

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

Ms N Klosterkötter-Dit-Rawé

[redacted]

(By 'Special delivery')

Your Ref : 2009 060 000 181

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

20 September 2009

- At 11 Nov 09, no reply to this letter from the Public Access Office, but a 'Get lost' from Acting Chief Inspector, Steve McSorley, Professional Standards & Performance, Kensington & Chelsea police, dated 22 Sep 09 - who was also 'responding' to my copying Chief Superintendent, Mark Heath, Kensington police, on this letter, with a covering letter, dated 20 Sep 09
- I replied to Steve McSorley on 8 Oct 09. Lack of response one month later, led me to send a chaser letter on 11 Nov 09
- I also wrote to Mark Heath on 8 Oct 09, and copied him on McSorley's 22 Sep 09 'response'. Ditto: lack of response led me to send a chaser letter on 11 Nov 09
(See also what has been going on with my Member of Parliament, Sir Malcolm Rifkind, a Queen's Counsel)

Dear Ms/Mrs [redacted]

KENSINGTON & CHELSEA POLICE IS NOT EXEMPT FROM COMPLIANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE DATA PROTECTION ACT 1998

I acknowledge receipt of your 25 August 2009 letter following my 13 August 2009 response to your 20 July 2009 reply to my 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request under the Data Protection Act 1998.

I assume you are acting on behalf of Chief Superintendent Mark Heath, Borough Commander and senior officer in charge of Kensington & Chelsea police (K&C police) – who must be the "data controller", as defined in section 1(1) of the Data Protection Act 1998 (the "Act"), in respect of the processing of personal data about me carried out by Kensington & Chelsea police.

The highly dismissive, contemptuous and arrogant tone of your letter leads me to conclude that Mark Heath considers K&C police to be exempt from complying with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998. Indeed, you state:

"I have forwarded your concerns on to the Investigating Officer who will if he feels necessary update the report".

"If this is completed I will forward you a updated version"

"... I can confirm after making enquiries there is no further information we can provide you with"

While the conduct of its personnel clearly demonstrates otherwise, K&C police is **not** exempt from complying with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998.

I am copying Mark Heath on this letter, as well as on my previous correspondence to you and your reply of 25 August 2009 as:

(1) a large proportion of the data you hold about me is false, unlawful, misleading, scurrilous, libellous, biased, corrupted, incomplete in some very significant aspects – and I have the right, under the Act, to seek – and obtain – an end to the processing of data "likely to cause damage or distress", as well as obtain correction of data to ensure that it is "fair, lawful and accurate".

(2) you are refusing to provide me with the data processed about me i.e. data that is 'obviously about me' / 'relates to me' / is 'linked to me' – and are thereby preventing me from ensuring that fair processing

requirements have been complied with, as well as submit subject access requests to other processors of my personal data.

(3) the current guidelines from the Association of Chief Police Officers recommend that the information about an individual is retained “until the individual reaches 100 years of age”. It means that my personal data will be ‘processed’ by a multitude of individuals. It is therefore of paramount importance to me that this data is fair, accurate and lawful.

If you persist in failing to comply with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998, and hence persist in causing me distress, as well as damage, I will contact the Office of the Information Commissioner to request that an Enforcement Notice under s.42 of the Act is served on Chief Superintendent Mark Heath. In this context, I will also ask the Information Commissioner to take into consideration my rights under the Human Rights Act 1998.

If this proves necessary, I will follow this with legal proceedings as per my rights under s.14 of the Act.

Whether or not this matter ends-up in court, I demand that Mark Heath immediately sends a letter to my website Host retrieving all the malicious, scurrilous and libellous accusations made against me by his member of staff, TDC Simon J Dowling, in his 16 and 20 March 2007 emails to my website Host – and that he copies me on this letter. I have informed him of this.

The sections and page location in this document are:

1. Requirements imposed on ‘data controllers’ under the Data Protection Act 1998	3
1.1 DPA and ICO: It is the duty of a data controller to comply with the data protection principles in relation to all personal data with respect to which he is the data controller	3
1.2 Definition of “data”	3
1.3 Definition of “data subject”, “personal data”	4
1.4 The Data Protection Principles.....	5
1.4.1 First Principle	5
1.4.2 Second Principle	5
1.4.3 Third Principle	6
1.4.4 Fourth Principle.....	6
1.4.5 Fifth Principle	6
1.4.6 Sixth Principle	6
1.4.7 Seventh Principle	6
1.5 Right of access to personal data.....	6
1.6 Right to prevent processing likely to cause damage or distress	7
2. Your comment “If the Investigating Officer feels it necessary to update the report”.....	7
2.1 You hold data about me that are trumped-up accusations, unlawful, malicious, vicious attacks on my name, character and reputation	7

- 2.2 You hold data about me that is false, a scurrilous, libellous, malicious attack on my name, character and reputation 13
- 2.3 You hold data about me that is biased, corrupted, false, deceitful, conveys a false, misleading impression of me 21
- 2.4 Highly pertinent evidence has been withheld to cover-up 'inconvenient' events, and as a means of disparaging me and discrediting me 25
3. Your comment "...I can confirm after making enquiries there is no further information we can provide you with" 28

The date preceding each point e.g. 'Pg 5 - Pt 3 – 2003 "'It is not true that the person is "unknown"..." refers to the date of the complaint.

1 Requirements imposed on 'data controllers' under the Data Protection Act 1998

In light of your letter, in support of my response, from section 2 onwards, I remind you – or, more appropriately, given your letter: *inform you* - of the pertinent requirements imposed on 'data controllers' under the Act.

To this effect, I quote from: (1) the Data Protection Act 1998 (DPA); (2) 'The Data Protection Technical Guidance – Determining what is personal data – Information Commissioner's Office, 21 August 2007 (ICO); (3) 'Use and disclosure of health data, Information Commissioner Office, May 2002 (ICO-2)

1.1 DPA and ICO: It is the duty of a data controller to comply with the data protection principles in relation to all personal data with respect to which he is the data controller

DPA – Part I – 1. (1) "*data controller*" means, subject to subsection (4), a person who (either alone or jointly or in common with other persons) determines the purposes for which and the manner in which any personal data are, or are to be, processed"

1.2 Definition of "data"

DPA - Part I – 1. (1) - "**data**" means information which-

- (a) is being processed by means of equipment operating automatically in response to instructions given for that purpose;
- (b) is recorded with the intention that it should be processed by means of such equipment,
- (c) is recorded as part of a relevant filing system or with the intention that it should form part of a relevant filing system, or
- (d) does not fall within paragraph (a), (b) or (c) but forms part of an accessible record as defined by section 68"

"**processing**", in relation to information or data, means obtaining, recording or holding the information or data or carrying out any operation or set of operations on the information or data, including-

- (a) organisation, adaptation or alteration of the information or data,
- (b) retrieval, consultation or use of the information or data,
- (c) disclosure of the information or data by transmission, dissemination or otherwise making available, or
- (d) alignment, combination, blocking, erasure or destruction of the information or data;

"**relevant filing system**" means any set of information relating to individuals to the extent that, although the information is not processed by means of equipment operating automatically in response to

instructions given for that purpose, the set is structured, either by reference to individuals or by reference to criteria relating to individuals, in such a way that specific information relating to a particular individual is readily accessible”

Part I – 1. (2) *“In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires-*

(a) "obtaining" or "recording", in relation to personal data, includes obtaining or recording the information to be contained in the data, and

(b) "using" or "disclosing", in relation to personal data, includes using or disclosing the information contained in the data”

1.3 Definition of “data subject”, “personal data”

DPA - Part I – 1. (1) **"data subject"** means an individual who is the subject of personal data;

"personal data" means data which relate to a living individual who can be identified-

(a) from those data, or

(b) from those data and other information which is in the possession of, or is likely to come into the possession of, the data controller,

and includes any expression of opinion about the individual and any indication of the intentions of the data controller or any other person in respect of the individual”

DPA – Part I – **“Sensitive personal data - 2.** In this Act "sensitive personal data" means personal data consisting of information as to-

(a) the racial or ethnic origin of the data subject,

(b) his political opinions,

(e) his physical or mental health or condition,

(g) the commission or alleged commission by him of any offence”

ICO - **Personal data is when:**

- The data is ‘obviously about’ a particular individual
- The data is ‘linked to’ an individual and provides particular information about that individual
- The data is used, can be used to inform or influence actions or decisions affecting an identifiable individual

‘Relates to’ the identifiable individual: Data that ‘relates to’ the individual is data processed to learn or record something about that individual, or where the processing of that information has an impact upon that individual i.e. processed for the purpose of determining or influencing the way in which that person is treated. Hence, it covers data intended to (1) learn, (2) record; or (3) decide something about an identifiable individual.

Also includes data which, in itself is not personal data but, in certain circumstances, becomes personal data where it can be linked to an individual to provide particular information about that individual i.e. the incidental consequence of processing of the data allows (1) to learn or record something about an identifiable individual; (2) can have an impact on, or affect an identifiable individual .

Processing which has an impact on individuals – When the personal information about one individual is personal data affecting another individual.

The data focuses or concentrates on the individual as its central theme rather than on some other person, or some object, transaction or event. The data about an object, transaction or event is personal data when the information is processed to record something about an individual.

The data impact or have the potential to impact on an individual, whether in a personal, family, business or professional capacity.

1.4 The Data Protection Principles

DPA – Part I – *“The Data Protection Principles –*

4.(1) References in this Act to the data protection principles are to the principles set out in Part I of Schedule 1.

(2) Those principles are to be interpreted in accordance with Part II of Schedule 1.

(3) Schedule 2 (which applies to all personal data) and Schedule 3 (which applies only to sensitive personal data) set out conditions applying for the purposes of the first principle; and Schedule 4 sets out cases in which the eighth principle does not apply”

(4) Subject to section 27(1), it shall be the duty of a data controller to comply with the data protection principles in relation to all personal data with respect to which he is the data controller.”

1.4.1 First Principle

“Personal data shall be processed fairly and lawfully and, in particular, shall not be processed unless- (a) at least one of the conditions in Schedule 2 is met, and (b) in the case of sensitive personal data, at least one of the conditions in Schedule 3 is also met”

Hence, the **cumulative requirements** are: (1) to satisfy a condition in Schedule 2 and Schedule 3 (I leave it up to you to look-up Schedules 2 and 3); (2) data collected fairly, and (3) processed lawfully.

ICO-2 – *“When obtaining data from a third person: the data controller has an overriding duty to process personal data fairly. The fact that the data controller has had to expend a substantial amount of effort and/or cost in providing the information does not necessarily mean that the Commissioner will reach the decision that the data controller can legitimately rely upon the disproportionate effort exception. In certain circumstances, the Commissioner would consider that such an effort could reasonably be expected”.* (A prime example of this situation relates to the police when it accuses an individual of committing an offence).

ICO-2 – *“Lawfully” - A data controller must comply with all relevant rules of law whether derived from statute or common law, relating to the purpose and ways in which the data controller processes personal data. A data controller may only act within the limits of his / her legal powers: the **ultra vires rule**”.*

ICO-2 – *“When data on an individual is passed on to e.g. social services, the individual must be provided with this information in order to satisfy the fair processing requirements... and to allow the individual to make subject access requests”*

1.4.2 Second Principle

“Personal data shall be obtained only for one or more specified and lawful purposes, and shall not be further processed in any manner incompatible with that purpose or those purposes”

1.4.3 Third Principle

“Personal data shall be adequate, relevant and not excessive in relation to the purpose or purposes for which they are processed”

1.4.4 Fourth Principle

“Personal data shall be accurate and, where necessary, kept up to date.

Part II – Interpretation - *“7. The fourth principle is not to be regarded as being contravened by reason of any inaccuracy in personal data which accurately record information obtained by the data controller from the data subject or a third party in a case where-*

(a) having regard to the purpose or purposes for which the data were obtained and further processed, the data controller has taken reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of the data, and

(b) if the data subject has notified the data controller of the data subject’s view that the data are inaccurate, the data indicate that fact”.

1.4.5 Fifth Principle

“Personal data processed for any purpose or purposes shall not be kept for longer than is necessary for that purpose or those purposes”

1.4.6 Sixth Principle

“Personal data shall be processed in accordance with the rights of data subjects under this Act”

Part II – Interpretation - *“8. A person is to be regarded as contravening the sixth principle if, but only if- (a) he contravenes section 7 by failing to supply information in accordance with that section”*

1.4.7 Seventh Principle

“Appropriate technical and organisational measures shall be taken against unauthorised or unlawful processing of personal data and against accidental loss or destruction of, or damage to, personal data”

Part II – Interpretation - *“10. The data controller must take reasonable steps to ensure the reliability of any employees of his who have access to the personal data”*

1.5 Right of access to personal data.

DPA - Part I – 7 (1) *Subject to the following provisions of this section and to sections 8 and 9, an individual is entitled-*

(a) to be informed by any data controller whether personal data of which that individual is the data subject are being processed by or on behalf of that data controller,

(b) if that is the case, to be given by the data controller a description of-

(i) the personal data of which that individual is the data subject,

(ii) the purposes for which they are being or are to be processed, and

(iii) the recipients or classes of recipients to whom they are or may be disclosed,

(c) to have communicated to him in an intelligible form-

(i) the information constituting any personal data of which that individual is the data subject, and

(ii) any information available to the data controller as to the source of those data, and
(d) where the processing by automatic means of personal data of which that individual is the data subject for the purpose of evaluating matters relating to him such as, for example, his performance at work, his creditworthiness, his reliability or his conduct, has constituted or is likely to constitute the sole basis for any decision significantly affecting him, to be informed by the data controller of the logic involved in that decision-taking”.

