



Endorses criminal conduct

Our ref: PC-SL/183/4402/05
Your ref:
PLEASE QUOTE OUR REFERENCE

01 March 2005

Private & Confidential
Ms N Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawe
Flat 3 Jefferson House
11 Basil Street
London
SW3 1AX

Dear Ms Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawe

- I guessed from this letter that the decision to (typically) reject my legitimate **02.02.05** complaint had already been taken - and proved to be right: **04.11.05**.
- Typically for this rotten to the core, contemptuous and arrogant so-called 'regulatory body', the path to this point was littered with more 'Get lost!'
- 3 years later, it was followed by the RICS attempting to gag me

My **05.03.05** reply, in which I challenged the claim of 'having nothing to do with breaches of legislation'

- For subsequent events, see **Overview # 10 & # 11**
- **Martyn Gerrard- Background** (another "RICS regulated firm")

Re: Your complaint against Miss Joan Hathaway BSc MRICS and Mr Barrie Martin FRICS

Further to our telephone conversation of Friday 25 February, I can confirm that the RICS is still in the process of reviewing your complaint.

"Able" but does not do it

I think it would be helpful if I explained this office's powers to you. The RICS are able to investigate allegations of professional misconduct to determine whether there is evidence of a breach of the Institution's Rules of Conduct, which Chartered Surveyors are required to follow. In addition, whilst RICS can discipline chartered surveyors in respect of breaches of the Rules of Conduct, we have no power to assess or award any compensation and cannot compel a chartered surveyor to do so or indeed to refund any fees paid.

= The RICS has taken steps to dissuade consumers from complaining

On pg 1 of the summary

In referring to your complaint, at page 1 you place reliance on 7 points. I think it would be advantageous to make clear at this stage that points 3 through 7 are not within our remit to investigate. The RICS will not usurp the powers of justice and as such the appropriate forum for these would be through civil or criminal proceedings. As regards point 2 the Service Charge Residential Management Code (RMC) is not mandatory, but should be used as a guide by Members who act as Managing Agents. Members who do depart from it however, should be able to justify their reasons for doing so.

= "The Code" is (typically for a 'regulatory body') a sham

Why, given that "not mandatory"?

That said, we will be approaching the Members named in your complaint for their comments on three specific matters and one general one. When we have received their replies, we may need to consult with you for further information.

Yours sincerely

Henchman of the Jewish- Freemason Brotherhood (Persecution # 6)

Simon Love
Conduct Manager (Complaints)
Professional Regulation & Consumer Protection
Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors

Ha!Ha!Ha!Ha!

T + 44 (0)20 7695 1672
F + 44 (0)20 7334 3746
slope@rics.org

Of note: My item # 5 is "Money Laundering Regulations / Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 - in relation to which the RICS has issued 'guidance' to its members:

- "...criminal offence to enter into a become concerned in an arrangement which you know or suspect facilitates that acquisition, retention, use or control of criminal property"
- "Criminal property is...anything which constitutes or represents a person's benefit from criminal conduct ...and you know or suspect that it constitutes or represent that benefit..."
- "The Act introduces criminal liability for failing to disclose information when there are reasonable grounds for knowing or suspecting that another person has engaged in money laundering..then this is sufficient to establish guilt"

Hence: the RICS considers that its members - as well as itself - are 'excluded from compliance'