

Mrs / Ms Pam [REDACTED]
Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman
Millbank Tower
Millbank
London SW1P 4QP

Ms N Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

1 (By 'Special Delivery')

2 Your reference: EN-62245 /0019

3 27 August 2009

See

(1) the 22 Sep 09 reply from the ParliaOmb

(2) the 30 Sep 09 letter from Sir Malcolm Rifkind to me

(3) my 19 Oct 09 reply; (4) his of 23 Oct 09; (5) mine of 7 Nov 09; (6) his of 10 Nov 09

4 Dear Mrs / Ms [REDACTED]

See point # 2.1 for the 29 July 2010 'Get lost!' ONE YEAR LATER

5 I acknowledge receipt of your correspondence of 29 July 2009 to my current MP, Sir Malcolm Rifkind,
6 following my complaint of 12 July 2009 against West London County Court, Wandsworth County Court
7 and the London Leasehold Valuation Tribunal.

8 For the purpose of replying to your letter I refer to the documents I supplied with my 12 July 2009
9 complaint:

- 10 ■ my 12 July 2009 reply to section 5 of your complaint form "*What are you complaining about?*"–
11 giving the page and line number: 'Page `#` - L `#`';
- 12 ■ the 390-page supporting bundle of 164 documents by referring to the document number, date, title
13 and position in the bundle: 'Doc `#` - Date - Title - Page`#`'. Hence, as per the content
14 list for the bundle.

15 You state: "*I have made enquiries with both organisations and it is clear that Ms Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé
16 has not completed HMCS and RPTS complaints procedures*"

17 1 HMCS

18 → In what way is it "*clear that [I] have not completed HMCS... procedures*"?

19 → What evidence has HMCS given in support of this assertion?

20 In your letter, you provide the link 'www.hmcourts-service.gov.uk/infoabout/complaints/index.htm'. I have
21 looked at the site. It refers to 'Leaflet EX343', stating that it provides "*guidance*" for complaints – but the
22 link does not work i.e. the leaflet cannot be accessed.

23 However, in your letter, you state "*With regard to HMCS they have a 3 tier complaint system. In the first
24 instance a written complaint should be put to the Manager of the court concerned. If having exhausted
25 this tier the complaint can then be forwarded to the Area Director, the final tier after this is to contact the
26 customer service Unit*"

27 You claim in your 29 July 2009 letter to Sir Rifkind to have "*carefully considered the papers you sent*".

28 Your assertion is quite extraordinary considering that **it is blatantly obvious from the information
29 contained in my reply to section 5 of your form – with evidence in support from the bundle - that
30 I have gone through ALL the stages of this "3 tier system"**.

1 **1.1 In 2004**

2 Starting from December 2002 when I received the fraudulent claim, WL 203537, for a period of 19
3 months, I suffered horrendous, highly traumatic treatment at the hands of **West London County Court**
4 **(WLCC), and in the latter part, Wandsworth County Court** as they – **Court managers AND District**
5 **Judges - repeatedly ignored my numerous correspondences.** Firstly, in the context of my
6 highlighting that the London Leasehold Valuation Tribunal had specifically told us, leaseholders – in light
7 of a Court of Appeal decision, 'Daejan Properties v LVTs' - to NOT pay the service charge demanded
8 until the tribunal had issued its determination, and it had been implemented:

- 9 ■ Page 15 - L 16-18; Doc 28 - 02.12.10 - My letter to WLCC informing of
10 the LVT action; proof postage - Page 69;
- 11 ■ Page 15 - L 25-27; Doc 33 - 02.12.17 - My letter to WLCC asking for the
12 action to be stayed - Page 88;
- 13 ■ Page 17 - L 28-33; Doc 47 - 03.03.25 - My letter to WLCC challenging its
14 21 March 2003 Notice of a Charging Order hearing - Page 108;
- 15 ■ Page 18 - L 7-13; Doc 49 - 03.03.30 - My letter to the LVT panel
16 informing it that, in spite of its directions, I was facing a Charging
17 Order hearing in WLCC on 4 April 2003; cc'd WLCC- Page 111;
- 18 ■ Page 19 - L 27-36 and Page 20 - L 1-2; Doc 57 - 03.06.17 - My letter to
19 WLCC asking why a hearing has been set for 24 June 2003 - Page 123;

