

- Events discussed under **Pridie Brewster**
- Snapshot: **Doc library # 6.1**

No, not headed paper unlike e.g. the **23.08.05** letter

06 September 2005

Our Ref: I69236/JV/hg

PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL

Ms N K-Dit-Rawé

Jefferson House
11 Basil Street
London
SW3 1AX

Dear Ms N K-Dit-Rawé

Re: Complaint against Pridie Brewster

Thank you for your letter dated 1 September 2005.

I note that the full LVT decision is available and I can confirm that as is standard practice in cases such as these I have already obtained a copy of the decision.

I note also the fact that you object to being provided with 7 days for a response. I would highlight that my original letter was dated 4 August 2005 and my letter dated 23 August was a letter chasing a reply and hence you were provided with approximately 26 days to provide a response. However, if at any time you require an extension to respond for a reasonable reason (annual leave being a common reason at this time of year), then do not hesitate to contact me and a reasonable extension can be granted.

Thank you for highlighting that Steel Services Limited is a company. However, the accounts provided are not statutory accounts per the Companies Act. For example, the accounts are not 'financial statements' in the form prescribed by the Companies Act as they do not contain a profit and loss accounts, balance sheet, cash flow and other notes required. Further, the accounts are not held out to be statutory Limited company financial statements.

Therefore, I would revert to my query in; what legislation are you referring to when you state that the previous accounts need to be adjusted and reissued? This is an important query as Pridie Brewster will want to know what legislation and rules you are looking at when you make this complaint. Just because you believe that this would be the appropriate course of action is not sufficient reason for a Pridie Brewster's actions to be misconduct.

section 19(2) of the Landlord & Tenant Act 1985

Your letter dated 1 September 2005 stated that it appears that Pridie Brewster have taken the information from the managing agents 'without question'. I would refer you again to the accountant's report. The accountant's report is not that of an audit per the Companies Act or a review per the Landlord & Tenants Act, but merely states that they have examined the records provided to them by the managing agent. Therefore, the accountant's report is saying exactly what you are saying, in that Pridie Brewster only reviewed information provided to them (and no-audit was conducted). You may wish to have a higher level of assurance and hence request a review (which is still not

- Continuation of the dictatorial tone from **Jim Vessey**, with a grossly inflated sense of self-importance (his previous letter of **23.08.05**) - note that:
(1)- you are supposed to be psychic i.e. guess when the ICAEW might 'lower itself' to respond to you;
(2)- you 'must ask' it for 'permission' to not jump immediately when it decides to do so - and it will be the judge as to whether or not your reason for not doing so is "reasonable"

Because I did not respond, the little dictator communicated in 'his' **02.11.05** letter the had "closed down" what he inaccurately described as "the investigation". **However, I had not given up: my 07.03.06 letter to ICAEW**

26 days from 4th to 23rd August? Yep! It's the Institute of Chartered

And opted to ignore it - because 'inconvenient'

Which states: "Where a service charge is payable before the relevant costs are incurred, no greater amount than is reasonable is so payable" ... added to my Lease: **Clause (2)(2)(c)(ii)** - that states the same thing

= Pridie Brewster are just (expensive) typesetters...who ignored my lease - and legislation

Unbelievable!
See my **07.03.06** letter to the ICAEW

Again: **unbelievable!** He states: (1)- "*the LVT has looked at the reasonableness of costs*";
(2)- at the beginning of the letter that he "*has a copy of the LVT report*": **LVT # 4 ; Brian Gale #5**

an audit under the Companies Act) under the Landlord & Tenants Act and as in my previous letter I suggest that you direct this request at the managing agent.

The issue is that these findings have NOT been reflected in the accounts - and the costs have NOT sufficiently supported - as I pointed out in my 07.03.06 letter to the ICAEW

Finally, I note the extracts quoted from the LVT, but the LVT is looking at the reasonableness of costs, something that Pride Brewster has not done. It will be for the tenant or the landlord to separately consider whether the costs disclosed in the summary are excessive and, if necessary, to take the dispute to the LVT who can consider this matter.

I have not identified any heads of complaint that would, in my personal opinion, lead to a potential disciplinary action and I would be grateful for a response within the next 14 days which clarifies your complaints that can be proven and would be misconduct under our Disciplinary Bye-laws. (If you require an extension please contact me on my direct number below or via my e-mail).

Here we go again: 'must ask for permission!'

I am on annual leave from 30 September to 23 October 2005 inclusive and I apologise for any delay that this will cause. Is the objective of this 'training'?

Yours sincerely

Jim Vessey ACA
Case Manager
Professional Conduct Directorate

Direct Telephone: 01908 546373
Department Fax: 01908 546271
Email: James.Vessey@icaew.co.uk

= Henchman of the Jewish-Freemason Brotherhood

- 'I' = the Jewish-Freemason Brotherhood (Persecution # 6)
- "**haven't identified**":
= 'because I was told to ignore the very damning evidence...
as, for starters, we had to protect 'the brothers' i.e. bent judiciary in **West London County Court** and **Wandsworth County Court** who had **illegally** made your fellow leaseholders pay monies that were **not due and payable**' (**kangaroo courts**)