

As discussed under **Lord Falconer of Thoroton # 5.2 and # 5.3** that corrupt West London County Court continued with the criminal psychological harassment (Persecution # 1) - by:  
**(1)- denying that a hearing had taken place';**  
**(2)-sending the wrong tape to the transcribing company - resulting in my not getting this transcript until more than 2 months later.**

43 North End Road  
London W14 8SZ  
Friday, 28th May 2004

I have to say, as I am reading through this 11 years later (in 2015) - it still makes my blood boil to see this unbelievable moral depravation and corruption

Before:

**DISTRICT JUDGE MADGE**

(In Chambers)

**Who proceeded with the 28 May 04 so-called 'hearing' (WLCC # 13.2) - IN SPITE of knowing - from the RCJ - that DUE to the court's fault I could NOT attend.**

**YEP! DEFINITELY PART OF HER MAJESTY'S KANGAROO COURTS!**

BETWEEN:

**STEEL SERVICES**

=criminal Andrew David Ladsky

Claimant

- and -

**DIT-RAWE & Ors.**

Defendants

Transcribed by **BEVERLEY F. NUNNERY & CO**  
Official Shorthand Writers and Tape Transcribers  
Quality House, Quality Court, Chancery Lane, London WC2A 1HP  
Tel: 020 7831 5627 Fax: 020 7831 7737

**Ayesha Salim**

MS. SALIN (Solicitor, Messrs. **Cawdery Kaye Fireman & Taylor**) appeared on behalf of the Claimant. **Andrew David Ladsky's corrupt racketeer solicitors**

**THE DEFENDANTS** did not attend and were not represented.

**SURPRISE!  
SURPRISE!  
The conspiring worked!  
(WLCC # 13.2)**

PROCEEDINGS

And we ARE at the mercy of these  
judges (+ Judge Wright + Judge Ashworth)  
don't read/don't want to read documents  
in files, preferring to 'map-up' what solicitors  
tell them

1 DISTRICT JUDGE MADGE: This is a directions hearing listed because there was  
2 apparently non-compliance with a number of the directions. So far as I can see  
3 disclosure has taken place.

4  
5 MS. SALIN: Disclosure has taken place. Sir, I do not know if you have had the  
6 opportunity to read a short skeleton argument that I have prepared?

7  
8 DISTRICT JUDGE MADGE: No, I have not, because it was handed in late. What has  
9 happened with witness statements?

10 In the same way that he ignored the very damning evidence e.g. my 09.08.03 letter to Wright

11 MS. SALIN: Witness statements have not been exchanged yet.

NO, because they got my 19.10.03 WS - and responded with a 21.10.03 Part 36 offer (WS pg)

13 DISTRICT JUDGE MADGE: When are they going to be exchanged?

14  
15 MS. SALIN: As far as the fourth defendant is concerned, we have agreed a timetable of  
16 directions. They have said that they can provide copies of the documents that we  
17 have requested from their list.

18  
19 DISTRICT JUDGE MADGE: So I need to deal with inspection first, do I?

= Her Majesty's, at best, totally incompetent judge,  
needing to take directions from the corrupt lawyer!

21 MS. SALIN: Yes.

23 DISTRICT JUDGE MADGE: You say "the defendant", which of the defendants?

25 MS. SALIN: It is only the fourth defendant. As far as the second defendant is  
26 concerned, there is a completely separate issue.

Referring to me (2nd on the  
29.11.02 claim)

28 DISTRICT JUDGE MADGE: 4 p.m. on 11th June. The fourth defendant do send to  
29 the claimants' solicitors copies of the items requested at 3 and 4 in its list of  
30 documents by 4 o'clock on 11th June.

32 MS. SALIN: Thank you, sir, and we agreed the exchange of witness statements by  
33 9th July.

35 DISTRICT JUDGE MADGE: Given what has happened, I am considering making an  
36 order that if that is not complied with the other party be at liberty to serve  
37 unilaterally and the defaulting party be debarred from calling evidence. Is there  
38 any reason why I should not do that?

