suffer persecution by the courts.

19 **As my MP, who has access to the Rt. Hon. Jack Straw, MP, Justice Secretary** (‘You and your MP’,
20 referred to above), **I would like YOU to determine why the Court Service considers itself to be at**
21 **the service of Mr Andrew Ladsky and his aides – at the expense of mine – thereby denying me my**
22 **right of access to justice and redress.**

23 Since 2002 I have and continue to go through absolute, sheer utter hell – and the root cause is Mr
24 Ladsky and his aides deciding that I (and my fellow leaseholders) should pay for the cost of building of a
25 penthouse flat and adding three other flats to Jefferson House – costs for which we are **not** liable.

26 In breach of the legal principle which presumes innocence before being proven guilty - I have
27 automatically been presumed to be guilty. And worst still, having proven my innocence against
28 unbelievable odds and obstacles: I - the INNOCENT VICTIM OF CRIME - have and still continue to be
29 treated as though I am guilty, a criminal – treated and portrayed as a liar, a fraud, a cheat, a scum who
30 renegades on her contractual obligations, in the process suffering humiliation, defamation of my name
31 and of my character – while Mr Andrew Ladsky and his aides – WHO ARE THE LIARS, THE
32 FRAUDSTERS, THE THIEVES, THE BULLIES, THE PARASITES who feed their greed by stealing from
33 leaseholders (as very amply demonstrated in my 7 March 2009 letter e.g. P8, L25-34, 39-40) - have and
34 continue to be treated as though they are the victims.

35 **As a British taxpayer, I have the right to get access to justice and redress for the horrendous**
36 **suffering I have and continue to be subjected to and the financial loss I have suffered since 2002.**

37 **I HAVE THE RIGHT TO GO INTO A COURT AND TO EXPECT THAT COURT TO PERFORM AS PER**
38 **ITS STATED MANDATE.**

39 **I would also like to know why one part of the English legal system considers it appropriate to go**
40 **against and ignore the directions given to respondents by another part of the English legal**

1 **system: West London County Court repeatedly ignoring the fact that the Leasehold Valuation**
2 **Tribunal had specifically told me (and my fellow leaseholders) to NOT PAY the service charge**
3 **demand – until its determination had been issued and therefore implemented (my 7 March 2009**
4 letter P3, L4-9, 16-22). I went through hell because of this.

5 This week, a relative of somebody who died at the Stafford hospital described the hospital as being at
6 the level of a *“third world country”*. This is how I feel about the London Leasehold Valuation Tribunal,
7 West London County Court and Wandsworth County Court. They have made me go through four whole
8 years of absolute, sheer utter hell, suffering unbelievable torment, anguish and distress – and causing
9 me to – unnecessarily – lose a very large part of my hard-earned life savings, accumulated through many
10 sacrifices. The experience has been so traumatic that, at times, I contemplated ending it all. Right now,
11 as I am writing this I am unable to fight back the tears.

12 **9 What Kensington & Chelsea police did:**

13 As in the case of the Leasehold Valuation Tribunal and the courts, I believe that any fair minded,
14 reasonable person with integrity would agree with me that what I related to you in my letter of 7 March
15 2009 demonstrates a serious breach of mandate and concurrent breach of trust by the police - a *“central*
16 *government department”*.

17 The following comprises of what I wrote you in my 7 March 2009, as well as additional information.

18 **9.1 In 2002 Kensington police # 1**

19 In 2002, I started to suffer ongoing harassment from Mr Andrew Ladsky because I was trying to continue
20 the activities of the residents association following the forced departure of the person who was running it,
21 as she had been suffering highly vicious harassment and persecution from Mr Ladsky (P7, L2-4)

22 1. On 17 February 2002, I received anonymous phone calls in the flat. British Telecom told me that 13
23 calls had been made that evening. (I switched the bell off after 8-9 calls in succession). A further
24 seven anonymous phone calls were made on 19 February 2002. All were traced by British Telecom.
25 Hence, a total of 20 anonymous phone calls were made.

26 (NB: In late February/early March 2002, I also received anonymous phone calls at work – which I
27 knew were from Mr Ladsky / one of his accomplices as the first call had led the switchboard to
28 contact me to say that somebody was asking for ‘Noëlle K-Dit-Rawé’ - which is the name I use in
29 relation to the flat). (For work I only used Noëlle Rawé).

30 2. On 18 February 2002, I went to Chelsea police, Lucan Street, to report the anonymous phone calls.
31 At the same time, I also reported the other instances of harassment I had been suffering over the
32 previous weeks: pressing of my door bell late at night; object thrown at my windows, also at night –
33 and identified Mr Andrew Ladsky as the perpetrator of this harassment (P7, L2-4).

34 3. One or two days later, I was told by DC Adams, CID, that the form I had completed at the station was
35 lost. Considering the very obvious reluctance to record my complaint, it did not surprise me to hear
36 this. I completed another form and was given a crime report number, BS 560 4102/02C.