20 Secondly, that Martin Russell Jones (MRJ)-'Steel Services' (SS) i.e. Andrew Ladsky had NOT
21 implemented the LVT 'determination':

- 22 ■ Page 20 - L 5-13; Doc 59 - 03.06.22 - My letter to WLCC and enclosures
23 pointing out that it is subjecting me to double jeopardy - Page 140;
- 24 ■ Page 21 - L 1-12; Doc 63 - 03.07.15 - My letter to WLCC highlighting the
25 sums considered as unreasonable by the Tribunal, and stating that SS-MRJ
26 has not implemented the Tribunal's 'determination'- Page 154;
- 27 ■ Page 21 - L 30-35; Doc 71 - 03.08.09 - My letter to WLCC that "there are
28 no side deals to be made with the claimant" - Page 170;

29 **After these 19 months of sheer, utter hell, of being treated like a piece of dirt** – which also
30 included, among others – weeks of battling with court managers et. a.l. - and concurrently suffering
31 horrendous torment, anguish and distress, when:

- 32 (1) WLCC wrongly sent me a notice that a charging order hearing concerned me, and kept on
33 persisting that it concerned me (Page 17 - L 22-37 and Page 18 - L 1-24);
- 34 (2) WLCC wrongly sent me a notice that I was the defendant in a trial and, with Wandsworth County
35 Court, kept on persisting, over several weeks that 'I' was the defendant in the trial (Page 22 -
36 L 31 to Page 26 - L 26);
- 37 (3) WLCC wrongly told me that a judgement had been entered against me (Page 23 - L 20-
38 40);
- 39 (4) WLCC made me miss a hearing (Page 24 - L 1-30)...

1 ... on 29 June 2004, I sent 'a cry for help' to the then Lord Chancellor, Lord Falconer of Thoroton:
2 Page 28 - L 2-3; Doc 104 - 04.06.29 - My 'cry for help' to Lord Falconer of
3 Thoroton - Page 236.

4 It led a 23 August 2004 reply – from the THIRD TIER, the Court Service at Clive House, Petty
5 France: Pages 28-30; Doc 113 - 04.08.23 - Reply from the Court Service to my
6 29 June 2004 'cry for help' to Lord Falconer of Thoroton - Page 263 – which, as I
7 wrote on Page 28 - L 4-6, is “defiant, arrogant, challenging, patronizing, dismissive, failed to own-
8 up to any accountability and responsibility, covered-up what had taken place – generally by implying that
9 I was illiterate / an imbecile / a liar – and through deceit” – and amounts to a resounding 'GET LOST!'

10 HMCS 'Customer Service' very clearly sees it as 'Job done! Matter closed. Another one of the Great
11 Unwashed acting above her station, a piece of dirt, a non-entity, told to go and bite the dust!' – in the
12 typical, dismissive, contemptuous civil service speak “I am sorry to hear that you feel that the system
13 has let you down and that in this case you have not received justice”

14 As detailed on Page 25 - L 33 - 36, Page 26 - L 1-31, and Page 27 L 1-2, post my
15 'cry for help' to Lord Falconer, over the following three weeks, I continued to be subjected to ongoing
16 mental torture, distress and torment by the courts. This took place while I was waiting for a reply.

17 1.2 In 2007

18 In the same way that the Court manager, as well as District Judges in West London County Court had
19 ignored 'inconvenient' documents from me since the 27 February 2007 fraudulent claim, ref. 7WL00675,
20 had been filed against me (= a repeat of my experience with that court in 2002-2004), of course, the
21 Court manager also ignored my 2 October 2007 letter – in spite of two chaser letters: Page 35 - L 6-
22 8; Doc 143 - 07.10.02 - My letter to WLCC; proof of postage - Page 334; Doc
23 145 - 07.10.28 - My second chaser letter to WLCC asking for a response to my
24 2 October 2007 letter; proof postage - Page 339.

25 After waiting – in vain - another two weeks for a reply to my second chaser letter, I looked on HMCS
26 website and determined that, in order to file a complaint, I needed to contact the Area Manager – which
27 is how I obtained the contact details. Therefore, on 13 November 2007, I sent a complaint to Kevin
28 Pogson, HMCS Regional Director, Rose Court, Southwark Bridge: Page 38 - L 22-34 and
29 Page 39 - L 1-18; Doc 146 - 07.11.13 - My complaint against WLCC sent to
30 HMCS Customer Service, Regional Director, Southwark Bridge - Page 342.

