

Ms/Mrs [redacted]
Case Worker
Metropolitan Police
Public Access Office
PO Box 57192
London SW6 1SF

Ms N Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé
[redacted]

Your Ref : 2009 060 000 181

My Ref (given by you): CR :5604 202/02

13 August 2009

Dear Ms/Mrs [redacted]

- See the 25 Aug 09 'response'
- Mine of 20 Sep 09, copied to Mark Heath, Chief Superintendent, Kensington & Chelsea police
- The 22 Sep 09 'Get lost' 'response' from Acting Chief Inspector, Steve McSorley, Professional Standards and Performance, K&C police
- My 8 Oct 09 reply to McSorley, and 8 Oct 09 to Heath
- Lack of response after one month, led me, on 11 Nov 09, to send a chaser letter to McSorley and Heath

(See also what has been happening with my Member of Parliament, Sir Malcolm, Rifkind, a Queen's Counsel - whose constituency covers Kensington & Chelsea police, et. al.)

MY REPLY TO YOUR RESPONSE TO MY SUBJECT ACCESS REQUEST UNDER THE DATA PROTECTION ACT 1998

I acknowledge receipt of your letter, dated 14 July 2009 and enclosures, posted on 20 July 2009, following my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request under the Data Protection Act 1998 – hence, significantly above the 40 day deadline for reply. Your enclosures comprised of:

1. Three sets of computer printouts: (i) CR:5604102/02; (ii) CR:5602261/03; (iii) CR:5605839/07
2. An 'Abbreviation list'
3. A 'Standard Police Notification for the Purpose of Policing'

The sections and page location in this document are:

1	Overall conclusions.....	3
2	Report CR:5604102/02 – Events in 2002.....	4
2.1	Pages 6 and 7 – Victim details – 'Knows suspect'.....	4
2.2	Page 13 - Classification (of offence) 'Method'	5
2.3	Page 13 – Main classification (of offence)	5
2.4	Page 16 – 18/02/2002 – 18h53 – CIV JC Howard.....	6
2.5	Page 19 – 20/02/2002 – 13h37 – DC DR Adams.....	6
2.6	Pages 19 and 20 – 22/02/2002 – 14h31 – DC SP Crockett	8
2.7	Page 20 – 28/02/2002 – 12h51 – ST Jude	9
2.8	Page 21 – 28/02/2002 - DC DR Adams.....	9
2.9	Page 22 – 20/03/2002 – 9h34 – DC SP Crockett.....	10
2.10	Page 23 – 20 March 2002 – 13h51 – DC SP Crockett.....	11
2.11	Page 23 – 26/03/2002 – 13h23 – DC Adams	11
2.12	My 26 March 2002, 12h50 fax – Not recorded.....	12
2.13	Page 24 – 26/03/2002 – 13h42 – DC Adams	12

2.14	27 March 2002 conversation – Not recorded.....	13
2.15	Page 24 – 28/03/2002 – 12h44 - DC Adams.....	14
2.16	Page 26 – 08/04/2002 – 14h32 – DC Adams.....	15
2.17	My 5 May 2002 and 31 May 2002 correspondence to Sir Toby Harris, MPA – Not recorded..	15
2.18	Page 29 – 22/05/2002 – 19h39, and page 30 – 25/05/2002 – 10h52 – DC Adams.....	15
2.19	Other outstanding requests made in my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request.....	16
3	Report CR:5602261/03 – Events in 2003.....	16
3.1	Page 15 - Suspect details – ‘Known by victim’	16
3.2	Page 22 - Main classification – Description	17
3.3	Page 25 – 25/01/2003 – 13h55 – CIV ???.....	17
3.4	Page 28 – 27/01/2003 – 13h49 – PC N Watson.....	22
3.5	Page 28 – 06/02/2003 – 11h06 – PC N Watson.....	23
3.6	6 February 2003 letter from PC N Watson – Not recorded.....	23
3.7	My 11 February 2003 letter to PC N Watson – Not recorded	23
3.8	Other outstanding requests made in my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request.....	24
4	Report CR:5605839/07 – Events in 2007	24
4.1	Page 1 – General information – Branch.....	24
4.2	Page 2 – General information - DV/Hate crime	24
4.3	Page 3 – General information – Category of hate crime	24
4.4	Page 12 - Suspect details – ‘Known by victim’	25
4.5	Page 19 – Classification – Method	25
4.6	Page 19 – Classification – Main classification	25
4.7	Page 22 – 15/03/2007 – 16h14 – PC K O'Brien	26
4.8	Page 25 – 16/03/2007 – 18h56 – TDC SJ Dowling	31
4.9	Page 26 – 16/03/2007 – 19h07 – TDC SJ Dowling	34
4.10	Page 26 – 19/03/2007 – 10h50 – PC ???.....	35
4.11	Page 26 – 19/03/2007 – 17h59 – TDC SJ Dowling	35
4.12	TDC SJ Dowling failed to record my ISP's reply, and his of 20 March 2007 to my ISP	36
4.13	Page 27 – 19/03/2007 – 18h04 – TDC SJ Dowling	37
4.14	Page 27 – 17/02/2009 – 99.....	37
4.15	Other outstanding requests made in my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request.....	37

Given Kensington & Chelsea police's blatant bias towards Andrew Ladsky, in support of my claims and counter-claims, this reply refers to a total of **49 documents**, amounting to 101 pages - **as supporting evidence**. They are enclosed in descending chronological order - preceded by a 2-page content list.

1 Overall conclusions

I state on my website, under the section for Kensington & Chelsea police (http://www.leasehold-outrage.com/pg_police/index.htm) *"The words I have to sum-up events with Kensington & Chelsea police - in relation to myself - the INNOCENT VICTIM OF ORGANISED CRIME - in 2002, 2003 and 2007, and other Residents at Jefferson House are: complicity, duplicity, misrepresentations, cover-up and protection of, and assistance to a criminal"*.

My detailed review of the three reports further reinforces my conclusions, as Kensington & Chelsea police has:

- (1) Throughout recorded Andrew Ladsky as just *"a neighbour"* – instead of what it – most definitely - knows he is: 'landlord for Jefferson House' – thereby giving him scope to play the 'poor innocent victim', as well as making the captured 'story' and trumped-up accusations (stemming from revenge and abuse of power) an 'easier sale' to those not familiar with the situation – and thereby build the case against me.
- (2) Failed to challenge Ladsky on the veracity of his accusations against me by failing to obtain evidence in support of his accusations. In the process, totally played into Ladsky's hand – to the extent, in 2007, of 'concluding' *"she may have some mental issues"*, and *"speaking to social services to see if they are aware of her"*
- (3) Failed in relation to each of the three complaints - to record some important correspondence – because, as evidenced by events, evidently 'inconvenient' to its needs/objectives. (This correspondence would not have been redacted) Among others: the failure to do this in 2003 provided the opportunity, in 2007, to build 'more of a case' against me.
- (4) Failed, in relation to my complaint in 2002, to record the important content of conversations – because, as evidenced by events, evidently 'inconvenient' to its needs/objectives. (Ditto – the content of these conversations would not have been redacted as I was party to the conversations).
- (5) In 2003, falsely classified Ladsky's accusation against me as an *"offence of harassment"* – allowing it to *"formally"* record his complaint against me.
- (6) In 2007, falsely recorded against me that I committed (1) a *"racist offence"*; (2) an *"anti-Semitic offence"*
- (7) In 2003, recorded other data about me that is false. In the process, it breached the Fourth Principle of the Data Protection Act 1998 by failing *"to take reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of the data"* - as it failed to reply to my letter of 11 February 2003 in which I asked for *"precise detail"* of the accusation against me (It failed to record the fact I sent the letter)
- (8) In 2007, recorded other false data about me, including making highly defamatory and libellous comments – among others, about my mental health, as well as branding me *"a Nazi"*. In the process, it breached the Fourth Principle of the Data Protection Act 1998 by failing *"to take reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of the data"* – as it never contacted me following Ladsky's 'complaint' against me.
- (9) Failed to address the majority of my questions in my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request.

It leads me to ask: What gives Andrew Ladsky control over Kensington & Chelsea police?

2 Report CR:5604102/02 – Events in 2002

1.	2.1 Pages 6 and 7 – Victim details – ‘Knows suspect’
2.	<p>On page 6, ‘Knows suspect – How known’ states “<i>RE House/Flat mate</i>”, while on page 7 it states “<i>RD neighbour</i>”</p> <p>As evidenced under ‘Page 16 – 18/02/2002 – 18h53 – CIV JC Howard’, I <i>did</i> identify Andrew Ladsky as being connected with the ownership of Jefferson House.</p> <p>While, of course, recording the relationship as just “<i>neighbour</i>” is particularly convenient for Ladsky as it saves having to explain, and therefore avoid capturing ‘inconvenient’ information – the correct description of Andrew Ladsky (which, I have absolutely no doubt in my mind, Kensington & Chelsea police (K&C) is fully aware of) is: ‘Landlord for Jefferson House’ - as Ladsky and ‘Steel Services Ltd’ (SS) - defined as my ‘landlord’ in 2002 - are one and the same. In fact, as there are others hiding behind him, the description could be further refined.</p> <p>Police records must be amended to reflect the true nature of the relationship.</p> <p>Examples of evidence that Andrew Ladsky = SS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">(1) Ladsky’s (enclosed) 25 January 2001 letter ¹ sent to leaseholders at Jefferson House trying to dissuade us from considering acquiring the headlease(2) Ayesha Salim, Cawdery Kaye Fireman & Taylor (CKFT), solicitors, London NW1 QA3, sent this (enclosed) 11 October 2001 letter to Mr [redacted], Flat 12 ² stating “<i>We are solicitors instructed by Mr Andrew Ladsky. Our client was visited by D Malam of Kensington and Chelsea police...</i>”(3) CKFT filed the (enclosed) (fraudulent) West London County Court (WLCC) claim of 29 November 2002, ref. WL 203537 ³ against me (and 10 of my fellow leaseholders – representing a total of 14 flats) - in the name of ‘Steel Services’(4) In the (enclosed) 3 October 2006 ⁴ letter to my then Internet Service Provider (ISP), Jeremy Hershkorn, Portner and Jaskel, solicitors, London W1U 2RA, identifies Ladsky as its “<i>client</i>”(5) Portner and Jaskel filed the (enclosed) (vexatious and fraudulent) 26 February 2002 Central London County Court claim, ref. CL201 770, against the elderly resident, Mr [redacted], Flat 12 ⁵, in the name of ‘Steel Services’ (It was preceded by this (enclosed) 2 January 2002 bullying letter from SS i.e. Ladsky ⁶ to Mr [redacted])(6) Portner and Jaskel issued the (enclosed) (bogus) 10 February 2006 ‘Notice of first refusal’ ⁷ “<i>on behalf of Steel Services</i>”

¹ 01.01.25 – Andrew Ladsky’s letter to leaseholders trying to dissuade us from buying the headlease

² 01.10.11 - Letter from Ayesha Salim, Cawdery Kaye Fireman & Taylor (CKFT), solicitors, London NW3 1QA, to Mr [redacted], flat 12, that he “*reported our client Andrew Ladsky to the police...he was visited by D Malam of the Chelsea police station*”

3.	2.2 Page 13 - Classification (of offence) 'Method'
4.	<p><i>"By person unknown making nuisance phone calls"</i></p> <p>The person is not "unknown" as, at the time of my complaint to K&C police, I identified Andrew Ladsky.</p> <p>I continued to identify him e.g. in:</p> <p>(1) my (enclosed) 13 March 2002 letter to the Police Complaints Authority (PCA)⁸, on page 2 – on which I copied DC DR Adams and DC SP Crockett</p> <p>(2) my (enclosed) 5 May 2002 letter to Sir Toby Harris, then Chair of the Metropolitan Police Authority⁹, on the first page</p>
5.	2.3 Page 13 – Main classification (of offence)
6.	<p>The classification states <i>"Improper use of public telecommunication system"</i>.</p> <p>I believe the Act in question to be the Malicious Communications Act 1988 as, although nothing was said during the 20 anonymous phone calls made to my home number, the intention very clearly meets</p> <p>Section (1)(b) <i>"...guilty of an offence if his purpose, or one of his purposes, in sending it is that it should...cause distress or anxiety to the recipient..."</i>; .s.2A <i>"electronic communication includes...(b) any communication (however sent) that is in electronic form"</i></p> <p>Point (4) states <i>"A person guilty of an offence under this section shall be liable on summary conviction to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months or to a fine not exceeding level 5 on the standard scale, or to both"</i></p>
7.	<p>The classification also needs to include "Offences under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997" The Act states</p> <p>s.1(1) <i>"A person must not pursue a course of conduct (a) which amounts to harassment of</i></p>

³ 02.11.29 – (Fraudulent) West London County Court claim, ref WL 203537 – including Particulars of claim - filed against me (and 10 of my fellow leaseholders) by CKFT, solicitors, London NW3 1QA, on behalf of 'Steel Services'

⁴ 06.10.03 – (Scurrilous) letter about me from Ladsky's solicitor, Jeremy Hershkorn, Portner and Jaskel, solicitors, London W1U 2RA, to my then ISP – identifying Andrew Ladsky as its *"client"*

⁵ 02.02.26 – (Vexatious and fraudulent) Central London County Court claim, ref. CL201 770, filed against Mr [redacted], Flat 12, by Ladsky's solicitors, Portner and Jaskel, London W1U 2RA, on behalf of 'Steel Services'

⁶ 02.01.02 – (Bullying) letter from 'Steel Services' i.e. Ladsky to Mr [redacted], Flat 12

⁷ 06.02.10 – (Bogus) 'Notice of first refusal' issued by Portner and Jaskel, solicitors, London W1U 2RA, on *"behalf of Steel Services"*

⁸ 02.03.13 – My complaint to the Police Complaints Authority; cc'd DC Adams and DC Crockett

⁹ 02.05.05 – My request to Sir Toby Harris, then Chair of the Metropolitan Police Authority, for *"an independent investigation of events with Kensington & Chelsea police"*

another; (b) which he knows or ought to know amounts to harassment of the other”

s.1(2) “For the purposes of this section, the person whose course of conduct is in question ought to know that it amounts to harassment of another if a reasonable person in possession of the same information would think the course of conduct amounted to harassment of the other”

s.7(3) “A “course of conduct” must involve conduct on at least two occasions”

s.2(2) “A person guilty of an offence under this section is liable on summary conviction to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months, or a fine not exceeding level 5 on the standard scale, or both”

In addition to Mrs [redacted], who, it is alleged by the police, made 20 anonymous phone calls to me over several days, **the acts committed against me by Andrew Ladsky are also classified as offences under this Act.**

Indeed, as evidenced by ‘Details of investigation’, on page 16 of the CR:5604102/02 report, I identified Ladsky as forcing me into Jefferson House on 30 January 2002. As also detailed, I also identified him as the suspect who **(1)** pressed my door bell late at night, on 1 February 2002; **(2)** threw a hard object at my windows, also late at night, on 15 February 2002.