37 4. During my conversation with DC Adams, when I reiterated my claim that the perpetrator was Mr
38 Andrew Ladsky, his immediate response was *“nobody else has complained about him!”* (Making me
39 feel as though I was a liar). When I said that the resident of flat 12 had complained about him, his
40 split-second reply was *“the 71 year old man!”* What shocked was the implication that the police
41 dismissed a complaint made by a man of this age, and the fact that DC Adams had lied to me. It is

1 obvious that DC Adams knew / had heard of Mr Ladsky – and he gave it away by immediately saying
2 that *“nobody has ever complained about him”*

3 5. After a delay caused by the police, BT supplied the numbers to the police on 22 February 2002.

4 6. On phoning DC Adams, he told me that the calls had been made from two numbers: a mobile phone
5 and a landline. He said that in the case of the landline number, what was *“very odd”* was that there
6 was *“no subscriber”*. I checked with BT who told me that the reason it did not provide the name of a
7 subscriber was because the phone was registered with another telephone service supplier – and that
8 it had specified the name of the provider: ‘Reach Europe’. DC Adams had withheld this information
9 from me making it sound as though it would be impossible to determine the name of the subscriber
10 (which is ridiculous as somebody had to be paying for the calls).

11 In reply to my question as to how long it would take to obtain the name of the owner of the
12 telephones, he said *“it could take several weeks”*

13 7. As, by 11 March 2002 the police told me that it had not heard from the phone service providers, I
14 said that I would file a complaint with the Police Complaints Authority – which I did on 13 March 2002
15 – and copied DC Adams, as well as DC Crockett, with whom I had also been dealing when DC
16 Adams was not available.

17 8. On 20 March 2002, DC Adams phoned me to say that the calls made from a mobile number were
18 from a phone that belonged to Resident K who then lived in flat 33 (apparently, below that of Mr
19 Ladsky). (I noted with great interest how the *“it could take several weeks to get the name of the*
20 *subscribers”* had suddenly been reduced – evidently, as a result of my complaint).

21 DC Adams said that Resident K’s phone had been *“stolen in November 2001”*, and that she was
22 *“very sorry”*. I did not buy this story. While Resident K might have obtained my number from the
23 Residents Association (I had not given her my number, but I was a member of the Committee), it
24 simply does not make sense that somebody who ‘steals’ a phone waits four months to start dialling a
25 number stored in the memory and does so 13 times on one day; waits another two days, and does it
26 another six times. This person clearly knew who he / she was dialling.

27 When I asked about the subscriber for the calls made from a landline, DC Adams told me *“They*
28 *came from your own phone”*. I could not believe the stupidity of the reply, and asked *“Are you telling*
29 *me that I am making anonymous phone calls to myself?”*

30 DC Adams asked whether I used BT voicemail. To my replying that I did, he said *“Well something*
31 *must have gone wrong with it. It’s been calling your number by mistake”*.

32 It was blatantly obvious that DC Adams was going out of his way to not reveal the subscriber of the
33 landline number – which I concluded was Mr Ladsky.

34 DC Adams asked me *“Will you prosecute?”* to which I replied that I would get back to him.

35 9. DC Adams phoned me at 10h45 on 25 March 2002, and said, in an extremely aggressive, angry
36 tone *“You said you would phone back. Are you going to prosecute?”* To my replying that I did not
37 have enough information to make this decision, he said that I had – to which I replied *“No, I want to*
38 *know who, what, when, where, how? I cannot take a decision without having the facts. For all I*
39 *know, Mrs [x] is innocent”*.

40 DC Adams then said *“We take the decision whether or not to prosecute”*, to which I replied *“Why ask*
41 *me if I want to prosecute if the decision is not mine to take in the first place?”*

1 It led him to say *"If we find out that she has done it, will you be prepared to come and make a*
2 *statement at the station?"* I replied *"Absolutely!"* He then asked *"Are you prepared to come to court?"*
3 – to which I also replied *"Absolutely!"*

4 10. My replies spurred on the most 'amazing' development as, three-and-half hours later, DC Adams
5 phoned me back. 'Amazingly', in the space of these three-and-half hours, DC Adams had managed
6 to contact Resident K and interview her. DC Adams said *"She admits to having made the*
7 *anonymous phone calls. She said that her phone mysteriously reappeared at her door. I told her we*
8 *were not buying that story. She said she does not know why she has done it. I really probed her,*
9 *asked her whether you had upset her in any way. She said no. She is very sorry she has done this.*
10 *She said that Andrew Ladsky has been harassing her"* (Everything 'stunk' of cover-up).

11 To this I replied *"So, there are five people now who have complained to the police about Andrew*
12 *Ladsky!"* – and I listed them. DC Adams replied *"We are talking about anonymous phone calls here".*
13 To which my response was *"Why are you so reticent when I mention Andrew Ladsky's name?"* In
14 fact, I should have said 'why do you go on the defensive when I mention Andrew Ladsky?'

15 It was blatantly obvious that DC Adams was protecting Andrew Ladsky – and so were others with
16 whom I had been in contact at Kensington & Chelsea police – and it continued to be blatantly
17 obvious.

18 Knowing the harassment, intimidation, bullying and other scare tactics suffered by other residents at
19 the hands of Mr Ladsky / his aides, I thought that Resident K might have been made to act under
20 duress – and the concocted story by DC Adams added to this impression. Hence, I told DC Adams
21 that I agreed with his suggestion of *"issuing her with a formal warning and that should she do this*
22 *again, you would prosecute her".* (Subsequent events: on the 29 November 2002 claim the 'service
23 charge' demand for flat 33 was the second highest, at £62,000; in 2003, the Land Registry record for
24 flat 33 had *"a caution"* filed against the flat *"on 10 October 2003 in favour of Steel Services"*)

25 (Before the July 2002 demand, Mrs 'x' had been circulating 'scare' stories about Andrew Ladsky.
26 Was she an accomplice who then became a victim, or just a victim? I don't know).

