

Crispin Lee
Detective Inspector
Directorate of Professional Standards
Prevention and Organisational Learning Command
DPS South West
Jubilee House
3rd Floor
230-232 Putney Bridge Road
London SW15 2PD

Ms N Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé

Of course, the police's poodle, the so-called 'Independent' Police Commission, staffed by police officers on secondment, obliged: **02.03.10**

BUT, I continued my fight, eventually filing a 19.04.11 Claim against the police et.al. - Overview # 18 ; my 19.07.11 and 29.08.11 Witness Statements ; my 17.10.11 Appeal Request against the 09.08.11 pack of lies Order

(By 'Recorded delivery')

Your ref : PC/07160/09

See [K&C police point # 5.1](#) for subsequent events, including [my 2 June 2010 s.10 Notice](#) to Mark Heath and [supporting document](#) which, of course, in his continuing breach of legislation - he has ignored

18 February 2010

**Snapshots in relation to events reported in this letter:
Doc library # 4.7 to # 4.12**

Dear DI Lee,

1. I acknowledge receipt of your '[21 January](#)' 2010 letter, posted second class, two weeks later, on 4 February 2010 – of which I took delivery on 15 February.

Your objective in doing this?

I note that your letter was posted on the day that my [2 February 2010](#) letter, headed, "When am I due to be killed?", was delivered to, among others, the Office of Sir Paul Stephenson, Met Commissioner - thereby providing further evidence that your Office had no intention of addressing my requests... in the expectation that?

2. → You state that your letter is "*in connection to the complaint [I] made on [2 December 2009](#)*" (the letter I sent to Sir Paul and [The Rt. Hon. Alan Johnson, Home Secretary](#)).

What have I complained of in my 2 December 2009 letter to Sir Paul and Mr Johnson – headed "Head of Kensington police approves of illegal conduct by some of its officers"?

I reproduced the content of the [20 November 2009](#) letter from **Acting Chief Inspector Steve McSorley, Professional Standards and Performance, Kensington police** - said to be in acknowledgement of my [8 October 2009](#) letter to Chief Superintendent Mark Heath, Borough Commander, Kensington & Chelsea police, and my [8 October 2009](#) letter to McSorley. (Hence, reply written six weeks after my letter, which, on [11 November 2009](#), I followed by a chaser letter [to both](#) of them) – namely:

"For the sake of clarity, may I stress that I do not accept that there has been any "gross misconduct" by any of our officers in relation to the various crime reports in which you are named.

Nor do I accept that TDC Dowling made "malicious, scurrilous or libellous allegations" when he contacted your website host.

With regard to the wording of the crime reports, I am satisfied that this represents an accurate account of what police were told at the time even if you do not agree with what was said by third parties.

I followed this by highlighting "I am satisfied that this represents an accurate account of what police were told at the time...Consequently I... will not be making any alterations to the various crime reports..." – and stated "**What a very damning indictment!** As I wrote in my [20 September 2009](#) reply to Jenna Neville, Police Public Access Office, the requirements under the Data Protection Act 1998 include:

- *Fourth Principle - "Duty of data controller to take reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of the data"*

- *First Principle - Information Commissioner: "When obtaining data from a third person **the data controller has an overriding duty to process personal data fairly and lawfully**. The fact that the data controller has had to expend a substantial amount of effort and/or cost in providing the information does not necessarily mean that the Commissioner will reach the decision that the data controller can legitimately rely upon the disproportionate effort exception. In certain circumstances, the Commissioner would consider that such an effort could reasonably be expected".*

It certainly IS "reasonably expected" of the police to investigate third party claims, including obtaining supporting evidence. And it IS likewise "reasonably expected" of the police to do this BEFORE accusing an individual of having committed criminal actions.

On page 2 of my [2 December 2009](#) letter to Sir Paul and Mr Johnson I wrote: "...this letter amounts to wholesale endorsement by McSorley, and by implication, Mark Heath, of the gross misconduct by the officers involved in the 2002, 2003 and 2007 complaints to K&C police".

In light of this reply from Steve McSorley - and drawing from:

(1) My letter of [13 August 2009](#) to Jenna Neville, Case Worker, Metropolitan Police, Public Access Office - in response to the reports [CR:5604102/02](#), [CR:5602261/03](#) and [CR:5605839/07](#) - I received following my [28 May 2009](#) Subject Access Request.