Other instances when I reported Ladsky for harassment:

(1) below, on ‘Page 20, 28/02/2002 – 12h51 – CIV ST Jude’, I again reported Ladsky as, initially forcing me into Jefferson House on 16 February 2002, then assaulting me in the corridor by pushing me aside to go past me.

(2) On ‘Page 21 – 28/02/2002’, I reported being “harassed”: “Ms Rawé continues to make allegations against - 75 - claiming that - 76 - is harassing her”

(3) On ‘Page 24 – 26/03/2002 – 13h42 – DC Adams “Ms Rawe yesterday still insisted that - 102 - 101 - is harassing her and other people living at Jefferson House”

Furthermore, as detailed in the rest of this document, it is blatantly obvious that the anonymous phone calls made from a landline number to my home phone were made by him – amounting to yet another offence under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997.

And, given the blatant lack of transparency by K&C police – perhaps were some / all the calls made from the mobile number were also made by him?

8. 2.4 Page 16 – 18/02/2002 – 18h53 – CIV JC Howard

9. Second paragraph “...it is believed that the suspect has some interest in the ownership of the block”

As detailed, above, under ‘Pages 6 and 7 – Victim details – ‘Knows suspect’: **“the suspect” definitely “has interest in the ownership of the block”**

10. 2.5 Page 19 – 20/02/2002 – 13h37 – DC DR Adams

<p>11.</p>	<p>DC Adams has failed to capture that when I first spoke to him, (as I had done when I made the complaint on 18 February 2002), I identified Andrew Ladsky as the perpetrator of the harassment, and said that other residents had already complained against him to Kensington & Chelsea police.</p> <p>He immediately denied this – clearly demonstrating that he knew / knew of Ladsky. When I said “How about Mr [redacted] in flat 12?” his immediate reaction was “<i>the 71 year old man!</i>” It definitely proves that DC Adams knew that I was not the first resident to complain about Ladsky.</p> <p>I reported this conversation in my:</p> <p>(1) 13 March 2002 letter to the Police Complaints Authority (PCA) (supplied), on page 2 – and on which I copied DC Adams and DC Crockett;</p> <p>(2) (enclosed) 2 April 2002 letter to DI P Webster ¹⁰, on page 3;</p> <p>(3) 5 May 2002 letter to Sir Toby Harris, Chair of the Metropolitan Police Authority, on page 4 (supplied)</p>
<p>12.</p>	<p>In addition to the fact that Mr [redacted], Flat 12, told me that the person he had complained to at K&C police was “<i>Emma Whitlock, 92ES, Tel 020 8246 0325</i>” – suggesting I phone her - he also received an 11 October 2001 letter (supplied) from Ladsky’s solicitor, Ayesha Salim, CKFT, stating</p> <p><i>“We are solicitors instructed by Mr Andrew Ladsky. We are informed that on the morning of Thursday 11th October 2001, you reported our client to the police alleging he had illegally entered Flat 12 and Flat 14 Jefferson House. Our client was visited by Mr D Malam from the Chelsea Police Station”.</i></p>
<p>13.</p>	<p>As I wrote e.g. in my 13 March 2002 letter to the PCA (supplied), on page 2, under point 5 “<i>Other residents have, like me, suffered harassment and intimidation from Andrew Ladsky. (I seem to be the only one who has also suffered assault)...</i>”</p> <p>In addition to Mr [redacted], I report being aware of at least two other residents who had complained to K&C police of suffering harassment from Andrew Ladsky: (1) Mr & Mrs [redacted], Flat [redacted]; (2) Mrs [redacted], Flat [redacted], who was the Head of the Residents Association for Jefferson House.</p>
<p>14.</p>	<p>Evidence:</p> <p>(1) As can be seen from the (enclosed) 11 October 2001 letter from Ayesha Salim, CKFT, ¹¹ to Mr & Mrs [redacted], Flat [redacted], her letter is identical to the 11 October 2001 letter she sent to Mr [redacted] (supplied)</p> <p>(2) Following Mrs [redacted]’s departure - who left due to suffering ongoing harassment, bullying and intimidation from Ladsky (I have numerous letters from her in support of this) - a resident, Ms [redacted], sent me this (enclosed) email on 18 April 2002 ¹² stating that, following Mrs [redacted]’s complaint to K&C police against Ladsky, she had been told by the police to “<i>fold her tent and go</i>”</p>

¹⁰ 02.04.02 - My letter to DI P Webster, Kensington & Chelsea police, relating events with DC Adams

	(I also captured this information in my 5 May 2002 letter to Sir Toby Harris, MPA) (supplied)
15.	<p>This is in addition to DC Adams telling me on 25 March 2002 that Mrs [redacted] had told him that “Andrew Ladsky has been harassing her”. This is captured on page 2 of my 2 April 2002 letter to DI Webster (supplied)</p> <p>(Clearly, I would not have written this if it were not true. DC Adams never challenged me on the content of my letter).</p>
16.	<p>Hence, this made me – at least - the fifth resident to complain to Kensington & Chelsea police against Andrew Ladsky.</p> <p>I was subsequently informed that a sixth resident had, apparently, also complained again Ladsky to K&C police.</p> <p>(NB: Among other parties who have suffered harassment from Ladsky, it includes Nucleus, the local Citizens Advice Bureau, when it tried to help us, leaseholders at Jefferson House - as can be seen from the enclosed letter of 14 November 2001 from SS i.e. Ladsky¹³)</p>
17.	2.6 Pages 19 and 20 – 22/02/2002 – 14h31 – DC SP Crockett
18.	<p><i>“BT Nuisance calls have returned the fax with details of callers to WIW. There are two prolific numbers. These are [redacted] and 020 7584 7519”.</i></p> <p>As can be seen from page 6 of the CR:5604102/02 printout, the landline number was my home number at the time.</p> <p>Your covering letter, dated 14 July 2009, states “...although information that can identify a third party...will be edited out”. Surely, telephone numbers are information that “can identify a third party”.</p> <p>Whereas, among others, all the names of the parties have been “edited” from the printout, the telephone numbers have not. Evidently, K&C police has a very unique interpretation of the Data Protection Act 1998... to suit its needs i.e. fit its ‘story’.</p>
19.	<p>Why isn’t there a note to this entry to correct ‘the error’ (as done e.g. on page 23 of CR:5605839/07 – 15/03/2007 – 16h26)? - given that:</p> <p>(1) On 22 February 2002, after talking to BT who said that it had supplied the details of the calls to the police, I phoned DC Adams who told me that (1) the calls had been made from two numbers: a mobile number and a landline number; (2) he said that what was “very odd” about the landline number is that “there was no subscriber” (This is captured on page 1 of my</p>

¹¹ 01.10.11 - Letter from Ayesha Salim, CKFT, London NW3 1QA, to Mr & Mrs [redacted], flat [redacted], that they “reported our client Andrew Ladsky to the police... he was visited by D Malam of the Chelsea police”

¹² 02.04.18 - Email to me from Ms [redacted] stating that, following her complaint to Kensington & Chelsea police against Ladsky, Mrs [redacted] had been told by the police to “fold her tent and go”

¹³ 01.11.14 - Letter from ‘Steel Services’ i.e. Andrew Ladsky to Nucleus Citizens Advice Bureau in which he makes numerous threats

	<p>13 March 2002 letter to the PCA – supplied)</p> <p>The telephone service supplier for my number 020 7584 7519 was BT. Hence, had BT supplied this number, it would have stated my name as the subscriber.</p> <p>(2) In my (supplied) 13 March 2002 letter to the PCA – on which I copied DC Adams and DC Crockett (who evidently passed it on to DI P Webster, as he acknowledged it in his (enclosed) 19 March 2002 letter ¹⁴) – I wrote, on page 2, <i>“I also repeated to them [BT] the information I had obtained from the police, namely that there was no subscriber for the land line number – and that, clearly, this could not be possible. They told me that the telephone number is supplied by a company other than BT, hence their inability to identify a subscriber”</i></p> <p>It provides further proof that, had BT supplied my home number in error (which the police ought to have spotted), it would definitely have identified me as the subscriber.</p> <p>(3) In my (enclosed) 26 March 2002, 12h50 fax ¹⁵ to DC Adams, I wrote <i>“Last week you told me that the two calls made from a land line number on 19 February at 18h24 and 18h27 had been made from my home telephone number. When I pointed out that this was totally impossible... you mentioned the name Reach Europe as the source of the calls. I have phone BT to clarify. These calls have absolutely nothing to do with them. They told me that Reach Europe is a telephone supplier. Hence, they added that the police needs to contact this supplier to get the subscriber for the telephone number they provided you with. BT said they would be happy to explain this to you. Their number is 0800 0854 750”</i></p> <p>(4) My 2 April 2002 letter to DI Webster (supplied), in which, on pages 2 and 3, I repeated the same thing – including copying DI Webster on the faxes I had sent to DC Adams.</p>
20.	<p>2.7 Page 20 – 28/02/2002 – 12h51 – ST Jude</p>
21.	<p><i>“...the victim... has now stated that the suspect came behind her and once passing each other he touched her/pushing past on purpose...”</i></p> <p><i>“has now stated”</i> – implies that it was the first time that I reported this type of event. It was not.</p> <p>This took place on 26 February 2002: as I was about to open the front door to get in the block, i.e. Jefferson House, Andrew Ladsky jumped up the entrance steps, and pushed me aside in the corridor. ST Jude has failed to capture the date on which I said it had taken place.</p> <p>This was the second time that Ladsky had suddenly appeared behind me as I was about to enter Jefferson House, attempting to intimidate me, and forcing me into the entrance corridor. Indeed, the previous occasion, was on 30 January 2002 (recorded on page 16 of the printout)</p>
22.	<p>2.8 Page 21 – 28/02/2002 - DC DR Adams</p>
23.	<p><i>“Ms Rawé continues to make allegations against - 75 - claiming that - 76 - is harassing her because she is complaining about over charging of</i></p>

¹⁴ 02.03.19 – Letter from DI Webster to me acknowledging my 13 March 2002 complaint to the PCA

¹⁵ 02.03.26 - My fax to DC Adams reporting my conversation with BT that the calls from the landline were made from a phone serviced by Reach Europe – and evidence of successful transmission