27 11. On the same day i.e. 25 March 2002 I sent a fax to DC Adams summarizing what he had told me,
28 and requesting that he sends me confirmation. Of course, he never did.

29 12. On 26 March 2002, I phoned BT to ask for confirmation of what I had been told by DC Adams i.e.
30 *"something must have gone wrong with it. It's been calling your number by mistake".* BT strongly
31 refuted this, reiterating that the calls had been made from a landline provided by a telephone service
32 provider other than BT. The BT person suggested I give BT's number to the police so that it could
33 explain it to the police. Following this conversation, I sent a fax to DC Adams.

34 13. On 27 March 2002, I phoned DC Adams to ask him whether he had received my two faxes. Reply
35 *"Only the first one"* i.e. the 25 March 2002 fax in which I asked him to confirm what Resident K had
36 said 'during the interview'. When I told him what my second fax contained (which, of course, he had
37 received), his reply was *"So, we are going to have to throw resources at this for just two phone calls!"*

38 DC Adams followed this by saying *"You won't be able to prove a link with Andrew Ladsky!"* To which
39 I replied *"How do you know that? Are you talking to him?"* Given that DC Adams had 'not obtained'
40 the name of the subscriber for the landline number, how could he be so certain that *"there is no link*
41 *with Andrew Ladsky?"* Answer: because he knew that the subscriber for the landline number was
42 Andrew Ladsky – and he was not going to reveal it.

1 DC Adams then said *“As you have complained, my superior will be in touch with you next week.*
2 *Goodbye!”* (NB: I copied DC Adams on my 13 March 2002 complaint to the Police Complaints
3 Authority).

4 14. In spite of saying that, DC Adams was evidently so intent on not revealing the name of the
5 subscriber for the landline, that he phoned me the following day to say *“We’ve contacted Reach*
6 *Europe. There isn’t a subscriber for the number. BT is wrong. Something has gone wrong with their*
7 *system. We’ll contact BT again but, if they got the wrong number, we won’t contact you again”.*

8 15. BT has traced some calls – to MY phone - from a number supplied by Reach Europe. Therefore, of
9 course there must be a subscriber for this number. Somebody had to be paying for the calls made
10 from that phone.

11 My translation of the message from DC Adams: ‘Get lost! You won’t get evidence from us that
12 incriminates Andrew Ladsky’.

13 (NB: All the above details, starting from 20 March 2002, are captured in my 2 April 2002 letter to Paul
14 Webster, Detective Inspector, Kensington Police station. Clearly, I would not have written this to the
15 head of the local police if it were not true. Note also that DC Adams never came back to me to
16 challenge what I wrote in the letter). **My lack of knowledge: he is just a superior grade to DC Adams**

17 16. In his 23 April 2002 letter to me, Paul Webster, Detective Inspector, wrote *“No crime report has been*
18 *reported to this police borough regarding Mr Ladsky, in your letter you mention that other occupiers*
19 *had complained this may be correct, but there are no reported crimes about Mr Ladsky”* (P7, L5-7)

20 I knew that I was *“correct”* e.g. the identical letter of 11 October 2001 from Cawdery Kaye Fireman &
21 Taylor to two of my fellow leaseholders (P7, L8-12). In fact, I knew for a fact that at least four
22 residents had complained against him to Kensington & Chelsea police.

23 17. DI Webster also wrote, among other, *“DC Adams will contact you when we receive a result [in*
24 *relation to the landline subscriber]...I have been informed they have a major backlog in the system”.*
25 My translation: confirmation of ‘we’ll never give you the evidence’.

26 And this was also evident from this comment *“The main (NB!!!) caller to your telephone has been*
27 *identified as Mrs [x]. Should you have any specific criminal investigation about Mr Ladsky contact DC*
28 *Adams and they will be investigated”.* Considering my experience by then, it was blatantly obvious
29 that it would – continue – to be a complete waste of time.

30 18. In light of this attitude, on 5 May 2002, I escalated my complaint to Sir Toby Harris, then Chair of the
31 Metropolitan Police Authority (P7, L17-20) asking for his assistance in getting Kensington & Chelsea
32 police’s investigation *“reviewed by a totally independent party”* - because his *“department’s remit on*
33 *its website states: “to ensure that London has a police force that is responsive to the needs of its*
34 *community”.*

35 19. The lack of response led me to send a chaser email on 31 May 2002. In this email, I relate more
36 recent events with Kensington & Chelsea Police - because, yet again, they don’t ‘stack-up’. Indeed,
37 on 23 May 2002 DC Adams told me that the anonymous phone calls from the landline number – of
38 which there were apparently three – *“were made from the Carlton Tower hotel”.* And that, *“like the*
39 *calls from the mobile phone, they were made by Mrs [x]”.* He added *“As Mrs [x] has received a*
40 *warning for the calls made from the mobile phone, I consider the matter close”.*

41 20. I viewed this as yet another concocted story – for the brain dead – as it implies that Resident K had
42 booked a room in the hotel which is c. 120m from Jefferson House where she had a two-bedroom

1 flat. How could the calls have been traced otherwise? And the *"I consider the matter close"* was the
 2 equivalent of, yet, another 'Get lost!' My view is that Kensington & Chelsea police had no intention of
 3 getting back to me - but did so because I had written to Sir Toby Harris.