In this letter, I included an overall summary starting with "I state on my website, under the section for Kensington & Chelsea police (http://www.leasehold-outrage.com/pg_police/index.htm) "The words I have to sum-up events with Kensington & Chelsea police - in relation to myself - the INNOCENT VICTIM OF ORGANISED CRIME - in 2002, 2003 and 2007, and other Residents at Jefferson House are: complicity, duplicity, misrepresentations, cover-up and protection of, and assistance to a criminal" My detailed review of the three reports further reinforces my conclusions, as Kensington & Chelsea police has:..."

(2) My reply of [20 September 2009](#) to Jenna Neville's 'response' of [25 August 2009](#) (ref. CR :5604 202/02) – I viewed as amounting to a 'get lost!...'

...I concluded in my [2 December 2009](#) letter to Sir Paul: "It follows from this that, as **Chief Superintendent and Borough Commander for [Kensington & Chelsea police](#), Mark Heath:**

1. Approves of his officers NOT contacting me – AT ANY POINT IN TIME – in relation to the 2007 so-called 'complaint' against me 'by [Andrew Ladsky](#)' – giving them free rein to communicate unlawful, fabricated lies against me to third parties, as well as record them on the police systems.
2. Approves of his officers defaming my name, character and reputation to a third party by making – totally unsupported - unlawful, libellous and malicious accusations against me to my website Host – with the aim of scaring my website Host into closing down my website, by: (1) TDC Simon J Dowling claiming in his [16 March 2007](#) email to my website Host that I had 'committed a crime' "I am the police officer dealing with this crime"; (2) stating that I have used "racially abusive terms towards Jewish people from the Nazi's"; (3) claiming that "This is directed at a particular person"
3. Approves of his officers making unlawful, racist, xenophobic comments by branding me "a Nazi" - by TDC Simon J Dowling stating in his [20 March 2007](#) email to my website Host "The producer of this website is of franco-german origin and so would be aware of the terms pigs and monkeys used during the Nazi regime" – and therefore approves of his officers breaching the police code that "MPS personnel must not use MPS systems to author, transmit or store documents such as electronic mail...containing racist,...defamatory, offensive,...material"

4. Approves of his officers recording on the police systems expressions of opinion about my mental health that are malicious, scurrilous and libellous. Concurrently, of approaching social services, in what I conclude, was part of an attempt at getting me sectioned – with the ultimate objective of gaining the closure of my website "She is obviously extremely paranoid"; "I believe she may have some mental issues so will be speaking to social services to see if they are aware of her"
5. Approves of his officers "fully recording" Andrew Ladsky's so-called 'complaint' against me in 2003 as "SUBSTANT/Offence of harassment" - BEFORE even contacting me.
6. Approves of his officers threatening me on the say-so of Andrew Ladsky e.g. [27 January 2003](#) letter - which was the first form of contact by K&C police following Ladsky's so-called 'complaint' - "Of perhaps greater importance is the fact that any further such outbursts may result in charges of harassment being made against you, as this initial complaint has been fully recorded by the police... Please avoid (if you can) any confrontation with Mr Ladsky or there may be further consequences"
7. Approves of his officers bullying me and intimidating me into dropping my 2002 complaint, as well as telling me "You won't be able to prove a link with Andrew Ladsky" – with the effect of undermining my credibility, as it can be construed that I backed down on my complaint.
8. Approves of his officers repeatedly processing data that gives an inaccurate description of Andrew Ladsky's role in Jefferson House – by: (1) describing him as "a neighbour", instead of what he is 'landlord for Jefferson House'; (2) stating in 2007 that I "seem to think that Ladsky is behind the company who has sent these letters [from the 'managing' agents, [Martin Russell Jones](#)]" – with the aim of giving him scope to play the 'poor innocent victim', as well as give some weight to his trumped-up, malicious and slanderous accusations against me.
9. Approves of his officers totally failing to challenge Ladsky on the veracity of his accusations against me, including failing to obtain supporting evidence - as it would discredit his complaints against me.
10. Approves of his officers totally failing to probe, and therefore failing to record the context of situations/ surrounding events - as it would discredit Ladsky's complaints against me e.g. in 2007, not determining the content of "The service charge letter sent by the managing agents to all the residents" and stating that "[I] took exception to this" – as it would require capturing that (1) "[the letter](#)" demanded the sum of £736,000; (2) Ladsky followed this by having a [West London Court claim](#) filed [against me and another 13 flats](#) – proving that I was not the only one "taking exception"; (3) c.£500,000 of the demand was knocked-off [during the tribunal hearings](#); (4) Ladsky subsequently made me [an 'offer'](#) that was £8,000 below [his original demand](#).
11. Approves of his officers recording on the police systems – totally unsupported, unlawful, libellous and malicious accusations against me – many of which I only discovered as a result of making the [28 May 2009](#) Subject Access Request:
 1. in 2003 – (1) that I committed an "Offence of harassment"; (2) that I "wrote letters accusing [Ladsky] of theft" (but as it turned out: he DID commit theft – on a grand scale); (3) "swore at Ladsky approximately 3 or 4 times"; (4) that "This verbal abuse started in November 2002" – and the concurrent, equally false implication, that I had been doing this on an ongoing basis since November 2002;

