

Mrs Zahida Manzoor CBE
 Office of the Legal Services Ombudsman
 3rd Floor
 Sunlight House
 Quay Street
 Manchester M3 3JZ

Ms Noëlle Rawé
 3 Jefferson House
 11 Basil Street
 London SW3 1AX

Mobile:
 Tel (wo

(By Special Delivery)

5 December 2004

Dear Mrs Manzoor,

Failure by the Law Society to deal with my complaint against Mr Richard Twyman and Ms Lisa McLean, Piper Smith Basham (now known as Piper Smith Watton), London SW1V 2AF

I am escalating my complaint to your Office as the Law Society has either ignored or dismissed all the substantive points in my complaint against Mr Richard Twyman, Partner, and Ms Lisa McLean, Litigation Assistant, Piper Smith Basham, solicitors, as well as the majority of the other points. (I am opting to refer to the firm as Piper Smith Basham (PSB) as this was the entity at the time that I was a client).

1 Correspondence with the Law Society and PSB in relation to my complaint

Law Society reference number for my complaint	CRO/45399-2004/RT4/AA1/R TUTT CRO	
Law Society Caseworker	Ms Tutt – Direct line 01926 823112	
16 March 2004	Date of my complaint to the Law Society. (It took one phone call and two letters to finally get the complaint form)	Enclosed
3 April 2004	My letter to Ms Tutt asking her to proceed with my complaint	Enclosed
2 June 2004	Initial reply by Ms Tutt, including her correspondence to PSB detailing her understanding of my complaint	Enclosed
6 June 2004	My feedback to Ms Tutt on her document to PSB	Enclosed
17 June 2004	My reply to Ms Tutt's 2 June initial reply	Enclosed
1 July 2004	1 st reply from PSB (sent to Law Society)	Enclosed
3 August 2004	2 nd reply from Ms Tutt stating that, although PSB has not addressed all the points, she would like me to reply	Enclosed
16 August 2004	My letter to Ms Tutt stating that I will await a complete reply before responding	Enclosed
25 August 2004	2 nd reply from PSB (sent to Law Society)	Enclosed
3 September 2004	Letter from Ms Tutt saying that she notes my intention to only respond once I have a complete reply, and that she has not as yet received the (2 nd) reply from PSB	Enclosed
22 September 2004	3 rd reply from Ms Tutt (which was held up in the post)	Enclosed
28 October 2004	My letter to Ms Tutt stating that I would reply by the end of November	Enclosed
30 November 2004	My reply to Ms Tutt	Enclosed

These were preceded by:

2 December 2003	My letter of complaint to PSB
18 December 2003	PSB's reply to my letter of complaint
24 January 2004	My reply to PSB's 18 December letter

I am making an assumption on the documents you are likely to require in order to deal with my complaint. Should you wish it, I am happy to supply you with copy of any other documents.

2 My complaint to the Law Society, dated 16 March 2004

As you can see from the enclosed, the first 5 pages are a summary of my complaint – with reference/s to the relevant page/s for more detail.

Pages 6 and 7 give background information on my case.

3 Replies from Ms Tutt and my replies

The subsequent correspondence entails a total of 3 replies from Ms Tutt and 3 from me.

In my last reply dated 30 November 2004, under point 157, I have summarised my views on Ms Tutt's assessment and method. In particular: she has (very clearly) intentionally ignored highly substantive points; used what I can only describe as a 'devious' approach to, in my opinion, test what her Office would be able to 'get away with', as well as an intention to 'wear me down' by 'leaving the door open' in order to engage in further correspondence.

Under point 156 of the same reply, I have provided feedback to Ms Tutt's suggested sum of £150 - £200 compensation.

Throughout the document, I have incorporated Ms Tutt's assessment as detailed in her 3 August 2004 and 22 September 2004 reply – which I have highlighted.

As I bluntly stated at the beginning of my 30 November 2004 letter: "... it occurred to me that, as your Office has the dual role of 'trade union' and 'regulator' of that profession, this might lead to a potential conflict of interest. Namely, to use a colloquial expression, that there might potentially be the possibility of your 'not wanting to bite the hand that feeds you'. I was far from imagining that it would be so blatantly obvious. On all the substantive points, as well as the majority of the lesser ones, you have disregarded the information supplied to you.

I am appalled by the way the Law Society has handled my complaint.

As you can see, in her 3rd reply, dated 22 September 2004, Ms Tutt is counting on keeping the exchange of correspondence going.

I am simply not prepared to waste any more of my time corresponding with her. She has opted to ignore, among others, highly material evidence I supplied her with on 3 occasions: in my complaint; in my replies dated 6 and 17 June 2004. I therefore see no point engaging in further correspondence.

In my 30 November 2004 reply I took into consideration the fact that I would be copying you on the reply and therefore opted to include comprehensive detail (leading to repetition of points included in my 16 March 2004 complaint and replies of 6 and 17 June 2004).

In my documents you will see a reference to Mr Gallagher. He was the barrister who acted for me in relation to the 21 October 2003 offer made by the landlord, Steel Services. (I have filed a complaint against him with the Bar Council and currently await a reply).

Thank you in anticipation of your taking the time to consider my complaint.

Royal Mail
specialdelivery
guaranteed by 1pm
next day

to
Name Mrs Zahid Khan
Address Royal Services Director
5 Leon Surlough House
Manchester
Postcode M13 3JZ

Moneyback guarantee for delay. You can claim compensation of up to £100 for lost or damaged items. (This covers most.)
Tick one level: Up to £1,000 Up to £2,500

Write your address below.
Hand this label and your package in at a Post Office® branch

Ref: ZU 4436 1111 6GB