1.6 Right to prevent processing likely to cause damage or distress

DPA – Part I – “10. - (1) Subject to subsection (2), an individual is entitled at any time by notice in writing to a data controller to require the data controller at the end of such period as is reasonable in the circumstances to cease, or not to begin, processing, or processing for a specified purpose or in a specified manner, any personal data in respect of which he is the data subject, on the ground that, for specified reasons-

(a) the processing of those data or their processing for that purpose or in that manner is causing or is likely to cause substantial damage or substantial distress to him or to another, and

(b) that damage or distress is or would be unwarranted”

2 Your comment “If the Investigating Officer feels it necessary to update the report”.

As very clearly and comprehensively detailed in my 13 August 2009 reply:

2.1 You hold data about me that are trumped-up accusations, unlawful, malicious, vicious attacks on my name, character and reputation

Pg 17 Pt 4 2003 – The classification of the complaint as “*SUBSTANT/Offence of harassment*” is **false**, as **I have not** committed an offence under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997. K&C police does NOT have evidence to support this classification. It is **a trumped-up accusation** concocted by Andrew Ladsky and the police.

As two or more offences under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 are punishable by imprisonment – and therefore criminal – it implies that I am a criminal.

This is an unlawful, scurrilous, malicious, libellous accusation against me.

Processing of this data, which under Part I – 2. of the Act is defined as “*Sensitive personal data... as it consists of information as to - (g) the commission or alleged commission by him of any offence*” - amounts to, among others, a breach of my rights under:

1. the First Principle “*Personal data shall processed fairly and lawfully*”. “*Lawfully*” means that “*A data controller must comply with all relevant rules of law whether derived from statute or common law*” “*When obtaining data from a third person the data controller has an overriding duty to process personal data fairly*”
2. the Fourth Principle “*Personal data shall be accurate... (a) the data controller has taken reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of the data*”

3. the Sixth Principle *“Personal data shall be processed in accordance with the rights of data subjects under this Act”*

It also amounts to a breach of the Seventh Principle which requires that *“Appropriate technical and organisational measures shall be taken against unauthorised or unlawful processing of personal data”*. Part II – Interpretation *“10. The data controller must take reasonable steps to ensure the reliability of any employees of his who have access to the personal data”*

It is fascinating to see K&C police’s readiness to – falsely – capture that I have committed an offence under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 v. its blind eye attitude to Andrew Ladsky and his puppets’ criminal offences against me (and my fellow leaseholders) under:

- the same Act;
- the Fraud Act 2006;
- the Malicious Communications Act 1988;
- the Theft Act 1968 / Theft Amendment Act 1996;
- the Money Laundering Regulations / Proceeds of Crime Act 2002;
- the Criminal Justice Act & Public Order Act 1994. Etc.

What’s the benefit to K&C police of turning a blind eye to these criminal offences?

Pg 18 Pts 2003 - It is **not true** I said *“Go fuck yourself”* to Ladsky on *“approximately 3 or 4 other occasions”*

As I wrote under this point in my 13 August 2009 letter *“Perhaps the objective is an attempt to make it ‘stick’ under the Protection 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””*

To process this data amounts to stating that I am a criminal, as offences under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 are punishable by imprisonment.

Among others, processing of this data which, under Part I – 2. of the Act is defined as *“Sensitive personal data... as it consists of information as to - (g) the commission or alleged commission by him of any offence”* - amounts to a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles. It also amounts to a breach of the Seventh Principle.”

Pg 34 Pt 41 2007 – It is therefore equally **not true** that *“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”*

Ditto re the point about K&C police’s readiness to capture lies about me v. its blind eye attitude when it comes to criminal offences committed by Ladsky and his puppets.

Rest of comments: as per above, under ‘Pg 18, Pts 8,9’.

Pg 34 Pt 41 2007 – The statement *"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"*

Oh dear! How 'magnanimous' to not *"not take action at the time"*! Of course no action *"was taken"* as I have not committed an offence.

Ditto re the point about K&C police's readiness to capture lies about me v. its blind eye attitude when it comes to criminal offences committed by Ladsky and his puppets.

Rest of comments: as per above, under 'Pg 17, Pt 4'...

...to which is added breach of my rights under the Second Principle *"Personal data shall be obtained only for one or more specified and lawful purposes, and shall not be further processed in any manner incompatible with that purpose or those purposes"*

Pg 19 Pt 14 2003 - It is **not true** that I *"wrote letters accusing the victim [i.e. Ladsky] of theft"*

K&C police has very conveniently omitted to obtain the evidence in support of the accusation. It is an unlawful, malicious, scurrilous and libellous accusation against me.

As I wrote under this point in my 13 August 2009 response: *"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 the full amount 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"*

Ditto re the point about K&C police's readiness to capture lies about me v. its blind eye attitude when it comes to criminal offences committed by Ladsky and his puppets.

Processing of this data which, under Part I – 2. of the Act is defined as *"Sensitive personal data... as it consists of information as to - (g) the commission or alleged commission by him of any offence"* - amounts to, among others, a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles. It also amounts to a breach of the Seventh Principle.

Pg 24 Pt 2 2007 - It is **not true** that the content of my website www.leasehold-outrage.com
Pg 25 Pt 7 amounts to committing *"racist"* and *"anti-Semitic"* acts.

Pg 25 Pt 13

Yet, again, K&C police has NOT provided any evidence in support of these accusations. They are therefore unlawful, scurrilous, libellous and malicious accusations against me intended to defame my name, character and reputation – including in the eyes of my website Host to whom TDC, Simon J Dowling of the 'Community Safety Unit', communicated these false accusations.

The reason no evidence has EVER been supplied is because these accusations against me **are false**. They are sick, **trumped-up accusations** concocted by Andrew Ladsky, the police and parties external to the police - with the blatantly obvious objective of

scaring my website Host into closing down my website (evidence on page 35, point 47 of my 13 August 2009 reply).

This is the reason why K&C police opted to NOT contact me at ANY point in time in relation to this so-called 'complaint' by Ladsky. It gave it free rein to capture fabricated lies against me.

Ditto re the point about K&C police's readiness to capture lies about me v. its blind eye attitude when it comes to criminal offences committed by Ladsky and his puppets.

Processing of this data which, under Part I – 2. of the Act is defined as "*Sensitive personal data... as it consists of information as to - (g) the commission or alleged commission by him of any offence*" - amounts to, among others, a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles. It also amounts to a breach of the Seventh Principle.

Pg 24 Pt 5 2007 - It is **not true** that I committed a "*Hate crime*". It is a **trumped-up accusation** concocted by Ladsky, the police, and parties external to the police.

Rest of comments: as per above, under 'Pg 24, Pg 25, Pg 25 - Pt 2, Pt 7, Pt 13; Pg 24, Pt 5'.

Pg 35 Pt 45 2007 – The statement that "*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*"

This is a **trumped-up accusation**. Rest of comments: as per above, under 'Pg 24, Pg 25, Pg 25 - Pt 2, Pt 7, Pt 13; Pg 24, Pt 5'.

Pg 37 Pt 57 The statement that "*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*"

This is a **trumped-up accusation**. Rest of comments: as per above, under 'Pg 24, Pg 25, Pg 25 - Pt 2, Pt 7, Pt 13'.

Pg 25 Pt 11 2007 - It is also **not true** that my website www.leasehold-outrage.com "*contains anti-Semitic, anti-black and anti-Asian pictures and text*"

Until I received the report from the police in July 2009, I had no knowledge that accusations of "*anti-black and anti-Asian pictures and text*" had also been recorded against me. These are sick, **trumped-up accusations** concocted by Ladsky, the police and probably parties external to the police.

K&C police has NOT provided ANY evidence whatsoever in support of these accusations. They are therefore unlawful, scurrilous, malicious accusations against me intended to defame my name, character and reputation.

Ditto re the point about K&C police's readiness to capture lies about me v. its blind eye

attitude when it comes to criminal offences committed by Ladsky and his puppets.

Processing of this data which, under Part I – 2. of the Act is defined as “*Sensitive personal data... as it consists of information as to - (g) the commission or alleged commission by him of any offence*” - amounts to, among others, a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles. It also amounts to a breach of the Seventh Principle.

Pg 29 Pt 22 2007 - The statement that *"There are a number of sections which are alleged to be of a racial nature and numerous references by name to the victim"*

These allegations are unlawful, malicious, scurrilous and libellous because they are **not true**. Yet again, they are **trumped-up accusations**. No evidence has EVER been supplied to support these accusations.

Furthermore, as detailed under the below section headed, ‘Your comment “*I can confirm after making enquiries there is no further information we can provide you with*” – you have failed to address my questions for evidence in support of these allegations. WHY?

The reason no evidence has EVER been supplied – and continues to NOT be supplied - is because these allegations against me **are false** – and K&C police knows that.

Ditto re the point about K&C police’s readiness to capture lies about me v. its blind eye attitude when it comes to criminal offences committed by Ladsky and his puppets.

Processing of this data which, under Part I – 2. of the Act is defined as “*Sensitive personal data... as it consists of information as to - (g) the commission or alleged commission by him of any offence*” - amounts to, among others, a breach of my rights under the First, Fourth and Sixth Principles. It also amounts to a breach of the Seventh Principle.

Pg 30 Pt 23 2007 - The statement *"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..."*

These accusations are unlawful, malicious, scurrilous and libellous because they are **not true**. They are **trumped-up accusations** concocted by Ladsky, the police and probably parties external to the police. No evidence has EVER been supplied.

Furthermore, as detailed under the below section headed, ‘Your comment “*I can confirm after making enquiries there is no further information we can provide you with*” – you have failed to address my questions for evidence in support of these accusations. WHY?

The reason no evidence has EVER been supplied – and continues to NOT be supplied - is because these accusations against me **are false** – and K&C police knows that, which is why it opted to NOT contact me at ANY point in time in relation to this so-called ‘complaint’ by Ladsky. It made it a lot easier to capture fabricated lies against me.

Ditto re the point about K&C police's readiness to capture lies about me v. its blind eye attitude when it comes to criminal offences committed by Ladsky and his puppets.

As it stands, processing of this data which, under Part I – 2. of the Act is defined as "*Sensitive personal data... as it consists of information as to - (g) the commission or alleged commission by him of any offence*" - amounts to, among others, a breach of my rights under the First, Fourth and Sixth Principles. It also amounts to a breach of the Seventh Principle.

Pg 30 Pt 24 2007 - The statement "*The specific remarks and pictures that are being complained about are contained throughout...*"

These are trumped-up accusations. Other comments: as per above, under 'Pg 30, Pt 23'.

Pg 31 Pt 27 2007 - The statement "*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... and believes this what the suspect is referring to*"
Pg 32 Pt 29

Unbelievably, in writing this in his 16 and 20 March 2007 emails to my website Host, TDC Simon J Dowling justified it by quoting the fact that I am "*Franco-German*" - hence, by using data which, under Part I – 2. of the Act is defined as "*sensitive personal data... as it consists of information as to (a) the racial or ethnic origin of the data subject*"

I stated in my reply that, aside from having no knowledge of this, it is blatantly obvious from my website that these accusations against me **are false**.

Yet again, K&C police has NOT provided any evidence in support of these accusations. They are sick, **trumped-up accusations** concocted by Andrew Ladsky, the police and parties external to the police with the blatantly obvious objective of scaring my website Host into closing down my website (evidence on page 35, point 47 of my 13 August 2009 reply).

They are therefore unlawful, malicious, scurrilous and libellous accusations against me intended to defame my name, character and reputation – including in the eyes of my website Host to whom TDC Simon J Dowling of the 'Community Safety Unit', communicated these false accusations.

Furthermore, as detailed under the below section headed, 'Your comment "*I can confirm after making enquiries there is no further information we can provide you with*" – you have failed to address my question for evidence in support of these accusations. WHY?

The reason no evidence has EVER been supplied – and continues to NOT be supplied - is because these allegations against me **are false** – and K&C police knows that, which is why it opted to NOT contact me at ANY point in time in relation to this so-called 'complaint'. It gave it free rein to capture fabricated lies against me.

Taken with the other equally scurrilous, libellous and malicious accusations against me,

I attribute these trumped-up accusations to revenge and abuse of power.

Ditto re the point about K&C police's readiness to capture lies about me v. its blind eye attitude when it comes to criminal offences committed by Ladsky and his puppets.

Hence, processing of this data which, under Part I – 2. of the Act is defined as “*Sensitive personal data... as it consists of information as to - (g) the commission or alleged commission by him of any offence*” - amounts to, among others, a breach of my rights under the First, Fourth and Sixth Principles. It also amounts to a breach of the Seventh Principle.

Pg 33 Pt 34 2007 – The statement “*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*”

As I stated under this point in my 13 August 2009 correspondence “*“Slander” is the ‘spoken word’, and ‘libel’ the ‘written word’. There is no recording on my website*”.

These are **trumped-up accusations** by Ladsky et.al – because they don’t like having a mirror held to their face - as it reflects their incompetence, maladministration, malpractice, collusion, deceit, corruption, fraud.

K&C police has NOT provided ANY evidence in support of these accusations. They are therefore unlawful, malicious, scurrilous and libellous accusations against me intended to defame my name, character and reputation.

Furthermore, as detailed under the below section headed, ‘Your comment “*I can confirm after making enquiries there is no further information we can provide you with*” – you have failed to address my question for evidence in support of these allegations. WHY?

The reason no evidence has EVER been supplied – and continues to NOT be supplied - is because these allegations against me **are false** – and K&C police knows that, which is why it opted to NOT contact me at ANY point in time in relation to this so-called ‘complaint’. It gave it free rein to capture fabricated lies against me – for which it clearly had carte blanche to do so at high level within Government and the Establishment.

Ditto re the point about K&C police's readiness to capture lies about me v. its blind eye attitude when it comes to criminal offences committed by Ladsky and his puppets.

Processing of this data which, under Part I – 2. of the Act is defined as “*Sensitive personal data... as it consists of information as to – (b) his political opinions; (g) the commission or alleged commission by him of any offence*” – amounts to, among others, a breach of my rights under the First, Fourth and sixth Principles. It also amounts to a breach of the requirements set under the Seventh Principle.

2.2 You hold data about me that is false, a scurrilous, libellous, malicious attack on my name, character and reputation

Pg 19 Pt 13 2003 - It is **not true** that I “*started to verbally abuse Ladsky in November 2002*”

K&C police has, yet again, ‘very conveniently’, omitted to ask Ladsky for evidence in

support of his accusations against me.

Firstly, as detailed under this point in my 13 August 2009 response, at the 29 October 2002 pre-trial LVT hearing, I, (in tandem with my fellow leaseholders), called Ladsky a 'liar'. This is *not* 'abuse' – as it is **a fact**.