2. in 2007 – (1) that I committed "a hate crime"; "a racist, anti-Semitic offence"; (2) that my website "is alleged to contain anti-Semitic, anti-black, and anti-Asian pictures and text"; (3) that "The specific remarks and pictures that are being complained about are contained throughout [my website]"; (4) that it contains "a lot of slanderous comments on the site mainly directed at [Ladsky] but also at K&C and even MPs, the Prime Minister and DPM. Also against solicitors and many others"; etc.
12. Approves of his officers failing to record correspondence – because 'inconvenient' to Ladsky / his officers, and / or in order to disparage me / discredit me / lessen my complaint e.g.
- in 2002: my [26 March 2002](#) fax to DC Adams in which I reiterate the BT evidence he had already been supplied with, one month previously - which totally refuted his 'story';
 - in 2003: my [11 February 2003](#) letter to PC Neil Watson in which I asked "for precise detail – in writing – of the accusation against me";
 - in 2007: (1) from my website Host to K&C police asking "Are you aware that there are laws against making false accusations?"; (2) the [20 March 2007](#) email from TDC Simon J Dowling to my website Host, in which he backed down from his accusations, stating "Thanks for your reply, yes there are laws relating to false reporting. If you are unable to close the site down I will let the victim know as there is nothing we as a police force can do except class it as a racist incident..." (while still making an unsupported, libellous accusation: "racist incident").
13. Approves of his officers recycling false accusations against me from Ladsky's 2003 'complaint' in order to add weight to his equally false accusations in 'his' 2007 'complaint' e.g. "There is a previous [CRIS 5602261/03](#) which relates to an harassment of [Ladsky] by Ms Rawé no further action was taken at the time. But it shows Ms Rawé used to swear at [Ladsky] when seeing [Ladsky] in the communal area. This was when the service charge dispute first arose".
14. Approves of his officers failing to record the content of correspondence, as well as failing to act on it – because 'inconvenient' - such as (1) my [25 March 2002](#) fax to DC Adams in which I captured his claim that the resident had "admitted to having made the anonymous phone calls to [me]" – and asked him to confirm that what I wrote in the fax accurately reflected what he told me; (2) my [4 April 2002](#) letter to DI Webster in which I provide comprehensive detail of events with DC Adams.
15. Approves of his officers lying; knowingly record false data; telling me / writing one thing to me, and capturing something totally different in the police database – with the aim of covering-up events / avoid capturing 'inconvenient' data / disparaging me and discrediting me e.g.
- in 2002, (1) falsely telling me that all the calls had been made by the resident v. recording in the report that "there is no way of tracing which telephone was used"; (2) falsely telling me that BT had said that the second number was also one of its own; (3) recording my landline number as being the source of the anonymous phone calls to my landline phone;
 - in 2003, (1) PC Neil Watson falsely recording that I did not respond to his [27 January 2003](#) letter; (2) PC Watson stating in this letter "any further such outbursts **may result** in charges of harassment being made against you, as this initial complaint has been fully recorded by the police..." v. recording Ladsky's so-called 'complaint' against me under the 'Main classification' as

"SUBSTANT/Offence of harassment".

