

Mr Barry Martin
[Martin Russell Jones](#)
5 Watford Way
Hendon Central
London NW4 3JN

[Ms N K-Dit-Rawé](#)
3 Jefferson House
11, Basil Street
London SW3 1AX

(By Recorded Delivery)

See also, attached, my COMMENTS to 'his'
[02.08.04](#) letter to "All Lessees"

London, 11 August 2004

Dear Mr Martin

I acknowledge receipt of your letter dated [4 August](#). I have sent it to my surveyor, Mr Tim Brock, LSM Partners.

In terms of setting an appointment for you to do the "Schedule of Condition" of my flat, Mr Brock and I could do the following:

- Wednesday 18 August – 9h00 – 16h30
- Thursday 19 August – 14h00 – 16h30
- Friday 20 August – 9h00 – 16h30
- Monday 23 August – 9h00 – 16h30

Which of these dates is convenient? At what time?

I assume that it will take at the most one hour (?)

Please, inform Messrs Moyle and [Gale](#) that they will need to remove their shoes on entering my flat.

Regarding your last paragraph that: "[I] refused to pay [my] contribution and this resulted in the proceedings before the LVT which of course resulted in the considerable delay in the commencement of the work".

Given your extremely inaccurate – and quite ludicrous - understanding of the situation, I will take the opportunity to remind you of some of the key facts and events:

1. In [Section 2.03 of his "Expert Report / Proof of Evidence", dated 24 February 2003](#), to [the LVT](#), [Mr Brian Gale](#) states: "At this stage [at the 29 October 2002 pre-trial LVT hearing], of the 35 flats within the block, 11 Lessees had already paid the relevant service charge, a further 10 had partly paid and had promised to pay the balance and were not in disagreement. Of the remaining tenants, only the 5 attending as Respondents had indicated any objection to payment of the service charge, reasonableness of the works or their cost"
2. In [Section 2.09 of the same report](#), he describes the outcome of the [14 November 2002](#) meeting convened by Ms Hathaway - (with a [3 day notice](#) – and prematurely given the [LVT's directions](#) as to the purpose of this meeting) - as: "...4 of the 5 objecting Respondents who attended the Pre-Trial Review on the 29th of October 2002 were now not objecting any further and had agreed to pay, or had paid..."
3. [Mr Gale](#) also states in his report that, at the 14 November 2002 meeting, residents had the opportunity to get a copy of the priced specification. By then, **4 months** had elapsed since the [original demand](#) for payment had been sent – as it was dated [17 July 2002](#).
4. While under [5.01](#), Mr Gale wrote: "I would like to draw to the attention of the Tribunal that I am advised by the managing agents that now some 31 of 35 tenants have paid, either in full or substantial contributions toward the cost of the proposed works"
5. [Barely 2 weeks after the 14 November meeting, on 29 November 2002, Steel Services-your firm filed a claim in West London County Court against 11 residents representing 14 flats](#). In other

words, a very significant proportion of the flats not connected with the [ownership of the block](#).