4 21. In his 11 July 2002 reply Sir Toby wrote *"... you seem convinced that Mrs [x] acted under the*
 5 *direction of Mr Ladsky. While this may or may not be the case, the police cannot act on the basis of*
 6 *your suspicions, however strongly held, and must act only on the basis of established facts. There*
 7 *was therefore no option other than to hold Mrs [x] fully responsible for this crime"*.

8 Also *"Although the subscriber for the landline was never identified (NB: Evidence of change of plan:*
 9 *this v. DC Adams call of 23 May - and proof that I had read the subtext of DI Webster's letter*
 10 *correctly), you must appreciate that officers have to act with consideration for resource and time*
 11 *expenditure when investigating a case and as such, it seems reasonable to assume that following*
 12 *Mrs [x] confession nothing further would be gained by ascertaining that information"*. (NB!!!)

13 And *"While I can understand your frustration at this turn of events, it does seem unlikely that*
 14 *ascertaining this information would assist your ultimate goal which appears to be to prove that you*
 15 *are being harassed by a party or parties that wish to force the sale of your home for their own*
 16 *financial gain"*. Evidently, the police does not consider this as amounting to a crime.

17 22. It led me to reply on 4 August 2002 *"that there is the Protection from Harassment Act 1997. But, this*
 18 *is conveniently ignored by the police"* And that *"...my dealings with the police in recent months, have*
 19 *led me to totally - and for ever - lose my confidence in the British police"*

20 23. I should also add that in 2002 Kensington & Chelsea police tried to talk to me. However, given my
 21 experience, the only communication I was prepared to have with the police was in writing. Because
 22 of this, in a letter dated 20 June 2002, Paul Kirby, A/Inspector, Chelsea Police station, informed me
 23 that my *"...original letter has not been recorded as a complaint because I have been unable to*
 24 *establish if you wish to substantiate your original letter"*.

25 Obviously, the police does not consider the contents of - signed - correspondence as evidence.
 26 Hence, same attitude as two other government departments in the borough of Kensington &
 27 Chelsea: West London County Court in 2002-04 and in 2007-08, as well as Kensington & Chelsea
 28 Housing... but, 'mysteriously', they *all* treat any document from Mr Ladsky and his aides as the
 29 'Gospel'. Funny that! And in fact, just his words as well – as evidenced by what took place in 2003.

30 **9.2 In 2003**

31 1. In January 2003, Mr Ladsky reported me to Chelsea police station for *"swearing at him"*. By 'amazing
 32 coincidence', it was c. one week before the first day of the tribunal hearing.

33 2. It generated a letter, dated 27 January 2003, from Neil Watson, PC 206BS, Crime Investigator,
 34 stating: *"Of perhaps greater importance is the fact that any further such outbursts may result in*
 35 *charges of harassment being made against you, as this initial complaint has been fully recorded by*
 36 *the police..."* (P7, L24-27)

37 Very clearly, no concern here about: *"acting only on the basis of established facts"* nor about
 38 *"consideration for resource and time expenditure when investigating a case such as this"* (Sir Toby's
 39 reply to me of 11 July 2002).

40 And, whereas complaints made against Mr Ladsky by at least five (perfectly sane and respectable)
 41 individuals, over a period of time, do not get recorded, his complaint against me does! (P7, L28-29)

1 Neil Watson asked me to contact him "...to clarify this situation". I laughed on receiving this letter, as
 2 I visualised the scene: a man, standing in a police station saying: "Mr Policeman, a woman swore at
 3 me" – or was it just a phone call to Kensington police? I therefore opted to ignore it.

4 3. My not responding led to another letter from Neil Watson, dated 6 February 2003, "please contact
 5 me".

6 4. When I replied by recorded delivery on 11 February 2003 asking for precise details – in writing - of
 7 the accusations against me, there was no follow-up. Why not? Obvious: it was another set-up.

8 **9.3 In 2007**

9 (This subsection is reproduced from my 7 March 2009 letter to you)

10 1. Having failed to get my current American website Host to close down my website in spite of ongoing
 11 threats of legal action – based on scurrilous accusations against me - in March 2007, yet again, Mr
 12 Ladsky turned to his 'friends' at Kensington & Chelsea police for assistance.

