



Metropolitan Police Authority

Ms Noelle Rawe
3 Jefferson House
11 Basil Street
Londobn
SW3 1AX

10 Dean Farrar Street
London
SW1H 0NY

Telephone: 020 7202 0188
Fax: 020 7202 0200

Email: natasha.porter@mpa.gov.uk
Ref: RAWE001/020809/NP

11 July 2002

Dear Ms Rawe,

Thank you for your letter of 5th May 2002. I have consulted the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) on this matter and have the following information.

Your initial complaint was recorded on 18th February 2002 (CRIS reference 5604102/02) under the Malicious Communications Act. As stated in your letter the telephone numbers from which the silent calls were made were identified through British Telecom on 20th February 2002.

On 22nd February 2002 DC Adams discussed this information with you and suggested various options, which you declined at that time, and the telephone numbers were then submitted to the Telephone Investigation Unit for a subscriber check on 25th February 2002. Unfortunately, due to the volume of casework there was a long delay in securing this information, which clearly caused you some concern. This being the case, the investigating officer took it upon himself to ascertain the identity of the caller by telephoning the identified number (20th March 2002). It was at this time that your neighbour, Mrs ██████ was identified as the caller. When asked how you wished to proceed at this time you said that you needed more information and time to consider your position.

Having considered your options, you informed DC Adams that you wished to pursue this matter further. This resulted in Mrs ██████ receiving a formal warning for having made the nuisance calls.

These are the circumstances as I understand them, but your letter raises two particular concerns, which I should like to address in turn.

Firstly, you seem convinced that Mrs ██████ acted under the direction of Mr Ladsky. While this may or may not be the case, the police cannot act on the basis of your suspicions, however strongly held, and must only act on the basis of established facts. This being the case they have traced all but two of the nuisance calls to Mrs ██████ who has not admitted to the police or yourself that she was put under duress by Mr Ladsky to make those calls. There was, therefore, no option other than to hold Mrs ██████ fully responsible for this crime and since she is of previously good character and showed obvious remorse, she was given a formal warning.

!!!

Although the subscriber for the landline was never identified, you must appreciate that officers have to act with consideration for resource and time expenditure when investigating a case and as such, it seems reasonable to assume that following Mrs [redacted]'s confession nothing further would be gained by ascertaining that information. While I can understand your frustration at this turn of events, it does seem unlikely that ascertaining this information would assist your ultimate goal, which appears to be to prove that you are being harassed by a party or parties that wish to force the sale of your home for their own financial gain.

I WAS PROVEN RIGHT!!!!

Secondly, you say in your letter that you are no longer happy to deal with Kensington police and that you would like me to arrange an independent review of the investigation. However, the Authority does not have the power to investigate or intervene in such matters, which fall within the remit of the Commissioner. Cases of this nature can be extremely difficult to prove, but given the assurances you have received from DCI Webster that any evidenced criminal allegations will be investigated as appropriate, I would suggest that you continue in your efforts to document any incidents that take place, ensuring your personal safety by only holding meetings in the presence of another witness and that you report any criminal activity to your local station.

Really ???
!!

Yours sincerely,

Toby Harris
Metropolitan Police Authority, Chair