	<p><i>excessive maintenance costs. She believes that a deception is being practised surrounding these costs..."</i></p> <p>On 'Page 16 – 18/02/2002 – 18h53 – CIV JC Howard' – Records my stating at the time of filing the complaint "<i>All people are in dispute over service charges..."</i></p> <p>This was true. And I have kept on saying that it was a fraudulent service charge demand – and was proven right (as I am absolutely certain K&C police is aware of).</p> <p>Among the voluminous amount of 'black on white' evidence, I give:</p> <p>(1) the (enclosed) 17 July 2002 'service charge' of £14,400 ¹⁶ demanded of me by Martin Russell Jones (MRJ), London HA8 7BI, 'managing' agents for Jefferson House – and for which the 29 November 2002 West London County Court claim (supplied) was filed against me;</p> <p>(2) After a one year battle in the London Leasehold Valuation Tribunal and West London County Court, Ayesha Salim, CKFT, on behalf of 'SS' i.e. Ladsky, sent me the enclosed 21 October 2003 "offer" for £6,350 ¹⁷ Hence, more than £8,000 <i>below</i> the original demand of £14,400 of 17 July 2002 (supplied). (Legally, I did even owe this amount either)</p> <p>See also: CR:5605839/07 – 'Page 22 – 15/03/2007 – 16h14 – PC K O'Brien' for further evidence of the fraudulent service charge demand.</p>
24.	<p>2.9 Page 22 – 20/03/2002 – 9h34 – DC SP Crockett</p>
25.	<p>The entry reads "<i>I have contacted TIU to chase up the outstanding subscriber details. I have been informed that the number is a BT Cellnet number</i>"</p> <p>This is false – and would be known to DC Crockett to be false as:</p> <p>(1) From one month previously, he knew that the anonymous phone calls were made from just two phones: a mobile phone; a landline phone e.g. as he recorded on 'page 20, 22/02/2002 – 14h31'</p> <p>(2) As detailed above, under 'Pages 19 and 20 – 22/02/2002 – 14h31 – DC SP Crockett' other communication had taken place confirming this – including confirmation from BT that the landline number was serviced by Reach Europe.</p>
26.	<p>Furthermore, DC Crockett states (under the 20/03/2002 – 9h34 entry) "<i>...there is no other course of action than to phone the number</i>". Quite clearly, the number for which the "subscriber details" are "outstanding" is the number which BT told me was supplied by Reach Europe – and was a landline number.</p> <p>DC Crockett repeats this in the 20/03/2002 – 13h51 entry "<i>...the only course of action left open was to phone the number concerned. I have telephoned the</i></p>

¹⁶ 02.07.17 – 'Service charge' invoice for £14,400 sent to me by Martin Russell Jones, London HA8 7BI, 'managing' agents for Jefferson House

¹⁷ 03.10.21 – £6,350 "offer" to me (v. the 17 July 2002 original demand of £14,400) from Cawdery Kaye Fireman & Taylor, solicitors, London NW3 1QA, on behalf of 'Steel Services' i.e. Andrew Ladsky

	<i>victim and informed her of this fact"</i>
27.	2.10 Page 23 – 20 March 2002 – 13h51 – DC SP Crockett
28.	<p>I believe I spoke to DC Adams rather than DC Crockett. Maybe I was mistaken.</p> <p>The comment "... <i>as if intimating that - 84 - [i.e. Ladsky] has something to do with this offence despite the evidence pointing to someone else"</i></p> <p>What DC Crockett and DC Adams have failed to record is that DC Adams told me on 20 March 2002 that Mrs [§<] - who is alleged by the police to have made the calls - had apparently told him that her mobile phone "<i>had been stolen in November 2001</i>".</p> <p>I dispute the claim that somebody who 'steals' a phone waits four months to start dialling a number stored in the memory and does so 13 times on one day; waits another two days, and does it another five/six times. This person clearly knew who he / she were dialling. (This is captured in my 2 April 2002 letter to DI P Webster - supplied).</p> <p>By the way: I won't buy the excuse that "<i>she said that her phone had been stolen in November 2001</i>" was redacted from the report – as it does not come under the Data Protection Act 1998. In other words: I do not believe that this information was captured.</p>
29.	<p>DC Crockett has also failed to record that during this conversation i.e. on 20 March 2002, when I asked about the originator of the calls on the landline number 'he' replied "<i>These came from your own phone</i>". In reply to my asking him "<i>Are you telling me that I am making anonymous phone calls to myself?</i>" he attributed the calls to "<i>something must have gone wrong with your BT voicemail. It's been calling your number by mistake</i>" (This is captured on page 1 of my 2 April 2002 letter to DI Webster - supplied)</p> <p>It was abundantly clear to me that DC Crockett and DC Adams were going out of their way to avoid revealing the subscriber for the Reach Europe landline number. The fact that key correspondence and conversations have not been recorded – is further confirmation of this.</p>
30.	2.11 Page 23 – 26/03/2002 – 13h23 – DC Adams
31.	<p>DC Adams states "<i>I spoke to Ms Rawé yesterday morning and she confirmed that she wanted to take the matter further</i>".</p> <p>What DC Adams has failed to record is the fact that when he called me on Monday 25 March 2002, at c. 10h45, he was very aggressive, asking me whether me I intended to prosecute Mrs [§<]. He dismissed my reply that I had not been provided with evidence to help me decide whether or not I wanted to prosecute her – and then told me in a domineering, angry tone "<i>We take the decision whether or not to prosecute</i>" – to which I replied "<i>Why ask me then?</i>". This is detailed on page 2 of my 2 April 2002 letter to DI Webster (supplied). (As stated earlier on, DC Adams never challenged me on the content of my letter).</p>
32.	<p>While DC Adams captured, under this entry "<i>I managed to speak with Ms Rawé in the afternoon and explained that - 95 - had admitted making the calls</i>", he has failed to record when this so-called "<i>admission</i>" 'apparently' took place.</p>

	<p>During his c. 14h10 call, on Monday 25 March 2002, DC Adams told me "<i>We have interviewed Mrs [redacted]</i>". (This is captured on page 2 of my 2 April 2002 letter to DI Webster - supplied).</p> <p>As he first said this to me c. three hours after his bullying phone call i.e. at c. 10h45 on Monday 25 March 2002, I assumed that this so-called 'confession' had been obtained during this space of time (as I related on page 2 of my 2 April 2002 letter to DI Webster – supplied)</p>
33.	<p>Considering that e.g. in CR:5602261/03, 'Page 28, 06/02/2003 – 11h06', PC N Watson claims that he "<i>attended address nrrk have left note for susp to call me</i>" – all because Ladsky claimed I told him to "<i>Go fuck yourself</i>" – Mrs [redacted] who was alleged, by then, to have made 17 anonymous phone calls to my home phone, over a three-day period – hence offences punishable by imprisonment under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 and the Malicious Communications Act 1988 – must surely have been 'visited' by the police/asked to come to K&C police station. Hence, there <i>has</i> to be a record of this – stating at a minimum the date and time when the event took place (as this is not 'personal data' under the Data Protection Act 1998).</p> <p>The fact that there is no record of it, added to the omission of key communication (detailed above, and below), leads me to conclude that what is recorded is false. More specifically, I believe that a key factor in events is the fact that the service charge demand from Mrs [redacted] was £64,500 - See CR:5602261/03 – 'Page 25 – 25/01/2003 – 13h55 – CIV ???'</p>
34.	<p>DC Adams has also failed to record that 'apparently' Mrs [redacted] had told him that "<i>her phone mysteriously reappeared at her door. I told her we were not buying that story...</i>" (This is also captured in my 2 April 2002 letter to DI Webster, on page 2 – supplied)</p>
35.	<p>2.12 My 26 March 2002, 12h50 fax – Not recorded</p>
36.	<p>DC Adams has failed to capture the fact that, on 26 March 2002, at 12h50, I sent him a fax (supplied) reporting the conversation I had with BT which:</p> <p>(1) totally dismissed his conclusion that "<i>something has gone wrong with your voicemail. It's been dialling your number by mistake</i>";</p> <p>(2) confirmed that the telephone supplier for the calls from a landline number was Reach Europe;</p> <p>(3) provided me with a number for DC Adams to call BT so that it could explain to DC Adams. (See further detail, above, under 'Pages 19 and 20 – 22/02/2002 – 14h31 – DC SP Crockett')</p>
37.	<p>2.13 Page 24 – 26/03/2002 – 13h42 – DC Adams</p>
38.	<p>While DC Adams has recorded receiving a fax from me, which is the enclosed 25 March 2002 fax I sent him at 15h11¹⁸ he has failed to record the fact that, in this fax, I related the main points of what he claimed Mrs [redacted] had told him on 25 March 2002– asking him to confirm. He never replied to my fax.</p>

¹⁸ 02.03.25 - My fax to DC Adams asking him to confirm what he claimed Mrs [redacted] had told him – and evidence of successful transmission

39.	<p>DC Adams captured <i>"Whilst updating Ms Rawé yesterday she still insisted that - 102 - 101 (I identified Andrew Ladsky) - is harassing her and other people living at Jefferson House - 103 - has not been the subject in any Cris reports..."</i></p> <p>I do not know what "Cris" stands for, but assume the meaning is captured in DI Webster's (enclosed) 23 April 2002 reply ¹⁹ to my 2 April 2002 letter (supplied), in which he wrote <i>"No crime report has been reported to this police borough regarding Mr Ladsky, in your letter you mention that other occupiers had complained this may be correct, but there are no reported crimes about Mr Ladsky"</i>.</p> <p>K&C police claims to have no "crime report" against Ladsky - because it evidently ensures that none are recorded.</p> <p>As detailed earlier on under 'Page 19 – 20/02/2002 – 13h57', there is 'black on white' evidence that at least four other residents have complained to K&C police of suffering harassment from Andrew Ladsky.</p>
40.	<p>As harassment is a criminal offence under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 – it follows that Kensington & Chelsea police has not only failed to record these acts by Andrew Ladsky – it has also failed to take action.</p>
41.	<p>Against DC Adams's claim (last sentence of the 26 March 2003, 13h42 entry) that <i>"...in this case there was absolutely no evidence to link - 104 - (i.e. Ladsky) with this matter"</i></p> <p>This was a premature conclusion by DC Adams which turned out to be unsupported – and is therefore false. Indeed, among others, the entry on 'Page 29, 22/05/2002 – 19h39 – DC Adams' (covered below) reads <i>"There is no way of tracing which telephone was used to make the three calls between 18h23 and 18h27 on 19/2/2"</i>. Assuming that – as claimed - the calls were made from the Carlton Tower hotel, and that the telephone <i>"cannot be traced"</i> then, nor can the caller. Hence:</p> <p>(1) Mrs [§<] cannot be accused of having <i>"also made these calls"</i> to me. (On 'Page 30; 25/05/2002 – 10h52 – DC Adams captured <i>"...I explained that as 147 - 137 - had already been warned for making calls before and after the three calls made from the hotel, no further action would be taken against - 138 - and that was the end of the matter"</i>)</p> <p>(2) DC Adams's categorical statement that <i>"in this case there was absolutely no evidence to link - 104 - (i.e. Ladsky) with this matter"</i> – is, at best, not proven – and therefore false. (See also next reply)</p>
42.	<p>2.14 27 March 2002 conversation – Not recorded</p>

¹⁹ 02.04.23 - Reply from DI P Webster to my 2 April 2002 letter, stating among others *"that are no crime reports concerning Andrew Ladsky"*

<p>43.</p>	<p>DC Adams has failed to capture the fact that, on Wednesday 27 March 2002:</p> <p>(1) I phoned him to determine whether he had received my faxes of 25 and 26 March;</p> <p>(2) he complained "<i>So, we are going to have to throw resources at this for just two phone calls!</i>";</p> <p>(3) had said to me "<i>You won't be able to prove a link with Andrew Ladsky</i>" To this I replied: "<i>How do you know that? Are you talking to him?</i>"</p> <p>As I wrote on page 3 of my 2 April 2002 letter to DI Webster (supplied) – in which I quoted the above - this is fascinating "<i>Given that DC Adams has not obtained the name of the subscriber for the landline number, how can he be so certain that there is no link with Andrew Ladsky?</i>" (NB: I also captured this on page 4 of my 5 May 2002 letter to Sir Toby Harris – supplied)</p> <p>Very clearly, DC Adams did not like my asking whether he was "<i>talking to Ladsky</i>", as he ended the conversation abruptly saying "<i>As you have complained, my supervisor will be in touch with you next week. Goodbye!</i>" (This is also recorded in my 2 April 2002 letter to DI Webster)</p>
<p>44.</p>	<p>2.15 Page 24 – 28/03/2002 – 12h44 - DC Adams</p>
<p>45.</p>	<p>DC Adams states "<i>Ms Rawé has contacted me</i>". This is not true. It is DC Adams who (in spite of his parting comment on 27 March 2002) contacted me.</p> <p>His second paragraph reads "<i>... and have requested the subscribers check and have also contacted BT Nuisance Call Bureau who will contact me should their records be incorrect</i>"</p> <p>While DC Adams captured under '28/03/2002 – 13h18' "<i>BT Nuisance calls have confirmed that the number they have supplied is correct</i>", as detailed above, under 'Pages 19 and 20 – 22/02/2002 – 14h31 – DC SP Crockett':</p> <p>(1) DC Adams was informed by BT on 22 February 2002 that the landline number supplier was Reach Europe;</p> <p>(2) BT further confirmed this information to me on 26 March 2002, leading me to capture it in a fax of the same date to DC Adams (supplied);</p> <p>(3) in my 13 March 2002 letter to the PCA (supplied), on which I copied DC Crockett and DC Adams, I stated having told them that BT had, yet again, "<i>confirmed to me that the landline number "is supplied by a company other than BT, hence their inability to identify a subscriber"</i></p> <p>It is clear that DC Crockett and DC Adams were continuing with their game to avoid revealing the true subscriber of the landline number.</p>
<p>46.</p>	<p>What DC Adams told me on 28 March 2002 is captured on page 4 of my 5 May 2002 letter to Sir Toby Harris (supplied), and on page 2 of my 2 April 2002 letter to DI Webster (supplied) i.e. that (1) he had "<i>contacted Reach Europe</i>"; (2) that there was "<i>no subscriber for the number</i>"; that "<i>BT is wrong. Something must have gone wrong with their system</i>"; (3) "<i>We'll contact BT again but, if they got the wrong number, we</i></p>