(Concise Oxford English dictionary definition of 'abuse': "*Address in an insulting and offensive way*"; Definition of 'fact': "*A thing that is indisputably the case; information used as evidence; the truth about events as opposed to interpretation*")

Secondly, this statement – falsely - implies that I have been "*verbally abusing Ladsky*" 'on an ongoing basis since November 2002'.

This data is clearly intended to convey a misleading and detrimental perception of me.

Hence, processing of this data amounts to, among others, a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles.

Pg 29 Pt 20 2007 - The statements that "*Since this she has been extremely upset and is seeking compensation and retribution for her time, money and effort*" – which are preceded by "*In order to challenge this charge it actually cost a considerably larger sum of money than she saved*"

This accusation is malicious, scurrilous and libellous because it is **not true**. What I am seeking is justice – and this is very amply supported by the evidence – which, of course, K&C police has very conveniently opted to overlook in order to not undermine the so-called 'complaint' from Andrew Ladsky.

As to the comment that "*it actually cost a considerably larger sum of money than she saved*"- which is used with the aim of giving weight to the malicious accusation: considering that a c.£500,000 theft actually took place, it is a dire indictment of the so-called 'justice' system of this country that I was not able to recoup my costs. So, yes, keep that statement in! See My Diary 6 May 08

Processing of this data which, under Part 1 – 2. of the Act is defined as "*Sensitive personal data... as it consists of information as to - (g) the commission or alleged commission by him of any offence*" - amounts to, among others, a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles.

Pg 29 Pt 21 2007 - The statement that "*...there are parts of the site which are alleged to be extremely upsetting and insulting*"

This allegation is malicious, scurrilous and libellous because it is **not true**. NO evidence has EVER been supplied in support of this allegation.

Furthermore, as detailed under the below section headed, 'Your comment "*I can confirm after making enquiries there is no further information we can provide you with*" – you have failed to address my questions for evidence in support of this allegation. WHY?

The reason no evidence has EVER been supplied – and continues to NOT be supplied - is because this allegation against me is **false** – and K&C police knows that.

Hence, as it stands, processing of this data is, among others, a breach of my rights under the First, Fourth and Sixth Principles.

Pg 30 Pt 25 2007 - The 'expression of opinion' "...although it appears to be becoming quite paranoid".

This 'expression of opinion' about me is malicious, scurrilous and libellous as **I have evidence to support my claims** that I am under surveillance – to which a lot more has been added since. This includes e.g. on 15 June 2009, being followed by a cyclist in Hyde Park who told me "Enjoy your life. You don't have long to live". It was abundantly clear from the sequence of events that the cyclist knew who I was. (Another example is contained, below, in this section: under 'Pg 34, Pt 38)

Furthermore, as detailed under the below section headed, 'Your comment "I can confirm after making enquiries there is no further information we can provide you with" – you have failed to address my question "On what basis does PC K O'Brien considers himself entitled to make this 'assessment' about me?" WHY?

Processing of this data which, under Part I s.2 of the Act is defined as "Sensitive personal data...an expression of opinion consisting of information as to (e) the physical or mental health or condition of the data subject" – amounts to, among others, a breach of my rights under the First, Fourth and Sixth Principles. It also amounts to a breach of the Seventh Principle.

Pg 32 Pt 32 2007 - The statement "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..."

"She is obviously extremely paranoid..." This 'expression of opinion' about me is malicious, scurrilous and libellous as **I have evidence to support my claims** that I am under surveillance – to which a lot more has been added since – e.g. the example reported under the above point. Another example is contained, below, in this section: under 'Pg 34, Pt 38.

To this can be added K&C police's very blatant siding with Andrew Ladsky – and therefore protection – which was already blatantly obvious from my experience with K&C police since 2002, and has been further confirmed by the data currently held about me by the police, as well as your highly dismissive, arrogant and contemptuous reply of 25 August 2009 letter to my 13 August 2009 response.

Furthermore, as detailed under the below section headed, 'Your comment "I can confirm after making enquiries there is no further information we can provide you with" – you have failed to address my question "On what basis does PC K O'Brien considers himself entitled to make this 'assessment' about me?" WHY?

Processing of this data which, under Part I s.2 of the Act is defined as "Sensitive personal data...an expression of opinion consisting of information as to (e) the physical or mental health or condition of the data subject" – amounts to, among others, a breach of my rights under the First, Fourth and Sixth Principles. It also amounts to a breach of the Seventh Principle.

Pg 32 Pt 30 2007 – The statement *"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"*

"The suspect took exception to this" is intended to portray me as somebody who defaults on her financial obligations, etc. It is a false, malicious, scurrilous, libellous comment against me.

This attack on my reputation is helped by the fact that K&C police has very conveniently **failed to establish**, or, probably more accurately: **conveniently failed to capture** key events, such as: **(1)** the fact that the 'determination' by the tribunal resulted in a £500,000 reduction in the global sum demanded by SS i.e. Andrew Ladsky; **(2)** Ladsky made me an offer for £6,350 - hence more than £8,000 less than the original demand of £14,500 (page 10, point 23 and page 21, point 16 of my 13 August 2009 reply)

Hence, processing of this data is, among others, a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles.

Yet again, it is fascinating to see K&C police's readiness to capture, false, disparaging comments and innuendos about me v. its blind eye attitude to Andrew Ladsky and his puppets' criminal offences against me (and my fellow leaseholders) under:

- the Protection from Harassment Act 1997;
- the Fraud Act 2006;
- the Malicious Communications Act 1988;
- the Theft Act 1968 / Theft Amendment Act 1996;
- the Money Laundering Regulations / Proceeds of Crime Act 2002;
- the Criminal Justice Act & Public Order Act 1994. Etc.

What's the benefit to K&C police of turning a blind eye to these criminal offences?

Pg 34 Pt 38 2007 – The statement *"I believe she may have some mental issues so will be speaking to social services to see if they are aware of her"*

This entry provides proof of the extent of the moral depravation that pervades K&C police, and of the extent to which it and its behind-the-scene backers will go to help a 'certain' thief get away with a multi-million Pound jackpot.

I am absolutely incensed by this entry, added to the previous claims that I suffer from *"paranoia"*. This, in addition to your highly dismissive, arrogant and contemptuous reply, leads me to provide comprehensive evidence in support of my position that this *"expression of opinion about my mental condition"* is malicious, vicious, scurrilous and libellous, and the action a despicable, morally depraved attack on my reputation.

Processing of this data which, under Part I s.2 of the Act is defined as *"Sensitive personal data...an expression of opinion consisting of information as to (e) the physical*

or mental health or condition of the data subject” – amounts to, among others, a breach of my rights under:

the First Principle – including “A data controller may only act within the limits of his / her legal powers: **the ultra vires rule**”

the Second Principle, as it is blatantly obvious that TDC Simon J Dowling was fed this data - “Personal data shall be obtained only for one or more specified and lawful purposes, and shall not be further processed in any manner incompatible with that purpose or those purposes”

and the Fourth Principle.

It also amounts to a breach of the Seventh Principle which requires that “Appropriate technical and organisational measures shall be taken against unauthorised or unlawful processing of personal data”. Part II – Interpretation “10. The data controller must take reasonable steps to ensure the reliability of any employees of his who have access to the personal data”

This ‘expression of opinion’ about me, and action against me are - motivated by revenge - by, in addition to Andrew Ladsky, the various parties exposed on my website: police, courts, tribunal and other public sector departments; lawyers, surveyors, accountants and their respective so-called ‘regulators’ - because they don’t like having a mirror held to their face - as it reflects their incompetence, maladministration, malpractice, collusion, deceit, corruption, fraud.

As I wrote under point 47, page 35 of my 13 August 2009 reply, “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. 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”

(I know from personal contacts and the media that this country is not averse to resorting to this tactic in the case of ‘troublesome’ individuals. I am also aware from the media that, in 2006, the Fixated Threat Assessment Centre was quietly set-up within Scotland Yard, with powers to, without evidence, lock-up individuals deemed to “pose a threat to VIPs” in psychiatrist units for an indefinite period)

Evidence against the sickening, morally depraved claim and action against me:

1. TDC Simon J Dowling recorded the above entry on 16 March 2007, day he sent his first malicious, scurrilous and libellous email to my website Host. Having been challenged by my website Host who replied “Are you aware that there are laws against making false accusations?” under the 19 March 2007 entry, Dowling wrote “I am still trying to get the website closed down”.
2. I assume the approach to social services returned the message that ‘some’ evidence of “mental issues” was required in order to get me sectioned.

This is when KPMG, my then employer ‘stepped in’ (K&C police used KPMG as a

conduit to tell me, on 26/27 April 2007 "The police is not going to pursue it. Isn't that good news?" – detailed under point 59, page 37 of my 13 August 2009 reply).

A - See next page

It did this by using Andrew Ladsky's trumped-up accusations in his 26 March 2007 letter to KPMG as an excuse to cut-off my access to the Internet. In the process, it also cut-off my access to the majority of the internal sites for the whole month of April 2007 – leaving me unable to do my work.

(Having failed to show me the evidence, following my Subject Access Request under the Data Protection Act 1998, KPMG initially refused to supply me with a copy of Ladsky's letter. After battling, it eventually supplied me with a highly redacted version of it) (supplied with my 13 August 2009 reply). I now view this letter as likely to have been concocted by Ladsky, the police et.al. to give an excuse to KPMG to 'step in').

A` - see next page

Not surprisingly - and as very clearly intended - I went through a very traumatic, horrendous time. The injustice of the action against me was unbearable. I was the innocent victim of crime, yet, it was 'I' who was subjected to punishment. It was as though I was going through a double bereavement: first being let down by the system in which I totally believed, and now being let down by KPMG for whom I had worked for 10 years as a very dedicated, value-adding employee. I held KPMG on a pedestal, perceiving it as totally committed to its Core Values and Code of Conduct – and I, likewise, fully bought into these.

My world collapsed. I could not comprehend what was happening to me. Here was KPMG siding against me for behaving in the manner it prescribes in its Code of Conduct. A manner it imposed on me during my 10 years of employment through yearly compulsory training re. "[my] *legal obligations*" in relation to the Money Laundering Regulations / Proceeds of Crime Act; "*Key Independence training*", etc.

B - see next page

I was in such a state that I saw my doctor in mid-April 2007. He prescribed me anti-depressants and tranquilizers. (Demonstrating the extent of the morally depraved collusion within the gigantic network of symbiotic relationships: When I saw my doctor the following year, he denied the consultation had taken place, and consequently claimed to have "*no record*" of the prescription he had given me. But, having learnt a great deal as a result of my experience in this country since 2002, I had a record of it, as I had scanned his prescription, as well as the packagings for the medicines. I sent him a copy "*to ensure that my file is up-to-date*")

B - see next page

As KPMG was putting me through hell, a representative of its 'WellBeing' service insisted I see 'a specialist' in Harley Street. Hence, a case of KPMG 'beating me up' on the one hand and on the other offering to attend to my wounds. Seeing that the 'WellBeing' representative had clearly been instructed to secure agreement from me, I decided to play the game and help her 'tick the box' by agreeing to it. This so-called 'specialist' turned out to be just a therapist who, as I reported back to the 'WellBeing' representative, "*heard me, but did not listen to me*". I do not know 'the evidence' that was captured as a result of this 'consultation'.

The victimization, discrimination and bullying continued over the following months quite clearly in the hope of, among others, 'breaking me'. Finally admitting to myself

Note A – To page 18 of my [20 Sep 09 reply to the Police Public Access Office](#)

[My 5 Apr 07 email to Jeanette Dunworth, HR](#), in which I state that it *“it is nearly one week and nothing has been done to address my inability to access various sites”*. That it *“is very upsetting and makes me feel like a criminal... I come in the morning with the mindset of forgetting about my case for the day. Every occurrence of this reminds me of it, makes me think that it is I, the victim, who gets treated as though I am the criminal”*. This email also contains surrounding emails, including the first one I sent on 30 Mar 07 to J Dunworth – [after the meeting](#) with her and Peter Bassett, Partner, then Head for my group, at which she told me that *“in light of Andrew Ladsky’s approaches to KPMG and his persistence, to protect [me] and KPMG it would be best that [I] no longer have access to the Internet”*

The only reason given to me at the 30 Mar 07 meeting for cutting-off my access, was Ladsky’s scurrilous accusation that *“[my] website contains anti-Semitic comments”* (Unbeknown to me at the time, Ladsky had in fact made other, equally scurrilous accusations against me; see [Note 1](#) below).

I said that: it was not true; that [Kensington & Chelsea police](#) had made this accusation to my website Host – without providing any evidence in support – and that, 10 days earlier, as a result of being challenged by my website Host who asked the police (TDC Simon J Dowling of K&C police’s [Community Support Unit](#)) *“Are you aware that there are laws against making false accusations?”* - he had backed down.

As can be seen from [this email](#), four hours after the 30 Mar 07 meeting, I sent the [16 Mar](#) and [20 Mar 07](#) emails from TDC Simon J Dowling to Peter Bassett – in support of what I stated during the meeting. It made no difference: the decision to cut off my access had been taken **before** the meeting – and hence **regardless of what I would say during the meeting** – as, by the time I got back to my desk, not only had my access to the Internet been cut-off, but also to the majority of the internal sites – making it near impossible for me to do my work.

Still very trusting of KPMG, as well as concerned that Ladsky had brought his long-standing, extremely vicious, perverse vendetta against me to KPMG, at the 30 Mar meeting, I did not challenge the rationale of the decision, and nor did I ask to see the communication received by KPMG from Ladsky. (I was not offered to see it.) (See [Note 1](#) below for KPMG’s subsequent refusal to provide me with evidence – in breach of my legislative rights under the Data Protection Act 1998)

(The fact that my access was cut-off on that day can be seen in the [25 Apr 07](#) letter Peter Bassett forced me to sign – by making it a condition on which my access to the internal sites would be resumed.