=Continuing to fall over backwards to help speed  
up 'the brother' (Persecution # 6) Andrew Ladsky's  
theft of monies...  
...so that he can realise his multi-million £ jackpot!

40 MS. SALIN: No, that is fine, sir.

And Her Majesty's judge Madge - who very clearly, has not read a single word in the file - does NOT ask for ANY explanation whatsoever - such as querying why 'Steel Services' (= Ladsky) made me a 21.10.03 Part 36 offer for £6,350 - when his 29.11.02 claim against me was for £14,400 i.e. knocked off £8,000!

1 DISTRICT JUDGE MADGE: Correct me if I am wrong, but I think the directions  
2 allowed for experts?

3  
4 MS. SALIN: In relation to the second defendant only.

5  
6 DISTRICT JUDGE MADGE: Has that been complied with or not?

My 19.12.03 Acceptance Notice- for £6,350- even though, legally, I did NOT owe this either- Overview # 3

LYING  
VERMIN! See  
e.g. the RCJ's  
02.04.04 letter  
to the court

7 MS. SALIN: That has not, no. As far as the second defendant is concerned, we have  
8 received payment from her and the matter, in principle, is settled, but we have been  
9 unable to agree the terms of a consent order. Different versions have been flying  
10 back and forward since November 2003, but the second defendant is not prepared  
11 to sign the consent order that we have submitted to her. Historically it has been a  
12 case of the consent order that she submitted has included works that may possibly  
13 take place in the future to the property and not just the amount that is claimed  
14 within this claim. The problem is that we simply have not been able to get a signed  
15 consent order in terms of the second defendant. The money has been received and  
16 accepted.

What?

What they wanted me  
to endorse: 27.04.04

Months later: 17.02.04

Since Sep And Dec 2003 !!

17  
18 DISTRICT JUDGE MADGE: So all that is outstanding is what the claimants'  
19 obligations to her are - is that right or is that over-simplifying it?

20  
21  
22 MS. SALIN: Sir, if I can show you - there are a few letters attached to the skeleton  
23 argument that I have handed to you. There are various different draft consent  
24 orders attached to that, starting with the earliest draft prepared by the defendant's  
25 then solicitors.

The 13.11.03 'draft' I refused to endorse, because it said 'amen' to  
Ladsky (it includes my Comments). It sent the cabal into a rage.

26  
27 DISTRICT JUDGE MADGE: The money has been paid and it is said there is no order  
28 for costs - is that right?

Between the mafia - NOT with me! Events captured in my Comments added to the 13.11.03 draft

Oh dear! the  
Defendant  
refused to be  
tricked!

29 MS. SALIN: Yes, that was what was agreed in November. The defendant subsequently  
30 disinstucted her solicitors and served a replacement notice of acceptance whereby  
31 she refused to pay the interest that had been agreed with her solicitors. Just for the  
32 sake of settling the matter we agreed to that, submitted another draft consent order,  
33 but since then the two draft orders that she has submitted to us have included  
34 monies that may be outside the scope of these proceedings.

What?

35  
36  
37 DISTRICT JUDGE MADGE: Is it sensible for me simply to stay the claim against her?

And HE DID! pt 4 of the Order - IN SPITE OF KNOWING that agreement had been reached!

38 MS. SALIN: Yes, if I can show the last order that she sent us yesterday that she would  
39 be prepared to accept, I think that is fine. I am just concerned because she is not

WHAT! Criminal Rachman vermin Ladsky had  
other plans: he repeated the same demand (YES!),  
and later on, filed another fraudulent claim against  
me - again relying on his judiciary mates for  
unlimited assistance: Overview # 6 & 10

(A) Don't bother yourself with  
the facts Judge Madge!

Double-dealing hypocrite! Salim KNEW why I did not attend, as she had played an active part in it.

1 here today and that is unusual for her. I am conscious that I do not particularly  
2 want to vary from that too much, given that she may make an application to vary  
3 the order herself.

=Realised from what took place in Nov & Dec 03 (13.11.02 draft;  
pg my 19 Oct 03 WS) that I was not going to be a push over

4  
5 DISTRICT JUDGE MADGE: Is there anything wrong with this draft consent order of  
6 24th May?