	<p>won't contact you again".</p> <p>Very clearly, DC Adams had no intention of "contacting me again". Indeed, his entry for 27 March 2002 – 22h52, page 23 states "<i>This matter is complete</i>"</p>
47.	2.16 Page 26 – 08/04/2002 – 14h32 – DC Adams
48.	<p>The entry reads "<i>Ms Rawé has written a second letter which I have gone through with DI Webster</i>" This refers to my 2 April 2002 letter to DI Webster (supplied). "<i>In this she claims that a number of residents have made allegations of harassment against - 117 -</i>" i.e. Ladsky.</p> <p>The rest of the entry is blocked out. For detail of at least four other residents who have complained of harassment against Ladsky to K&C police, see above, 'Page 19 – 20/02/2002 – 13h37 – DC Adams'</p>
49.	2.17 My 5 May 2002 and 31 May 2002 correspondence to Sir Toby Harris, MPA – Not recorded
50.	<p>While the printout records the fact ('Page 22, under 19/03/2002 – 15h27 – DI Webster') that I contacted the PCA to complain, there is no record of the fact that I approached Sir Toby Harris by sending him a letter dated 5 May 2002 (supplied) asking for "<i>an independent investigation</i>", followed by the enclosed chaser email on 31 May 2002 ²⁰ (As can be seen from the enclosed 11 July 2002 reply from Sir Toby Harris ²¹ he contacted K&C police).</p>
51.	2.18 Page 29 – 22/05/2002 – 19h39, and page 30 – 25/05/2002 – 10h52 – DC Adams
52.	<p>The entry for 22 May 2002 reads "<i>The result from the last subscribers check has been received, the line is held by - 131 - This is the - 132 - 133 - the number being one of their outside lines. There is no way of tracing which telephone was used to make the three calls between 18h23 and 18h27 on 19/2/2</i>"</p> <p>While that for 25 May reads "...<i>I explained [to Ms Rawé] that as - 147 - 137 - had already been warned for making calls before and after the three made from the hotel...</i>"</p> <p>In addition to my above reply, 'Page 24 – 26/03/2002 – 13h42 – DC Adams', as evidenced by my 31 May 2002 email to Sir Toby Harris (supplied) my conversation with DC Adams actually took place on 23 May 2002.</p> <p>As can be seen, I report telling DC Adams that it now makes it the third explanation for the telephone calls from a landline – which I listed: (1) that the calls had been made from my own phone; (2) as a result of my challenging this, I was told that there was no subscriber for the number; (3) because I continued to challenge this – by writing to Sir Toby Harris – this third</p>

²⁰ 02.05.31 – My email to Sir Toby Harris, Metropolitan Police Authority, chasing a reply to my 5 May 2002 letter, and providing an update on the ongoing 'story' from Kensington & Chelsea police

²¹ 02.07.11 – Reply from Sir Toby Harris, Metropolitan Police Authority, to my 5 May 2002 letter

	<p>explanation was 'produced'. Also that DC Adams' reply had been "<i>Not my fault if our unit got it wrong before</i>"</p>
53.	<p>As evidenced in my 31 May 2002 email Sir Toby Harris (supplied), DC Adams did not tell me "<i>There is no way of tracing which telephone was used to make the three calls between 18h23 and 18h27 on 19/2/2</i>"</p> <p>Indeed, as stated in my email, DC Adams told me that "<i>the anonymous phone calls were made from the Carlton Tower hotel by Mrs [§<]</i>". I wrote in my email that I questioned the claim that Mrs [§<] could have made the calls, and that they could have been traced to her. 'Assuming' that these calls were made from the Carlton Tower hotel - as demonstrated by the above entry "<i>There is no way of tracing which telephone was used...</i>" I was correct.</p> <p>Therefore, DC Adams' comment to me on 23 May that "<i>as Mrs [§<] has received a warning for the calls made from the mobile phone, he considered the matter closed</i>" amounted to DC Adams wanting to close the case – something he had been desperate to do since 27 March 2002 i.e. two months previously, when he wrote under the entry for 22h52 (page 24) "<i>This matter is complete</i>".</p>
54.	<p>2.19 Other outstanding requests made in my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request</p>
55.	<p>In my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request, page 2, point 2, I asked:</p> <p><i>"Please supply copy of briefings, correspondence, including any electronic transmission, record of any meetings and of any telephone conversations relating to me following</i></p> <p><i>(1) my complaint against Andrew Ladsky, and</i></p> <p><i>(2) my complaint to the Metropolitan Police Authority against Kensington & Chelsea police"</i></p> <p>This request has not been complied with.</p> <p>It is clear from the above that other data relating to me has been generated by Kensington & Chelsea police.</p>

3 Report CR:5602261/03 – Events in 2003

1.	<p>3.1 Page 15 - Suspect details – 'Known by victim'</p>
2.	<p>The entry states 'How known' "<i>Neighbour of victim</i>"</p> <p>As detailed above for CR:5604102/02 - 'Pages 6 and 7 – Victim details – 'Knows suspect', Andrew Ladsky is 'the landlord' for Jefferson House. Hence, I am not just "<i>a neighbour</i>", I am a tenant of Ladsky – to which I ought to add 'et. al.' as there are others hiding behind him.</p> <p>As evidenced under 'Page 25 – 25/01/2003 – 13h55 – CIV???' Ladsky portrays himself as having no connection with the ownership of Jefferson House, as the entry reads "<i>The suspect seems to think that the victim is behind the company who has sent these letters asking for money</i>"</p>

	Police records must be amended to reflect the true nature of the relationship.
3.	3.2 Page 22 - Main classification – Description
4.	<p>The 'description' reads: <i>"SUBSTANT/Offence of harassment"</i></p> <p>This is a false classification as I have not committed an offence under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997. See next reply.</p> <p>A breach of the Fourth Principle of the Data Protection Act 1998 has been committed – as PC Neil Watson failed "to take reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of the data" – by not responding to my 11 February 2003 – see below, 11 February 2003</p>
5.	3.3 Page 25 – 25/01/2003 – 13h55 – CIV ???
6.	<p>The entry reads <i>"- 60 - the suspect was walking out of her flat and shouted "Go fuck yourself!""</i></p> <p>It is indeed correct that I said this to Andrew Ladsky, as I was in the corridor, about to get out of Jefferson House – totally ignoring him.</p> <p>What Ladsky has failed to report is what he said to me: <i>"Better luck next time!"</i>, followed by a sarcastic laugh.</p> <p>I concluded that he was referring to the impending London Leasehold Valuation Tribunal hearing on 5 February 2003 – and that, in light of his comment, had ensured that it would be 'sewn-up'.</p> <p>(NB: By then, there were already numerous signs of this since Martin Russell Jones (MRJ), 'managing' agents, for Jefferson House had filed, on behalf of 'Steel Services' (SS) i.e. Ladsky, the (enclosed) 7 August 2002 application to the LVT ²² <i>"to determine the reasonableness of the global sum demanded of £736,206 for the major works"</i>.</p> <p>Further undeniable evidence came at the time the tribunal issued its 17 June 2003 report – as it failed to perform its remit by not including a summary of the impact of its decision on the global sum demanded of £736,206 – which had the effect of reducing the £736,206 sum demanded by £500,000 (incl. the contingency fund) - down to £236,000. Of course, failure to state this in the LVT report was 'extremely convenient' for 'SS'. The LVTs President, Siobhan McGrath, twice refused my request to get the tribunal to address this very major failing).</p>
7.	Ladsky has failed to report that, three weeks previously, on 3 January 2003, as I found him standing by the door to my flat as I was coming out, he told me, with a lot of venom in his voice <i>"I am going to get you this year!"</i>
8.	<p>The next paragraph of the 25/01/2003 – 13h55 entry reads <i>"The suspect say 'Go fuck yourself' to the victim when she sees approx 3 or times"</i></p> <p>This is not true. (NB: Perhaps the objective is an attempt to make it 'stick' under the Protection</p>

²² 02.08.07 – 'Steel Services' application to the London Leasehold Valuation Tribunal *"to determine the reasonableness of the global sum demanded of £736,206 for the major works"*

	<p>from Harassment Act 1997 which, (as detailed above, for CR:5604102/02, under 'Page 13 – Main classification (of offence)'), s.7(3) of the Act states "A "course of conduct" must involve conduct on at least two occasions")</p>
9.	<p>I highlight the fact that (no doubt because Ladsky was frustrated that I had not contacted PC Watson following his 27 January 2003 letter (see below, 6 February 2003) i.e. the intended scare tactic had not worked), he asked his solicitor, Lanny Silverstone, Cawdery Kaye Fireman & Taylor (CKFT), London NW3 1QA, to send me the (enclosed) 4 February 2003 letter ²³ – falsely – stating "We further understand that this is not the first incident of this description and that, indeed, there have been two other such occasions" (I did not bother to reply).</p>
10.	<p>Silverstone also states in his 4 February 2003 letter "These incidents have now been reported to the police and formal complaint made against you as a result"</p> <p>On page 4, point 7 of my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request I asked: "Please supply copy of briefings, correspondence, including any electronic transmission, record of any meetings and of any telephone conversations that have taken place between the police and Cawdery Kaye Fireman & Taylor following my complaint to Chelsea police against its client, Andrew Ladsky".</p> <p>This request has not been complied with.</p>
11.	<p>The second sentence of the third paragraph for the '25/01/2003 – 13h55' entry reads "Letters from the managing agents for a service charge to the flats. This letter has been sent to all the residents to pay for this refurbishment"</p> <p>Not surprisingly, no detail is provided about "this letter". I assume it refers to the (enclosed) 15 July 2002 letter ²⁴ from Joan Hathaway, MRICS, MRJ, claiming £736,206 "for repair and maintenance works". The letter also states, among other, "We have to state that the sum quoted may be exceeded due either to subsequent changes in the specifications or to problems encountered while the works are in progress". In breach of our statutory rights, no breakdown of cost was provided in support of the demands.</p> <p>As can be seen from the 29 November 2002 Particulars of claim (supplied), on an individual basis, the demands ranged from £14,400 (in my case) (17 July 2002 demand - supplied) to £65,827.</p> <p>(NB: In relation to CR:5604102/02: As can also be seen, the demand for flat 33, is £64,500. This is Mrs [redacted] who, K&C police claimed, had made "all" the anonymous phone calls to me in 2002. Also of note, the (enclosed) 26 April 2004 Land Registry record for flat 33 states on page 2 "10 October 2003 – Caution in favour of Steel Services Limited (incorporated in the British Virgin Islands) care of CKFT solicitors, 25/26 Hampstead High Street, London NW3 1QA. Ref: AS/17/STEEL". I strongly believe that this service charge demand is a key factor in the 2002 events).</p> <p>And not surprisingly, follow-on events have not been reported. As detailed above, under</p>

²³ 03.02.04 – Letter to me from Andrew Ladsky's solicitor, Lanny Silverstone, CKFT, London NW3 1QA, making false accusations and false claims against me

²⁴ 02.07.15 – Letter from Joan Hathaway, MRICS, Martin Russell Jones, 'managing' agents for Jefferson House claiming that the costs "for repair and maintenance works" will be £736,206

	<p>'Page 25 – 25/01/2003 – 13h55 – CIV ???', three weeks after sending the demand – to which, not surprisingly, there was massive objection - on 7 August 2002, MRJ filed an application in the London LVT – on behalf of 'SS' - to determine the "<i>reasonableness of the global sum demanded</i>" i.e. the £736,206.</p> <p>For further detail, see CR:5605839/07 – 'Page 22 – 15/03/2007 – 16h14 – PC K O'Brien'</p>
12.	<p>The following sentence of the 25/01/2003 – 13h55 entry reads "<i>The suspect seems to think that the victim is behind the company who has sent these letters asking for money</i>" (The rest appears to have been blocked out)</p> <p>Having described himself as my "<i>neighbour</i>" ('Page 15 – Suspect details', covered above), this is a continuation of Ladsky failing to reveal his true position and role at Jefferson House – thereby giving him scope to play the 'poor innocent victim'.</p> <p>The police records must detail the true nature of the relationship.</p>
13.	<p>The fourth paragraph of the entry reads "<i>This verbal abuse started in November 2002</i>"</p> <p>This is not true. (The only "<i>verbal</i>" comment I made to Ladsky, was at the London LVT 29 October 2002 pre-trial hearing (see enclosed 29 October 2002 LVT directions ²⁵ for evidence of his attendance). Ladsky was sitting alone, at the back of the room, away from everybody. When asked by the Chair, Mr Sharma, what his interest was in the proceedings, he replied "<i>I am just a resident</i>" At this point, all the leaseholders, including myself, turned round and, in chorus, called him a "<i>liar</i>" as he was going round the block saying he owns it.</p>
14.	<p>From the second sentence of the fourth paragraph "<i>The suspect...wrote letters accusing the victim of theft</i>"</p> <p>This is not true. It refers to my (enclosed) 24 October 2002 fax ²⁶ to Sandy McDougall, Tenancy Relations Officer at Kensington & Chelsea Housing, and my (enclosed) 24 October 2002 fax ²⁷ to David Stewart, Clerk for the London LVT.</p> <p>As can be seen in my fax to Sandy McDougall, (in addition to reminding him that, in its (enclose) 8 August 2002 reply to me ²⁸, the British Virgin Islands authorities stated that "<i>Steel Services has been struck-off the register for non-payment of the licence fee</i>" - thereby proving that Lanny Silverstone's assertion "<i>All we can say is Steel Services Ltd is an existing company</i>", in his (enclosed) 1 August 2002 reply ²⁹ to the (enclosed) 29 July 2002 letter from Sandy McDougall ³⁰</p>