6. The '[Particulars of Claim](#)' state that: "[I] have failed to pay the service charges... that they are now due and owing from [me] to the Claimant"
7. The '[Particulars of Claim](#)' include a '[Statement of Truth](#)' signed by "[Joan Doreen Hathaway, Managing Agent](#)" as "duly authorised by the Claimant to sign this statement" stating: "[The Claimant believes that the facts stated in this Claim Form are true](#)"
8. [Six times](#) over a six-month period spanning 11 August 2002 to 12 January 2003, I requested – in writing - a copy of the priced specification. These include: four letters to [Ms Hathaway and CKFT](#) (11 August 2002; [16 September 2002](#); [17 October 2002](#); [12 January 2003](#)), and two letters to the LVT which were copied to Ms Hathaway/CKFT ([22 October 2002](#); [25 November 2002](#)). I wrote a third letter to the LVT, on [18 December 2002](#), highlighting the fact that the deadline set by the LVT for the provision of information had passed and that I had not received anything from your office. In fact, a copy of the priced specification was eventually hand-delivered to my flat just [36 hours before the 5th February hearing](#). This was therefore [7 months after](#) I received the original demand for payment
9. Aside from other residents also stating that they had not been supplied with a copy of the priced specifications (letters from residents to your office and to the LVT), the LVT captured the following in its [17 June 2003](#) report, under Point 14 – [LVT # 8.1.2](#)
"Ms Hathaway (of Martin Russell Jones), on behalf of the Applicant, resisted the application for an adjournment... She maintained that Ms Dit-Rawé had seen the specification in the porter's room, but [was unsure as to whether this had been a priced version](#)".
Point 16 of the LVT report states – *"In the interest of justice, the Tribunal agreed to an adjournment..."*
10. In his [24 February 2003](#) report, [Mr Gale](#) wrote under 5.02 – ["It would therefore appear... that only one lone tenant continues to make any representation or objection of the 35 tenants"](#)
11. Under [point 50 of its report](#), the LVT recorded the following:
"It is noted that, apparently, the majority of the tenants wish all the works to be carried out. [A letter from Mr Ladsky](#), the lessee of flats [34 and 35](#) dated [28 April 2003](#) stated:
"[31 or 32 of the 35 tenants have paid their contribution towards the major work... \pg_works\index.htm](#). They are, therefore, in agreement with both the scope and cost of the proposed refurbishment. Whilst I accept that the Tribunal is to rule on the reasonableness of the proposed works, it must surely follow that if the overwhelming majority of lessees in the building are ad idem, some considerable weight must be given to their collective view. [It seems to me that it would be wholly inequitable for one lone tenant acting entirely unilaterally to be able to frustrate and delay the building works desired by the many](#)".
The last part of [point 50](#), the LVT report states: *"[On the last day of the hearing](#) a legal representative for another lessee in the subject property attended to say that [her client was also unhappy about the service charges demanded of the proposed works](#)"*
12. In its [23 May 2003](#) application to [West London County Court](#) for a Case Management hearing, [CKFT highlights ongoing litigation against 4 residents](#). In fact, it appears that there is another one as well. This is in addition to having only agreed a Consent Order with another resident at the [beginning of April](#). All of these were therefore [after Mr Gale](#) had written his "[Expert Report/Proof of Evidence](#)" report in which he claimed that I was ["only one lone tenant \[who\] continues to make any representation or objection of the 35 tenants"](#).
13. When Mr [Ladsky](#) said to the LVT Panel on [5 February 2003](#): *"Will Ms Rawé pay the £250,000 of additional costs that will be incurred as a result of the delay in the start of the works due to the hearing?"*, the Chair, Mrs Goulden,

replied that I was perfectly within my rights to challenge the application made by Steel Services. This was captured in the [LVT report](#) under point 64: "Although she is in the minority, the Respondent's legal right to challenge the Applicant's proposal, as she had done, cannot be fettered"

Perhaps, I should also remind you of some of the [key findings by the LVT](#):

Point 44 – "The reports prepared on behalf of the Applicant and provided to the Tribunal were, in the words of Mr Jones, "a wish list" for refurbishment of the subject property to a high standard. They do not seem to have been prepared on behalf of the Applicant having regard to its rights and responsibilities under the lease...The Tribunal would normally expect alternative proposals to be costed and produced, in order to make a proper and considered judgement of the best way forward to meet the obligations of both the landlord and the tenants"

Point 46 – "In this case the Tribunal was frustrated by the lack of detail in the specification and in Mr Gale's evidence. Works were not clearly identified, were not measured where they clearly could have been, and there was some element of duplication. Some items were not specified at all, e.g. the types and capacity of the boilers"