As to the reason given to me for cutting-off my access, I captured this in my [9 July 09 Subject Access Request](#) as - as had happened with the 13 Feb 07 meeting with Peter Bassett and Jeanette Dunworth, **no notes were made of the 30 Mar 07 meeting**. I considered doing as I had done for the [13 Feb 07 meeting i.e. write my own notes](#) and send them to Bassett and Dunworth for their comments. However, considering that, in his [7 Mar 07 email](#), Bassett had assessed my notes of the 13 Feb 07 meeting as *“not an accurate account of what was discussed”*, I saw no point doing this. I did not want to be, yet again, falsely portrayed as a liar. (I believe that [his main points](#) are captured in [my notes](#)).

I wrote notes of the 13 Feb 07 meeting because, the following day, when I asked Bassett, he said that he would not be issuing some. Note that in his [7 Mar 07](#) email he said to be *“sorry [I] felt it necessary to put [my] version of what was discussed in the meeting into a set of notes”*. A meeting takes place with HR – at which I am told *“if you continue to use KPMG equipment (1), next time you will receive a formal warning”* – and **he expects this to not be recorded! WHY NOT?** As I wrote in my notes: *“Given that if such meeting were to take place, the meeting on 13 February would be referred to, I wish the events to be recorded”*

(At the 13 Feb 07 meeting, Peter Bassett did the talking. The roles were reversed at the 30 Mar 07 meeting with Jeanette Dunworth doing the talking. A case of Bassett, a Partner, wanting to distance himself from what took place – and in case I opted to yet, again, capture notes of the meeting?)

- [My 11 Apr 07 email to IT](#) in which I captured examples of sites I could not access, as well as some emails exchanged over the previous 11 days, in which I state e.g. *“I can’t work like that. This is in*

addition to getting very upset by this" My perception of injustice was unbearable: I was the victim of crime. Yet, I was being punished, discriminated against and further victimized for 'daring' to stand-up for my rights – this time by KPMG – and [on the say-so of my attacker](#) – against whom I had a mountain of 'black on white' evidence of criminality – that was available for all to see (my website, <http://www.leasehold-outrage.com>). My world collapsed.

- [My 17 Apr 07 10h44 email to IT](#) showing numerous examples of the sites I cannot access
- [My 17 Apr 07 16h59 email to IT](#) listing other sites I cannot access and in which I wrote *"It would be easier to define what I can access rather than what I cannot access – which is very little. For more than two weeks now, I feel totally cut-off"*
- **My access to the internal sites was only resumed on 24 Apr 07**, hence **after nearly one month of being totally cut-off**. This took place as a result of [forcing me to sign a letter](#) stating *"under no circumstances should you access the external internet"* As can be seen in this letter, it confirms that my access **to both** the internal sites and the Internet had been cut-off since 30 Mar 07 (KPMG - one of the country's largest IT service suppliers - claimed *"technical difficulties"* for cutting-off my access to the internal sites – see [Note B](#), below)

NOTE 1 - At the 13 Feb 07 meeting, I was **NOT** told that Ladsky had contacted [KPMG](#) – thereby denying me the opportunity to defend myself against his accusations. **WHY?** I discovered this firstly, as a result of – finally - getting some documents, on [5 Oct 07](#), following my [9 July 07](#) Subject Access Request and a subsequent battle to enforce my rights (see KPMG's initial response of [19 Jul 07](#) and mine of [30 Aug 07](#)). These heavily redacted documents include some extremely brief notes of what Ladsky apparently said during a phone call to KPMG on 9 Feb 07 – in which he falsely accused me of *"updating my website using KPMG systems"* – an accusation he repeated in his [26 Mar 07](#) letter to KPMG. Secondly, I discovered this in the course of correspondence with KPMG, after I resigned from KPMG in Jan 08 - which revealed that Ladsky had apparently approached KPMG in Oct 06 (time when [I launched my website](#)), and in Jan 07. **WHY did KPMG keep this from me?**

As, to my knowledge, Ladsky was external to KPMG: how could he make these accusations?

Furthermore **(1)** my group KNEW that I had my personal computer at work, and used it to work on and update my website; **(2)** to *"work on my website"* and then *"update it"* *"using KPMG's internet services"* would have been impossible (as a result of discovering about the accusation, I checked with IT who confirmed my assessment); **(3)** in addition, as KPMG had evidently been looking at what I had done with my work computer, it would have been able to see that it was not the case.

Hence, **WHY** did KPMG opt to take Ladsky's false accusations against me on board - with open arms?

Post my resigning, [KPMG](#) claimed that it *"could not ignore these allegations"*. In addition to knowing that they were false, it suggests that anybody can just walk-off the street into a KPMG office, make false accusations against an employee and, without giving the employee the chance to defend herself / himself against the accusations by not divulging the accusations to the employee - KPMG proceeds with taking punitive actions against the employee. That's how a [Sunday Times](#) 'Best company to work for' behaves?

As I wrote in a subsequent document *"What took place from February 2007 onwards 'screams' of KPMG using Mr Ladsky's accusations as an excuse for taking punitive action against me for exposing on my website malpractice / wrongdoings by parties with which KPMG has a working relationship (*) e.g. the Ministry of Justice (project by KPMG "to design the high-level structure and business model for the Ministry of (In)Justice, including Board-level roles and responsibilities". [Lord Falconer of Thoroton, also covered on my website](#), was the Lord Chancellor at the time, and hence Head of [the courts](#)), [the police](#), [the ICAEW](#)..."*

(NB: In its 29 Jul 09 article, ["Accountancy giants channel £500,000 in resources and staff to Conservatives ahead of election"](#), The Independent reports that *"Some estimates put the amount to be spent [by the public sector] on consultancy over the next three years as high as £4bn... KPMG, which also holds many public sector contracts... A single KPMG consultant working in the Department for Children, Schools and Families costs the taxpayer £1.35m over three years, a parliamentary inquiry found"*)

(*) Another example - See [My Diary 7 Jun 08, whistleblowers # 4](#), for KPMG's report on Mr Moore, then Head of Compliance at HBOS, a KPMG's audit client.

In his [7 Mar 07](#) email Peter Bassett wrote *"I did need to raise with you [at the 13 Feb 07 meeting] the firm's concerns as to what is considered to be inappropriate use of KPMG IT systems. Unfortunately there have been occasions when you... sent notification of the relaunch to other web sites and media organisations which have led to KPMG's address appearing on those sites"*.

I did send a total of half a dozen near identical emails to the media on 4 Oct 06 e.g. [email to the Guardian](#), and one to Which? and to BBC Radio 4 'You and Yours' on 6 Oct 06 - stating, in each instance, in capital letters in the header *"Please note that this email is sent in my personal capacity and not in my capacity as an employee of KPMG"*.

My situation at the time: Ladsky had asked his puppet, [Jeremy Hershkorn, Portner and Jaskel](#), to send this [3 Oct 06](#) fax to my then website host, threatening my host with *"proceedings for defamation and for substantial damages and costs"* if it did not close down my website – by making highly libellous, scurrilous - unsupported – accusations against me that *"[my website] contains suggestions that our client [Ladsky] is guilty of criminal activities and fraud all of which are totally unsubstantiated, outrageous and false... Our client's reputation has been severely damaged..."* (So *"outrageous and false"* that e.g. on [6 Jun 08](#), his equally crooked, evil, greed-ridden client dropped *"ALL of the claim"* filed against me on [27 Feb 07](#)).

Hershkorn concluded the letter to my website host by stating *"We will of course, take all appropriate steps to enforce any judgement obtained in the UK against you"*. I replied to Portner on [5 Oct 06](#) challenging its scurrilous accusations – but my then host caved in to the threats, and closed down my site.

I was left with no email account, as it was with this website host. (I opened an account with another supplier. It became operational on 8 Oct 06, and I used it from then on - on my personal computer - I kept at work).

Post my leaving KPMG, it claimed to be *"right to have restricted [my] internet access due to [my] contravening KPMG's IT policy"* and that *"[my] serious breach of the IT policy could potentially have led to [my] dismissal"*

The following is the section on *"use of email"*, from KPMG's IT policy I downloaded on 7 Aug 07 (from the internal site ...mylife/sections/pppt/IT_policy.htm).

"When using KPMG's email system internally or externally, staff may not send any email, attachment which:

- *Makes representations or express opinions purporting to be those of KPMG.*
- *May damage KPMG's reputation or its relationships with its clients, or which may embarrass clients of KPMG.*
- *Is illegal, defamatory, obscene, pornographic, offensive, or damaging, or which may be considered by others to cause distress, sexual, racial or other harassment or discrimination.*
- *May infringe copyright.*
- *May introduce a virus or other malicious software to any KPMG or client network.*
- *Constitutes 'junk' email (usually non-business messages posted to multiple addresses) or is posted to multiple news groups.*
- *Is for private commercial purposes unrelated to KPMG.*

In addition, even where none of the above categories of email traffic are involved, where an individual has excessive amounts of personal email traffic on their system (defined as levels of personal email activity sufficient to cut into their working time or to interfere with the performance of their duties), this may also be treated as a disciplinary offence"

As I wrote in a document, once I had resigned from KPMG in Jan 08, *"Without any evidence to the contrary from KPMG - I hold the view that what I have done does not breach any of the above... I conclude from this that what KPMG holds against me is the fact that my emails established a link between my website and KPMG"*

As to KPMG stating that it had *"obtained an IT report relating to [my] IT use. Following receipt of the IT report (which highlighted some 10,000 hits on a small number of websites related to [my] "personal issues") [it] decided to restrict [my] access to the internet as a precautionary measure"* (In the evenings, and at

weekends, I did look at various sites e.g. HMCS for the Civil Procedure Rules; other government sites containing Acts, Kensington & Chelsea police' website and its claims in relation to its Community Support Unit, etc.)

In my correspondence of 1 July 08, I asked KPMG for a copy of the report. It did not supply it.

In the same letter in which I quoted the above IT policy, I also quoted the following from the same IT policy:

“Conducting personal business - Staff should be aware that no computer network can be guaranteed as being absolutely secure...staff using the KPMG network for personal business (such as conducting online banking or shopping) do so at their own risk...”

As I wrote in my correspondence:

“This clearly demonstrates that KPMG staff can use the Internet for “personal business”.

“In his [7 Mar 07](#) email, Peter Bassett wrote “Unfortunately there have been occasions when you relaunched your Web site and sent notification of the relaunch to other Web sites and media organisations which have led to KPMG’s address appearing on those sites”“

“Accessing “the KPMG network for personal business (such as conducting online banking or shopping)...will also “lead to the KPMG address appearing on those websites”. Why isn’t that an issue?””

I hold the view that **I have NOT done anything that brings shame on KPMG**. Indeed, I believe that any fair minded, reasonable person with integrity looking at my website would endorse my position that my conduct since 2002 in relation to my nightmare with the greed-ridden, extremely vicious, perverse, [criminal vermin controlling Jefferson House](#) actually reflects [KPMG’s Code of Conduct and Values](#).

Indeed, throughout, I have **“acted with integrity... doing the right thing”** e.g.

(For as long as I could, in the face of the very traumatic, horrendous treatment I was subjected to by [Piper Smith Basham/Watton](#), [Stan Gallagher](#), [Cawdery Kaye Fireman & Taylor](#) (CKFT), the [Leasehold Valuation Tribunal](#), [West London County Court](#), etc) - I refused to be treated differently from my fellow leaseholders in Jefferson House, refusing to ‘strike a deal’ e.g. my [9 Aug 03](#) letter to [West London County Court](#); my [12 Aug 03](#) letter to the [Leasehold Valuation Tribunal](#); my [21 Aug 03](#) letter to Lisa McLean, [Piper Smith Basham](#); my [11 Nov 04](#) letter to Gerald Wild, Chief Housing Officer, Kensington & Chelsea housing

There is also:

- My [27 May 02](#) pack to [my then Member of Parliament, Michael Portillo](#) (In 2009, I am also having a battle with his successor, [Sir Malcolm Rifkind](#) who, as a Queen’s Counsel, evidently approves of Ladsky’s absolute, utter contempt of Her Majesty’s Court Service, etc. e.g. my letters of [19 Oct 09](#) and [7 Nov 09](#)) – and concurrently with the [Parliamentary Ombudsman](#))
- My letter of [12 Aug 03](#) with my [20C application](#) to the LVT intended to stop ‘[Steel Services](#)’ i.e. Ladsky from charging his tribunal related costs to the service charges for Jefferson House – which led me into an unbelievable battle – see [LVT # 5 and 9](#) / [Piper Smith Basham/Watton # 7.18](#)
- My [30 Mar 05](#) letter to [Joan Hathaway, MRICS, Martin Russell Jones](#) – on which I copied [Pridie Brewster](#), accountants for Jefferson House

etc.;

I have **“spoken against breaches of legislation and regulations”** and I **“held”** and continue **“to hold my ground”** in spite of being repeatedly dismissed, pushed away, sent from pillar to post – in the hope that I would eventually give up, e.g.