²⁵ 02.10.29 – London Leasehold Valuation Tribunal pre-trial hearing directions – stating attendance by Andrew Ladsky

²⁶ 02.10.24 – My fax to the Tenancy Relations Officer, at Kensington & Chelsea Housing; copied to David Stewart, Clerk to the London Leasehold Valuation Tribunal

²⁷ 02.10.24 – My fax to David Stewart, Clerk to the London LVT

²⁸ 02.08.08 – Communication to me from the British Virgin Islands authorities that "*Steel Services has been struck-off the register for non-payment of the licence fee*"

²⁹ 02.08.01 – Letter from Ladsky's solicitor, Lanny Silverstone, CKFT, London NW3 1QA, to Kensington & Chelsea housing falsely asserting that "*Steel Services is an existing entity*"

³⁰ 02.07.29 – Letter from S McDougall, Tenancy Relations Officer, Kensington & Chelsea housing, to CKFT asking for proof of existence of Steel Services

	<p>- as false) - I quote from the British Virgin Islands website: “<i>Protection of assets from expropriation or confiscation orders from foreign governments</i>” and follow this by stating, in brackets “<i>Hence, they could siphon-off – at this stage - £750,000+ from Jefferson House residents and make it disappear</i>”</p> <p>While in my fax to David Stewart, I wrote, in the last paragraph, “...at least some of the flats are owned by people connected with the headlease – namely, Andrew Ladsky...”</p> <p>Hence, aside from providing further evidence that Steel Services = Andrew Ladsky, It is clearly not true that “I accused Ladsky of theft”. It amounts to another lie by Ladsky to the police.</p> <p>(As it turned out ‘SS’ did steal c. £500,000 from the leaseholders as, with the help of the accountants, Pridie Brewster, the LVT and West London County Court, the majority were made to pay <i>the full amount</i> demanded in July 2002 – in breach of their statutory rights – which is aside from the 17 June 2003 LVT determination which had the effect of reducing the sum demanded by £500,000 (incl. the contingency fund of £143k). (Based on analysis by my Chartered Surveyor). Hence, either way: a £500,000 fraud took place.</p> <p>For further detail, see the following second point, as well as CR:5605839/07 ‘Page 22 – 15/03/2007 – 16h14 – PC K O’Brien’</p>
<p>15.</p>	<p>The first part of the second sentence of the fourth paragraph, on page 25, reads “<i>The suspect on her work headed paper...</i>”</p> <p>Yes, that was a silly mistake on my part for which, of course, Ladsky - even though he did not have a leg to stand on - got his puppet, Lanny Silverstone, CKFT, to:</p> <p>(1) send the (enclosed) 28 November 2002 letter ³¹ to my then employer, KPMG, claiming that my comments “<i>were highly defamatory</i>” and stating “<i>In the absence of a proper offer of amends and offer of compensation from Ms Rawé and/or from KPMG we have instructions to commence proceedings both against your employee and against your firm</i>”; (2) send me the (enclosed) 28 November 2002 letter ³² in which Silverstone made equally scurrilous accusations against me, as well made similar threats if I did not meet his client various demands.</p> <p>I did not bother to reply and, needless to say, did not comply with any of the diktats. Not surprisingly, the threats never materialised.</p>
<p>16.</p>	<p>Given Kensington & Chelsea police’s blatant bias towards Andrew Ladsky - in support of my claims - I also highlight the fact that, in his 4 February 2003 letter (supplied), Lanny Silverstone, CKFT, also wrote “<i>The due process of law is under way to claim the perfectly proper service charges that are due from you</i>”. It was “<i>so perfectly proper</i>” that, after filing the West London County Court 29 November 2002 claim against me (supplied) for £14,400, its “<i>client</i>” made me a 21 October 2003 “<i>offer</i>” for £6,350 (supplied). Hence, a reduction of more than £8,000. (Covered above under CR:5604102/02 ‘Page 21 – 28/02/2002 – DC – 74 – DR Adams’)</p>

³¹ 02.11.28 – Letter from Ladsky’s solicitor, Lanny Silverstone, CKFT, London NW3 1QA, to my then employer, KPMG, claiming “*compensation*” and threatening “*proceedings against [me] and KPMG*”

³² 02.11.28 – Letter from Ladsky’s solicitor, Lanny Silverstone, CKFT, London NW3 1QA, to me, making scurrilous accusations against me, demands, as well as a variety of threats

	<p>Considering Ladsky's profile and that of his stable of puppets, it is blatantly obvious that he would not have made me an "offer" if he could prove that I owed the £14,400. Even then, legally I did not owe the £6,350.</p> <p>Of note, one year previously, in his (enclosed) 7 October 2002 letter ³³, Silverstone had threatened me with "forfeiture" (taking the flat away from me); "costs" and "contacting my mortgage lender unless I immediately pay the sum of £14,400 to our client, Steel Services"</p>
17.	<p>So, 'just as true' as the (enclosed) 27 February 2007 West London County Court claim, ref. 7WL 00675, for £10,357 ³⁴, filed against me by Ladsky's other puppet solicitor, Jeremy Hershkorn, (then at) Portner and Jaskel, London W1U 2RA (For example of evidence that Ladsky is Portner's client, see the (scurrilous) 3 October 2006 letter (supplied) from Hershkorn to my ISP).</p> <p>Prior to filing the claim, Hershkorn had sent me the (enclosed) 16 February 2007 letter ³⁵ threatening me with "bankruptcy proceedings, forfeiture of my flat (taking the flat away from me), and costs" – unless I "immediately pay the sum of £8,937 to Rootstock Overseas Corp." (a company I had never heard of).</p> <p>What happened after a 20-month battle in West London County Court? Portner sent me the (enclosed) 6 June 2008 Notice of Discontinuance of "ALL of the claim" against me ³⁶</p> <p>The 'black on white' evidence clearly demonstrates that Ladsky's use of the threat of "forfeiture, bankruptcy proceedings and costs", as well as court claims, are his favourite extortion tactics to defraud leaseholders i.e. they are used as FRAUD TOOLS. My Diary 22 Nov 08</p>
18.	<p>The third example is the (enclosed extracts) from the 13 December 2002 "Expert Witness report" to the LVT ³⁷, by Brian Gale, Ladsky's surveyor, in which he states, under section 4 – 1.4 "I am able to categorically state that the Specification makes NO provisions for any construction of an additional floor nor any future requirement in the building to create a penthouse flat", and under section 3.02 "the specification does not contain any known enhancement or improvement works"</p>
19.	<p>And, related to this categorical statement, the fourth example is the claim made by Ladsky's other puppet, Joan Hathaway, MRICS, MRJ, in her (enclosed) 5 March 2003 letter ³⁸ to Ladsky's surveyor, Brian Gale – which was supplied as part of the evidential document during the LVT hearings "...regarding the proposed penthouse ...although the planning permission was granted it was subsequently found that the scheme was not a viable proposition...there are no plans to build the penthouse at the property...When it was obvious that the penthouse was not going to</p>

³³ 02.10.07 – Letter from Ladsky's solicitor, Lanny Silverstone, CKFT, London NW3 1QA, threatening me with "forfeiture and costs" unless I immediately pay the sum of £14,400 to his client

³⁴ 07.02.27 – West London County Court (fraudulent) claim, ref. 7WL 00675, for £10,357, filed against me by Portner and Jaskel, solicitors, London W1U 2RA

³⁵ 07.02.16 – Letter from Ladsky's solicitor, Jeremy Hershkorn, (then at) Portner and Jaskel, solicitors, London W1U 2RA, threatening me with "bankruptcy, forfeiture of my flat, and costs" – unless I "immediately pay the sum of £8,937 to Rootstock Overseas Corp."

³⁶ 08.06.06 – 'Notice of Discontinuance' of "ALL of the claim" against me, filed by Portner and Jaskel, solicitors, London W1U 2RA

³⁷ 02.12.13 Extracts from Ladsky's surveyor, Brian Gale's "Expert Witness report" to the LVT

³⁸ 03.03.05 Letter from Joan Hathaway, MRICS, MRJ to Brian Gale – supplied as part of the evidential documents to the Tribunal – claiming that "the construction of the penthouse is not a viable proposition"

	<p><i>be built the deteriorating condition of the roof...caused us to start the procedure...”</i></p> <p>In fact, when the works – finally - started in September 2004, so did the construction of the penthouse flat – as can be seen from the (enclosed, colour) A4 size photographs ³⁹</p> <p>And the lies continued as, in their (enclosed) November 2004 “<i>Description of the works</i>” ⁴⁰ Brian Gale and the newly appointed contractor, Mansell Construction Services, described the construction of the penthouse flat as “<i>replacing asphalt roofs</i>” (In fact, as can be seen from the photographs, the roof was entirely demolished in order to build the penthouse flat) (Three other flats were also added to the block).</p> <p>See also: CR:5605839/07 – ‘Page 22 – 15/03/2007 – 16h14 – PC K O’Brien’ for other detail</p>
20.	<p>3.4 Page 28 – 27/01/2003 – 13h49 – PC N Watson</p>
21.	<p>Enclosed is the 27 January 2003 letter ⁴¹ sent to me by PC N Watson.</p> <p>As can be seen, in his letter, N Watson states “<i>Of perhaps greater importance is the fact that any further such outbursts may result in charges of harassment being made against you...</i>”, as this initial complaint has been fully recorded by the police.”</p> <p>In his 11 July 2002 reply (supplied) Sir Toby Harris, MPA, wrote that “<i>the police can only act on the basis of established facts</i>”</p> <p>On page 4, point 4 of my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request, I asked: “<i>Please supply copy of relevant procedure, briefings, correspondence, including any electronic transmission, record of any meetings and of any telephone conversations that led to the decision to have the complaint against me “fully recorded” – before even contacting me</i>”.</p> <p>This request has not been complied with.</p>
22.	<p>While, also on page 4, under point 6 I asked: “<i>Please provide copy of relevant procedure, briefings, correspondence, including any electronic transmission, record of any meetings and of any telephone conversations that led to Andrew Ladsky’s complaint against me to be “fully recorded” – whereas the complaint of harassment by Andrew Ladsky from at least four of my fellow residents was not recorded (DCI Webster, 23 April 2002 “...you mention that other occupiers had complained this may be correct, but there are no reported crimes about Mr Ladsky...”).</i></p> <p>This request has not been complied with.</p>
23.	<p>In his 27 January 2003 letter (supplied), PC Watson also wrote “<i>Please avoid (if you can) any confrontation with Mr Ladsky or there may be further consequences</i>”</p>

³⁹ 05.09.xx and 02.07.xx A4 size colour photographs of the back of Jefferson House

⁴⁰ 04.11.xx – Ladsky’s surveyor, Brian Gale, and Mansell Construction Services “*Description of the works*” at Jefferson House stating “*replacing asphalt roof*” when in fact, they demolished the whole roof in order to build the penthouse flat

⁴¹ 03.01.27 – Letter to me from PC N Watson, Kensington & Chelsea police, stating that “*a formal complaint has been recorded against [me]*”

	<p>On page 4, point 5 of my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request, I asked <i>“Please supply copy of relevant procedure, briefings, correspondence, including any electronic transmission, record of any meetings and of any telephone conversations relating to the “consequences” that took place – as referred to in Neil Watson comment’s of “or there may be further consequences”.</i></p> <p>This request has not been complied with.</p>
24.	<p>3.5 Page 28 – 06/02/2003 – 11h06 – PC N Watson</p>
25.	<p>The entry states <i>“Have attended address nrrk have left note for susp to call me”</i></p> <p>I never found “a note” from PC Watson at my flat.</p> <p>(NB: To have a police officer do this is an outrageous use of police resources)</p>
26.	<p>3.6 6 February 2003 letter from PC N Watson – Not recorded</p>
27.	<p>PC N Watson has failed to capture that he sent me this (enclosed) 6 February 2003 letter ⁴² (posted on 7 February 2002) asking me to contact him – as, contrary to his request in his 27 January 2003 letter, I had not phoned him. Firstly, because I could not stop laughing from visualising the scene: a man, standing in a police station saying <i>“Mr Policeman, a woman swore at me”</i>.</p> <p>Secondly, because in his 11 July 2002 reply (supplied) Sir Toby Harris had written, in response to my asking for the subscriber of the Reach Europe landline to be identified <i>“you must appreciate that officers have to act with consideration for resource and time expenditure when investigating a case such as this”</i>. Obviously, Kensington & Chelsea police has no concern about the judicious use of resources when it comes to Andrew Ladsky.</p>
28.	<p>3.7 My 11 February 2003 letter to PC N Watson – Not recorded</p>
29.	<p>The last entry, page 28 - 12/02/2003 – 10h44 – PS – 80, reads <i>“OIC has attempted to make contact with the suspect but this has been fruitless”</i></p> <p>What has not been recorded is the fact that, following taking delivery of PC Watson’s letter of 6 February, on 11 February, I sent the (enclosed) 11 February 2003 letter ⁴³ (by recorded delivery) stating <i>“In order for me to respond, please provide me – in writing – with the following”</i>. I followed this by listing five questions, asking for <i>“precise”</i> detail. PC N Watson did not reply to my letter.</p> <p>As identified in my above replies, some of the data captured about me is false. PC Neil Watson breached the Fourth Principle of the Data Protection 1998 as, by not replying to my 11 February 2003 letter, he clearly failed “to take reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of the data” he captured about me.</p>