Point 16.07 – "It would appear to the Tribunal from the above, and the evidence given by Mr Jones, that his instructions were obviously client led rather than an independent opinion... There was no evidence, save for the complaints from the owner of the top floor flats, flat 34 and 35, that the boilers were failing regularly. Indeed, in evidence, Mr Jones confirmed that they were working, were being maintained and were not defective at present... The specification is considered inadequate in that it is vague and lacked specific detail e.g. the provision to "remove and replace with new the boiler plant and all associated pipework". It is noted that initially, there was no breakdown of the specification until 7 March 2003 when Mr Gale responded to Mr Brock's report of 24 February 2003. Mr Gale accepted during the hearing that there had been no boiler specification in the tender document"

(The sum demanded for the boiler was £89,824.00. Therefore, with the addition of VAT and fees the intention was to charge residents the sum of £117,153)

Point 38 – "Mr Gale also accepted that there were no boiler specification in the tender document which merely stated "to remove and replace with new the boiler plant and all associated pipework"

Point 16.07 - "In the circumstances, the Tribunal does not consider that it has sufficient information to make a proper judgement and therefore makes no determination in respect of the boilers... This is an area which, in the Tribunal's view, alternatives and costings should have been explored"

Points 19 & 20 – "Mr Jones, C Eng MCI Bsc of Michael Jones & Associates, Engineering consultants... said that his instructions had been to prepare a report on the work which needed to be carried out. He said that a lift survey had been carried by a specialist, John Bashford. He said that the report on the condition at the time had been 'a wish list'"

Point 16.07 – "The Tribunal does not consider that Mr Jones' report is sufficient, having regard to the reason why it was commissioned. In evidence, Mr Gale said "Michael Jones will be asked to provide specifics on design where unclear now and ensure that they are fit for the purpose", which indicates that Mr Gale accepts that there is some lack of clarity on this issue"

Point 16.07 – "The recommendation of J Bashford and Associates... to prepare a specification and drawings appeared to have been ignored by Mr Gale in

his own specification since it refers in 16.26 to "the contractor is to (with full regard to J Bashford & Associates recommendation in the service engineer's report) allow to carry out a major refurbishment and replacement of the lift shaft and associated equipment, supplies and decorations". The **specification prepared by Mr Gale is therefore insufficiently detailed** to allow for a quotation for this work, and he conceded during the hearing that there may have been an element of duplication. Further, no proper explanation has been given for the increase from £27,3000 to £60,000 over a matter of months..... **the Tribunal is unable to make a determination on the specification, since it is considered inadequate.**

Point 36 – "The original tender dated 2002 showed a fixed sum of £27,300 in respect of the lift installation. **Mr Gale conceded that there may have been an element of duplication in the specifications for the lift**"

Point 42 – "Mr Gale was questioned on the **provision of £20,000** in the specification in respect of the **porter's desk**... He also accepted that there could have been a fixed, rather than a provisional sum for this within the specification and said "it was a time factor really". **He acknowledged "there is not specification yet"**

Point 37 – "In respect of the provision for **downlighters** **Mr Gale said: I agree that there is latitude for contractors to fit 25 or 50 units. We may have to tighten it up**"

Point 41 – "Mr Gale accepted that he had been **"upping the specification" for the fire doors**".

As pointed out by the LVT in its determination – under **point 54**:

"Assuming that, on a proper construction of the lease, the services in issue are covered by the charging clause, this does not mean that the landlord enjoys carte blanche to incur costs..."

And so, and so on.

And perhaps I should also remind you of the **impact of the LVT determination on the original sum demanded**:

The total sum demanded was **£736,206.08** (£564,467.00 exc. VAT and fees)

(1) Amount **disallowed** by the LVT because improvements: **£169,497.72** (£129,958.00 exc. VAT and fees) = 23% of the global sum demanded

(2) Amount for which the LVT **could not make a determination due to lack of specification** = **£188,783.67** (£144,745.00 exc. VAT and fees) = 25.6% of the global sum demanded

(3) A view supported by the LVT, considering the terms of the lease, as well as RICS best practice, that the **reserve fund should be used as contribution: £141,977.00** – or 19.3% of the global sum demanded

Leaving an amount that can be charged of £235,946.56 – or 32% of the original sum demanded. In other words, £500,000.00 of the sum demanded was not considered as reasonable.