7  
8 MS. SALIN: This one that we received yesterday, no, I do not see anything wrong with  
9 that because that is limited to this claim, but historically one ---

LIAR! RCJ's  
02.04.04 ltr

10  
11 DISTRICT JUDGE MADGE: You should sign it and get it back to her before she  
12 changes her mind.

YEP! Definitely a member of the Brotherhood (Persecution # 6)

13  
14 MS. SALIN: I am happy with that order, sir, if it can be made in those terms. I do not  
15 think she will have any objection to it either.

I was the 2nd Defendant

16  
17 DISTRICT JUDGE MADGE: I do not think, without her being here, I can force it on  
18 her, but what I can do is simply say the claim against the fourth defendant be  
19 stayed. In fact, let me say, "Terms having been agreed", because you tell me they  
20 are agreed.

ABSOLUTELY OUTRAGEOUS! See Lord Falconer of Thoroton # 5.2  
and # 5.3 for his 23.08.04 'response' to my 29.06.04 'cry for help'

21  
22 MS. SALIN: Yes.

23  
24 DISTRICT JUDGE MADGE: Yes, "Terms having been agreed the claimant against the  
25 fourth defendant be stayed".

Any other freebie you could throw in for good  
measure judge Madge?

26  
27 MS. SALIN: Thank you, sir. Sorry, that is the second defendant.

Yes, 'thank you ever so much Sir'...for including this as pt 4 of 'your' 28.05.04 Order! Hahahahaha!

28  
29 DISTRICT JUDGE MADGE: Yes, I am sorry, the second defendant. Then if I say "As  
30 between the claimant and the fourth defendant costs in the case"?

31  
32 MS. SALIN: Yes, sir, thank you.

33  
34 DISTRICT JUDGE MADGE: What should happen about listing?

35  
36 MS. SALIN: Neither party as far as I can see has any dates to avoid, and once witness  
37 statements have been exchanged there are no further directions.

38  
39 DISTRICT JUDGE MADGE: What is the time estimate?  
40

1 MS. SALIN: As between us and the fourth defendant it is one day, I think.

2  
3 DISTRICT JUDGE MADGE: **Remind me about allocation, is this fast-track or multi-**  
4 **track?**

5  
6 MS. SALIN: It is multi-track - but let me just check. Yes, it is multi-track.

7  
8 DISTRICT JUDGE MADGE: So if I simply say the claimants' claim against the **fourth**  
9 **defendant** be listed for hearing before the circuit judge - when are we talking about  
10 realistically, during August?

11  
12 MS. SALIN: Sir. Sir, I am so sorry, I have just checked and I have got my numbering  
13 wrong, **we are actually talking about the fifth defendant rather than the fourth**  
14 **defendant.**

The 5th Defendant: another  
case of BLATANT INJUSTICE

15  
16 DISTRICT JUDGE MADGE: **Throughout?**

17  
18 MS. SALIN: Yes, **so the directions and the trial are in relation to the fifth defendant.**

19  
20 DISTRICT JUDGE MADGE: "The claimants' claim against the fifth defendant be  
21 listed for hearing before the circuit judge between 1st and 31st August with a time  
22 estimate of one day", there being no dates to avoid.

23  
24 What is the position about expert evidence with the fifth defendant?

25  
26 MS. SALIN: **The issues that remain in relation to the fifth defendant will not require**  
27 **expert evidence.**

28  
29 DISTRICT JUDGE MADGE: Right. **Is there anything else that I can usefully do**  
30 **before I print out the order?** \*

31  
32 MS. SALIN: I do not think so, sir, I think that is everything.

33  
34 DISTRICT JUDGE MADGE: The court will obviously send a copy to the fifth  
35 defendant in due course, but it would be helpful if you could send a photocopy  
36 straight away. Thank you very much.

37  
Better still: (as Lord Falconer of Thoroton  
would not sack you and prosecute you  
for failing to perform your official remit)  
RESIGN so that you stop inflicting so  
much injustice on 'the little people'

from the point of view of justice?  
Yeah! Read the evidence!

4 And challenge what you  
are being told. That would  
be a good start!!