⁴² 03.02.06 – Letter to me from PC Neil Watson, Kensington & Chelsea police, asking me to contact him

⁴³ 03.02.11 – My letter to PC Neil Watson, Kensington & Chelsea police, asking for *“precise details of Ladsky’s accusation against me”* – and ‘recorded delivery’ receipt

30.	3.8 Other outstanding requests made in my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request
31.	<p>On page 4, point 8 of my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request, I asked <i>“Please provide detail of individuals / organisations to which Andrew Ladsky’s 2003 complaint against me - which was “fully recorded” by the police - has been transmitted, as well as copy of:</i></p> <p>(1) <i>The information supplied to the individuals / organisations</i></p> <p>(2) <i>Briefings, correspondence, including any electronic transmission, record of any meetings and of any telephone conversations that led to this information being communicated to the individuals / organisations”</i></p> <p>This request has not been complied with.</p>

4 Report CR:5605839/07 – Events in 2007

1.	4.1 Page 1 – General information – Branch
2.	<p>The entry states that <i>“Branch - RI racial incident; RS anti-Semitic incident”</i></p> <p>I disagree with this classification - as <i>neither</i> took place.</p> <p>This is therefore libellous – and in breach of the Fourth Principle of the Data Protection Act 1998 – as, by not contacting me – at any point in time - following ‘the complaint’, Kensington & Chelsea police clearly failed <i>“to take reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of the data”</i> it captured about me.</p>
3.	<p>Indeed, Kensington & Chelsea police NEVER contacted me in relation to this ‘complaint’ – leading me to ask, in my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request:, page 5, point 10 <i>“Please supply copy of relevant procedure, briefings, correspondence, including any electronic transmission, record of any meetings and of any telephone conversations that led to the decision to have Simon J. Dowling contact my website Host - without ever contacting me, the owner and author of the website – i.e. neither before, during or after his contact with my website Host”</i></p> <p>This request has not been complied with.</p>
4.	4.2 Page 2 – General information - DV/Hate crime
5.	<p>The entry states: <i>‘Hate crime? Y’.</i></p> <p>This is <i>not</i> true..</p> <p>Ditto re. failure <i>“to take reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of the data”</i> captured about me.</p>
6.	4.3 Page 3 – General information – Category of hate crime

7.	<p>The entry states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- 'Race? Y'. This is not true.- 'Faith/Religion/Belief? Y'. This is not true. <p>Ditto re. failure "to take reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of the data" captured about me.</p>
8.	<p>4.4 Page 12 - Suspect details – 'Known by victim'</p>
9.	<p>The entry states "<i>Neighbour of victim</i>"</p> <p>As detailed above for (1) CR:5604102/02 - 'Pages 6 and 7 – Victim details – 'Knows suspect'; (2) CR:5602261/03 – 'Page 15 – Suspect details – 'Known by victim', Andrew Ladsky is 'the landlord' for Jefferson House. Hence, I am not just "<i>a neighbour</i>", I am a tenant of Ladsky – to which I ought to add 'et. al.' as there are others hiding behind him.</p> <p>Police records must be amended to reflect the true nature of the relationship.</p>
10.	<p>4.5 Page 19 – Classification – Method</p>
11.	<p>The entry for 'Method' reads "<i>A web page has been created which is alleged to contain anti-Semitic, anti-black, and anti-Asian pictures and text</i>"</p> <p>While the – false – claims that my website contains "<i>anti-Semitic</i>" material are contained in other parts of this report, the – equally false claim – that my website contains "<i>Anti-black and anti-Asian pictures and text</i>" is the only reference to this in this report - and the first time I am made aware of these.</p> <p>Where is the evidence to support these claims?</p> <p>These claims are false.</p> <p>By not contacting me – at any point in time – following the 'complaint', Kensington & Chelsea police clearly failed "to take reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of the data" it captured about me.</p>
12.	<p>4.6 Page 19 – Classification – Main classification</p>
13.	<p>The entry for 'Main classification – Description' reads "<i>SUBSTANT/Racial incident</i>".</p> <p>This is not true.</p> <p>This is therefore libellous – and in breach of the Fourth Principle of the Data Protection Act 1998 – as, by not contacting me – at any point in time - following 'the complaint', the police clearly failed "to take reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of the data" it captured about me.</p> <p>I note that, on the same page, under 'Current status' the entry reads "<i>Undetected crime</i>"; 'Last</p>

	changed: "20/03/2007"
14.	4.7 Page 22 – 15/03/2007 – 16h14 – PC K O’Brien
15.	<p>The entry reads "A web site www.leasehold-outrage.com was created in July 2002 (rectified on page 26 to '2006') in response to a large service charge..."</p> <p>It is not true that I launched the site "in response to the service charge" (although I can see how 'inconvenient' it is to – all – to make this claim).</p> <p>should read: how 'convenient'</p> <p>As stated, among others, on the home page to my site:</p> <p><i>"This site was first launched on 19 September 2006 out of utter despair - as a cry for help - after FIVE YEARS of soul-destroying battles triggered by a fraudulent service charge demand - attempting to implement the rights I have been told I have the right to demand as a leaseholder, and because I naïvely believed what I was told: that there was a system in place to help me in time of need.</i></p> <p><i>ALL TURNED OUT TO BE LIES (outcome of my (so far) 28 battles in My Diary 6 May 08). As blatantly obvious from the ton of 'black on white' evidence on this website, the 'system' is not there to help me: it's there to help crooked landlords and their aides fight against me".</i></p> <p><i>Yet - as a law-abiding - British taxpayer, I pay for the courts, tribunals, police, the local council, Ombudsmen, etc. on the basis of their claims that they will perform as per their mandate - and I have done this for a very long time - amounting to an estimated total of c. £500,000.</i></p> <p><i>I hoped that the site would put pressure on resolving my situation, leading me to close it within days, at most a few weeks after its launch.</i></p> <p><i>It soon became clear that, in spite of my five years of first-hand experience of sheer, utter hell (e.g. snapshot in My Diary 15 May 08), I had underestimated the arrogance, moral depravation and lack of common sense / intelligence in the residential leasehold sector and its supporting infrastructure - and their 'carte blanche' to do exactly as they please, in total disregard of legislation, regulations, codes of conduct...</i></p> <p><i>...as my site triggered an ever growing 'lynch mob' doing the equivalent of crying 'Off with her head!', absolutely intent on 'making me pay' for 'daring' to expose the detail of my case in the public domain – and, as a consequence of this, expose their / their 'friends' incompetence / malpractice / collusion / corruption..."</i></p>
16.	<p>The next part of the sentence reads "...which she regarded as excessive and unfair"</p> <p>"Excessive": most definitely – and I was proven right: see above, under: (1) CR:5604102/02 – 'Page 21 – 28/02/2002 – DC DR Adams'; (2) CR:5602261/03 – 'Page 25 – 25/01/2003 – 13h55 – CIV ???' – which includes detail of Ladsky making me an "offer" for £6,350 v. the original demand of £14,400 (Legally, I did not even owe £6,350 either)</p> <p>And at the time that Ladsky made his scurrilous accusations against me to the police, on 15 March 2007, he had, two weeks previously, on 27 February 2007, asked his puppet, Jeremy</p>

Hershkorn, then at Portner and Jaskel, to file a £10,357 fraudulent claim against me in West London County Court (supplied). Proof that it was fraudulent? After a 20-month battle, on 6 June 2008, he dropped “*ALL of the claim*” against me (supplied). This is covered, above, under CR:5602261/03 – in the latter part of my reply to ‘Page 25 – 25/01/2003 – 13h55 – CIV ???’)

The service charge demands are not just “*excessive*”: **They amount to THEFT / FRAUD.** (See also below, my reply to the second sentence) see My Diary 22 Nov 08

As to “*unfair*”, it is not just “*unfair*”: in addition to a breach of covenants in my lease, **it is a breach of numerous Acts – many of which are punishable by imprisonment** e.g.:

Fraud Act 2006: “2. *Fraud by false representation...the person knows that it is, or might be untrue or misleading*” and “3. *Fraud by failing to disclose information which the person is under a legal duty to disclose...and fails to do this with the aim of making a gain for himself or another*” – as evidenced, among others, by **(1)** filing the fraudulent 29 November 2002 WLCC claim against me (supplied); **(4)** filing the fraudulent 27 February 2007 claim against me (supplied)

Malicious Communications Act 1998 by getting **(1)** Lanny Silverstone, CKFT, to send me the 7 October 2002 letter (supplied) threatening me with “*forfeiture and costs*” if I failed to immediately pay the sum of £14,400; **(2)** Jeremy Hershkorn, then at Portner and Jaskel, to send me the 16 February 2007 letter (supplied) threatening me with “*bankruptcy proceedings, forfeiture and costs*” if I failed to immediately pay the sum of £8,937 to “*Rootstock Overseas Corp*”, a company I had never heard of; **(3)** filing the fraudulent claims against me; etc.

Theft Act 1968 - s.16 Obtaining pecuniary advantage by deception (superseded in January 2007 by the Fraud Act 2006); **s.17 False accounting** – “*Offence to conceal or falsify any account required for accounting purposes*”, **s.21(1) Blackmail:** “*A person is guilty of blackmail if, with a view to gain for himself or another or with intent to cause loss to another, he makes any unwarranted demand with menaces...*” – as evidenced by my replies in this document.

Ladsky and his stable of puppets have committed other breaches of legislation against me – that are punishable by imprisonment e.g. Property Misdescriptions Act 1991; Landlord and Tenant Act 1987, and breaches of several other Acts – not least the **Defamation Act 1996** by defaming my name and my character by making libellous and slanderous claims against me to many parties, including government departments: the police, the LVT, the courts, etc.

17.

The second sentence of the first paragraph, for 15/03/2007 – 16h14, reads “*This charge was challenged at the leasehold valuation tribunal who reduced this amount quite significantly*”

“*Quite significantly*” is a **massive understatement** given that it reduced the global sum demanded of £736,206 by £500,000 down to £236,206. (For further detail, see CR:5602261/03 – ‘Page 25 – 25/01/2003 – 13h55 – CIV ???’)

18.

Of particular importance: Ladsky admits that the ‘service charge’ was “reduced quite significantly”. Yet, through his puppets (and with the help of his ‘supporters’), he ensured that the majority of my fellow leaseholders were made to pay the full amount demanded in

July 2002.

Indeed, as can be seen from my (enclosed, colour version) analysis ⁴⁴ of the 'service charge' paid by 31 December 2003 (based on information supplied by the Institute of Chartered Accountants for England and Wales in its (enclosed) 29 August 2006 reply ⁴⁵ to my complaint against its member, Pridie Brewster, accountants for Jefferson House): 17 flats had been made to pay the full amount by 31 December 2002; by 31 December 2003, 9 out of the 14 flats on the 29 November 2002 WLCC claim, ref. WL 203537 (supplied) had been made to pay the FULL AMOUNT. In total, the 25 flats, hence, the majority of the leaseholders, had been made to pay £502,000 by 31 December 2003.

As stated under point 64 of the LVT 17 June 2003 report *"...the Respondent and other tenants could not be forced to contribute in the case of improvements and/or works not determined as reasonable by the Tribunal."*

As a result of a one year battle with the ICAEW following my complaint against Pridie Brewster, the ICAEW's 29 August 2006 reply (supplied) to my quoting the above from the 17 June 2003 report was *"What is crucial in the decision is that the LVT stated that tenants could willingly contribute towards the extra costs should they wish to do so"*

To which my reply is: **If the leaseholders were that "willing", how come they ended-up having the 29 November 2002 WLCC claim, ref. WL 203537, filed against them?** Of course they were NOT *"willing"*.

- We had the equivalent of 'a gun held to our head': threat of forfeiture; court claim; had been terrorised e.g. (enclosed) 20 October 2002 email ⁴⁶ from Mrs [3<] to the LVT *"I paid...not of my own free will, but because I felt intimidated and threatened....out of fear [that] Steel Services and MRJ will take legal action if I do not comply"*

- We had NOT been provided with the required information to justify the service charge demand – information to which we were legally entitled

- We had persistently been lied to, etc.

19.

The beginning of the third sentence of the first paragraph, for 15/03/2007 – 16h14, reads *"In order to challenge this charge it actually cost a considerably larger sum of money than she saved"*

Correct. Thanks to the collusion between the LVT, Ladsky and his aides (see, above, CR:5602261/03 - Page 25 – 25/01/2003 – 13h55 – CIV ???'), I was forced to employ a solicitor, a barrister and a surveyor – at a total cost of c.£30,000 from my hard-earned life savings – in order to challenge Ladsky's massively fraudulent service charge demand of £14,400.