16. Approves of his officers repeatedly ignoring the evidence, and fabricate stories upon stories to avoid revealing it – with the aim of clearing Ladsky of involvement e.g. in relation to the data supplied by BT in 2002 – leading DC Adams to state "...in this case there was absolutely no evidence to link [Ladsky] with this matter".
17. Approves of his officers failing to record the content of verbal communication from the police to me – because 'inconvenient' to his officers / Ladsky's 'complaint' - in 2002: **(1)** that the person alleged to have made the anonymous phone calls had "her mobile phone stolen in November 2001" and that "the phone had mysteriously reappeared at her door four months later"; **(2)** bullying me and intimidating me into dropping my complaint, as well as telling me "You won't be able to prove a link with Andrew Ladsky".
18. Approves of his officers failing to acknowledge that at least four of my fellow leaseholders at Jefferson House also complained to K&C police of suffering harassment from Andrew Ladsky – thereby lessening my complaint against him.
19. Last but not least - approves of his officers – who claimed to have 'looked' at my website - turning a blind eye to the 'mountain' of overwhelming 'black on white' evidence of breaches of numerous Acts, that are punishable by imprisonment, such as the [Protection from Harassment Act 1997](#); [the Fraud Act 2006](#); [the Malicious Communications Act 1988](#); [the Theft Act 1968](#); [the Money Laundering Regulations / Proceeds of Crime Act 2002](#); [the Criminal Justice Act & Public Order Act 1994](#), etc.

It follows that, among other, Chief Superintendent Mark Heath, [Kensington police](#):

20. Approves of his officers breaching my rights under the [Data Protection Act 1998](#):
 - to ensure that data held about me is accurate, lawful and fair – and thereby approves of his officers holding data about me that causes me damage and distress;
 - to be provided with the data processed about me – to ensure that fair processing requirements have been complied with, as well as allow me to submit subject access requests to other processors of my personal data.
21. Approves of his officers breaching my rights under the [Human Rights Act 1998](#) – among others: "to be treated fairly and with dignity by the police and without prejudice" (Equality and Human Rights Commission website <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/fairer-britain>)

In a nutshell: Mark Heath approves of his officers providing assistance to a crook in shutting-up his victim - by whatever means.

3. As your '[21 January](#)' 2010 letter was posted on 4 February 2010, day on which my [2 February 2010](#) letter was received by Sir Paul's Office: **what did I complain of in this letter?**

I started section "1. Sir Paul Stephenson and the Rt. Hon. Alan Johnson, MP, Home Secretary" by reminding them of what I wrote in my [28 November 2009](#) letter to both of them, headed "Need for action", which included challenging their claims about the police.

I also stated that I had provided "a brief overview of my experience with K&C police in 2002, 2003 and 2007... - explaining my doing so by stating "trusting that, as the Met's Commissioner, you will take the necessary actions to ensure that the police performs as per its mandate – as well as the laws of the land"

In my 2 February 2010 letter, I followed this by listing the enclosures I had sent to both of them with my 28 November letter, and reminded them of my concluding comments "I hope you will change my perceptions by taking immediate action in relation to K&C police, and ensure the

implementation of my rights: pursuing Andrew Ladsky and parties he instructed for the offences they committed against me; ensuring that police records are amended to reflect my feedback, and my outstanding questions answered”.

I then added another conclusion I had forgotten to include in my [2 December 2009](#) letter: that “Mark Heath evidently approves of TDC Simon J Dowling, a ‘Community Support Officer’, impersonating a police officer,...” – giving evidence in support of my conclusion.

I followed this by stating, among others, that since the [3 December 2009](#) letter from Sir Paul’s Office, which was followed by “an [8 December 2009](#) letter from Hema Patel, Caseworker, Directorate of Professional Standards, Customer Service Team – posted eight days later - on 16 December 2009,...” there had been “TOTAL SILENCE!”

I then state: “I am reporting that (1) I am the victim of crime – supporting my claim with a ‘mountain’ of ‘black on white’ evidence; (2) my local police station has not only opted to turn a blind eye and a deaf ear to the evidence, it has blatantly sided with my attacker; (3) I have a death threat hanging over my head...”