31 The eventual 20 December 2007 'reply' was from Suki Bhangra, Customer Service Officer, London
32 Civil & Family Director's Office, Rose Court, Southwark Bridge: Page 40 - L 10-12; Doc 152
33 - 07.12.20 - 'Reply' to my complaint from HMCS 'Customer Service', Southwark
34 - Page 355.

35 I headed my 27 December 2007 response “Confirmation of collusion”, highlighting, among others, the
36 falsification of evidence and lack of response to many items in my complaint: Page 40 - L 10-34
37 and Page 41 - L 1-31; Doc 153 - 07.12.27 - My response to HMCS Customer
38 Service's letter of 20 December 2007 - Page 357.

39 It was followed by a 2 January 2008 letter from Lynsey Noon, Customer Service Officer, London
40 Civil & Family Director's Office, Rose Court, Southwark Bridge: Page 41 - L 32-35; Doc 154
41 - 08.01.02 - Letter from HMCS 'Customer Service' apologising for “not
42 supplying you with an adequate response to your concerns” - Page 361.

1 Without my doing anything – **the next correspondence was the 10 January 2008 letter from Paulette**
2 **James OBE, Customer Service Unit, Clive House, Petty France – hence the THIRD TIER:** From
3 Page 41 – L 37 to Page 45 – L 36; Doc 155 – 08.01.10 – HMCS Petty France
4 response to my complaint – Page 362.

5 This escalation to the ‘third tier’ was due to the fact that, frustrated by the obvious games and delaying
6 tactics, **I had sent ‘a cry for help’ to Jack Straw, Lord Chancellor, on 11 December 2007** (on which I
7 copied Kevin Pogson, HMCS Regional Director, and Suki Bhangra, Customer Service Officer - both at
8 Southwark Bridge Road): Page 40 – L 5-9; Doc 150 – 07.12.11 – My ‘cry for help’
9 to the Rt. Hon. Jack Straw, Lord Chancellor – Page 352.

10 The header to my 28 January 2009 reply to the 10 January 2008 response from Paulette James,
11 *“Absolute confirmation of collusion”*, makes my overall assessment of the 10 January 2008 reply very
12 clear – and is supported by evidence in my detailed response to each of the points: From Page 41 –
13 L 37 to Page 45 – L 36; Doc 158 – 08.01.28 – My reply to HMCS Petty France
14 response to my complaint – Page 374.

15 Understandably, in light of this latest contemptuous, dismissive, patronizing response which - in spite of
16 my previous replies - was a continuation of the typical serpentine civil service response when a mirror
17 held to its face reflects back its wrongdoings: twisting, distorting, falsifying, trivialising, covering-up the
18 facts and fabrication of excuses - I concluded my letter by stating *“I no longer wish to correspond with*
19 *your Office as it is proving to be a waste of my time. So please, inform your colleague, Mr Danny*
20 *O’Sullivan that I do not wish to receive any more communication. Thank you.”*

21 Hence, it surely cannot be the reason for your assertion that *“[I] have not completed HMCS...
22 procedures”* – as any fair minded, reasonable person with objectivity and integrity would agree that
23 HMCS’ responses to my complaint – as summarised on Page 28 – L 4-6; Page 38 – L 16-21
24 – are the exact opposite of your Principles of Good Complaint handling and Remedy: *“1. Getting it right;
25 2. Being customer focused; 3. Being open and accountable; 4. Acting fairly and proportionately; 5.
26 Putting things right”*.

27 **Therefore, it overwhelmingly qualifies for your taking action for “maladministration, not acting**
28 **properly or fairly”** (from your Office’s introduction to the Principles)

29 As to your claim in the same overview document, that *“we focus on the individual’s experience as a
30 human being... we will also have regard to the human rights context. Taking account of basic human
31 rights principles of fairness, respect, equality, dignity...”* - from the Equalities and Human Rights
32 Commission website (<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/fairer-britain>), I highlight that under the
33 Human Rights Act 1998:

34 ***“Being treated fairly and with dignity... means that everybody should have access to***
35 ***public services...and the right to be treated fairly by those services. This applies to all***
36 ***public services...***

37 ***...UK law includes a range of human rights which protect you from poor treatment and***
38 ***prejudice, and which require you to have equal and fair treatment from public***
39 ***authorities”***