As implied by Ladsky's comment, crooked landlords like him and their equally crooked aides rely

⁴⁴ 03.12.31 Sums paid by Jefferson House leaseholders at year-end 2003 (colour version)

⁴⁵ 06.08.29 Institute of Chartered Accountants for England & Wales' reply to my complaint against Pridie Brewster, accountants for Jefferson House – incl. *"summary of contribution paid by each flat at 31-12- 03"*

⁴⁶ 02.10.20 Email from Mrs [3<] to the LVT saying *"no evidence supplied in support of the July 2002 service charge demand...paid because feel intimidated and threatened"*

	<p>on this: leaseholders not challenging their extortionate service charge demands because of the cost of doing this – in an environment that is hell bent on helping landlords – at least certain landlords - line their pockets at the expense of leaseholders. See Introduction to My Diary 2009</p>
20.	<p>The fourth sentence of the first paragraph, for 15/03/2007 – 16h14, reads "<i>Since this she has been extremely upset and is seeking compensation and retribution for her time, money and effort</i>"</p> <p>"<i>She has been extremely upset...</i>" This comment is clearly intended to 'set the scene' for the rest of the sentence.</p> <p>"<i>she... is seeking...retribution</i>". This is not true. The Concise Oxford English Dictionary definition of 'Retribution' is: "<i>Punishment inflicted as vengeance for a wrong or criminal act</i> "</p> <p>While I note with great interest that, in his choice of word, Ladsky admits to having committed "<i>wrongful or criminal acts</i>" - as very amply evidenced in my c. 30 battles since 2002, what I am seeking is 'justice and redress' i.e. the rights I have been told by the State, and the institutions, I have the right to demand.</p> <p>(As equally very amply evidenced, "<i>retribution</i>" and vengeance – by absolutely whatever means - are Ladsky's response to leaseholders (and others) who 'dare' stand-up to him, 'dare' to challenge his fraudulent activities and 'dare; to expose him – in the knowledge that he evidently has carte blanche to do as he pleases).</p>
21.	<p>The second paragraph, for 15/03/2007 – 16h14, reads "<i>...there are parts of the site which are alleged to be extremely upsetting and insulting</i>"</p> <p>What evidence has Ladsky provided to the police in support of these claims? i.e.</p> <p>(1) Which – specific - "<i>parts of the site</i>" did he identify?</p> <p>(2) For – each – of the "<i>alleged parts of the site</i>": (i) what reason/s has Ladsky given to support his claim that it is "<i>extremely upsetting</i>"?; (ii) what evidence has he supplied to substantiate his counter-claim/s?</p> <p>(3) For – each – of the "<i>alleged parts of the site</i>": (i) what reason/s has Ladsky given to support his claim that it is "<i>extremely insulting</i>"?; (ii) what evidence has he supplied to substantiate his counter-claim/s?</p> <p>As it stands, without detailed – specific - evidence to support the claims, as well as concurrent evidence to substantiate the counter-claims – these claims must be treated as false.</p>
22.	<p>The second sentence of the second paragraph, for 15/03/2007 – 16h14, reads "<i>There are a number of sections which are alleged to be of a racial nature and numerous references by name to the victim</i>"</p> <p>What evidence has Ladsky provided to the police in support of these claims? i.e.</p> <p>(1) Which – specific - "<i>sections are alleged to be of a racial nature and numerous references by name to the victim</i>"?</p>

	<p>(2) For – each – of the "<i>alleged sections</i>": (i) what reason/s has Ladsky given to support his claim that it is "<i>of a racial nature</i>"; (ii) what reason/s has he given to support his claim "<i>and numerous references to the victim</i>"; (iii) what evidence has he supplied to substantiate his counter-claim/s?</p> <p>As it stands, without detailed – specific - evidence to support the claims, as well as concurrent evidence to substantiate the counter-claims – these claims must be treated as false.</p>
<p>23.</p>	<p>The third paragraph, for 15/03/2007 – 16h14, starts with "<i>The sections of the web site that the complaint relates to is headed "My Diary" 2002-2007. The specific remarks and pictures that are being complained about are contained throughout..."</i></p> <p>What evidence has Ladsky provided to the police in support of these claims? i.e.</p> <p>(1) Which "<i>specific remarks</i>"?</p> <p>(2) For – each – of the "<i>specific remarks</i>": (i) what reason/s has Ladsky given to identify "<i>the remark</i>"?; (ii) what evidence has he supplied to substantiate his counter-claim/s?</p> <p>(3) Which "<i>specific picture</i>"?</p> <p>(4) For – each – of "<i>the specific pictures</i>": (i) what reason/s has Ladsky given to identify "<i>the picture</i>"?; (ii) what evidence has he supplied to substantiate his counter-claim/s?</p> <p>As it stands, without detailed – specific - evidence to support the claims, as well as concurrent evidence to substantiate the counter-claims – these claims must be treated as false.</p>
<p>24.</p>	<p>PC K O'Brien asserts that "<i>The specific remarks and pictures that are being complained about are contained throughout..."</i></p> <p>As it stands, this statement is libellous, and in breach of the Fourth Principle of the Data Protection Act 1998 – as, by not contacting me – any point in time – following the 'complaint', Kensington & Chelsea police clearly failed "<i>to take reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of the data</i>" it captured about me</p>
<p>25.</p>	<p>The second part of the second sentence in the third paragraph, for 15/03/2007 – 16h14, reads "<i>...although it appears to be becoming quite paranoid</i>".</p> <p>While the following sentence reads "<i>She thinks the police may be following her as well as numerous people employed by her enemies</i>"</p> <p>"<i>Becoming paranoid</i>" This statement comes under "<i>Sensitive personal data</i>" of the Data Protection Act 1998 – Part I 2.(e) "<i>his physical or mental health or condition</i>"</p> <p>On what basis does PC K O'Brien considers himself entitled to make this 'assessment' about me?</p>

	<p>This statement is libellous – and in breach of the Fourth Principle of the Data Protection Act 1998 – as, by not contacting me – at any point in time - following ‘the complaint’, PC K O’Brien and TDC SJ Dowling clearly failed “to take reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of the data” they captured about me.</p> <p>(Two other - equally outrageous and highly libellous statements - about my ‘mental state’ are made under the next entry, ‘Page 25 – 16/03/2007 – 18h56)</p>
26.	<p>4.8 Page 25 – 16/03/2007 – 18h56 – TDC SJ Dowling</p>
27.	<p>The entry starts with "<i>I have spoken to - 72 - and - 73 - has informed me that the mention of pigs and monkeys relates to the words the Nazi's used referring to Jewish people during the holocaust. This is obviously very offensive., - 74...</i>"</p> <p>While I have never heard of this, it is totally untrue that I used the terms ‘pigs and monkeys’ to refer to “Jewish people”</p> <p>In his (enclosed) 16 March 2007 email ⁴⁷ to my website Host, TDC Simon J Dowling, of the ‘Community Safety Unit’ wrote: "<i>Hi the above site contains some inappropriate use of the words "pigs and monkeys" which are racially abusive terms towards Jewish people from the Nazi's. This is directed at a particular person</i>"</p> <p>TDC Simon J Dowling did not provide any evidence in support of his accusation.</p> <p>What is the evidence to support these claims?</p> <p>Re. use of the word ‘pig’ - As blatantly obvious from my website, I used the term ‘pigs’ to refer to the police. (I first came across the term in the film, ‘A fish called Wanda’, in which, as the police entered into a room, one of the characters said to another (played by John Cleese), “<i>Ask the pigs to leave!</i>”. I checked in the Concise Oxford English Dictionary and discovered that it is defined as “<i>informal, derogatory : a police officer</i>”.</p> <p>At the time, i.e. early 2006, my decision to use the derogatory term ‘pig’ for the police, in my online diary, stems from, among others, my experience with Kensington & Chelsea police (i) in 2002 and (ii) in 2003 - which led me to lose all respect for the police. (Since then, my experience with the police in 2007 has only added to my disgust and contempt).</p> <p>Re. use of the word ‘monkey’ – It is equally clear from the context in which the word is used on my website that I have used it as per the Concise Oxford English dictionary definition: “<i>a mischievous person, especially a child</i>”; ‘mischievous: “<i>intended to cause harm or trouble</i>”</p> <p>As it stands, I attribute these trumped-up accusations to revenge and abuse of power.</p>
28.	<p>In my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request, page 5, point 11, I asked: “<i>Please supply copy of relevant procedure, briefings, correspondence, including any electronic transmission, record of any meetings and of any telephone conversations that led to the decision to have Simon J.</i>”</p>

⁴⁷ 07.03.16 –E-mail from TDC SJ Dowling to my website Host accusing me of using the words ‘pigs and monkeys’ in relation to Ladsky

	<p><i>Dowling contact my website Host – making totally unsupported accusations against me”</i></p> <p>This request has not been complied with.</p>
29.	<p>The last part of the second sentence, in the first paragraph, reads <i>“...and believes this is what the suspect is referring to”</i></p> <p>The accusation that I have used the terms as claimed is libellous – and in breach of the Fourth Principle of the Data Protection Act 1998 – as, by not contacting me – at any point in time - following ‘the complaint’, TDC SJ Dowling clearly failed <i>“to take reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of the data”</i> he captured about me.</p>
30.	<p>The beginning of the second paragraph for 16/03/2007 – 18h56, reads <i>“About four years ago - 75 - organised for refurbishments on the flats. Each household was to pay a certain amount of costs through the service charge. The suspect took exception to this and went to a tribunal to get this charge reduces”</i></p> <p><i>“The suspect took exception to this”</i> has a connotation that I am a troublemaker, somebody who automatically challenges any demand for payment.</p> <p>For (some) of the evidence of what actually took place – which refutes the implied comments about me - see above: (1) CR:5604102/02 – ‘Page 21 – 28/02/2002 - DC DR Adams’; (2) CR:5602261/03 – ‘Page 25 – 25/01/2003 – 13h55 – CIV ???’</p> <p>This statement is therefore libellous and, in breach of the Fourth Principle of the Data Protection Act 1998 – as, by not contacting me – at any point in time - TDC SJ Dowling clearly failed <i>“to take reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of the data”</i> he captured about me.</p>
31.	<p>As to what TDC SJ Dowling captured in the following sentence: <i>“Despite the values of the flats going up a considerable amount the suspect is still obviously not happy with what - 75 - initiated”</i> – I read in this an implied approval by TDC SJ Dowling of the c. £500,000 fraud by Ladsky and his aides, and therefore support for the fact that it helped them generate a multi-million Pound jackpot. (As TDC SJ Dowling claimed to have looked at my site, he would be aware of these facts).</p> <p>This attitude is consistent with the rest of the events that have taken place with K&C police – including in 2002 and 2003.</p>
32.	<p>The third paragraph of the entry for 16/03/2007 – 18h56 reads <i>“Looking at the website it seems the suspect thinks she is being followed by either the police or - 77 - 78. This is not the case and she is obviously extremely paranoid...”</i></p> <p>How does TDC Simon J Dowling, of the ‘Community Support Unit’, know that <i>“This is not the case”</i> that I am <i>“being followed”</i>?</p> <p>As he claimed to have <i>“looked at the website”</i>, he would have seen that I have evidence to support my claim, including witnesses (claim for which, at the date of writing, I have since</p>

	accumulated more supporting evidence)
33.	<p><i>"She is obviously extremely paranoid"</i> – This is the second time in this report that I am being described as <i>"paranoid"</i> (The previous occasion is by PC K O'Brien - see above, last part of 'Page 22 – 15/03/2007 – 16h14').</p> <p>On what basis does TDC Simon J Dowling, of the 'Community Support Unit', consider himself entitled to make this categorical 'assessment' about me?</p> <p>Considering the (enclosed) 26 March 2007 letter ⁴⁸ from Ladsky to my then employer, KPMG, in which he makes the same, as well as numerous other libellous comments about me, it seems that TDC Simon J Dowling is, like a parrot, regurgitating what Ladsky told him – and in the process, endorsing it.</p> <p>This statement is libellous – and in breach of the Fourth Principle of the Data Protection Act 1998 – as, by not contacting me – at any point in time - following 'the complaint', TDC SJ Dowling clearly failed "to take reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of the data" he captured about me.</p>
34.	<p>The last part of the third paragraph for the 16/03/2007 – 18h56 entry, reads <i>"There is a lot of slanderous comments on the site mainly directed at – 79 – but also at K&C and even MPs, the Prime Minister and DPM. Also against solicitors and many others"</i></p> <p>Firstly, "Slander" is the 'spoken word', and 'libel' the 'written word'. There is <i>no</i> recording on my website.</p> <p>All of these claims are false.</p> <p>What is the evidence in support of – EACH - of these categorical claims?</p> <p>As it stands, these claims are libellous – and in breach of the Fourth Principle of the Data Protection Act 1998 – as, by not contacting me – at any point in time - following 'the complaint', TDC SJ Dowling clearly failed "to take reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of the data" he captured about me.</p>
35.	<p>The fourth paragraph the 16/03/2007 – 18h56 entry, reads <i>"I have contacted the – 121 – to have the site shut down and await a response"</i></p> <p>It refers to TDC SJ Dowling's highly defamatory and libellous email of 16 March 2007 (supplied) to my ISP – in which he also implied that I had 'committed a crime', as he wrote <i>"I am the police officer dealing with this crime. I would therefore be grateful if this site could be taken down"</i></p>
36.	<p>In my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request, page 5, point 11, I asked: <i>"Please supply copy of relevant procedure, briefings, correspondence, including any electronic transmission, record of any meetings and of any telephone conversations that led to the decision to have Simon J. Dowling contact my website Host – making totally unsupported accusations against me"</i></p>