I trust that you will not repeat this false accusation.

Yours sincerely,

N K-Dit-Rawé

I trust that you will not repeat this false accusation.

Yours sincerely,



~~N K-Dit-Rawé~~

Page 4 of 4

throughout and compensation for loss or damage
details of where your item is going

Name	GARY PLANDER FARJ-Sulford U.S.A
Building name or number, and street	London
Postcode complete in full	N.W.4. 3J.N.

Reference

DT 8015 9992 8GB

barcode label to top left of package

A BLATANT FRAUD BY THE LADSKY LYING ORGANISED CRIME RACKETEERS

1 Background

1.1 Repeated denial of the intention to build a penthouse – and THE REALITY

A planning application to build a penthouse at Jefferson House was renewed on 13.11.01.

Joan Hathaway, MRICS, MRJ

In her correspondence, she **KEPT DENYING** the intention to build the penthouse:

- 26.03.02, to me: "*Your suggestion that the appointment of professional advisors is in any way connected with any planning application is incorrect*"
- 30.08.02, to me: "*We are informed that there is no intention to build the penthouse at the current time*"
- 04.03.03 letter to Brian Gale, copied to the London Leasehold Valuation Tribunal: "*...regarding the proposed penthouse...although the planning permission was granted it was subsequently found that the scheme was not a viable proposition...*"; "*...there are no plans to build the penthouse at the property*"

Brian Gale, MRICS

- In his 02.02.xx 'condition survey' of Jefferson House, Ladsky's surveyor, Brian Gale, had pages upon pages discussing the "*need to repair / replace parts of the asphalt roof*".
- In his 13.12.02 "*Expert Witness*" report to the London LVT, under Section 4 -1.4, he wrote: "*I am able to categorically state that the Specification makes NO provisions for any construction of an additional floor nor any future requirement in the building to create a penthouse flat*"

How the "*repair*" rather than "*renew*" (Brian Gale's 02.02.xx 'condition survey') ACTUALLY translated?: **the WHOLE ROOF was DEMOLISHED in order TO BUILD A PENTHOUSE** – which Brian Gale – Mansell Construction Services, in their 04.11.xx "*Description of works*" described as "**REPLACING ASPHALT ROOF**": Major works ; Photo gallery



Back of Jefferson House – **July 2002**



Back of Jefferson House – **September 2005**

1.2 The previous FRAUDULENT demands and West London County Court claim

In her [07.06.01](#) letter, [Joan Hathaway, MRICS, MRJ](#), wrote: "At present, there is approximately £125,000 in the Reserve Fund, but in view of the scope of works required to be carried out it is anticipated that this sum will be inadequate to meet the costs. This means that...a notice will be served on you giving details of the **additional payment required from you...**"

6 months LATER, in her [21.12.01](#) letter to the Jefferson House leaseholders, she wrote: "**We have to state that the sum quoted may be exceeded due to disbursements but these will be of a minor nature. Sufficient funds are held to cover the cost of the works within the Reserve Fund**"

6 months AFTER that, in 'her' [15.07.02](#) - TOTALLY UNSUPPORTED, because FRAUDULENT demand ([LVT # 4](#) ; [Sale of apartment](#) ; [OVERVIEW # 3](#)) - 'she' was asking for £736,200 (US\$882,000) - £14,400 (US\$25,400) from me in 'her' [17.07.02](#) 'invoice'.

As this demand, not surprisingly, caused a 'mini-revolt' among the leaseholders, 3 weeks later, [MRJ-'Steel Services = Andrew Ladsky - FILED a 07.08.02 application in the London LVT to "determine the reasonableness of the global sum demanded" i.e. the £736,200.](#) (Due to conniving and collusion between the [tribunal](#) and [Ladsky](#), we, leaseholders, were ONLY informed of this application, more than 2 months later – see [OVERVIEW # 2](#))

At the [29 Oct 02 LVT pre-trial 'hearing'](#) ([LVT # 1](#)) we (i.e. I and other leaseholders) were asked by the Chair whether we had already paid the 'service charge' demanded in the 15 Jul 02 letter. We all replied that we had NOT because we had not been supplied with details of costings - at the time of the demand, nor since - hence, in breach of our statutory rights under [s.20 of the Landlord & Tenant Act 1985](#) and, indeed, of our [Lease](#).