40 The horrendous, inhumane and very traumatic treatment I have been subjected to by the courts, and the
41 subsequent treatment by HMCS following my complaints - very clearly stems from prejudice and bias:

42 ■ because I am a woman, on my own, challenging an extremely arrogant, self-regarding, ego-crazed,
43 power-corrupted, male dominated environment;

- 1 ■ of very limited financial means, making me an easy prey for morally depraved cowards;
- 2 ■ of foreign origin (e.g. Deputy Master Hoffman's comment at the 30 January 2009 SCCO hearing "*in*
3 *this country...*"), including partly of German descent - leading to my being at the receiving end of
4 racist, xenophobic, scurrilous statements (e.g. Kensington & Chelsea police branding me "*a Nazi*" to
5 my website Host in a 16 and 20 March 2007 email in an attempt to get my website closed down. By
6 'coincidence', this took place three weeks after the fraudulent claim was filed against me in WLCC);
- 7 ■ with strongly held moral principles of right and wrong from my Catholic upbringing, that led me to, for
8 as long as I could in the face of the horrendous and very traumatic treatment I was being subjected
9 to - refuse to be treated differently from my fellow leaseholders (e.g. Doc 71 - 03.08.09 - My
10 letter to WLCC that "there are no side deals to be made with the
11 claimant" - Page 170);
- 12 ■ who has 'dared' stand-up for the so-called 'rights' I have been told, by the legislators, I have the right
13 to demand,
- 14 ■ 'dared' stand-up against organised crime;
- 15 ■ 'dared' to do this to a Jewish landlord, his Jewish aides, and their supporters, a number of which -
16 at high levels - include people of the same ethnicity.

17 And the evidence in support of this prejudice and blatant bias is the highly vicious, bestial treatment by
18 HMCS, including the tribunal, comprising of bullying, harassment, victimization, intimidation,
19 persecution, defamation of my name and of my character, etc. I have been subjected to since 2002 -
20 while those with the mandate to protect me and help me get justice and redress from my attackers have
21 colluded with them, deciding to endorse and support their criminal conduct against me. (And the
22 revenge against me is continuing e.g. being told on 15 June 2009 "*Enjoy your life. You don't have long*
23 *to live*" (detail in my diary, on my website www.leasehold-outrage.com),

24 So, yes: 'They' are denying 'their' wrongdoings and persecuting me for them, because 'they' don't like
25 having a mirror held to 'their' face - as it reflects 'their' incompetence, maladministration, malpractice,
26 collusion, corruption, fraud.

27 **2 London Leasehold Valuation Tribunal**

28 In you letter, you state "*RPTS has also confirmed that they hold no records showing that Ms*
29 *Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé has gone through their complaints procedure*"

30 Thank you for sending me the booklet 'Unhappy with our service? Here's what we'll do'.

31 After the tribunal issued its 17 June 2003 'determination', having by then spent c. £30,000 of my many
32 years of very hard-earned life-savings due to MRJ-SS i.e. Ladsky's - proven - highly fraudulent service
33 charge demand, combined with the tribunal's obvious collusion with SS-MRJ (Page 7 - L 3-38 and
34 Page 8 - L 1-2) - my main concern was to get the tribunal to perform as per its stated remit: by
35 including a summary of the impact of its determination on the global sum demanded (Page 8 - L 3-
36 23) - thereby drawing a line under the costs which would allow me to get out of the flat.

37 Being left with an open-ended report (Page 12 - L 1-2), on top of the c. £25,000 Ladsky and the
38 tribunal had already cost me (Page 11 - top to L 4) - at a cost of £1,800, I asked my surveyor to
39 do the job the tribunal had failed to perform (Page 10, L 28-33): determine the impact of the report
40 on the global sum demanded. Including the contingency fund, it amounted to a £500,000 reduction
41 (Page 9 - L 6-34 and Page 10 - L 1-11)

1 After the waste of a phone call to the tribunal, I contacted various parties, including LEASE, and some
2 journalists to determine how I could get the tribunal to complete its report. **I was told that I needed to**
3 **raise it with Siobhan McGrath, Head LVTs.**

4 **This was confirmed to me in the 6 October 2003 reply from the Office of the Deputy Prime**
5 **Minister, comprising the LVTs** *"With regards to the LVT, you may wish to consider lodging a formal*
6 *complaint. To do this, you will need to write to the President of the London Valuation Tribunal". I did –*
7 *and the outcome is detailed above"* (Page 9 - L 11-5; Doc 85 - Letter from Office of
8 the Deputy Prime Minister - Page 201).