...and THAT is your response Sir Stephenson?!? That is your interpretation of your department’s legal remit? WHY? Are you counting on “my not having long to live”?”

4. → You go on to state in your [‘21 January’ 2010](#) letter: “I have reviewed the issues you raise and I have decided to apply to the Independent Complaints Commission (IPCC) to dispense with your complaint”

Yes, it is abundantly clear that you want to ‘get rid’ of my complaint.

5. → You continue “This is because I consider that you made your complaint more than 12 months after the alleged misconduct without good reason;”

1. As evidenced by the above, your assessment is incorrect.
2. It is fascinating to contrast your response with that of [20 November 2009](#) from Steve McSorley – also of ‘Professional Standards’ – who, as captured above, has not raised any ‘difficulty’ in arriving at his assessment (following my [13 August](#) and [20 September 2009](#) letters of which, the 2 December 2009 letter you refer to – is a summary).

3. You are a “Detective Inspector, in the Directorate of Professional Standards, Prevention and Organisational Learning Command”? No wonder many in the police behave as they do – starting with some individuals in [Kensington & Chelsea police](#).

→ “that your complaint has been made only because you have been unable to obtain the result that you desire through the Public Access Office”

Ditto re. my comment about your role.

→ “and that given the time elapsed it is impracticable to investigate the issues about which you are complaining”

1. Where, in the [Data Protection Act 1998](#), does it specify a time limit for a data subject to seek – and obtain – an end to the processing of data that is false, unlawful, misleading, scurrilous, libellous, biased, corrupted, incomplete in some very significant aspects – as well as obtain correction of the data to ensure that it is “fair, lawful and accurate”?
2. Ditto re. Steve McSorley’s [20 November 2009](#) assessment.
3. What a great message to criminals: ‘Make sure you don’t get caught in the 12 months following your crime. Then, you’ll have nothing to fear, as the police won’t pursue you’.
4. “impracticable” = ‘not in the interest of the officers concerned’ – as, based on the overwhelming ‘black on white’ evidence, they can rightfully be accused of corruption.
5. I also remind you that, with my [13 August 2009](#) reply to Jenna Neville, I supplied a

I subsequently discovered through desk research that he was using Reg.3(2)(a),(f) and (4)(b)(ii) of the Police (Complaints and Misconduct) Regulations 2004 - which is totally irrelevant - as it cannot interfere with my rights under the Data Protection Act

numbered, [101 page bundle of 49 supporting documents](#), preceded by a 2-page content list in chronological order, specifying the page number of each document. The reference to these documents is indicated, as appropriate, at the bottom of the pages of my 13 August 2009 reply.

This bundle includes the main documents in my possession in relation to my 'dealings' with Kensington & Chelsea police, as well as evidence in support of my comments refuting what has been captured in the reports: [CR:5604102/02](#); [CR:5602261/03](#); [CR:5605839/07](#).

8. → **"The IPCC will consider my request and inform you if they have granted a dispensation or whether we are required to deal with your complaint"**

Subsequent note - The answer to my question turned out to be YES... because the police very clearly wrote / dictated the reply... and Nick Harding's claim is deceitful - see [K&C police point # 5, and in particular the latter part](#)

1. Are you expecting the IPCC to exempt Kensington & Chelsea police from compliance with the Data Protection Act 1998?
2. Are you expecting the IPCC to turn a blind eye to what I report?
3. I hope that **Nick Hardwick, Chairman of the IPCC** will be true to his words, reported in The Independent article of 13 February 2010, "[Root out corrupt officers, police told](#)" (<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/crime/root-out-corrupt-officers-police-told-1898139.html>)

"The [Dizaei case] is a wake-up call, let's not wait, let's not go through this cycle again. We need a consistent and determined effort from the top, from the police leaders. There has to be a consistent message that this [corruption] is not acceptable".

"... "There are some people who say this is a very uncomfortable message. They do not want to look too hard [for corruption] and they do not want to hear this. But Dizaei teaches us that if we do not deal with it now, then in the end, it will just get worse. No one is talking about witch-hunt, we just need to be really consistent about this..."

"...By its nature you do not know how much corruption is there. But it is always there. We just do not know how much is beneath the water"...

