

Steel Services Ltd
c/o Martin Russell Jones
5 Watford Way
Hendon Central
London NW4 3JN

= from Andrew
LADSKY

compare ed. with
his 25 Jan 01
letter to me.

'Costs' And 'Litigation'

The 2 key words in
Mr LADSKY'S
VOCABULARY.

+ his penchant for
abducting 'soft targets':
women - and men
if they are elderly
And frail
Even man, he does not
Reveal his identity.

19 NOV 2001

Ms Yemah Barlay
Nucleus
298 Old Brompton Road
London SW5 9JF

14 November 2001

Dear Ms Barlay

Re: 11 Basil Street, London SW3

We write in relation to an application made to RICS by you on behalf of Mr and other tenants at the above property. We understand that this application has been made by you, for the appointment of an arbitrator, without ever having disclosed the nature of any dispute you may have and without you or any of your clients inspecting the service charge information you requested and which was made available to you. The necessity for a costly application to RICS could have been avoided.

In short, your application is premature and precipitate and, in fact, we understand that the managing agents have offered to meet the tenants to deal with any proper complaints or queries they may have - this offer was ignored by the tenants and by you. We believe, that you have, therefore, failed to mitigate any liabilities that may occur in relation to the application you have made as we have never been given the opportunity to comment on any complaint or request, proper or not. We will, of course, be holding the tenants liable for any costs to which we are put as a result of their failure to properly consult with us on any matters that they wish to raise. (A) !!

As we understand that you are the tenants' advisors, we find it strange that you have made such an application without informing us of the nature of the complaint that you may have. We are seeking legal advice as to whether you may be liable, personally or as an organisation for this conduct and we will of course be writing to RICS appropriately. !

(A) See letters from Nucleus to Ms HATHAWAY, MARTIN Russell Jones. She was not supplying the requested information.

We should also now be grateful if you could give us an explanation as to why you are in fact dealing with this matter at all. It is our understanding that Mr [redacted] and we believe [redacted] (another client) are persons with substantial means. [redacted] is a foreign resident who employs, we understand, in excess of 150 people in a company in America. She is a private tenant of two flats in the building, which she keeps as second or third homes in a foreign jurisdiction to her primary residence. She is, we are reliably informed, a multi-millionairess. Furthermore and likewise [redacted] is a private tenant, we understand he has very substantial assets in both investments and property. Again the property which he occupies is his second part time residence.

Mr [redacted] for whom we understand you may also act, retains his flat in Knightsbridge as a second home to his primary residence in Africa. It seems to us extraordinary, given the above information that an organisation - which we presume is funded by taxpayer's money with the intention of assisting under-privileged members of the community - should be acting on behalf of several millionaires residing in second homes adjacent to Harrods. We can not believe that your organisation was established for the purpose of freely assisting wealthy individuals who undertake complaints and proceedings where they are perfectly able to afford to engage lawyers to act on their behalf.

!!
①

We would be grateful for an appropriate explanation sent to us at our managing agents on the matters raised in this letter. Should we not receive that explanation within seven days of the date hereof it is our intention to take this matter to the leader of Kensington and Chelsea borough council, RICS and Mr Michael Portillo. We believe your application to be completely misconceived. The building upon which the application has been made has one of the lowest service charges in the area and has been properly managed without complaint for many years by the same surveyors.

Finally, you may wish to reflect on the fact that your client, Mr [redacted], has taken this action only since we had reason to point out that we had received complaints concerning cooking smells coming from his flat.

He was, in fact, cooking with his front door left open causing the common parts of the block to become polluted. This is a breach under the terms of his lease. He has, subsequently raised frivolous complaints, offended this companies resident staff and generally engaged himself in a vociferous and often offensive campaign. There are 35 tenants in this building virtually all of whom are totally satisfied with the services provided and we would venture to suggest that it is your clients umbrage which has got the better of him.

LIAR!

Yours faithfully

Steel Services Ltd
STEEL SERVICES

① The business model of the Rogue Landlord: make sure lessees can't get free advice. The more they have to pay on legal fees, the sooner they'll give up!