

-----Original Message-----

From: [ @leasehold-outrage.com]

Sent: 09 April 2007 21:47

To: 'Martin F[ ]

Subject: RE: Lease

Importance: High

Hello Martin

I am only just getting round to reading your email as the last few days have been very hectic. (e.g going without sleep for 48 hours in order to finish my document of evidence to contest the court's jurisdiction - which I had to send by Wednesday in order to meet the 14 day deadline)

I was so exhausted and so dreading to be in the 'hell hole' over Easter that since Friday I have been staying with friends - during which I spent more than half the time sleeping. Only came in the office this afternoon.

You sent a cheque to Portner and Jaskel? Seriously? I am sure you must be serious. Martin you are so very kind but, I do NOT owe the money these corrupt solicitors and their client claim I owe.

I have explained that in the document I sent to the court on Wednesday.

See the entry in My Diary 4 April 2007 under which I have placed the document I sent to the court. I supplied 64 documents as back-up evidence which, for the purpose of placing the document I sent to the court on the site - I have hyperlinked every reference contained in the document to the documents I supplied as appendices in support of my position.

Your very kind gesture is going to be perceived as an admission that I owe the monies claimed. I do NOT!!!!

While I can prove, among others, from the document I sent to the court that I most definitely do NOT admit to owing the amounts claimed - and therefore I had no knowledge of what you did, you must contact Portner and Jaskel and say that you are going to stop the cheque.

I don't know what you wrote to Portner and Jaskel but, you must explain that you did this of your own bat.

My lease is on the site. It's actually one of the hyperlinked documents.

And, no: I am not using a lawyer as I can do things better by myself.

Thank you again for your very kind gesture.

Please, contact Portner and Jaskel ASAP

Kind regards

-----Original Message-----

From: [ @leasehold-outrage.com]

Sent: 21 March 2007 01:58

To: 'Martin F [ ]'

Subject: RE: Last comment

Dear Martin

How very kind and thoughtful of you.

I have yet to look at the detail of the claim as it's going to be an absolute nightmare. (It took me 7 hrs to go through the mess in 2002. Imagine now! ) Hence, have not looked at the ground rent amounts. I will certainly refer back to your comments when I do. Thank you very much.

The reason I have not paid it is that I have a £6,100 credit because, as I referred to e.g. under the entry in My Diary for 9 March 2007 ([http://www.leasehold-outrage.com/pg\\_home/my\\_diary\\_2007.htm](http://www.leasehold-outrage.com/pg_home/my_diary_2007.htm) ) -

and explain in detail under section 29 for Martin Russell Jones [http://www.leasehold-outrage.com/pg\\_works/martin\\_russell\\_jones.htm#mrj29](http://www.leasehold-outrage.com/pg_works/martin_russell_jones.htm#mrj29)

they appointed Mansell ([http://www.leasehold-outrage.com/pg\\_works/mansell.htm](http://www.leasehold-outrage.com/pg_works/mansell.htm) ), a new contractor - WITHOUT issuing a Section 20 Notice.

Hence, of the £6,350 I paid for the works (which legally I did NOT owe)- under a Consent Order endorsed by the courts - they can only spend £250 - leaving me with a £6,100 credit.

As I explained e.g. under 9 March 2007, not only have they never acknowledged my correspondence, out of what can only be described as vengeance, they have bombarded me with fraudulent upon fraudulent invoices since the Consent Order.

This mob has throughout behaved - and continues to behave - in complete disregard of the laws of the land - including the undertakings made in my lease. If the courts want to continue turning a blind eye and a deaf ear to the evidence... I could become a 'cause celebre' as I will fight up to the last breath in my body - for what I have been told are 'my rights'.

By the way, another twist to the story (as I report under 9 March 2007), the claim that the mob filed against me (and 10 other leaseholders) in November 2002 should have been STRUCK-OUT as the Statement of Truth is signed by the managing agents - and CPR Practice Direction for Part 22 states that

"3.11 - Managing agent - "An agent who manages property or investments for the party CANNOT sign a statement of truth. It must be signed by the party or by the legal representative of the party"

"4.1 If a statement of case is not verified by a statement of truth, the statement of case will remain effective unless it is struck out, but a party may not rely on the contents of a statement of case as evidence until it has been verified by a statement of truth"

I only discovered this over the last few days as a result of going through the CPR in detail (because of the latest claim against me (what you would call a 'boomerang' effect); this time round, I am not going to be taken advantage of because of lack of knowledge)

And 31 Dec  
03 letter to  
MRJ