



16 March 2006

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

Please quote our reference in all correspondence  
I69236/VSS/lcb

**PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL**

**Ms N K-Dit-Rawé**

3 Jefferson House  
11 Basil Street  
LONDON  
SW3 1AX

Turns a blind eye to  
criminal conduct

'She' certainly demonstrated just how "seriously the Institute takes its obligations as a Regulatory Body" - in 'her' follow-on letters - starting with 'her' **13.04.06** letter = "obligation" to, for starters, protect the **corrupt judiciary 'brothers'** (Persecution # 6) who illegally made the Jefferson House leaseholders pay monies that were not **due and payable** (kangaroo courts)

Dear Ms K-Dit-Rawé

**INVESTIGATION OF A COMPLAINT CONCERNING PRIDIE BREWSTER**

Reality:  
switch of  
caseworker  
because of  
my  
challenge

Thank you for your letter dated 7 March 2006 addressed to **Jim Vessey**. **Mr Vessey has now left the Institute** and therefore the letter has been passed to me.

I will now re-open this case and once I have reviewed the file I will provide you with a more detailed response. I hope to do this within the next fourteen days.

I can assure you that the opinion expressed by Mr Wilkins is incorrect. The Institute takes its obligations as a Regulatory Body very seriously and does carry out investigations into potential cases of misconduct. There is a meeting of the Investigation Committee on a monthly basis and at each meeting approximately 25 cases are heard. This Committee is independent and is not out to represent the interests of the members. This is demonstrated by the numerous findings of this Committee against our members. If it is found that a member has rendered himself liable to disciplinary action then appropriate actions are taken.

Ignoring the content of my letters

Complaints under the Landlord & Tenant Act are always problematic. This usually arises out of the misunderstanding of the level of comfort provided by an Accountant's Report. Such reports do not usually give the same level of assurance as an audit report. The accountant is not required to assess whether costs are reasonable, rather they need to ensure that costs are supported by receipts.

I will now review your file in detail and will contact you again with my detailed response.

Yours sincerely

VSSm

**Vicky Smith ACA (Mrs)**  
Case Manager  
Professional Conduct Directorate

Direct Dial: 01908 546385  
Direct Fax: 01908 546271  
Email: [vicky.smith@icaew.co.uk](mailto:vicky.smith@icaew.co.uk)

(A) "reasonable" They keep on bringing this up. In spite of my pointing out in my 7 March 2006 letter: "The issues do not involve the question of reasonableness of the charges, but lack of supporting evidence, duplication..."

= Continuing to use the (typical) **'Frustrate and discourage tactics'** (header 2)

cc **Pridie Brewster**