13 2. It took the form of an email, dated 16 March 2007, from Simon J. Dowling, TDC, of the 'Community
 14 Safety Unit' of K&C police to my website Host stating: "*Hi the above site contains some inappropriate
 15 use of the words "pigs and monkeys" which are racially abusive terms towards Jewish people from
 16 the Nazi's. This is directed at a particular person...*"

17 By early 2006, I had become very angry at being monitored and hounded as though I am a terrorist,
 18 as well as being physically threatened - and started to use the words 'pigs and monkeys' in my
 19 online Diary to refer to the scums who are doing this to me ('pigs' being the recognised, derogatory
 20 term for the police). As I wrote in My Diary, on 23 August 2006 "*Visitor to the site, how would you feel
 21 if you were subjected to this kind of treatment every single day - any time of day? Add to that
 22 threatening behaviour*"

23 Clearly with the objective of scaring my website Host into closing down my site, Simon Dowling
 24 implied that I had committed a crime – without providing evidence in support, as he wrote: "*I am the
 25 police officer dealing with this crime. I would therefore be grateful if this site could be taken down*"

26 3. As a result of being challenged by my website Host who asked "Are you aware that there are laws
 27 against making false accusations?" in his 20 March 2007 reply, Simon Dowling backed down stating
 28 "...yes there are laws relating to false reporting...If you are unable to close the site down I will let the
 29 victim know as there is nothing we as a police force can do except class it as a racist incident" –
 30 while still no providing evidence in support of his accusation.

31 Demonstrating outrageous racism and xenophobia, Simon Dowling labelled me a "Nazi" by writing in
 32 the same email of 20 March 2007 "*The producer of this website is franco-german in origin and so
 33 would be aware of the terms pigs and monkeys used during the Nazi regime*"

34 Clearly, Simon Dowling breached, among others, the Metropolitan Police Service's policy stated at
 35 the bottom of his email of 16 March 2007: "*It is the policy of the MPS that: MPS personnel...must not
 36 use MPS systems to author, transmit or store documents such as electronic mail (e-mail) messages
 37 or attachments: containing racist, homophobic, sexist, defamatory, offensive, illegal or otherwise
 38 inappropriate material*".

39 It is blatantly obvious from the fact that Simon Dowling backed down as a result of being challenged by
 40 my website Host that the objective of the involvement by K&C police was to close down my website. On
 41 the upside, it showed my website Host what I am facing in this country.

1 What is also very telling – in light of the implied accusation that I had ‘committed a crime’ - is the fact that
2 **Kensington & Chelsea police did not contact me.** Instead, three days after I gave prominence to the
3 events on my website, the message that *"The police is not going to pursue it. Isn't that good news?"* was
4 communicated to me through my (then) employer, KPMG. By then, five weeks had elapsed since the 20
5 March 2007 email.

6 Why is it that the police did NOT contact ME about MY website: before, in between, or after its emails?

7 While I am very tempted to use the word ‘corruption’ as the key factor behind events with the police in
8 2002, 2003 and 2007 – currently, I do not have the evidence to support the dictionary’s first definition of
9 the word: *"acting dishonestly in return for money or personal gain"*. However, I am sure that any fair
10 minded, reasonable person with integrity would agree with me about using the word in the context of the
11 second definition: *"morally depraved"* - as well as the following: complicity; duplicity; misrepresentations,
12 cover-up; protection of, and assistance to a criminal.

13 What is it about Mr Andrew Ladsky that it leads Kensington & Chelsea police CID and a detective
14 inspector to fabricate stories, including – it seems - falsely blaming a woman, disregard the complaints of
15 his victims - as well as a Chair of the Met to back-up their actions? (P13, L5-7)

16 **9.4 Securing redress and my right to demand that the police acts as per its mandate**

17 It is blatantly obvious from my experience with the police that I do not stand a chance of getting it to take
18 action against Mr Ladsky, nor against his aides e.g. Mr Lanny Silverstone and Ms Ayesha Salim,
19 Cawdery Kaye Fireman & Taylor – as suggested to me by the Law Society following my complaint
20 against them; or Ms Joan Doreen Hathaway, MRICS, and Mr Barrie Martin, FRICS, Martin Russell Jones
21 – as suggested to me by the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors, also as a result of my complaint
22 against them.

23 **As my MP, who has access to the Rt. Hon. Jacqui Smith, MP, Home Office Minister** (‘You and your
24 MP’, referred to above), **I would like YOU to determine why the police considers itself to be at the**
25 **service of Mr Andrew Ladsky and his aides – at the expense of mine – thereby denying me**
26 **access to redress.**

27 **AS A BRITISH TAXPAYER, I HAVE THE RIGHT TO DEMAND THAT THE POLICE PERFORMS AS**
28 **PER ITS STATED MANDATE BY TAKING ACTION AGAINST THE INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE**
29 **COMMITTED CRIMINAL OFFENCES AGAINST ME.**

30 Likewise, it is blatantly obvious from my experience with the Police Complaints Authority that, currently, I
31 do not stand a chance of getting redress.

32 Hence, in my 7 March 2009 letter, I also asked for your assistance to help me *"Get redress from*
33 *Kensington & Chelsea police for treating me as though I am a criminal, instead of what I am: the victim of*
34 *crime - and, in the process, using intimidation and harassment tactics, as well as making racist,*
35 *xenophobic comments against me"*

36 I also know that I am under surveillance by the police. As stated in my letter to you of 7 March 2009, I
37 would like you to ***"Determine why I am under surveillance by the police – and put an end to it"***

38 In its 30 November 2008 issue, The Independent had an article headed *"The police are a law unto*
39 *themselves"*. It certainly applies to Kensington & Chelsea police.