(1) My [10 Dec 02](#), [17 Dec 02](#), [25 Mar 03](#), [17 Jun 03](#), [22 Jun 03](#), [15 July 03](#) and [9 Aug 03](#) letters to [West London County Court](#) in relation to the fraudulent [29 Nov 02](#) claim filed against me (and 10 of my fellow leaseholders) in [WLCC](#) – in which I repeatedly highlighted that: (1) we, leaseholders, had been told by the

[LVT](#) to [NOT PAY](#) the service charge demand until the tribunal had issued its determination and it had been implemented; (2) '[Steel Services](#)'-[Martin Russell Jones](#) had NOT implemented the LVT determination

(2) My [4 Apr 07](#), [12 Sep 07](#), [2 Oct 07](#), [26 Jan 08](#), [14 May 08](#), [3 June 08](#) etc. documents to [West London County Court](#) in the context of the second fraudulent claim filed against me, on [27 Feb 07](#) by [Portner and Jaskel](#), on behalf of [its client, Andrew Ladsky](#) - in which I repeatedly stated that: (1) the sum demanded of me was fraudulent; (2) raised the fact that two different companies, represented by two different law firms – claimed - on the claim - to be my 'landlord' (Evidence of fraud: [6 Jun 08 Notice of discontinuance](#) of "ALL the claim" against me issued by [Portner and Jaskel](#); my [19 Jan 09](#) reply to the points of dispute – and the outcome of the hostile 30 Jan 09 Supreme Court Costs Office hearing ([My Diary – Year 2009](#)))

See also [My Diary 22 Nov 08](#) for a summary of the evidence on how [Ladsky](#) and [his aides](#) use the **THREAT OF FORFEITURE, BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDINGS AND COURT CLAIMS** as **FRAUD TOOLS** – with, evidently, considering the outcome of my challenges and complaints: APPROVAL BY ALL

(3) My letters to the Leasehold Valuation Tribunal of [22 Oct 02](#), [24 Oct 02](#), [25 Nov 02](#), [12 Jan 03](#) in which I kept repeating that '[Steel Services](#)'-[Martin Russell Jones](#) were not complying with statutory requirements

(4) My letters to [Kensington & Chelsea housing](#) of [22 Jun 04](#), [25 Jun 04](#) (supported by 20 enclosures), [22 Jul 04](#), [25 Jul 04](#), [6 Aug 04](#), [30 Aug 04](#) (to my Councillor, Shireen Ritchie, supported by 42 enclosures), [5 Oct 04](#) (my reply to Shireen Ritchie's 'response' of [30 Sep 04](#)), [11 Nov 04](#) (supported by 135 enclosures – and copied to six individuals, incl. enclosures) – in which I repeatedly highlighted the breach of legislation by '[Steel Services](#)'-[Martin Russell Jones](#) – and my [11 Nov 04](#) to Gerald Wild, Chief Housing Officer, in which I state that 4 months on, it is still the case – and summarise events since I first approached the council with my [6 Jun 04](#) letter. My [complaint](#) to the [Local Government Ombudsman](#) who, of course, turned out to be another one supporting the breach of my statutory rights by Ladsky and [his mob](#)

(5) my [30 Mar 05](#) letter to [Martin Russell Jones](#) – on which I copied [Pridie Brewster](#), accountants for Jefferson House

(6) In reply to the response of [15 Apr 05](#) from [Roger Clement, Pridie Brewster](#), that he was "not made aware of the LVT determination of 17 Jun 03", in my [17 Apr 05](#) correspondence, I spent many hours explaining the situation, and compiling a pack of 48 supporting documents. I followed this by another letter on [9 May 05](#), as I had forgotten to mention something.

(7) Lack of response, led me to contact the [Institute of Chartered Accountants for England & Wales \(ICAEW\)](#) on [19 July 05](#) asking for assistance by detailing the issues, and supplying supporting documents

(8) My highlighting [Martin Russell Jones](#)' conduct to the [Financial Services Authority](#)

(9) My complaint to [Kensington & Chelsea police](#) in 2002. (In 2009, I am also having a battle in the context of my [28 May 09](#) Subject Access Request. The evidence demonstrates that K&C police knew what was going on from the start when I, the [Elderly Resident](#), the [person running the Residents Association](#), and [other residents](#) were suffering harassment from Ladsky)

(10) my **valid** complaints against [the lawyers, the courts, the surveyor, the accountant](#), etc – which, in spite of my battling – in each instance for one year or more – ALL led to the standard reply that amounts to: 'GET LOST'. Etc.

How ironic - and quite frankly: extremely sickening - that [KPMG](#) sided against me in the context of my personal problem – for behaving in the manner it prescribes in its [Code of Conduct and its Values](#) – a manner it imposed on me during my 10 years of employment [through yearly compulsory training re. "\[my\] legal obligations" in relation to the Money Laundering Regulations / Proceeds of Crime Act; "Key Independence training"](#), etc.

Note B - To page 18 of my [20 Sep 09 reply to the Police Public Access Office](#)

Post my resigning from KPMG in Jan 08, it claimed to have implemented "supervised", "limited relaxation of the restrictions to allow [me] to continue [my] work and alleviate [my] alleged distress".

This so-called "*limited relaxation*" took place on [8 Aug 07](#) i.e. **4 months after cutting-off my access** - by 'allowing' me – actually forcing me to use a spare computer, given that, as can be seen in my email to Ceri Hughes, my line manager, I report discovering that I could access the Internet from my own computer.

As can be seen in the [25 Apr 07](#) letter I was made to sign, the ban was NOT computer dependent. But, making me use a spare computer, which, every time, I had to request, was all part of the perverse game intended to cause me distress, humiliation and demean me in front of my colleagues. (It also meant that I had to keep on switching computer, and reconnect, in order to be able to access my emails – providing the opportunity to extend the pervasion to asking me for my feedback on emails that had just been delivered).

As I wrote in a document once I had left KPMG "*In April 2007, I was in tears at my desk practically every day, at times, sobbing uncontrollably due to my being treated as though I was a criminal – instead of what I am: the victim of criminal activity. Practically everyday I highlighted my plight in emails, asking for a resolution and, in several emails, I reported the impact it had on me. Why was nothing done at the time "to alleviate my distress"? Why was nothing done at the time "to allow me to continue my work?"*"

As to my "*alleged distress*" i.e. the impact it had on me:

- Why did KPMG have a 'WellBeing' representative waiting to meet with me at the end of the 30 Mar 07 meeting with Peter Bassett and Jeanette Dunworth?
- Why was this 'WellBeing' representative so persistent that I should see the 'specialist' within days of my access to all the sites being cut-off? i.e. days I spent sobbing uncontrollably at my desk because I simply could not believe the injustice I, the innocent victim of crime was being subjected to: by KPMG who had known me for 10 years; for the benefit of a criminal.
- Why did KPMG continue during April 07 and the first three weeks of May 07 to try to get me to see its 'support' services – as evidenced in my [21 May 07 reply](#) to the 'WellBeing' representative?

It is clear that the intention was to cause me maximum distress, to get me to break down. (Initially, they succeeded in doing that). In part, this was done perversely with the objective of subsequently claiming that I had "*let my personal problem affect me*" – instead of what had happened: [KPMG's](#) actions affecting my ability to work. And the surrounding 'offers of help' were an attempt to gather evidence to build a case against me. Evidence in support of my conclusions:

- On three occasions during my eventual 'half year-end performance appraisal' meeting with Ceri Hughes, when I said that the actions taken against me had affected my ability to work – she threatened to end the meeting if I insisted on raising them (as I captured in my [15 Oct 07](#) to Jeanette Dunworth, HR, on which I copied Hughes) (The content of my email was not challenged – because it is the truth).

As I report in my [15 Oct 07](#) email to HR, I filed [my performance appraisal form](#) on the system on 1 Aug 07. My performance appraisal meeting was set with Ceri Hughes for 7 Aug 07. She cancelled it claiming that she "*had to send [my] form to HR because of what [I] wrote*". Over the following two months, I kept reminding Hughes that I had not had my appraisal. Her excuse for the ongoing delay was that she had "*not heard back from HR*".

As I wrote in the same, 15 Oct 07 email to HR "*I would like to know why events that have impacted on my ability to perform are being ignored – especially in light of the fact that the two months plus delay in holding my performance appraisal was due to HR looking at what I captured on my form*"

- What Ceri Hughes did instead was accuse me of "*letting my personal problem come into [my] work life*". (One of my colleagues was also enlisted to add weight to this claim). I denied it saying that it was KPMG that had done this. This is evidenced by the fact that no comment of the kind was made at my mid-year appraisal (4 Apr 07).

In fact, an example that repudiates her accusation, is her praise, at my mid-year appraisal (captured on page 21 of my [performance appraisal form](#)), for my success in jointly managing a major global event in Mar 07 (preparations started in Feb 07). Indeed, she wrote "*Noëlle's involvement with the conference in March was hugely useful to the event and she played a key role. I am personally very grateful for the efforts that she put in...*"

And another, is the feedback I received from a director, on [30 July 07](#)

As I wrote in my performance appraisal “*While by mid-year, I was suffering greatly from events taking place in my private life ([unlawful threat of bankruptcy](#) [on 16 Feb 07 by [Portner and Jaskel](#), as well as threat of forfeiture and costs], [fraudulent claim filed against me](#) [on 27 Feb 07, in [West London County Court](#), also by Portner and Jaskel], [false accusations](#) [TDC Simon J Dowling, [Kensington & Chelsea police](#), in his [16 Mar](#) and [20 Mar 07](#) emails to my website Host; Ladsky’s false accusations against me to KPMG (what I was told at the time: his accusation that “[my] website contains anti-Semitic comments”) etc.), I nonetheless opted to leave this out of my mid-year performance appraisal. Being at work and concentrating on it gave me the possibility to forget about my problems”.*

As evidenced by the above assessment by Ceri Hughes: it did. I could immerse myself in my work and forget about the highly vicious, perverse vendetta against me. Had I been “*unable to disentangle [my] personal issues from my work*”, I would not have been able to perform as I did on this project.

(Considering that my ‘problem’ has been ongoing since 2002, making me go through absolute, sheer utter hell: if I were letting it affect my work, how does Hughes explain her glowing [31 Aug 04](#) feedback on my performance for year 2003-04? Also, how to explain the feedback I received [from other colleagues in 2004-2006](#)? (Consider that in e.g. 2003-04 I was going through hell with Ladsky’s puppets, [Cawdery Kaye Fireman & Taylor \(CKFT\)](#), my solicitors, [Piper Smith Basham/Watton](#), [West London County Court](#), the [Court Service’s complaint department](#), [Kensington & Chelsea housing](#), etc)

The intention to make this false accusation against me, and related fabrications, had been cooked-up for some time – and started to be implemented on 30 Mar 07. I view it as an extremely vicious and wicked accusation as it attempts to capitalise on the horrendous events that were taking place in my private life. This is VERY, VERY SICK.

- It can be seen on [my performance appraisal](#) that my comments, on pages 22 and 23, detailing what I had been subjected to, and the impact it had on my ability to work were **totally ignored** as they, Bassett and another individual, KW, who ‘did’ the second part of ‘my performance appraisal’ [to ensure “fairness and independence”](#) (on [24 Oct 07](#)) merely wrote “*This has not been the best year for Noëlle*”. **Is this how to address what I report?**

Like Hughes, they kept ignoring my raising what had happened, including Hughes playing games with me – and merely continued to try to make things stick against me. (One of the most hilarious comments, made by KW, was the suggestion that perhaps I “*lacked tenacity, pro-activity, determination*”. I laughed out loud saying she would have a very hard time proving that).

It was blatantly obvious from the time I filed my appraisal form on the system (which, I ‘think’, is managed overseas) that they viewed my capturing events as extremely inconvenient. This is added to: (i) Bassett’s reaction in his [7 Mar 07](#) email to my capturing [notes of the 13 Feb 07](#) meeting; (ii) him and Dunworth not capturing notes of the 30 Mar 07 meeting = they did NOT want to have ANY written record of events.

I give this as part of my overwhelming evidence that the treatment inflicted on me by KPMG from February 2007 onwards was victimisation – stemming from revenge on behalf of KPMG’s ‘friends’ – and perhaps, its ‘protégé’, Andrew Ladsky. Whether or not he is, KPMG can definitely claim credit for being the party that has, by far, played the greatest part in satisfying Ladsky’s revenge against me: ensuring the destruction of the rest of my life.

Seeing the ‘true face’ of KPMG, the lengths it is prepared to go to, what colleagues are prepared to blindly carry out - has hurt me, shocked me and sickened me beyond belief. I feel very let down, betrayed, conned, and very angry at the way KPMG treated me as: I have done NOTHING WRONG. I AM THE INNOCENT VICTIM OF CRIME, standing-up for the rights I have been told I have the right to demand.

Unable to leave the UK because of my situation in the flat, as well as ongoing denial of my right for justice and redress (e.g. [30 Jan 09 SCCO hearing](#); my experience (at 11 Nov 09) with: [my MP, Sir Malcolm Rifkind, QC](#) and concurrently with the [Parliamentary Ombudsman](#); [K&C police](#), following my [28 May 09 SAR](#)) - I have not worked since resigning from KPMG in Jan 08 – forcing me to live on the savings I intended for my retirement. I can’t. My experience at KPMG has traumatised me. Since Jan 08, I have avoided going in the City like the plague. It makes me feel physically sick. I have totally lost trust and faith in the business environment of this country. Not only do I now view legislation, regulations, codes of conduct and company values as just window dressing, the lesson I draw from my experience at KPMG is that complying with them can lead me to suffer very detrimental consequences – leaving me with no ‘navigation map’.

what was going on, by June-July 2007, I made my defence system build-up more immunity, determined to not let KPMG et.al. achieve their objective. After 10 months of this treatment, I decided I was not going to let myself be subjected to any more of it, and resigned in January 2008.

(KPMG's motive? Evidently coming to the aid of 'its friends': among others, it has carried out assignments for public sector parties about which I expose wrongdoings on my website e.g. (i) creation of the Ministry of Justice when Lord Falconer of Thoroton, also covered on my website, was the Lord Chancellor; (ii) the police. It is a member of the ICAEW, which is also covered – and exposed - on my website. It may also be that Andrew Ladsky is a client, or perhaps a friend of a KPMG partner, or a member of a group / association to which some KPMG partners / staff belong).

(I note with interest, this week, that KPMG has prosecuted one of my ex. work colleagues, Andrew Wetherall, for stealing from KPMG. Evidently, what it considers acceptable for me is not acceptable when it comes to KPMG).

3. Having left KPMG, the attempts to 'get me' continued through West London County Court, and Ladsky's solicitors, Portner and Jaskel – as evidenced by events, and supported by 'black on white' evidence.

Of course, concurrently, the 7/7 close surveillance of the previous 12 months to gather any scrap of evidence that the treatment I was being subjected to was having the 'desired effect' - ready to pounce on me – continued.

Blatant evidence in support of both my claims is that, on 7 May 2008, I saw a psychiatrist in London, for the purpose of filing a claim against KPMG. Knowing that my mobile phones are monitored, I went to the psychiatrist office to make the appointment.

This 'golden opportunity' was seized upon, as it was clear that this psychiatrist's objective was to 'put me out of action': he was very clearly not interested in what I had to say, getting impatient with me, hurrying me on, and, within less than half-an-hour of the 'consultation', suggested I "*should immediately book [myself] in a clinic for two weeks*". He also asked me whether I had "*family in France*". (Another one in the English medical profession not familiar with the concept of integrity and probity).

