

Our ref: RLS/BDF/Steel
Your ref: LVT/SC/007/120/02

Direct tel: 020 7317 8714
Direct fax: 020 7317 8750
E-mail: lsilverstone@ckft.com

The Chairman
Leasehold Valuation Tribunal
DX: 134205
Tottenham Court Road 2

17 July 2003

Dear Sir

See 21 Jul 03 reply from LVT stating it's not its job to do this - ONLY to determine the global sum - which APPLIES TO ALL...something CKFT, West London County Court, MRJ and accountant Pridie Brewster decided they could ignore...
...with the help of the LVT that FAILED to perform its remit

Flats 1-35 Jefferson House, 11 Basil Street, London SW3

We are solicitors for the Applicant in this matter.

We refer to the decision of the LVT dated 17 June 2003. Our client's Council has advised us that the LVT was asked to make a determination of the specific amount of service charge payable by the tenant of Flat 3, Ms Dit Rawe (the Respondent to the LVT proceedings). We enclose a revised schedule prepared by the managing agents in light of your decision and would ask whether the LVT wishes to receive written or oral submissions as to the amount payable by Ms Rawe. !

Yours faithfully

"The RespondentS to the LVT proceedings" instigated by Silverstone's client, SS = Andrew Ladsky's 7 Aug 02 application relates to ALL the Jefferson House leaseholders
The reason i ended-up on my own during the hearings is because of collusion + unlawful filing of 22 Nov 02 claim in West London County Court

CKFT
Enc

CC – Ms Dit Rawe & Client

Ms Noelle K-Dit-Rawe
3 Jefferson House
11 Basil Street
London SW3 1AX

17 July 2003

Dear Madam

Steel Services Limited v Yourself & Others
Claim number: WL203537
Flat 3, Jefferson House, Basil Street London SW1

We enclose copy of letters we have today sent to the Court and the LVT.

We also enclose copy of the revised Account showing how the reduced sum was calculated.

It does NOT reflect the 17 June 2003 LVT 'determination' - see my 15 Jul 03 letter to WLCC

!!

We also take this opportunity to repeat our offer to attend a round table meeting in an effort to resolve this matter.

Yours faithfully

CKFT
Enc

The only way to resolve it is by implementing the 17 June 2003 LVT determination - and to do so as per the terms of my lease and statutory requirements
Its client, Ladsky, wants to 'STRIKE A DEAL' instead of doing this. WHY?
Because it leaves the door wide open to rip-off the leaseholders

I WAS PROVEN RIGHT - see on my site, in addition to CKFT: My Diary 22 Nov 08;
Major works; LVT; Brian Gale; Pridie Brewster; Martin Russell Jones; West London County Court

CC – District Judge Wright & Client