At this point, we were specifically told that, **if we paid, the Tribunal would NOT be able to help us** - in other words: the Chair told us to **NOT pay** the 'service charge' **UNTIL** the tribunal had issued its report - AND **it had been implemented**.

To reinforce this point, we were handed a leaflet '[Applying to a Leasehold Valuation Tribunal - service charges, insurance, management](#)' which, on **page 5** states the following: "...a recent Court of Appeal case ruling (*Daejan Properties Limited v London Leasehold Valuation Tribunal*) determined that **LVTs only have the jurisdiction to decide the reasonableness of disputed service charges that are still unpaid...**" (NB: bold type face as per the leaflet)

THE 'DON'T PAY' MESSAGE COULD NOT HAVE BEEN ANY CLEARER.

As can be seen from the [29.10.02](#) tribunal's directions, [LADSKY, HATHAWAY et.al.](#) were also PRESENT.

Of note, in reply to my [17.10.02](#) letter asking whether he was aware that his client had filed an application to the tribunal, in his [21.10.02](#) letter, [Lanny Silverstone, CKFT](#), confirmed that HE KNEW about it.

IN SPITE of knowing this, the [evil, racketeering mafia](#) nonetheless FILED a [29.11.02 claim in West London County Court, against me and 13 other apartments](#) (hence, nearly half, as there were then 35 in the block – some with [Ladsky](#) as the lessee: [Owners identity # 4](#)) – **for the FULL AMOUNT demanded in the July 02 demand.** ([West London County Court](#) repeatedly ignored

my 7 letters, over a period of 7 months, that an abuse of process was taking place: [OVERVIEW # 3](#))

1.3 The outcome of the June 2003 LVT findings, was a reduction of £500,000 in the sum demanded

My belief that the demand was FRAUDULENT was vindicated, as **the original sum demanded of £736,207** (US\$1.3m) **was reduced by £500,000** (US\$882,000) (including the contingency fund of £144k) **i.e. nearly 70% less** ([LVT # 4](#)).

This is based on the assessment of my (RICS) surveyor as, while the [17.06.03](#) LVT report (ref LVT/SC/007/120/02) is a fair representation of what took place, **because it was 'most inconvenient' for 'Dear Mr Ladsky' (not to mention the WLCC judges** who had been issuing Orders: [OVERVIEW # 3](#)) - in breach of its statutory duty - at the 11th hour, the LVT panel made a U-turn - by NOT including a summary of the impact of its findings on the global sum demanded of £736,200 ([Overview # 2](#)).

The fact that it was its duty to do so is stated under para.1 of its [17.06.03](#) report ([LVT # 4, # 6](#) ; [Brian Gale # 6](#)). (It subsequently REFUSED my repeated demands to address this major failing: [LVT # 7](#))

2 NOTE 1

2.1 As the above tribunal's findings 'did not suit' Ladsky – they were NEVER implemented – and led to more LIES from the mafia

Having endorsed the [29.11.02](#) claim with a [Statement of Truth](#) (above), 2 weeks previously, against 14 apartments, in 'her' [16.12.02](#) letter [Joan Hathaway, MRICS, MRJ](#), wrote: "...**the tenants in the block, the vast majority of whom have paid...**" - followed by 'her' [04.03.03](#) letter: "**5 people have not paid**"

As captured under **para.50** of the [17.06.03](#) report by the [London LVT](#):

"A letter from Mr Ladsky, the lessee of flats 34 and 35 [Owners identity # 4] dated 28 April 2003 stated: "31 or 32 of the 35 tenants have paid their contribution towards the major works. They are, therefore, in agreement with both the scope and cost of the proposed refurbishment" (**SATANIC VERMIN**: his above [29.11.02](#) claim, etc.)