⁴⁸ 07.03.26 – Andrew Ladsky (defamatory) letter against me to my then employer, KPMG

	This request has not been complied with.
37.	<p>Under point 12, page 5 of my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request, I asked: “As, in his 16 March 2007 e-mail to my website Host, Simon J. Dowling implied that I had ‘committed a crime’: “I am the officer dealing with this crime” - please supply copy of evidence, relevant procedure, briefings, correspondence, including any electronic transmission, record of any meetings and of any telephone conversations that led to the decision to have Simon J. Dowling contact my website Host implying that I had ‘committed a crime’”</p> <p>As detailed in my above replies to the various data captured about me, this request has not been complied with.</p>
38.	<p>The last part of the 16/03/2007 – 18h56 entry, reads “I believe she may have some mental issues so will be speaking to social services to see if they are aware of her”</p> <p>This statement comes under “Sensitive personal data” of the Data Protection Act 1998 – Part I 2.(e) “his physical or mental health or condition”</p> <p>It is absolutely outrageous.</p> <p>On what basis does TDC Simon J Dowling, of the ‘Community Support Unit’, consider himself entitled to make this ‘assessment’ against me?</p> <p>This statement is highly libellous – and in breach of the Fourth Principle of the Data Protection Act 1998 – as, by not contacting me – at any point in time - following ‘the complaint’, TDC SJ Dowling clearly failed “to take reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of the data” he captured about me.</p>
39.	<p>In relation to TDC Simon J Dowling “contacting social services to see if they are aware of [me]”, please supply:</p> <p>(1) Contact detail of the social services section that has been contacted</p> <p>(2) Copy of briefings, correspondence, including any electronic transmission, record of any meetings and of any telephone conversations that have taken place between the police and social services</p>
40.	4.9 Page 26 – 16/03/2007 – 19h07 – TDC SJ Dowling
41.	<p>The entry reads “There is a previous CRIS 5602261/03 which relates to an harassment of - 64 - by Ms Rawé no further action was taken at the time. But it shows Ms Rawé used to swear at - 85 - when seeing - 86 - in the communal area. This was when the service charge dispute first arose”</p> <p>As detailed above, under this report:</p> <p>(1) the accusation of “harassment” is false - See ‘Page 22 – Main classification – Description’, and ‘Page 25 – 25/01/2003 – 13h55 – CIV ???</p>

	<p>(2) the assertion that I "used to swear at Ladsky" is equally false (See 'Page 25 – 15/01/2003 – 13h55 – CIV ???')</p> <p>As PC N Watson failed to reply to my 11 February 2003 letter (supplied) – which he failed to record – Kensington & Chelsea police breached the Fourth Principle of the Data Protection Act 1998 by clearly failing "to take reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of the data"</p>
42.	<p>4.10 Page 26 – 19/03/2007 – 10h50 – PC ???</p>
43.	<p>The entry states "<i>Classification confirmed</i>".</p> <p>As explained, the classification is false.</p>
44.	<p>4.11 Page 26 – 19/03/2007 – 17h59 – TDC SJ Dowling</p>
45.	<p>The entry states "<i>Advised by DS - 91 - at the Racial crime Directorate at NSY that there is no crime made out and therefore this should be classed as a racial incident and nothing more</i>"</p> <p>Why "should" it "be classed as a racial incident"?</p> <p>Where is the evidence that I have committed a "racist act"?</p> <p>As it stands, this claim is false and therefore libellous – and in breach of the Fourth Principle of the Data Protection Act 1998 – as, by not contacting me – at any point in time - following 'the complaint', TDC SJ Dowling clearly failed "to take reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of the data" he captured about me.</p>
46.	<p>On page 6, point 15 of my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request I asked: "<i>Please supply copy of evidence, briefings, correspondence, including any electronic transmission, record of any meetings and of any telephone conversations that led / allowed Simon J. Dowling to ascertain in his 20 March 2007 e-mail to my website Host that I had committed a "racist act" (His 16 March 2007 e-mail: "there is nothing we as a police force can do except class it as a racist incident..."</i>)</p> <p>This request has not been complied with.</p>
47.	<p>The next sentence of the 18/03/2007 – 17h59 entry reads "<i>I am still trying to get the website closed down</i>"</p> <p>Oh dear! Oh dear! The scare tactic used by TDC SJ Dowling in his highly defamatory and libellous email of 16 March 2007 to my ISP (supplied) implying that I had 'committed a crime' - failed to do the trick.</p> <p>So, behind the scene, TDC SJ Dowling et. al. were desperately trying to find a way of forcing the closure of my website – including evidently attempting to secure the 'ultimate solution': getting me sectioned – as suggested by the last part of the 16/03/2007 – 18h56 entry "<i>I believe she may have some mental issues so will be speaking to social services to see if they are aware of her</i>"</p>

48.	4.12 TDC SJ Dowling failed to record my ISP's reply, and his of 20 March 2007 to my ISP
49.	<p>What TDC Simon J Dowling, of the 'Community Support Unit', has failed to record are:</p> <p>(1) My ISP's reply to his 16 March 2007 email stating "<i>Are you aware that there are laws against making false accusations?</i>"</p> <p>(2) His (enclosed) 20 March 2007 email reply ⁴⁹ to my ISP in which he backed down on his accusations against me.</p> <p>As can be seen, he wrote: "<i>Thanks for your reply, yes there are laws relating to false reporting</i>".</p> <p>Having in effect branded me "a Nazi" in his 16 March 2007 (supplied), yet again, TDC Simon J Dowling repeated this racist, xenophobic and defamatory comment in this email, stating "<i>The producer of this website is franco-german in origin and so would be aware of the terms pigs and monkeys used during the Nazi regime to refer to Jewish people</i>"</p>
50.	<p>On page 6, point 16 of my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request, I asked: "<i>As Simon J. Dowling has branded me "a Nazi" - please supply copy of briefings, correspondence, including any electronic transmission, record of any meetings and of any telephone conversations that allowed him to breach the Metropolitan Police Service code that "MPS personnel must not use MPS systems to author, transmit or store documents such as electronic mail...containing racist,...defamatory, offensive,...material"</i>"</p> <p>This request has not been complied with.</p>
51.	<p>Having implied in his 16 March 2007 email (supplied) that I had 'committed a crime', as a result of being challenged by my website Host, TDC SJ Dowling climbed down, stating in the last part of his 20 March 2007 email (supplied) "<i>If you are unable to close the site down I will let the victim know as there is nothing we as a police force can do except class it as a racist incident...</i>" - while still not providing any evidence in support of his accusation.</p>
52.	<p>On page 6, point 13 of my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request I wrote: "<i>As, following being challenged by my website Host who asked "Are you aware that there are laws against making false accusations?, Simon J. Dowling backed-down in his 20 March 2007 e-mail by stating "there is nothing we as a police force can do..." - please supply copy of briefings, correspondence, including any electronic transmission, record of any meetings and of any telephone conversations that led to Simon J. Dowling to back down on his implied accusation that I had 'committed a crime'.</i>"</p> <p>This request has not been complied with.</p>
53.	<p>On page 6, point 14 of my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request I asked "<i>As, following being challenged by my website Host, Simon J. Dowling backed down from his implied accusation that I had 'committed a crime' - please supply copy of briefings, correspondence, including any</i></p>

⁴⁹ 07.03.20 – Email from TDC SJ Dowling of Kensington & Chelsea police 'Community Support Unit' to my website Host in which he backed down on his accusations against me in his 16 March 2007 email

	<p><i>electronic transmission, record of any meetings and of any telephone conversations that allowed him to breach the Metropolitan Police Service code that "MPS personnel must not use MPS systems to author, transmit or store documents such as electronic mail... containing ...defamatory,... illegal...material"</i></p> <p>This request has not been complied with.</p>
54.	4.13 Page 27 – 19/03/2007 – 18h04 – TDC SJ Dowling
55.	<p>The entry reads "<i>Crime reclassified to no crime unconfirmed</i>".</p> <p>What does this mean?</p>
56.	4.14 Page 27 – 17/02/2009 – 99
57.	<p>The entry reads "<i>The Branch flags 'FH', 'RJ', 'RS' were present in this crime report. As a result of the introduction of the new 'DV/Hate crime' tab on the General Information screen today, there are now associated fields ('HateCrimeReligion', 'HateCrimeRace') on the new tab and these have been selected</i>"</p> <p>As explained in my above replies I have not committed any of these "crimes". Hence, these classifications are false.</p> <p>I also repeat that, Kensington & Chelsea police has breached the Fourth Principle of the Data Protection Act 1998 – by not contacting me – at any point in time - following 'the complaint' – and has therefore clearly failed "to take reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of the data" it captured about me.</p>
58.	4.15 Other outstanding requests made in my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request
59.	<p>On 26/27 April 2007, three days after I gave prominence to the events on my website, the message that, "<i>The police is not going to pursue it. Isn't that good news?</i>" was communicated to me through my then employer, KPMG. By then, five weeks had elapsed since the 20 March 2007 e-mail from Simon J. Dowling. Nor had he contacted my website Host since.</p>
60.	<p>On page 6, point 17 of my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request, I asked: "<i>As the message "The police is not going to pursue it. Isn't that good news?" was communicated to me through my then employer, KPMG – please supply copy of relevant procedure, briefings, correspondence, including any electronic transmission, record of any meetings and any telephone conversations that resulted in the decision to communicate this message to me – about my personal website - through my employer.</i>"</p> <p>This request has not been complied with.</p>
61.	<p>On page 6, point 18 of my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request, I asked: "<i>Please provide detail of individuals / organisations to which Andrew Ladsky's 2007 complaint against me has been transmitted, as well as copy of:</i></p>

	<p>(1) <i>The information supplied to the individuals / organisations</i></p> <p>(2) <i>Briefings, correspondence, including any electronic transmission, record of any meetings and of any telephone conversations that led to this information being communicated to the individuals / organisations”.</i></p> <p>This request has not been complied with.</p>
62.	<p>On page 7, point 19 of my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request, I asked “<i>Considering:</i></p> <p>(1) <i>The accusations made by Simon J. Dowling to my website Host in relation to the content of my website</i></p> <p>(2) <i>The numerous instances of harassment and breaches of my Human Rights, overwhelming black on white evidence of criminal activity comprising of fraud, deception, blackmail, etc. – specifically identified as such on my website – at the time that Simon J. Dowling claimed to have looked at my website</i></p> <p>(3) <i>The mandate and promises made by Kensington & Chelsea police’s ‘Community Service Unit’ on its website (at 23 March 2007): “Every crime has a bad effect on the victim but hate crimes are probably the most damaging. They happen when a person hates someone else enough to abuse them, attack them or commit some other offence against them... The more we know about these crimes and who commits them, the better we can work to prevent, detect and investigate them in the future. It’s our job to identify what’s happened and make sure that appropriate action is taken”</i></p> <p><i>Please supply copy of relevant procedure, briefings, correspondence, including any electronic transmission, record of any meetings and of any telephone conversations that allowed Simon J. Dowling to totally ignore my claims, on my website – at the time he looked at it - that criminal acts had and continued to be committed against me”</i></p> <p>This request has not been complied with.</p>
63.	<p>On page 7, point 20 of my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request, I asked “<i>Please supply copy of any other information held about me by the police”.</i></p> <p>This request has not been complied with.</p>

Yours sincerely,

Noëlle Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé



Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

Great Portland Street
54 - 56 Great Portland Street

London
Greater London
W1W 7NE

Date and Time: 13/08/2009
Session Prefix: 3-3951077
Dest: UK (E.U.)
Quantity: 1
Weight: 0.777 kg

Special D by 1 £6.70

Total Cost of Services £6.70

Posted after Last Collection? No

Guaranteed Delivery Date: 14/08/2009

Barcode: ZW1933918656B

DESTINATION ADDRESS
Building Name or Number Postcode
PO Box 57192 SW6 1SF
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

http://postcode.royalmail.com/portal/rm/trackresults?catId=22700601&pageId=trt_rmresultspage&keyname

Started [Latest Headlines](#)

[Personal Customers](#) [Small & Medium Business](#) [Corporate & Public Sector](#)

Search 

Delivery Services

Marketing Services

Logistics Services

Discounts & Payment



Home > Track and trace >

Track it down

Please enter your [13 character reference](#)
e.g. AA000100019GB

ZW193391865GB

Track item 



[How to find your reference number](#) 

Delivered

Your item with reference ZW193391865GB was delivered from our FULHAM Delivery Office on 14/08/09.

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 