9 This letter was in response to my 6 September 2003 letter to Siobhan McGrath on which I copied John
10 Prescott, then Deputy Prime Minister (as well as a journalist at the Evening Standard with whom I had
11 been in contact).

12 As detailed in my 12 July 2009 complaint, Page 8 - L 25-27, *"In my 6 September 2003 letter I*
13 *asked Mrs McGrath to include a summary to the report stating exactly what the LVT had determined -*
14 *and the resulting impact on the global sum demanded. In other words: requesting that the Tribunal fulfils*
15 *its remit". As can be seen in my letter (Doc 79 - 03.09.06 - My letter to Siobhan*
16 *McGrath, President LVTs" - Page 189), my request is crystal clear. I also include a summary of*
17 *my surveyor's 31 July 2003 assessment of the LVT's 17 June 2003 determination (from Doc 68 -*
18 *03.07.31 - My surveyor's assessment of the 17 June 2003 'determination' by*
19 *the LVT - Page 161).*

20 As detailed in my 12 July 2009 complaint, *"Siobhan McGrath, President LVTs, twice refused my request*
21 *to address this very major failing". Page 8 - L 24-34; Doc 80 - 03.09.12 - Letter from*
22 *Siobhan McGrath, President LVTs - Page 192; Doc 84 - 03.10.06 - My letter to*
23 *Siobhan McGrath, President LVTs, "complete unfinished report", page 200; Doc*
24 *91 - 03.11.26 - Letter from Siobhan McGrath, Head LVTs, still refusing to*
25 *add a summary to the report - page 211.*

26 As the LVTs come under the same regime as HMCS (the Lord Chancellor of the day appoints the LVTs'
27 Chairs), not surprisingly, the responses from Siobhan McGrath are in the same vein as those from
28 HMCS: serpentine, making up excuses for failing to perform as per their stated mandate / remit.

29 Evidently, in this instance, the key consideration behind this refusal to include a summary was to not
30 sabotage 'the work' of its sister department, West London County Court which, by then, had been
31 instrumental in making the majority of the 11 leaseholders on the 29 November 2002 claim, representing
32 a total 14 flats – pay the full amount demanded in the July 2002 service charge demand for the 'major
33 works' (Page 9 - L 19-34 and Page 10 - L 1-27). Indeed, as Siobhan McGrath wrote in her 26
34 November 2003 letter *"this may well be regarded as providing additional reasons". Yes! To my fellow*
35 *leaseholders to challenge the highly fraudulent service charge demand and, among others, take action*
36 *against WLCC for being instrumental in making them pay monies not due and payable.*

37 **Hence, I could have written back a hundred times+ to Siobhan McGrath asking: 'get your tribunal**
38 **to finish its job' – the main message in the replies would have been the same: Get lost!**

39 Consistent with the above, the other 'get lost!' came when I asked for the summary on the database to
40 be amended: Page 12 - L 6-35 and Page 13 - L 1-17; Doc 90 - 03.11.09 - My
41 letter to Siobhan McGrath, President LVTs, asking that the summary of the
42 case on the Tribunal's online is amended to a "factually accurate summary" -
43 Page 210; Doc 91 - 03.11.26 - Letter from Siobhan McGrath, Head LVTs, still
44 refusing to add a summary to the report - Page 211.

1 As Siobhan McGrath was, yet again, refusing in her 26 November 2003 letter to include a summary of
2 the impact of the determination on the global sum demanded, there was no point my continuing to
3 pursue getting the summary of the case amended.

4 As explained, at the time, getting a line drawn under the costs (which is why, “*within my rights*”, I
5 challenged SS i.e. Ladsky’s application to the LVT) was my main concern, as my objective was to get
6 out of the flat and be rid of the morally depraved, greed-ridden, criminal vermin controlling the block.

7 In addition, it took another four years of battling for me to accumulate the ‘black on white’ evidence in
8 support of my claims that maladministration, malpractice, collusion, corruption and fraud had taken
9 place. Key among these was the Institute of Chartered Accountants supplying me with the amount paid
10 by each flat for the works – as this information, to which I am legally entitled, had, of course, been
11 withheld from me by Ladsky’s puppets: Martin Russell Jones.

