

FAX - C O N F I D E N T I A L

19 September 2003

To	Ms Lisa McLean
Organisation	Piper Smith & Basham
Fax	020 7630 6976
From	Noëlle Rawé (Jefferson House)
Subject	Not proceeding with 20C order hearing is definitely not a good idea
Number of pages	Page 1 of 4

Dear Ms McLean,

As I finished my day job, last night, I started to properly think about your advice to contact MRJ to confirm what the other side's Counsel meant on 28 April LVT hearing. I don't know whether you have received a reply from them.

My view is that it would be a very bad idea to not proceed with the hearing as Mr Ladsky/MRJ will charge other residents not only the costs relating to the 4 days of hearing, but also all the other related costs of dealing with other residents (those who followed-up on my letters to the LVT, those who followed-up on the report from the LVT. This could amount to £100,000. Maybe more.

- Imagine you are the resident in flat 32,
- who contributes 8.757%
- and you have paid the full amount asked by MRJ without arguing

You then receive the following next January:

Annual account for Jefferson House	Amount	Ms McLean share @8.757%
General maintenance	Xxxx	Xxxx
Professional costs of defending action in the LVT	£100,000.00	£8,757

How would you feel about being asked to pay £8,757.00?

I can also guarantee that Mr Ladsky/MRJ would have a field day with this. (As he told me on 3rd January: "I am going to get you this year!"). They would attach a note to the account stating that these £100,000 of professional costs were incurred solely because of the action of one lone resident, Ms K-Dit-Rawé, Flat 3. Probably would add as well that I was the only objector. The many who objected may reply that this is not true but, as they would send this letter to MRJ – none of the others would be any the wiser.

This means that we need to go with the application – and need to be successful!

In terms of 'submission', I wrote a **letter, dated 12 August, to the LVT** with my 20C order application. You already have a copy. I attach another one.

I also attach **my calculation of the impact of MRJ deducting 24.9% for each flat** - from the global sum demanded. You already have a copy but, at to this I have now added the impact of the further reduction of **£34,849.00** which Mr Tim Brock calculated MRJ removed in their 'revised costs' handed to the Court.

MEMORY TRANSMISSION REPORT

PAGE : 001
 TIME : 19-09-03 09:16
 TEL NUMBER: 020 ~~XXXX~~
 NAME : ~~XXXX~~ FX866

FILE NUMBER : 129
 DATE : 19-09 09:10
 TO : 902076306976
 DOCUMENT PAGES : 004
 START TIME : 19-09 09:10
 END TIME : 19-09 09:16
 SENT PAGES : 004
 STATUS : OK

FILE NUMBER : 129 *** SUCCESSFUL TX NOTICE ***

FAX - CONFIDENTIAL

19 September 2003

Tc	Ms Lisa McLean
Organisation	Piper Smith & Basham
Fax	020 7630 6976
From	Noëlle Rawé (Jefferson House)
Subject	Not proceeding with 20C order hearing is definitely not a good idea
Number of pages	Page 1 of 4

Dear Ms McLean,

As I finished my day job, last night, I started to properly think about your advice to contact MRJ to confirm what the other side's Counsel meant on 28 April LVT hearing. I don't know whether you have received a reply from them.

My view is that it would be a very bad idea to not proceed with the hearing as Mr Ladsky/MRJ will charge other residents not only the costs relating to the 4 days of hearing, but also all the other related costs of dealing with other residents (those who followed-up on my letters to the LVT, those who followed-up on the report from the LVT. This could amount to £100,000. Maybe more.

- Imagine you are the resident in flat 32,
- who contributes 8.757%
- and you have paid the full amount asked by MRJ without arguing

You then receive the following next January:

Annual account for Jefferson House	Amount	Ms McLean share @8.757%
General maintenance	XXXX	XXXX
Professional costs of defending action in the LVT	£100,000.00	£8,757

How would you feel about being asked to pay £8,757.00?

I can also guarantee that Mr Ladsky/MRJ would have a field day with this. (As he told me on 3rd January: "I am going to get you this year!"). They would attach a note to the account stating that these £100,000 of professional costs were incurred solely because of the action of one lone resident, Ms K-Dit-Rawé, Flat 3. Probably would add as well that I was the only objector. The many who objected may reply that this is not true but, as they would send this letter to MRJ - none of the others would be any the wiser.

This means that we need to go with the application - and need to be successful!

In terms of 'submission', I wrote a letter, dated 12 August, to the LVT with my 20C order application. You already have a copy. I attach another one.

I also attach my calculation of the impact of MRJ deducting 24.9% for each flat - from the global sum demanded. You already have a copy but, at to this I have now added the impact of the further reduction of £34,849.00 which Mr Tim Brock calculated MRJ removed in their 'revised costs' handed to the Court.

Ben Reynolds