At the time, by 'amazing coincidence', I had to, among others, serve my Witness Statement by 4 June 2008 i.e. within less than a month of my seeing this psychiatrist. The outcome of my serving my Statement – as a Litigant in Person? It led the crook, Andrew Ladsky, to drop "*ALL of the 27 February 2007 claim*" against me on 6 June 2008. Not bad for somebody who should be "*immediately booked into a psychiatric clinic*". It sure would have been 'very convenient' for Ladsky et.al. to have me out of action during that time!

My Diary 15 May 08

Who is "*In very serious need of help*" (to quote Ladsky's comment to me – by, yet another 'amazing coincidence', one week after I saw the psychiatrist)? And that's a lot more than just him with "*mental issues*" and in "*serious need of help*"!

Unbelievably, the root cause for ALL these morally depraved, despicable, sickening ploys, machinations and actions is a crook and his aides unlawfully deciding that I (and

My Diary 6 May 08
Introduction to My
Diary 2009

my fellow leaseholders) should pay for the construction of a penthouse flat and addition of three other flats to Jefferson House – so that they could realise a multi-million Pound jackpot. The spread and depth of the support they have – and continue to receive – ought to qualify for the Guinness Book of Records, as well as enter the league table of 'Crime Definitely Pays in This Country'.

And these despicable cowards and their equally despicable puppet-string-pullers have done this to me because:

- I am a woman; on my own; of very limited financial means;
- of foreign origin – leading to my being at the receiving end of racist, xenophobic and scurrilous accusations by K&C police;
- with strongly held moral principles of right and wrong from my Catholic upbringing, that led me to, for as long as I could in the face of the horrendous and very traumatic treatment I was being subjected to - refuse to be treated differently from my fellow leaseholders;
- who has 'dared' stand-up for the so-called 'rights' I have been told, by the legislators, I have the right to demand; 'dared' stand-up against organised crime;
- 'dared' to do this to a Jewish landlord and his Jewish aides (in name, rather than in practice, as they evidently perceive themselves to be exempt from complying with some of the 10 Commandments, or 'fundamental laws of the Jews', namely those which prohibit: theft, false testimony, and coveting others' goods) - as well as their supporters, a number of which – at high levels - include people of the same ethnicity.
- And last, but not least, because I have the balls to say what I think, and, since the launch of my website, to do it openly, in a public arena - by putting my name to it. Considering the despicable, sickening, underhanded behind the scene ploys, machinations, collusion, complicity, duplicity, deceit and cover-up I have, and continue to be the victim of – it is a quality which, quite clearly, the cowards and snakes in the grass I am dealing with cannot stomach.

Although, as I was reminded by the Daily Mail columnist, Richard Littlejohn in his 10 July 2009 article *"What kind of country sacks a dinner lady for telling the truth?"* – under this Government of fear, smear and persecution, even prominent people are not immune from retaliatory actions e.g. **(1)** the BBC reporter and the director general who lost their job *"for exposing the dodgy dossier used to take us to war in Iraq"*; **(2)** the Home Office whistleblower and Damian Green arrested *"for exposing Labour's systematic lies over illegal immigration"*; **(3)** the smear campaign *"by senior Labour figures"* of the then outgoing Head of the Armed Forces, Sir Richard Dannatt, who criticised the Government for the shortage of equipment to the army; **(4)** the smear campaign by 10 Downing Street's Damien McBride against some Tory MPs.

And of course, there are many examples of the 'little people' like me who have also suffered retaliation for 'daring' to stand-up e.g. **(1)** *"The civil servant in Hazel Blears' department who "was sacked for anonymously criticising Blears on the internet over her abuse of the expenses system and refusal to apologise...[her] comments sparked a full-scale inquiry... [and] were traced back to her work computer"*; **(2)** the Paddington train crash survivors *"who asked awkward questions about rail safety and elderly patients*

See
My Diary
February
2009 for
links to
articles

who complained about the NHS have been subjected to vile, orchestrated smear campaigns and character assassinations"

Mr Littlejohn concludes his 10 July 09 article with *"Labour has created a self-serving tyranny of lying and concealment, where duplicity is rewarded..."* Based on my first-hand experience since 2002: I agree wholeheartedly with him.

I wonder: what has been the *"reward"* to TDC Simon J Dowling? To KMPG? As announced in its 20 April 2007 internal newsletter *"being engaged on a non-competitive basis to help design the structure and business model for the new Ministry of Justice"*?

2.3 You hold data about me that is biased, corrupted, false, deceitful, conveys a false, misleading impression of me

Pg 4 Pt 2 2002 – 2003 – 2007 - Andrew Ladsky is not just a *"neighbour"*, he is the 'landlord for
Pg 16 Pt 2 Jefferson House' – and I am therefore 'the tenant' – as I very clearly explained.

Pg 25 Pt 9 These facts are of crucial importance in the context of the three complaints.

K&C police knows that Ladsky is the landlord but prefers to hide this fact as it helps portray him as the 'poor innocent victim', thereby giving some weight to his malicious, scurrilous, slanderous accusations against me, while undermining my complaint against him. Hence, the **failure to record** the accurate information helps creates a negative and false impression of me.

This outcome is evident from the data processed about me, as well as the manner in which I have been treated by K&C police – starting with my complaint in 2002.

Failure to record the accurate relationship amounts to a breach of my rights under:

1. the First Principle *"Personal data shall processed fairly and lawfully"* *"When obtaining data from a third person the data controller has an overriding duty to process the data fairly"*
2. the Fourth Principle *"Personal data shall be accurate... (a) the data controller has taken reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of the data"*

Pg 5 Pts 7 2002 - **Failure to record** that the c.20 anonymous phone calls made to me, which, based on events, clearly include - at least some calls - from Andrew Ladsky, amount to criminal offences against me under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997.

Also covered under this Act are the acts Andrew Ladsky committed against me – which I reported to the police, and which it also conveniently ignored.

By contrast, when Ladsky complained against me to K&C police in 2003, it immediately classified his complaint under *"harassment"*, as well as *"fully recorded"* it – BEFORE even contacting me.

It is blatantly obvious from this that K&C police holds data about Ladsky that impacts on me i.e. was processed for the purpose of determining how I should be treated. Hence, data held by the police on Ladsky becomes part of my personal data.

Failure to supply me with the data breaches my rights to fair processing of data about

me.

Pg 6 Pt 9 2002 – 2003 – The statement that I *"seem to think that Ladsky is behind the company who has sent these letters"*

Pg 19 Pt 12

Yet again, the objective of this statement is to portray Andrew Ladsky as the 'poor, innocent victim'.

I do not *"seem to think that"* Ladsky *"is behind the company who has sent these letters asking for the money"* - I know for a fact that he is – and I have provided undeniable supporting evidence in my 13 August 2009 reply. I have no doubt that K&C police has known this since at least 2002.

Therefore ditto: Andrew Ladsky definitely *"has interest in the ownership of the block"*

Failure to record this fact, as I stated, contributes to create a negative perception of me – which is evident by the way I have been treated by K&C police.

Hence, processing of this data amounts to a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles.

Pg 9 Pt 21 2002 – It was the second time – not the first time – that Ladsky had forced me into the entrance corridor at Jefferson House.

Failure to amend the entry reflects negatively on me by lessening my complaint that Ladsky is subjecting me to harassment.

Hence, failure to process this data amounts to a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles.

Pg 13 Pt 39 2002 – The statement *"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..."*

As I wrote under this point *"K&C police claims to have no "crime report" against Ladsky - because it evidently ensures that none are recorded"* Indeed, as reported, I know that at least four of my fellow leaseholders have complained to K&C police of suffering harassment from Ladsky - and I cited them by name to DC Adams in 2002.

And, as I wrote under point 40, page 13 *"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"*

By **hiding this evidence**, the consequential impact on me of the implication that Ladsky has 'not committed any criminal offences' is that it contributes to forming a negative perception of me by undermining my credibility. This is clearly evident by the way I have been treated by K&C police, starting with my complaint in 2002.

Hence, it amounts to a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles.

Pg 13 Pt 41 2002 - It is **not true** that "*there was absolutely no evidence to link - 104 - (i.e. Ladsky) with this matter*"

This **false statement** impacts negatively on me, by falsely portraying me as an individual who makes unfounded accusations.

Hence, failure to state the truth amounts to a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles.

Pg 14 Pt 45 2003 - It is **not true** that I contacted DC Adams. In spite of his call the previous day that his "*supervisor*" rather than he would be in contact with me – *he* contacted me on 28 March 2002.

This false statement impacts negatively on me by implying that I am a liar, as I reported in my correspondence to his superior, DI Webster, that DC Adams had quite clearly communicated to me that he would not contact me again.

Hence, failure to state the truth amounts to a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles.

Pg 17 Pt 6 2003 – The statement "*- 60 - the suspect was walking out of her flat and shouted "Go fuck yourself!"*"
Pg 18 Pt 7

PC N Watson has very conveniently **failed to establish** from Andrew Ladsky what had led me to say this to him – or perhaps, more accurately, failed to record this. I support this statement by the fact that PC Watson ignored my 11 February 2003 letter asking for "*precise detail*" of the accusation against me - as well as **failed to record it**.

This failure to capture the 'full picture' creates a negative, misleading perception of me as it suggests that I said this to him without being provoked. (This is all part of the objective of portraying me as "*mad*" – something which Ladsky (evidently, among others) tells anybody prepared to listen to him).

Hence, this failure to capture the 'full picture' amounts to a breach of my rights under the First Principle.

Pg 18 Pt 11 2003 - The statement "*the letter 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*".

K&C police has **very conveniently failed: (1)** to determine the content of the letter; **(2)** the events surrounding it – as they would discredit Ladsky's 'complaint'.

The incidental consequence of processing the data that "*the letter was sent to all the residents*" impacts on me as it implies that the service charge demand was fair and reasonable (which it definitely was not), and thereby – falsely - portrays me as the only objector to the service demand (which I most definitely was not, as evidenced by the fact that 14 flats ended-up being listed on the 29 November 2002 West London County Court claim) – with numerous negative connotations about me e.g. that I fail to honour my contractual obligations, etc.

Hence, failure to capture what the letter was about, and the events that followed,

amounts to a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles.

Pg 26 Pt 15 2007 - It is **not true** that I launched my website www.leasehold-outrage.com "*in response to a large service charge demand*". Under this point, my 13 August 2009 reply contains evidence in support of my position - but K&C police knew this at the time it recorded this lie.

Recording of this - false - information impacts on me as it is part of the objective of portraying me in a negative light – as was done previously by Andrew Ladsky in his 2003 'complaint' (Page 18, point 11 of my 13 August 2009 reply).

Of course, this is the objective, and the reason why K&C police opted to NOT contact me at ANY point in time in relation to this so-called 'complaint' by Ladsky. It gave it free rein to capture fabricated lies against me.

Processing of this data amounts to a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles.

Pg 26 Pt 16 2007 - The next part of the sentence that I "*regarded [the service charge] as excessive and unfair*" is a **misrepresentation** also intended to portray me in a negative light, and thereby impact on my reputation.

As detailed in my 13 August 2009 reply – supported by evidence - the service charge demands are not just "excessive" – they amount to **THEFT / FRAUD**. And they are not just "unfair" as they amount to breaches of legislation.

My Diary 6 May and 22 Nov 08

Yet again, K&C police knew about this at the time. By opting to NOT contact me at ANY point in time following the so-called 'complaint', it gave it free rein to capture whatever it and Ladsky wanted to ensure would reflect badly on me.

Hence, processing of this data amounts to a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles.

Pg 27 Pt 17 2007 - The statement that "*This charge was challenged at the leasehold valuation tribunal who reduced this amount quite significantly*" is a **massive understatement** given that the tribunal reduced the global sum demanded of £736,206 by £500,000, down to £236,206, or a reduction of nearly 70%, (including the contingency fund).

I also highlight the fact that, while, in breach of statutes, and of my lease, SS i.e. Ladsky never implemented the tribunal 'determination' - he eventually made me an offer for £6,350 v. the original demand of £14,400.

This statement is therefore **highly misleading** and intended to undermine the fact that – as per my rights - I challenged SS i.e. Ladsky's application to the tribunal – and thereby contributes in conjuring up a negative perception of me.

Hence, processing of this data amounts to a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles.

2.4 Highly pertinent evidence has been withheld to cover-up 'inconvenient' events, and as a means of disparaging me and discrediting me

Pg 5 Pt 3 2002 - It is **not true** that the person is "*unknown*" as I identified Andrew Ladsky as the perpetrator of the anonymous phone calls.

Failure to record this fact is intended to support K&C police's claim that "*there was absolutely no evidence to link - 104 - (i.e. Ladsky) with this matter*" (page 13, point 41 of my 13 August 2009 reply).

The consequential impact of this failure to record the truth undermines my credibility in identifying Andrew Ladsky as the perpetrator – and this is evidenced by the way I have been treated by K&C police.

Hence, processing of this data amounts to a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles.

Pg 7 Pt 11 2002 - K&C police has **failed to capture** that it already knew about Andrew Ladsky, as it had received complaints of harassment against him from at least four of my fellow leaseholders.

Failure to capture my reporting being aware that some of my fellow leaseholders had previously complained against Ladsky – and citing them by name – contributes to forming a negative perception of me by undermining my credibility. This is clearly evident by the way I have been treated by K&C police.

Hence, failure to capture that K&C police had already received several complaints against Ladsky amounts to a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles.

Pg 11 Pt 28 2002 - 'DC Crockett' **failed to record** the fact that he told me on 20 March 2002 that Mrs [X], who is – falsely - alleged by the police to have made "*all the anonymous phone calls to [me]*" – had apparently told him that her mobile phone "*had been stolen in November 2001*"

Failure to process this data has an impact on me as it undermines my credibility in stating that I believe the instigator of the anonymous phone calls to be Andrew Ladsky. The impact is clearly evident from the way I have been treated by K&C police.

Hence, failure to capture this data amounts to a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles.

Pg 12 Pt 34 2002 - DC Adams has **failed to record** telling me that 'apparently' Mrs [X] had told him that "*her phone mysteriously reappeared at her door*"

Comments as per above, under 'Pg 11, Pt 28'

Pg 11 Pt 29 2002 - DC Crockett has **failed to record** his claim during our 20 March 2002 conversation that the anonymous phone calls made from a landline "*These came from your own phone*".