1 YEAR LATER, Joan Hathaway was singing an entirely different tune, in 'her' [26.03.04](#) letter to "ALL Lessees": "**Due to extensive delays in collecting the contributions from all (NB!!!) lessees...**"

REASON? The LVT findings were 'highly inconvenient' for '[Dear Mr Ladsky](#)' - who 'needed' the money to make [his multi-million £ jackpot](#).

In breach of leaseholders' rights - **the racketeers NEVER implemented the findings** - greatly assisted by the [London LVT](#) DELIBERATE failure to include a summary of the impact of its findings on the global sum demanded (above)...

...leaving the door wide open to the mafia to send the attached 2 Aug 04 letter – that VERY CLEARLY – did NOT take the findings into consideration.

In this letter, [Barrie Martin, FRICS](#), claimed that the cost for "[the works](#)" were "[£513,656.70 + VAT](#)" - FAILING to mention the addition of an 11% management fee. The addition of the management fee + VAT brought the total to [£669,936](#) (US\$1.182m)...

... - thereby [making a difference of only £66,269](#) (US\$117,000), or 9% less than the [15.07.02](#) demand of £736,200 (US\$1.3m) that was the subject of the [07.08.02](#) Application to the [London LVT](#) - that resulted in a 70% reduction: [LVT # 4](#) ; [MRJ # 13 , # 17](#)

Contrast that also with the above [21.12.01](#) letter that asserted: "[Sufficient funds are held to cover the cost of the works within the Reserve Fund](#)"

This 2 Aug 04 letter was sent:

- ON THE DAY the last valiant leaseholder on the [29.11.02](#) claim capitulated in [Her Majesty's Wandsworth County Court](#) - [on terms](#) which suggest that he was, likewise, ripped-off ([WCC # 2](#) ; [WLCC # 14](#)) - (IN SPITE of the evidence against the claim, I had also supplied to this court: [WCC # 1](#))
- HENCE: by the time [Ladsky](#) had, through [his gang of racketeers](#), secured as much money as possible from [the claim](#) = A LOT! [29.08.06](#) letter from the [ICAEW](#).

OF NOTE:

Having stated in her (above) [07.06.01](#) letter that '[the sinking fund WOULD BE USED](#)', in 'her' (≡ [Ladsky](#)) letters, 'Hathaway' wrote:

- [16.12.03](#) to me: "[the existing fund is to be kept in reserve for potential future expenditure](#)"
- [04.03.03](#) to [Brian Gale](#), the following, OUTRAGEOUS argument: "[The sinking fund has not been utilised to contribute to the cost for the works as sums would be insufficient to cover the cost of the contract](#)".

Under para.63 of its [17.06.03](#) report, the [London LVT](#) disagreed with the refusal to use the fund, stating:

"The wording of the clause relating to the contingency or reserve fund in the lease is unambiguous. It refers to costs expenses and outgoings "not being of an annual recurring nature", and as such surely envisages the type of works proposed at the subject property. Although the tribunal has no power to order the Applicant to make payments from the contingency fund, the Tribunal considers it inequitable that this fund should not be used in part to fund the works, and cannot accept Mr Warwick's contention that to divest or reduce the contingency fund would be "wrong"."

[Ladsky](#) TOOK the contingency fund into consideration in his [21.10.03](#) 'offer' to me for [£6,350](#) (US\$9,900) (v. the £14,400 demanded in the [17.07.02](#) 'invoice'; [29.11.02](#) claim, and [Particulars of claim](#) filed in [West London County Court](#) – preceded by the [07.10.02](#) threat of forfeiture) (seizing my apartment) if I failed to pay immediately the £14,400 demanded)

The reason he did: because I flagged-up the [07.06.21](#) letter from [Hathaway](#) e.g. [para.26](#) of my [19.10.03 Witness Statement](#) ([19 Oct 03 Wit.Stat](#)) ('my' advisors [Piper Smith Basham\(Watton\)](#) and [Stan Gallagher](#) batted for [Andrew Ladsky](#): [my Comments to the 13.11.03 reply to 'the offer'](#))