12 However, it is abundantly clear from the above responses that, had I raised the other issues contained in
13 my 12 July 2009 complaint, the game would have been to ‘put me on a treadmill’ – as done by e.g.
14 HMCS – with the objective of making me give up - and always amounting to the same response: ‘get
15 lost!’. As very amply demonstrated by my experience, that’s the end game. The auto-pilot is switched on
16 as soon as a complaint is received, and is programmed with tactics aimed at refuting any wrongdoing,
17 responsibility and accountability, supported by automatic self-exoneration – in the process resorting to
18 deceit, denials, cover-ups, misrepresentations, fabrications, etc.

19 I give the following examples as further evidence in support of my position:

20 ■ In my initial 6 September 2003 letter to Siobhan McGrath (Doc 79 - 03.09.06 - My letter
21 to Siobhan McGrath, President LVTs” - Page 189), I wrote “*B. Unbelievably, your
22 Tribunal has agreed to the Applicant’s request for a hearing in relation to my 20C order
23 application...Another factor for consideration is the attitude of the Applicant. In particular: over a six-
24 month period I asked **seven times** (in writing) for a copy of the priced specification. This included
25 **four** occasions over a three-month period when I asked your Tribunal for its assistance in obtaining,
26 from MRJ, a copy of the priced specification (22 October 2002, 25 November 2002, 18 December
27 2002 and 12 January 2003)”.*

28 In the corporate world, in a customer-focused organisation, a customer who states, to the CEO,
29 ‘unbelievably’ your organisation has done ‘x’, and reports asking the organisation for assistance,
30 four times over a three-month period, and list the date of the letters – such customer would be able
31 to rely on follow-up. In the case of Siobhan McGrath, what did she do? She totally ignored it. WHY?

32 Among others, in these letters I repeatedly state that I have not been provided with any detailed
33 costing of the works. Had this been pursued, it would have shown that a ‘costed’ version of the
34 works had been supplied to the tribunal by MRJ-SS with the 7 August 2002 application. Instead, the
35 LVT let me battle on – obviously, intentionally – eventually forcing me to resort to employing a
36 solicitor, surveyor and barrister at enormous costs to myself – with the initial outcome of finally
37 leading the tribunal to accede to my request to postpone the 5 February 2003 hearing – which it said
38 it was doing “*in the interest of justice*” (Page 7 - L 1-38 and Page 8 - L1-2). Translation:
39 because it had been exposed by some of its peers.

40 So much for Siobhan McGrath’s claim that: “*the tribunals are an “affordable, local solution” for
41 landlords and leaseholders who are in dispute. We aim to provide an accessible and cost effective
42 forum for resolving residential leasehold problems*” and that “*there is no need for professional
43 representation*” (Page 7 - L 4-11)

1 ■ When I wrote to Siobhan McGrath, on 9 December 2002, to inform her that, in spite of the action
2 initiated by SS i.e. Ladsky, in the LVT, it had nonetheless filed a 29 November 2002 claim in WLCC
3 against me and 10 of my fellow leaseholders – and asked, “*What action the LVT proposes to take*
4 *since this action in the County Court conflicts with the jurisdiction of the LVT?*” - the 11 December
5 2002 reply from the Clerk amounted to ‘GET LOST! Not our problem’ (Page 15 - L 25-27)

6 There was most definitely an abuse of process but, both, the tribunal and WLCC washed their
7 hands of it, unbelievably putting the responsibility on me to control the conduct of Cawdery Kaye
8 Fireman & Taylor (Page 15 - L 28-36 and Page 16 - L 1-28) – or more accurately, as
9 part of an overall, behind the scene plan: agreed to turn a blind eye and a deaf ear to it. They were
10 not going to let me upset the scam.