40 The comments by Brian Paddick, a former Met police Commander, in The Mail on Sunday, 15 March
41 2009, adds weight to this view *"Criminals in the police? I've met plenty of them"* He states *"I can't say I*

1 was surprised when the Liberal Democrats last week revealed that more than 1,000 serving British police
2 officers have criminal convictions for offences including violence, theft and perverting the course of
3 justice". As a result of my experience with K&C police I say: Nor am I.

4 In its February 2009 report, the think-tank, Reform, states "*The police in England and Wales are the*
5 *most expensive in the developed world, but fail to deliver*". I do not know about the cost, but I certainly
6 know first-hand about "*failure to deliver*".

7 **10 Conclusions**

8 The State has led me to believe that I have rights I have the right to demand: the right to justice and
9 redress; the right for protection and redress against crime – and hence the right to expect central
10 government departments (and indeed, local ones) to perform as per their stated mandate. ALL of those
11 covered in this letter have, in my case, failed to perform as per their mandate opting instead to act as
12 though they perceive themselves to be at the exclusive service of Mr Andrew Ladsky and his aides.

13 **The conduct of these central government departments amounts to breach of mandate and gross** 14 **breach of trust.**

15 What gives Mr Andrew Ladsky and his aides the right to control the authorities by getting them to deny
16 me my rights - thereby helping them with their fraudulent activities? As a British taxpayer (who has so far
17 paid c. £500,000 in tax in this country) - and victim of their criminal actions – I have the right to know.
18 (P13, L5-7)

19 In the process, I have and continue to be subjected to the most horrendous, inhumane treatment,
20 breaching / denying me many of my statutory rights – including Human Rights – suffering harassment,
21 bullying, victimization, abuse, blackmail, intimidation including being physically threatened, defamation of
22 my name and character, being monitored and hounded like a terrorist (P13, L1-4)

23 To be the victim of crime is one thing. (There are criminals everywhere). But to be victimized and
24 persecuted by State departments with the mandate to ensure my rights for justice, redress and protection
25 (which, as a taxpayer, I am entitled to expect), and see these departments side against me with the
26 perpetrators - is absolutely outrageous. (P13, L8-11)

27 The Government has set up a helpline to help people report loan sharks who swindle them out of several
28 hundred Pounds – and the police and the courts take action against the perpetrators. By contrast, it turns
29 a blind eye and a deaf ear to a landlord and his aides who swindle people to the tune of c. £500,000 –
30 thereby helping them do it. (And I know of many other leaseholders in other blocks who have a similar
31 story to tell). **Why the two-tier system?**

32 By turning a blind eye and a deaf ear to their numerous breaches of legislation, regulations (as well as
33 codes of conduct) – a number of which are punishable by imprisonment - individuals in State-controlled
34 departments (as well as non-State-controlled e.g. Law Society, RICS, ICAEW) have aided and abetted
35 their c. £500,000 fraud, which helped them generate a multi-million Pound jackpot. **Why?** (P12, 23-26)

36 Prior to launching my website I was victimized and persecuted for 'daring' to stand-up for my rights by
37 challenging the scam by Mr Ladsky and his aides, refusing to pay monies I did not owe - and for 'daring'
38 to challenge and stand-up against the infrastructure supporting them. (P13, L15-17)

39 Post launching the site, I am being persecuted by the same parties, for the same reasons - and for
40 'daring' to expose the detail of my case on my website and, as consequence of this, various parties'
41 incompetence / malpractice / collusion / fraud. (P13, L18-20)

Overvie
w Note
2

1 **Whose fault is it? It certainly is not mine** (P13, L21)

2 Those responsible for the existence of my website are first and foremost Mr Ladsky and his aides who
3 opted for revenge instead of accepting closure when I finally opted to ignore the direction given to me by
4 the tribunal to NOT PAY until it had issued its determination and it had been implemented – and took the
5 'big step' of backing down on my rights - by accepting the 21 October 2003 "offer". (P13, L22-25)

6 The other parties responsible for my website are those with the mandate to protect me and help me get
7 redress from Mr Ladsky and his aides as, over the *five years* of absolute, sheer utter hell I went through
8 prior to launching my website - through their endless 'get lost!' – 'they' very clearly communicated to me
9 that 'they' would not lift a finger to help me (P13, L26-29)

10 **Hence, they are persecuting me for their wrongdoings** (P13, L30)

11 Furthermore, instead of addressing the situation, leading me to close down my website, their massive
12 arrogance, sense of power and belief of superiority led them to decide that 'they' were going to punish
13 me, 'make me pay' for 'daring' to continue fighting for my rights – because of who I am: a woman; of
14 foreign origin; on her own; with limited financial means and no influential connections = an easy target for
15 gutless, spineless individuals with no honour (P13, L31-35)

16 As I keep fighting back, defeating the ploys and attacks, the fury and hence revenge against me grows
17 stronger by the day – as does the number of parties only too keen to join the 'lynch mob' (P13, L36-37).