...as what I am reporting is evidence of **corruption by various individuals at Kensington & Chelsea police.** (I use the term 'corruption' in the sense of the Oxford English Dictionary's definition of "moral depravation", as well as in the sense of "for personal gain", because there has to be a reason for their not performing as per their legal remit). If it is not dealt with, other innocent victims of crime like me will be subjected to the same treatment.

4. My experience also demonstrates that some individuals tasked with ensuring compliance to the police's Professional Standards are failing to perform their remit.
9. → **"Until that decision is made no further action will be taken with your complaint"**

The more accurate statement in the case of your Office for 'Professional Standards' is, like that of your counterpart at Kensington police: **"We will continue to NOT take any action"**

10. → **"If you have any further enquiries, I must ask you to get directly in touch with the IPCC"**

[I am copying this letter to the IPCC.](#)

Yours sincerely

N Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé
<http://www.leasehold-outrage.com>

cc. The Independent Police Complaints Commission, 90 High Holborn, London WC1V 6BH, including the ['21 January' 2010](#) letter from DI Lee

Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

South Kensington Station
41 Old Brompton Road

IPCC

London
Greater London
SW7 3JG

Date and Time: 19/02/2010 14:24
Session Prefix: 6-3006191
Dest: UK (E.U.)
Quantity: 1
Weight: 0.020 kg

Special D by 1 £4.95

Total Cost of Services £4.95

Posted after Last Collection? No

Barcode: ZW45233792568

DESTINATION ADDRESS
Building Name or Number Postcode
90 HIGH HOLBORN WC1V6EH
Address Validated? N

IT IS IMPORTANT THAT YOU RETAIN THIS
RECEIPT AS IT IS YOUR PROOF OF POSTING

PLEASE REFER TO SEPARATE TERMS AND
CONDITIONS

Special Delivery is an express next
day service for the UK, offering a
money back guarantee for delay and
compensation for loss and damage to
your item. Check delivery at
www.postoffice.co.uk or call
08459 272100 quoting your ref number.

This is not a VAT receipt
Thank You

Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

South Kensington Station
41 Old Brompton Road

Loz
DPS

London
Greater London
SW7 3JG

Date and Time: 19/02/2010 14:25
Session Prefix: 6-3006197
Dest: UK (E.U.)
Quantity: 1
Weight: 0.020 kg

1st Class Letter £0.39
Recorded £0.75
Receipt £0.00

Total Cost of Services £1.14

Posted after Last Collection? No

Barcode: BR5272601896B

DESTINATION ADDRESS
Building Name or Number Postcode
JUBILEE HSE SW152PD
Address Validated? N

IT IS IMPORTANT THAT YOU RETAIN THIS
RECEIPT AS IT IS YOUR PROOF OF POSTING

PLEASE REFER TO SEPARATE TERMS AND
CONDITIONS

We do not pay compensation for
money, jewellery or valuables sent by
Recorded Signed For. Check
delivery at www.postoffice.co.uk
or call 08459 272100, quoting your
reference number.

This is not a VAT receipt
Thank You

Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt
South Kensington Station
41 Old Brompton Road
London
Greater London
SW7 3JG

VAT REG No. 243 1706 02
19/02/2010 14:26
SESSION : 6-3006191-3

Post Label SD 4.95
1 @ 4.95
Post Label 1L 1.14
1 @ 1.14
TOTAL DUE TO POST OFFICE 6.09
Cash FROM CUSTOMER 20.00
Cash TO CUSTOMER 13.91
BALANCE 0.00

Thank You



- [Delivery Services](#)
- [Marketing Services](#)
- [Logistics Services](#)
- [Discounts & Payment](#)



Home

Home > Track and trace >

Track and trace

- Sending tracked mail
- Tracking your mail

Top links

- > Find a postcode
- > Postal prices
- > Shop
- > Track an item
- > A-Z
- > Work for us
- > Customer service

Track it down

Please enter your 13 character reference
e.g. AA000100019GB

ZW452337925GB

Track item

[How to find your reference number](#)



Your item with reference **ZW452337925GB** was delivered from our **WEST CENTRAL LONDON Delivery Office** on 22/02/10.

Thank you for using this service.

We can confirm that this item was delivered before the guaranteed time.

The electronic Proof of Delivery may not be available for this item yet. Please allow up to 72 hours after delivery before checking.

[View Proof of Delivery](#)