Strasbourg, 19 February 2013

Dear Ms Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé,

Thank you for your letter dated 15 January 2013 which we received on 21 January, addressed to the Secretary General, concerning your application with the European Court of Human Rights which has been declared inadmissible.

I regret to inform you that the Secretary General of the Council of Europe cannot intervene in respect of any judicial proceedings initiated before the Court, either when they are pending or once they have been concluded.

Your letter has, however, been forwarded to the Registry of the Court for information.

Please address all future correspondence directly to the Central Office of the Registry of the Court. Please also kindly note that there will be no further correspondence from the Private Office of the Secretary General regarding this matter.

Yours sincerely,

Ms Noëlle Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé
It was posted in France on 26.2.13.

- Took delivery on 21 March.
- It was delivered at PO Box on 19 or 20 March.
- The letter had been opened.

Ms Noëlle Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé
1 Background

(As detailed in my 15.01.13 letter to Nils Muižnieks, Commissioner for Human Rights, Council of Europe)

My 26.01.12 Application to the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR), was rejected in a 06.06.12 letter, claiming a decision by Judge Vincent A. De Gaetano (Malta), that my Application "[failed] to meet the admissibility criteria set out in Articles 34 and 35 of the Convention".

However, in blatant breach of Article 45 of the European Convention, he FAILED to state in what way. My analysis of both Articles (ECt # 2) led to me to the conclusion that the assertion is FALSE.

Wanting to get confirmation of my conclusions, I sent an 18.09.12 letter (with my analysis) to Sir Nicolas Bratza, then British President of the court - asking: "Please, let me know in what way, if any, my conclusions are incorrect – such that they justify Judge De Gaetano’s rejection of my Application."

(Typically) (Overview # 7), to avoid dealing with my question, the 11.10.12 ‘reply’ misrepresented my letter – thereby amounting to confirmation that the rejection of my Application CANNOT be justified – as well as to another ‘GET LOST!’ (ECt # 2.1)

Having failed to resolve the situation at the level of the court, I escalated my complaint to Nils Muižnieks, Commissioner for Human Rights, Council of Europe, by letter of 15.01.13, and to Thorbjørn Jagland, Secretary General for the Council of Europe, by letter of 15.01.13. (Overview # 18.5)

2 ‘Response’ from Mr Jagland and Mr Nils Muižnieks

(As discussed under ECt # 4(2)) the 19.02.13 ‘response’ from Mr Thorbjørn Jagland, Secretary General for the Council of Europe (intercepted by the British State - see below), to my 15.01.13 letter to him – with which I copied him on my 15.01.13 letter to Mr Nils Muižnieks, Commissioner for Human Rights, Council of Europe, was:

“...the Secretary General of the Council of Europe cannot intervene in respect of any judicial proceedings initiated before the Court, either when they are pending or once they have been concluded”

In relation to Mr Nils Muižnieks (discussed under ECt # 4(1)) - in spite of my sending him a 04.03.13 chaser letter (comprising of a copy of: my 15.01.13 letter to him + all its enclosures + proof of postage, and of delivery + copy of my 15.01.13 letter to Mr Jagland) - more than 2 months later, he had NOT responded. It led me to phone him on 26th March.
The woman who replied tried to get rid of me immediately, by telling me: "The Commissioner does not deal with individual complaints". I replied that I was aware of this – as I stated in my 15.01.13 letter.

Then: "He cannot interfere with judicial decisions" = SAME excuse as above.

To my challenging her by saying that my complaint refers to the BREACH OF THE CONVENTION BY THE COURT - hence "it is NOT a judicial decision" – she still would not bulge.

I said: "So, the message from the Commissioner to country X, Y, Z is: do we as we say, but don’t do as we do; the Court is exempt from compliance with the European Convention. FANTASTIC!"

This is A BLATANT MISREPRESENTATION of my complaint – which is clearly DELIBERATE = ANOTHER ‘GET LOST’!

...as THE ISSUE IS – VERY CLEARLY - NOT “A JUDICIAL DECISION”,

...– but FAILURE BY THE EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS TO COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE EUROPEAN CONVENTION – specifically: ARTICLE 45.

The obvious conclusion from the above is that BOTH, the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, and the Commissioner for Human Rights...

...- perceive the European Court of Human Rights - as being EXEMPT FROM COMPLIANCE with the requirements of the European Convention...