18 Their failure to perform as per their mandate has resulted in totally ruining my life since 2002; losing a
19 very large part of my hard-earned life savings, built through making many sacrifices – for the sake of
20 ensuring financial security in retirement (P13, L41-43)

21 And, with KPMG opting to jump on the bandwagon, has cost me my job. Because of my experience at
22 KPMG that has hurt me very deeply (I held KPMG in very high esteem, 'on a pedestal', and therefore feel
23 betrayed, and unable to ever trust an employer in this country), as well as my age - it leaves me with no
24 prospect of finding another job (P14, L1-4)

25 Outcome: I am currently facing the rapidly advancing prospect of destitution and death on the pavement
26 (P14, L5)

27 Five years ago, in my 22 November 2004 letter to the [Parliamentary Ombudsman](#), I wrote "*Maybe my*
28 *tombstone will read: "She died because the British government opted to not only turn a blind eye and a*
29 *deaf ear, it actually helped a greed-ridden bunch of people who wanted to make her pay for a penthouse*
30 *flat and enlargement of flats on 4 floors – all in the name of the leasehold system. She fought for all she*
31 *had: a flat which was going to be her pension fund". What an epitaph!" (P14, L6-10)*

32 **Why** is that I - a 'model citizen' - decent, law-abiding with moral principles and integrity; a net contributor
33 to this country, who had been giving my whole to my employer; had, until 2002, i.e. in my previous 35
34 years in this country, never set foot in court, nor had any dealings with the police; have an impeccable
35 credit record, etc. - **am currently facing this destiny?** (P14, L11-14)

36 **I have done NOTHING WRONG. I am NOT the criminal. I AM THE VICTIM OF CRIME** (P14, L15)

37 Yet, since 2002, EVERYWHERE I have turned to for help, my rights have been denied and, in the
38 process, I have usually been treated like dirt, a non-entity, often as a liar / a deceitful person – and as a
39 criminal, while the criminals are treated as though they are the victims. **Why?** (P14, L16-18)

1 **10.1 What treatment is in store for the journalists who expose far more shocking evidence?**

2 Considering the vicious, barbaric treatment I have and continue to be subjected to for 'daring' to expose,
3 among others, government departments as *"aiding and abetting a c. £500,000 fraud by turning a blind*
4 *eye and a deaf ear to the evidence"* - what is going to happen to the journalists and decision makers in
5 their media organisations for exposing, for example:

6 • Video tapes and recordings of peers quoting their price for ensuring amendments to legislation e.g.
7 Lord Taylor *"some companies that I work for will pay me £100,000 a year"* Reporter *"£100,000?"*
8 Lord Taylor *"Oh yes. That's cheap for what I do for them..."* (The Sunday Times, 1 February 2009)

9 • An MEP (I 'think', a Tory) diverting £400,000 of taxpayer money into his private company.

10 • Tory MPs Sir Nicholas Winterton and wife Ann for claiming over £165,000 in expenses for a house
11 they already owned outright. They then had people, among other, from overseas, vote in a local
12 newspaper survey to say that they had not done anything wrong. The media reports that, in spite of
13 being exposed, the Wintertons were not obliged to pay back the money.

14 • Tory MP, Derek Conway, paying his son thousands of pounds by falsely claiming that he had been
15 doing research work for him.

16 • Numerous MPs abusing their housing expenses over the years e.g. Tony McNulty, Employment
17 Minister: c. £60,000(?). MPs using their expenses *"to dodge tax"*

18 • Keith Vaz, chairman of the Home Affairs Select Committee who asked a High Court judge to halt
19 proceedings against Dr Mireskandari, a 'lawyer' at Dean & Dean. (The judge is reported to have
20 reacted *"furiously"* to this request). (I know some of the victims of Dr Mireskandari, and I was with
21 them in court. That man is a scum).

22 • Publishing, in September 2008, the findings from an internal survey (Help Shape our Future), stating
23 *"The Crown Prosecution Service is a badly managed and failing organisation that cannot keep pace*
24 *with bringing criminals to justice...Only half of the 5,644 who answered a total of 102 questions*
25 *believe the teams they work in 'have the right skills and experience to conduct...work effectively.*
26 *Meanwhile, just one in four thinks poor performance is dealt with effectively...Just 26 per cent*
27 *believe the service is well managed, falling to 18 per cent in London"*.

28 (My view, in light of my horrendous and very traumatic experience with the courts: a similar survey
29 ought to be conducted among court staff – including asking questions about the integrity of judges. (I
30 have heard some horrific stories from other people, including, off-the-record from court staff). The
31 survey should also cover 'Customer Service' as, based on my experience, I suspect that even less
32 than 25 per cent of poor performance by the courts is *"dealt with effectively"*.)

33 • Hundreds of people reported to have died allegedly as a result of negligence at the Stafford hospital.

34 • The Information Commissioner revealing in November 2008 that the number of data breaches by
35 government and companies it employs – including lost laptops and memory sticks containing
36 sensitive personal records – had risen to 277 since the loss of 25 million child benefit records one
37 year previously – and stating the obvious *"The Government can't be trusted with information"*.

38 • A large part of the multi-billion pounds compensation allocated for sick miners ending-up in the
39 pockets of lawyers, leading e.g. one of the firms, Beresfords, increasing its income from a few
40 hundred thousand pounds a year to c. £130 million pounds. (It bought a private jet).

41 • Reporting the horrendous treatment suffered by the Canadian Lady who blew the whistle on the
42 police in relation to the shooting of Mr Jean Charles de Menezes.