IN BREACH OF MY FELLOW LEASEHOLDERS' RIGHTS, the contingency fund (among other) was NOT taken into account in the demand from them: 29.08.06 letter from the ICAEW : OVERVIEW # 3 ; West London County Court # 6 , # 8 , # 9 ; Pridie Brewster # 2 , # 3 , # 18)

NOTE also para.64 of the 17.06.03 LVT report "...**the Respondent and other tenants (NB !!!) could not be forced to contribute in the case of improvements and / or works not determined as reasonable by the Tribunal**"

(See [Pridie Brewster # 18](#) for my reply to the ICAEW who attempted to use this as 'justification' for "the extra payment")

3 NOTE 2

(To avoid opposition) **Mansell Construction Services** was appointed WITHOUT going through the legally required consultation procedures.

It meant that the demand from EACH of the apartment in the block should have been capped at £250 (US\$441). Hence, the MAXIMUM AMOUNT that could be demanded of the then 35 apartments, was £8,750 (US\$15,429) - v. the £500,000 (US\$882,000) that was PAID - and KEPT ([OVERVIEW # 5](#) ; [Pridie Brewster: # 2 , # 3 , # 8 , # 10 , # 17 , # 18 , # 19](#) ; [EXTORTION](#)) (Examples of precedents under [My Diary 6 May 08](#))

4 NOTE 3

THE NERVE OF THAT MAFIA!

The one who must have been over the moon was **CRIMINAL VERMIN ANDREW LADSKY** who could start seeing the £ signs from [his multi-million £ jackpot](#).

Note as well that "**the works**" had been described as "**URGENT**" – starting **2.5 years previously: 30.01.02**, to me ; **26.03.02**, to all ; **26.03.02**, to me.

5 The 04.08.04 letter from Barrie Martin, FRICS, MRJ

In 'his' (= [SATANIC VERMIN LADSKY](#)) **04.08.04** letter, Barrie Martin, FRICS, **accused me of being "the cause of the proceedings in the London LVT"**. Contrast this OUTRAGEOUS claim with the Background notes, above.

I replied in a letter dated [11.08.04](#).

THESE PEOPLE EPITOMIZE THE DEFINITION OF SATANIC, CRIMINAL VERMIN

6 The Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors DISMISSED ALL of my 02.02.05 complaint against MRJ

In my [02.02.05](#) complaint against [MRJ](#) to the [RICS](#), I discussed the 2 Aug 04 letter, under: headers 12.1 , 1.1.1.27.3 (pg 7) , 1.1.1..29. 1 (pg 7) , 1.1.1.35.3 (pg 9) , 1.1.1.41.2 (pg 10) , 1.1.1.51 (pg 11) and para.250 - as well as many of the others covered in these Comments.

IN SPITE of the unbelievably DAMNING evidence, the [RICS](#) DISMISSED ALL OF MY COMPLAINT: snapshot under [OVERVIEW Note 5](#)

For subsequent events: see [OVERVIEW](#), including my [03.06.08](#) Witness Statement.

As [the criminal, vermin mafia](#) KNOWS it does NOT have to fear sanction from its so-called 'regulators', or from ANYWHERE ELSE in the British State – including, 'of course', [Her Majesty's police that prefers to criminalize the victims of the criminals – instead of the criminals](#) – it has, 'of course' continued to send me FRAUDULENT upon FRAUDULENT demands – see [Martyn Gerrard](#), the successor in the [Ladsky's stable of racketeers](#) to Martin Russell Jones.

Consider that these demands are made, in the context of the fact that, in breach of [Clause 2\(2\)\(g\)\(i\) of my Lease](#) - **I have NOT been provided with accounts for Jefferson House since 2004**. Given that what is produced are works of fiction ([Pridie Brewster](#); my [04.10.11](#) response to the GLA survey on service charges, and [my analysis](#) – [My Diary 6 Oct 11](#)), it could be argued that it makes little difference.