As I wrote under this point in my 13 August 2009 reply "*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”.

Rest of comments: as per above, under ‘Pg 11, Pt 28’

Pg 11 Pt 31 2002 - DC Adams **failed to record** the fact, during our 25 March 2002 conversation he used intimidating and bullying language – with the obvious objective of making me abandon my complaint.

Failure to process this data has an impact on me as, by not stating that I was put under duress by DC Adams, it can be construed that I backed down on my complaint – thereby undermining my credibility.

Hence, failure to record what DC Adams told me amounts to a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles.

Pg 11 Pts 2002 - DC Adams **failed to record** - when - Mrs [redacted] allegedly admitted having made the 32, anonymous phone calls to me. 33

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.

Failure to process when [redacted] is alleged to have “*admitted making the anonymous phone calls to [me]*” has an impact on me as it affects the credibility of my accusations against Andrew Ladsky.

Hence, it amounts to a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles.

Pg 12 Pt 36 2002 - DC Adams has **failed to record** the fact that I sent him a fax on 26 March 2002 in which I provided evidence from BT that totally refuted his claim that “*something has gone wrong with your voicemail. It’s been dialling your number by mistake*”, reiterated the information BT had already supplied him with over a month previously i.e. that the calls made from a landline number was on a line supplied by Reach Europe.

Failure to process this data has an impact on me as it undermines my credibility in stating that I believe the anonymous phone calls were made by Andrew Ladsky.

Hence, failure to record this communication from me to the police amounts to a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles.

Pg 13 Pt 38 2002 - DC Adams **failed to record** the – highly relevant - content of my 25 March 2002 fax, as well as the fact that he never replied to it.

Failure to capture the evidence I supplied in the fax contributes to forming a negative and false perception of me.

Hence, failure to capture the content of my communication to the police amounts to a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles.

Pg 14 Pt 43 2002 - DC Adams **failed to record** the conversation I had with him on 27 March 2002 during which he tried to make me feel guilty, by stating: “*So, we are going to have to throw resources at this for just two phone calls!*”, and

said "You won't be able to prove a link with Andrew Ladsky"

Failure to process this data has an impact on me as, by not stating that I was put under duress by DC Adams, as well as, in effect, told (what was obvious to me) that K&C police was 'in Andrew Ladsky's camp', it can be construed that I backed down on my complaint – thereby undermining my credibility.

Hence, failure to record what DC Adams told me amounts to a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles

Pg 15 Pt 48 2002 - **What is captured is only one of many – highly relevant - points** in my 2 April 2002 letter to DI Webster, in which I detail the content of conversations I had with DC Adams.

While the intention is clearly to, among others, avoid recording the 'inconvenient' content of the conversations I had with DC Adams - this failure undermines my credibility.

Hence, failure to capture the evidence I supplied in my letter amounts to a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles.

Pg 15 Pt 50 2002 - There is **no record** of the fact that I approached Sir Toby Harris by sending him a letter dated 5 May 2002, and a chaser email on 31 May 2002 - asking for "*an independent investigation*"

Failure to record my correspondence to Sir Toby Harris is evidently intended to cover-up the fact that I was not satisfied with K&C police's 'handling' of my complaint. Not revealing this correspondence undermines my credibility.

Hence, failure to record my correspondence and the main points amounts to a breach of my rights under the First Principle.

Pg 15 Pts 52, 53 2002 - The version recorded by DC Adams that "*There is no way of tracing which telephone was used to make the three calls between 18h23 and 18h27 on 19/2/2*" is totally different from what he told me "*the anonymous phone calls were made from the Carlton Tower hotel by [x<]*" - as evidenced by my 31 May 2002 chaser email to Sir Toby Harris, then Chair of the Metropolitan Police Authority.

Aside from the blatant deceit, failure to record what I was actually told by DC Adams, and replacing it by something that is totally different, has an impact on me as it undermines my credibility in claiming that Ladsky had made calls to me.

Hence, failure to capture what DC Adams told me amounts to a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles.

Pg 23 Pt 29 2003 - PC N Watson has **failed to record** the fact that I sent him a letter, dated 11 February 2003, asking him for "*precise detail*" of the accusation against me.

To avoid capturing my 'inconvenient' letter, PC N Watson captured that "*OIC has attempted to make contact with the suspect but this has been*

fruitless". This is clearly not true and is therefore libellous.

Failure to record my correspondence amounts to a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principle.

Pg 36 Pt 49 2007 – TDC Simon J Dowling has **failed to record**

(1) my website Host's reply to his email of 16 March 2007 in which my Host asked "Are you aware that there are laws against making false accusations?";

(2) Dowling's email reply of 20 March 2007 to my website Host in which he wrote "Thanks for your reply, yes there are laws relating to false reporting"

Of course, this has not been recorded because it is most inconvenient, as it undermines the trumped-up accusations against me.

Failure to capture this data - which 'directly relates to me' - amounts to a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles. It also amounts to a breach of the requirements under the Seventh Principle.

3 Your comment "...I can confirm after making enquiries there is no further information we can provide you with"

I conclude from your comment that you are refusing to address my following demands.

As an introduction, I remind you / inform you – **in relation to each of the following** - that, under Part I – 7. (1) of the Data Protection Act 1998, I have "*Right of access to personal data*" which, among others means:

(b) the right *to be given a description of the data held about me*; (i) the right *to be told the purpose for which the data is being held, processed*; (ii) the right *to know the recipients or classes of recipients to whom data about me is or may be disclosed*; (d) *where the data is processed by automatic means for the purpose of evaluating matters relating to me, the right to be informed of the logic involved in that decision making* "

I also refer you to the beginning of this letter which contains the definition of 'data', 'data subject', 'personal data', 'sensitive personal data', the Principles, as well my right, under s.10 of Part I of the Act, "*to prevent processing of data likely to cause damage or distress*"

Also at the beginning of this letter, I highlight the Office of the Information Commissioner's statement that "*When data on an individual is passed on to e.g. social services, the individual must be provided with this information in order to satisfy the fair processing requirements... and to allow the individual to make subject access requests*"

Pg 16 Pt 55 2002 - Given the manner in which K&C police 'dealt' with my 2002 complaint, there must clearly have been 'directions' communicated on how it should be 'handled'.

Hence, data 'obviously about me' / 'relating to me' / 'linked to me' was processed for the purpose of influencing / determining the way I should be treated.

By failing to supply me with the data, you are breaching my rights to fair processing of

data about me, as well as my rights under the Sixth Principle "*Personal data shall be processed with the rights of data subjects under this Act*". Considering events, it is obvious that the data is in breach of my rights under the Act.

Pg 18 Pt 10 2003 - Given:

(1) the false accusations against me by Andrew Ladsky – recorded by the police - that I swore at him on "*approximately 3 or 4*" other occasions";

(2) the fact that the same scurrilous accusations were made by his solicitor Lanny Silverstone, Cawdery Kaye Fireman & Taylor in his 4 February 2003 letter to me;

(3) the fact that PC N Watson **(i)** ignored my 11 February 2003 letter to him asking for precise detail of the accusations against me; **(ii)** failed to record the fact I had sent him this letter; **(iii)** and therefore falsely captured that "*OIC has attempted to make contact with the suspect but this has been fruitless*"...

...it is clear that data 'obviously about me' / 'relating to me' / 'linked to me' was processed between K&C police and Cawdery Kaye Fireman & Taylor – for the purpose of influencing / determining the manner in which I should be treated.

By failing to supply me with the data, you are breaching my rights to fair processing of data about me, as well as my rights under the Sixth Principle. Considering events, it is obvious that the data is in breach of my rights under the Act.

Pg 22 Pt 21 2003 - Given that Sir Toby Harris, Chair of the Metropolitan Police Authority, wrote in his 11 July 2002 letter to me "*the police can only act on the basis of established facts*" – it is clear that data 'obviously about me' / 'relating to me' / 'linked to me' has been processed with the effect of allowing PC Watson to "*fully record*" a complaint against me, as well as classify it as "*harassment*" - BEFORE even contacting me - hence, data that determined the manner in which I was treated by K&C police.

By failing to supply me with the data, you are breaching my rights to fair processing of data about me, as well as my rights under the Sixth Principle. Considering events, it is obvious that the data is in breach of my rights under the Act.

Pg 22 Pt 22 2003 - Given that Andrew Ladsky's 2003 'complaint' against me was "*fully recorded*" by K&C police on the basis of his say-so, as well as classified as "*harassment*" - BEFORE even contacting me – the fact that the complaint of harassment against him, to K&C police, by at least four of my fellow leaseholders does NOT get recorded - HAS to be supported by a reason.

As very amply demonstrated by events, data processed by the police on Ladsky has an impact on me as it very clearly influenced, as well as determined the way in which I was treated. It therefore becomes part of my personal data.

By failing to supply me with the data, you are breaching my rights to fair processing of data about me, as well as my rights under the Sixth Principle. Considering events, it is obvious that the data is in breach of my rights under the Act.

Pg 23 Pt 23 2003 - PC N Watson's threat in his 27 January 2003 letter to me that "*or there may be further consequences*", very clearly implies, as I stated in my 28 May 2009 Subject

Access Request and my 13 August 2009 reply to your response, that other “consequences” had taken place by the time he wrote the letter.

Furthermore, the implication is that the past “consequences” have had a serious detrimental impact on me.

I therefore repeat my question: what “consequences” had already taken place? This is very obviously personal data, and may even be ‘sensitive personal data’.

Pg 24 Pt 31 2003 - I asked for “*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: (1) The information supplied to the individuals / organisations; (2) 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*”

It is abundantly clear from events that parties outside of K&C police had an input into how Ladsky’s ‘complaint’ against me should be ‘handled’. This is in addition to Sir Toby Harris, Chair of the Metropolitan Police Authority, who evidently sided with K&C police.

Hence, data ‘obviously about me’ / ‘relating to me’ / ‘linked to me’ was processed for the purpose of determining the manner in which I should be treated.

By failing to supply me with the data, you are breaching my rights to fair processing of data about me, as well as my rights under the Sixth Principle. Considering events, it is obvious that the data is in breach of my rights under the Act.

Pg 24 Pt 3 2007 - As Kensington & Chelsea police NEVER contacted me in relation to Andrew Ladsky’s so-called ‘complaint’ against me of March 2007 I asked for “*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*”

When the police holds the view that an individual has committed a crime, and does this as a result of receiving a complaint – I believe that the Met’s Directorate of Professional Standards would agree with me that the police would contact the ‘suspect’. Indeed, it might even make a ‘special trip’ to the home of the ‘suspect’ – as done by e.g. PC Watson in relation to Ladsky’s 2003 ‘complaint’ against me (page 23, point 25 of my 13 August 2009 reply).

There MUST therefore be personal data that is ‘obviously about me’ / ‘relates to me’ / ‘linked to me’ that was processed, which led K&C police to – at NO POINT IN TIME – contact me, the author and owner of the website, following the so-called ‘complaint’ by Andrew Ladsky.

Some of this personal data has clearly been issued to K&C policy by parties outside of the police – and therefore processed.

In light of, among others, what I report on my website, my guess is that some of the data sources include the previous and current Lord Chancellors: Lord Falconer of Thoroton

and Jack Straw, respectively.

Another party linked to the processing of data about me is KPMG which, as detailed under section 2.2 above, 'stepped-in' when K&C police failed to scare my website into closing down my website. KPMG was also used as a conduit to communicate to me the message *"The police is not going to pursue it. Isn't that good news?"* – providing undeniable proof that communication about me took place between the police and KPMG (Page 37, point 60 of my 13 August 2009 reply).

No doubt, there are other parties who have also issued personal data about me to the police, and hence data that has been processed by the police.

I, yet again, remind you that under the Data Protection Act 1998, I have the right to know the data that has been processed about me (and, no doubt, continues to be processed about me for 'daring' to insist on exerting the rights I have been told by the legislators I have the right to demand).

By failing to supply me with the data, you are breaching my rights to fair processing of data about me, as well as my rights under the Sixth Principle. Considering events, it is obvious that the data is in breach of my rights under the Act.

Pg 29 Pt 21 2007 – In relation to the allegations that *"parts of the site are alleged to be extremely upsetting and insulting"*. - I asked *"What evidence has Ladsky provided to the police in support of these claims? i.e.*

(1) Which – specific - "parts of the site" did he identify?

(2) For – each – of the "alleged parts of the site": (i) what reason/s has Ladsky given to support his claim that it is "extremely upsetting"?; (ii) what evidence has he supplied to substantiate his counter-claim/s?

(3) For – each – of the "alleged parts of the site": (i) what reason/s has Ladsky given to support his claim that it is "extremely insulting"?; (ii) what evidence has he supplied to substantiate his counter-claim/s?"

Under the same point I wrote *"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"*

You have failed to address my questions because they are false accusations. Hence, processing of this data is a malicious, scurrilous and libellous attack on my reputation.

Therefore, among others, it amounts to a breach of my rights under the First, Fourth and Sixth Principles. It also amounts to a breach of the Seventh Principle.

Pg 29 Pt 22 2007 – In relation to the allegation that *"There are a number of sections which are alleged to be of a racial nature and numerous references by name to the victim"* - I asked *"What evidence has Ladsky provided to the police in support of these claims? i.e.*

(1) Which – specific - "sections are alleged to be of a racial nature and numerous references by name to the victim"?

(2) For – each – of the "alleged sections": (i) what reason/s has Ladsky given to

support his claim that it is "of a racial nature"; (ii) what reason/s has he given to support his claim "and numerous references to the victim"; (iii) what evidence has he supplied to substantiate his counter-claim/s?"

Rest of comments: as per above, under 'Pg 29, Pt 21'

Pg 30 Pt 23 2007 - In relation to the accusation that *"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 asked *"What evidence has Ladsky provided to the police in support of these claims? i.e.*

(1) Which "specific remarks"? (2) For – each – of the "specific remarks": (i) what reason/s has Ladsky given to identify "the remark" ?; (ii) what evidence has he supplied to substantiate his counter-claim/s?