...ALL because ‘Dear Mr Andrew David Ladsky’ decided he was ‘entitled’ to make a multi-million £ jackpot - through extortion - at my expense (and that of my fellow leaseholders)...

...And they ALL said: YES! Of course, O' Great One!

I wonder: do they ALL have a timeshare on the penthouse apartment? (Planning application: Land Registry title)... that was: "categorically NOT going to be built" (Brian Gale, MRICS, 13.12.02 "Expert Witness" report to the London LVT), “because it was not a viable proposition" (Joan Hathaway, MRICS, MRJ - 04.03.03 letter) (Overview # 3). [Major works]

If so, given the ever-growing sheer number of those involved on protecting him, they will soon run out of days in the year.

For the IMPLICATIONS ON ME, of the above: see my Comments attached to the ECtHR’s letter of 06.06.12 / ECT # 5.
3 Of particular note - in the light of events

3.1 28 Feb 13 speech by my Mr Jagland

In the light of:

(1) the content of my 26.01.12 Application;

(2) my subsequent experience with: (i) the court (ECt # 2) ; (ii) Mr Jagland (ECt # 4(2)); (iii) Mr Muižnieks (ECt # 4(1))..

...– some of Mr Jagland’s comments in his 28 Feb 13 ‘Address to the High Level Segment of the United Nations Human Rights Council’ (access through ‘Speeches 2013’) are worth of particular note:

"...the three most pressing challenges we are facing currently in Europe...

The first is the fight against corruption and other forms of misuse of power. Corruption is a threat to democracy and it undermines citizens’ trust in the rule of law.”

"According to recent data, almost three quarters of the citizens of Europe perceive corruption as a major problem in their country..."

"The first precondition for fighting corruption is a trustworthy, effective and independent judiciary. The problems in this sector are many. Some have lengthy proceedings, in other countries the judiciary is corrupted or controlled by the executive power"

"Fighting corruption also requires genuine freedom of expression..."

"...a number of Council of Europe human rights treaties complement UN standards. Together they form an unprecedented and effective legal framework to protect human dignity"

"All these treaties have an integrated approach including prevention measures, protection of victims..."

3.2 UK applications “declared inadmissible or struck out” by the court

Also worth noting, is the ‘fascinating’ statistic about the Court’s handling of applications from the UK, in 2012 (year of my Application) – under the British Presidency of Sir Nicolas Bratza (ECt # 2.1):
I produced the graph using the ECtHR's data from its 'Analysis of statistics' (available from its website) for 2011 (reduced copy) and 2012 (reduced copy).

As can be seen, in 2012, the percentage of UK applications "Declared inadmissible or struck out" more than doubled - from 28% in 2011, to 62% in 2012.

(More detail under E Ct # 3)

4 Other points about the 19.02.13 letter from Mr Jagland

"Your letter has, however, been forwarded to the Registry of the Court for information"

"for information" =

- To provide the Court with confirmation that the Secretary General approves of its breaching the European Convention?
- For those concerned to continue to have a good laugh at my expense?

(Typically), as part of the ongoing criminal psychological harassment regime (*) THE BRITISH STATE INTERCEPTED THE LETTER.

(*) Persecution # 1

The same thing happened with the Court's 28.02.12 letter of acknowledgment of my 26.01.12 Application (as can be seen from the copy of the envelop attached at the back of the letter).

This time, as can be seen from the copy of the envelop attached to the 19.02.13 letter, on top of the French franking, a sticker was affixed, stating: "TNT post, 178, 2 L, WB1, EC1, LPG PO Box 903, Aylesbury, HP2 09FL"

The French franking states: 'Economique Autorisation', '99 Paris Inter'; 'Port Payé France'; '26.02.13' (which is 1 week AFTER the date of the letter! = hint of something going on).

(Contrast with e.g. the envelop in which the 06.06.12 rejection of my Application was sent). (More detail under E Ct # 4 (2)(3))

Outcome: the letter arrived at my PO Box on 19th or 20th March i.e. nearly 1 month after being posted.

Further, to make sure that all concerned had a good laugh (*): it arrived open 'due to' using an envelop on which the gum did not stick.
My conclusion influenced principally by the fact that it was posted 1 week AFTER the date of the letter.

The motivation this time for the criminal psychological harassment by the British State - et.al.?

(Among others) counting on the fact that, lack of reply would lead me to waste my time and money to send a chaser letter to Mr Jagland (04.03.13) – so that the psychos could get their sadistic kick.