11 In its booklet, ‘Unhappy with our service? Here’s what we’ll do’, the LVT claims to go to great lengths to
12 ensure that “*there is no bias and conflicts of interest*”. It is abundantly not true in my case – and
13 concurrently, that of my fellow leaseholders. As I wrote in my 12 July 2009 complaint “*With the Tribunal*
14 *so very clearly set against me, and evidently perceiving me as a non-entity relative to its ‘tribe*
15 *members’, Joan Hathaway, MRICS, and Barrie Martin, FRICS of Martin Russell Jones, as well as Brian*
16 *Gale, MRICS, Andrew Ladsky’s surveyor – I was forced to very quickly secure professional assistance*”.
17 (Page 7 - L12-15)

18 As to the factors that led to the bias against me, I view them as being the same as those listed above
19 under the HMCS section. Had I been a well connected, wealthy man, prepared to generously line the
20 pockets of City lawyers et. al., I would definitely not have been treated as I have by the LVT and the
21 courts. In fact, as I am dealing with cowards, it is highly improbable that I would have found myself in
22 this situation.

23 In conclusion on this section: **I maintain my position that the ball is in your court as there is blatant**
24 **evidence of maladministration and breach of your Office’s Principles by the LVT** (Page 14 - L
25 23-28; L 34-36)

26 I am copying Sir Malcolm Rifkind on this letter.

27 Yours sincerely,

28 N Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé

29 cc. The Rt. Hon. Sir Malcolm Rifkind, MP, House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA (By ‘*Recorded*
30 *Delivery*’)



Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

Knightsbridge
6 Raphael Street

London
Greater London
SW7 1DL

*Pakia Omb
Replying to
29 July Rspn1.*

Date and Time: 27/08/2009 16:02
Session Prefix: 5-2574574
Dest: UK (E.U.)
Quantity: 1
Weight: 0.060 kg

Special D by 1 £4.95

Total Cost of Services £4.95

Posted after Last Collection? No

Guaranteed Delivery Date: 28/08/2009

Barcode: ZW2175541236B

DESTINATION ADDRESS

Building Name or Number Postcode
12 SW1P 4QP
Address Validated? Y

IT IS IMPORTANT THAT YOU RETAIN THIS RECEIPT AS IT IS YOUR PROOF OF POSTING

PLEASE REFER TO SEPARATE TERMS AND CONDITIONS

Special Delivery is an express next day service for the UK, offering a money back guarantee for delay and compensation for loss and damage to your item. Check delivery at www.postoffice.co.uk or call 08459 272100 quoting your ref number.

This is not a VAT receipt
Thank You



Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

Knightsbridge
6 Raphael Street

London
Greater London
SW7 1DL

*Reliving on
copying on
my 2 Aug
2 PAKIA Omb*

Date and Time: 27/08/2009 16:03
Session Prefix: 5-2574582
Dest: UK (E.U.)
Quantity: 1
Weight: 0.064 kg

1st Class LgLetter £0.61
Receipt £0.00
Recorded £0.75

Total Cost of Services £1.36

Posted after Last Collection? No

Barcode: BR7251529786B

DESTINATION ADDRESS

Building Name or Number Postcode
House of Commons SW1A 0AA
Address Validated? Y

IT IS IMPORTANT THAT YOU RETAIN THIS RECEIPT AS IT IS YOUR PROOF OF POSTING

PLEASE REFER TO SEPARATE TERMS AND CONDITIONS

We do not pay compensation for money, jewellery or valuables sent by Recorded Signed For. Check delivery at www.postoffice.co.uk or call 08459 272100, quoting your reference number.

This is not a VAT receipt
Thank You



Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

Knightsbridge
6 Raphael Street
London
Greater London
SW7 1DL

VAT REG No. 243 1700 02
27/08/2009 16:04
SESSION : 5-2574574-2

Post Label SD	4.95
1 @	4.95
Post Label 1LL	1.36
1 @	1.36
TOTAL DUE TO POST OFFICE	6.31
Cash	21.31
Cash	15.00
BALANCE	0.00

FROM CUSTOMER
TO CUSTOMER

Thank You



Search

- Delivery Services
- Marketing Services
- Logistics Services
- Discounts & Payment



Home

Home / Track and trace

Track and trace

Sending tracked mail

Tracking your mail

Tracking your mail

Top links

- > Find a postcode
- > Postal prices
- > Shop
- > Track an item
- > Product A-Z
- > Work for us
- > Customer service

Track it down

Please enter your 13 character reference
e.g. AA000100019GB

ZW217554123GB

Track item



How to find your reference number

Delivered

Your item with reference ZW217554123GB was delivered from our SOUTH WEST LONDON Delivery Office on 28/08/09.

Thank you for using this service

We can confirm that this item was delivered before the guaranteed time.

You can now see the electronic Proof of Delivery for this item by clicking the button below.

View Proof of Delivery