1 I don't know about you, but I consider many of the above as being a lot more damning than stating
2 "*aiding and abetting a c. £500,000 fraud by turning a blind eye and a deaf ear to the evidence*" - which
3 merely adds to the overwhelming evidence of sleaze in the Westminster and Whitehall village. On the
4 upside, the public display of immediate denials of wrongdoing, refusal to accept responsibility and
5 accountability, passing the buck, the fabrications and cover-ups that typically follow the media reports -
6 help support my position in relation to my case. Finally! And the evidence keeps growing on a daily basis
7 – as does the number of people, including politicians, who deplore the systemic failure to take actions
8 against those who have committed wrongdoings – and contrasting this country with others.

9 What is the 'ruling elite' going to do to the journalists for 'daring' to expose these events? Subject them,
10 by any means, to ongoing persecution like me? Of course not! There would be outrage if retaliatory
11 actions were taken against the media.

= The British Establishment: My Diary # 2.5

12 But 'it's okay for me', because: I am a woman; of foreign origin; on her own; with limited financial means
13 and no influential connections. Hence: 'fair game' for vicious, barbaric punishment and revenge by
14 cowards with no morality and no honour who close rank and hide within the network of symbiotic
15 relationships - instead of having the guts to stand-up and take responsibility for their actions. They should
16 have paid heed to the saying 'If you can't take the heat, don't go in the kitchen'. They call themselves
17 'men'! Is that the product of privilege upbringing: letting nanny / the teachers / the employees take the
18 blame for their actions - while freezing their faces into masks of superior contempt (plagiarizing the latter
19 from a journalist)? Some 'men'! They are a disgrace to the many decent people of this country. I find their
20 conduct absolutely abhorrent.

Case summary

21 My life has been ruined, leaving me with nothing to look forward to. If the expectation at this stage - is still
22 – that I am just going to walk away and die quietly in some remote corner of this planet to suit morally
23 depraved, corrupt individuals: I WILL NOT. I WILL FIGHT LIKE A DEMON - TO THE VERY END - for
24 JUSTICE AND REDRESS – as I AM THE INNOCENT VICTIM OF CRIME – NOT THE CRIMINAL. I
25 trust you will help me in achieving this.

26 Thank you.

27 Yours sincerely

28 Noëlle Rawé

29 PS On 12 March 2009, i.e. 48 hours after my 7 March 2009 letter was delivered to your Constituency
30 Office, to make sure I heard him, Mr Andrew Ladsy stood outside my windows expressing disbelief to
31 somebody at the fact that I had contacted you. As I am sure that your Office would not breach the
32 confidentiality of contact with a Constituent (as stated in the House of Commons' factsheet, quoted
33 earlier on), I assume the source to be one of the parties covered in my letter to you - you are likely to
34 have approached. It certainly provides additional weight to my conclusion of collusion with Mr Ladsy.

35 (For several days afterwards I was subjected to further persecution: no hot water, added to having no
36 heating from the day after the electricity was cut-off in my flat on 8 March 2009. On 16 March 2009, I saw
37 Mr Ladsy by the entrance to the block (talking to a woman with a pram) and called him "*a criminal*" and
38 "*a thief*" who "*stole c. £500,000 from the leaseholders to build a penthouse flat and add three other flats
39 to the block*". His usual reply was "*You are mad*". Mine, that he was the one who is "*clinically unwell*" (his
40 comment about me in his 26 March 2007 letter to KPMG). He told me to "*Go f*** yourself*". I returned the
41 'compliment').



Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

Knightsbridge
6 Raphael Street

London
Greater London
SW7 1DL

Date and Time: 25/03/2009 16:05
Session Prefix: 10-2264349
Dest: UK (E.U.)
Quantity:
Weight: 0.169 Kg

Special D by 1 £500.00 £5.05

Total Cost of Services £5.05

Posted after Last Collection? No

Guaranteed Delivery Date: 26/03/2009

Barcode: ZW14395681168

DESTINATION ADDRESS

Building Name or Number	Postcode
1	SW3 5RP

Address Validated? Y

IT IS IMPORTANT THAT YOU RETAIN THIS
RECEIPT AS IT IS YOUR PROOF OF POSTING

PLEASE REFER TO SEPARATE TERMS AND
CONDITIONS

Special Delivery is an express next
day service for the UK, offering a
money back guarantee for delay and
compensation for loss and damage to
your item. Check delivery at
www.postoffice.co.uk or call
08459 272100 quoting your ref number.

This is not a VAT receipt
Thank You



[Personal Customers](#) | [Small & Medium Business](#) | [Corporate & Public Sector](#)

Search

Delivery Services

Marketing Services

Logistics Services

Discounts & Payment



Home

Home > Track and trace >

Track and trace

Sending tracked mail

Tracking your mail

Top links

- > Find a postcode
- > Postal prices
- > Shop
- > Track an item
- > Product A-Z
- > Work for us
- > Customer service

Track & Trace

Please enter your **13 character reference**
e.g. AA000100019GB

ZW143956811GB

Track item

[How to find your reference number](#)

Delivered

Your item with reference ZW143956811GB was delivered from our CHELSEA Delivery Office on 26/03/09.

Thank you for using this service.

We can confirm that this item was delivered before the guaranteed time.

The electronic Proof of Delivery may not be available for this item yet. Please allow up to 72 hours after delivery before checking.

View Proof of Delivery