(3) Which "specific picture"? (4) For – each – of "the specific pictures": (i) what reason/s has Ladsky given to identify "the picture" ?; (ii) what evidence has he supplied to substantiate his counter-claim/s?"

Rest of comments: as per above, under 'Pg 29, Pt 21'

Pg 30 Pt 25 2007 – Regarding PC K O'Brien's 'expression of opinion' *"...although it appears to be becoming quite paranoid"* - I asked *"On what basis does PC K O'Brien considers himself entitled to make this 'assessment' about me?"*

As explained under section 2.2 above, for 'Pg 30, Pt 25' - 'Pg 32, Pt 32' - 'Pg 34, Pt 38', this statement is a malicious, scurrilous and libellous attack on my reputation.

Processing of this data about me which, Part I s.2 of the Act defines as *"Sensitive data...an expression of opinion consisting of information as to (e) the physical or mental health or condition"* - amounts to, among others, a breach of my rights under the First and Fourth Principles. It also amounts to a breach of the Seventh Principle.

Pg 31 Pt 27 2007 - In relation to the statement *"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 stated "It is totally untrue that I used the terms 'pigs and monkeys' to refer to "Jewish people" – and asked "What is the evidence to support these claims?"

You have failed to address my question because, as detailed under section 2.1 above, 'Pg 31, Pt 27' – 'Pg 32, Pt 29' these are sick, trumped-up accusations concocted against me by Ladsky, the police et.al. – with the blatantly obvious objective of scaring my website Host into closing down my website (evidence on page 35, point 47 of my 13 August 2009 reply).

These trumped-up accusations are a defamation of my name, character and reputation.

Hence, processing of this data which, under Part I – 2. of the Act is defined as *"Sensitive personal data... as it consists of information as to - (g) the commission or*

alleged commission by him of any offence” - amounts to, among others, a breach of my rights under the First, Fourth and Sixth Principles. It also amounts to a breach of the Seventh Principle.

Of note: unbelievably, in writing the above in his 16 and 20 March 2007 emails to my website Host, TDC Simon J Dowling justified it by quoting the fact that I am *“Franco-German”* - hence, by using data which, under Part I – 2. of the Act is defined as *“sensitive personal data... as it consists of information as to (a) the racial or ethnic origin of the data subject”*

Pg 32 Pt 28 2007 - I asked *“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”*

There MUST EVIDENTLY be data ‘obviously about me’ / ‘relating to me’ / ‘linked to me’ that was processed (clearly, by morally depraved individuals), resulting in giving the green light to TDC Simon J. Dowling to make unsupported, unlawful, malicious, libellous and scurrilous accusations against me to my website Host – with the blatantly obvious objective of scaring my website Host into closing down my website (evidence on page 35, point 47 of my 13 August 2009 reply).

Yet again, I remind you that, under the Data Protection Act 1998, I have the right to know the data that has been processed about me. It is blatantly obvious that this data also includes ‘sensitive personal data’.

By failing to supply me with the data, you are breaching my rights to fair processing of data about me, as well as my rights under the Sixth Principle. Considering events, it is obvious that the data is in breach of my rights under the Act.

Pg 33 Pt 33 2007 – In relation to the statement that I am *“obviously very paranoid”*, I asked *“On what basis does TDC Simon J Dowling, of the ‘Community Support Unit’, consider himself entitled to make this categorical ‘assessment’ about me?”*

Comments as per above, under ‘Pg 30, Pt 25’.

Pg 33 Pt 34 2007 – In relation to the accusations *“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 asked *“What is the evidence in support of – EACH – of these categorical claims?”*

As detailed under section 2.1 above, ‘Pg 33, Pt 34’, you have failed to address my question because these are trumped-up accusations by Ladsky et.al.

Hence, processing of this unlawful, malicious, scurrilous and libellous data about me which, under Part I – 2. of the Act is defined as *“Sensitive personal data... as it consists of information as to – (b) his political opinions; (g) the commission or alleged commission by him of any offence”* – amounts to, among others, a breach of my rights under the First, Fourth and Sixth Principles. It also amounts to a breach of the

requirements set under the Seventh Principle.

Pg 34 Pt 37 2007 – 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”

There MUST EVIDENTLY be data ‘obviously about me’ / ‘relating to me’ / ‘linked to me’ that was processed (clearly, by morally depraved individuals), resulting in giving the green light to TDC Simon J. Dowling to **(1)** contact my website Host – without EVER contacting me; **(2)** imply to my website Host - without any evidence in support - that I had ‘committed a crime’ – with the blatantly obvious objective of scaring my website Host into closing down my website (evidence on page 35, point 47 of my 13 August 2009 reply).

Yet again, I remind you that, under the Data Protection Act 1998, I have the right to know the data that has been processed about me. It is blatantly obvious that this data also includes ‘sensitive personal data’.

By failing to supply me with the data, you are breaching my rights to fair processing of data about me, as well as my rights under the Sixth Principle. Considering events, it is obvious that the data is in breach of my rights under the Act. Furthermore, it is also clear that it amounts to a breach of the requirements under the Seventh Principle.

Pg 34 Pt 38 2007 – In relation to the ‘expression of opinion’ “I believe she may have some mental issues so will be speaking to social services to see if they are aware of her” – I asked “On what basis does TDC Simon J Dowling, of the ‘Community Support Unit’, consider himself entitled to make this ‘assessment’ against me?”

A ‘Community Support Unit’ officer states that he “believes” that I “may have some mental issues” and opts to “speak to social services” – and you fail to reply to my question. WHY?

For my detailed comments, see above, section 2.2. ‘Pg 34, Pt 38’

Pg 34 Pt 39 2007 - In relation to TDC Simon J Dowling “contacting social services to see if they are aware of [me]”, I asked “Please supply: (1) Contact detail of the social services section that has been contacted; (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”

It is clear from this action that:

(1) a police “expression of opinion about my mental condition”, and obviously other data about me has been transmitted to social services by the police;

(2) this data was evidently transmitted by TDC Simon J Dowling to social services with

an indication of intentions;

(3) this was done in order to influence decisions / actions 'obviously about me' / 'relating to me' / 'linked to me'

Under Part I s.2 of the Act 'this type' of data, "*an expression of opinion consisting of information as to (e) the physical or mental health or condition*" is classified as "*Sensitive personal data*"

The fact that the police has communicated, among others, an "*expression of opinion about my mental condition to social services*" – which is malicious, scurrilous and libellous – means that social services i.e. another data controller has and continues to process this malicious, scurrilous and libellous data about me. In all likelihood, this is captured by social services in a 'health record' (definition under s.68 of the Act)

I have the right to know: **(1)** the data about me that has been communicated and exchanged between the police and social services; **(2)** to whom the data has been communicated; **(3)** from whom it has been received. You should have communicated this information to me.

You are breaching my rights to fair processing of data about me – and it is blatantly obvious that my rights under the Act have been breached.

In addition, this action also amounts to a breach of the Seventh Principle which requires that "*Appropriate technical and organisational measures shall be taken against unauthorised or unlawful processing of personal data*". Part II – Interpretation "*10. The data controller must take reasonable steps to ensure the reliability of any employees of his who have access to the personal data*"

Pg 35 Pt 45 2007 – Regarding the statement "*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 asked:

"Why "should" it "be classed as a racial incident"? Where is the evidence that I have committed a "racist act"?"

You have failed to answer my question because it is a malicious, scurrilous and libellous accusation against me.

Hence, processing of this data amounts to, among others, a breach of my rights under the First, Fourth and Sixth Principles. It is also a breach of the Seventh Principle.

Pg 35 Pt 46 2007 - I asked "*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..."*

Considering that, to this day, NO evidence has been supplied in support of this accusation - there MUST EVIDENTLY be data 'obviously about me' / 'relating to me' /

'linked to me' that was processed (clearly, by morally depraved individuals), resulting in giving the green light to TDC Simon J Dowling to make this unsupported, unlawful, malicious, scurrilous and libellous accusation against me to my website Host – with the blatantly obvious objective of scaring my Host into closing down my site (evidence on page 35, point 47 of my 13 August 2009 reply).

By failing to supply me with the data, you are breaching my rights to fair processing of data about me, as well as the Sixth Principle. Considering events, it is obvious that the data is in breach of my rights under the Act. Furthermore, it is also clear that it amounts to a breach of the requirements under the Seventh Principle.

Pg 36 Pt 50 2007 - I asked *"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"*

Unbelievably, in writing this in his 16 and 20 March 2007 emails to my website Host, TDC Simon J Dowling of the 'Community Support Unit' justified it by quoting the fact that I am *"Franco-German"* – hence, by using data which, under Part I – 2. of the Act is defined as *"sensitive personal data... as it consists of information as to (a) the racial or ethnic origin of the data subject"*

There MUST EVIDENTLY be data 'obviously about me' / 'relating to me' / 'linked to me' that was processed (clearly, by morally depraved individuals), resulting in giving the green light to TDC Simon J. Dowling to breach the Metropolitan Police Service code – by maliciously and scurrilously branding me *"a Nazi"* to my website Host, and concurrently committing a racist and xenophobic act – all with the blatantly obvious objective of scaring my website Host into closing down my site (evidence on page 35, point 47 of my 13 August 2009 reply).

By failing to supply me with the data, you are breaching my rights to fair processing of data about me, as well as the Sixth Principle. Considering events, it is obvious that the data is in breach of my rights under the Act. Furthermore, it is also clear that it amounts to a breach of the requirements under the Seventh Principle.

Pg 36 Pt 52 2007 – I asked *"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'"*

There MUST EVIDENTLY be data 'obviously about me' / 'relating to me' / 'linked to me' that was processed, resulting in TDC Simon J. Dowling backing-down on his malicious, scurrilous and libellous accusations against me as a result of being challenged by my website Host.

By failing to supply me with the data, you are breaching my rights to fair processing of

data about me, as well as the Sixth Principle.

Pg 37 Pt 53 2007 – I asked *“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 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”*”

Comments as per above, under ‘Pg 36, Pt 50’

Pg 37 Pt 55 2007 – Regarding the statement *“Crime reclassified to no crime unconfirmed”* – I asked *“What does this mean?”*

You have also failed to answer this question.

Pg 37 Pt 60 2007 – I asked *“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.”*

There MUST EVIDENTLY be data ‘obviously about me’ / ‘relating to me’ / ‘linked to me’ that was processed, resulting in K&C police opting to communicate a message through my employer, about – my personal website – and thereby continue to have no contact WHATSOEVER with me in relation to Andrew Ladsky’s so-called ‘complaint’.

By failing to supply me with the data, you are breaching my rights to fair processing of data about me, as well as the Sixth Principle.

Pg 37 Pt 61 2007 – I asked *“Please provide detail of individuals / organisations to which Andrew Ladsky’s 2007 complaint against me has been transmitted, as well as copy of:*

(1) The information supplied to the individuals / organisations

(2) 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”

As detailed earlier on, it is blatantly obvious from events that parties outside of K&C police had an input into how Ladsky’s so-called ‘complaint’ against me should be ‘handled’. Hence, data ‘obviously about me’ / ‘relating to me’ / ‘linked to me’ was processed for the purpose of determining the manner in which I should be treated.

By failing to supply me with the data, you are breaching my rights to fair processing of data about me, as well as the Sixth Principle.

Pg 38 Pt 62 2007 – I asked *“Considering:*

(1) The accusations made by Simon J. Dowling to my website Host in relation to the

content of my website

- (2) *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*
- (3) *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"*

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"

There MUST EVIDENTLY be data 'obviously about me' / 'relating to me' / 'linked to me' that was processed that allowed TDC Simon J. Dowling to turn a blind eye to ALL the evidence contained on my website and make his unlawful, malicious, scurrilous and libellous accusations against me to my website Host, social services et.al..

I, yet again, remind you that, under the Data Protection Act 1998, I have the right to know the data that has been processed about me. It is blatantly obvious that this data also includes 'sensitive personal data'.

By failing to supply me with the data, you are breaching my rights to fair processing of data about me, as well as my rights under the Sixth Principle. Considering events, it is obvious that the data is in breach of my rights under the Act. Furthermore, it is also clear that it amounts to a breach of the requirements under the Seventh Principle.

Yours sincerely,

N Klosterkötter-Dit-Rawé

cc. Chief Superintendent Mark Heath, Borough Commander, Kensington & Chelsea police, 72 Earls Court Road, Kensington, London W8 6EQ – including my 13 August 2009 response to the police reports, and the 25 August 2009 reply from [3<], Public Access Office, Metropolitan Police



Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

*Mark
Health
Chief
Superintendent*

Paddington Quay
Retail Unit 6
West End Quay
4 Praed Street
London
Greater London
W2 1JE

Date and Time: 21/09/2009 13:52
Session Prefix: 3-256791
Dest: UK (E.U.)
Quantity: 1
Weight: 0.428 kg
Special D by 1 £5.40

Total Cost of Services £5.40

Posted after Last Collection? No

Barcode: ZW3796484156B

DESTINATION ADDRESS
Building Name or Number Postcode
Metropolitan Police W8 6EQ
Address Validated? Y

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

PLEASE REFER TO SEPARATE TERMS AND CONDITIONS

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

This is not a VAT receipt
Thank You



Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

*TAP
Public
Access
Office*

Paddington Quay
Retail Unit 6
West End Quay
4 Praed Street
London
Greater London
W2 1JE

Date and Time: 21/09/2009 13:53
Session Prefix: 3-256801
Dest: UK (E.U.)
Quantity: 1
Weight: 0.214 kg
Special D by 1 £5.40

Total Cost of Services £5.40

Posted after Last Collection? No

Barcode: ZW3796484246B

DESTINATION ADDRESS
Building Name or Number Postcode
METROPOLITAN POLICE PO BO SW61SF
Address Validated? N

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

PLEASE REFER TO SEPARATE TERMS AND CONDITIONS

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

This is not a VAT receipt
Thank You



Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

Paddington Quay
Retail Unit 6
West End Quay
4 Praed Street
London
Greater London
W2 1JE

VAT REG No. 243 1700 02
21/09/2009 13:54
SESSION : 3-256791-2

Post Label SD	5.40
1 @	5.40
Post Label SD	5.40
1 @	5.40
TOTAL DUE TO POST OFFICE	10.80
Cash	20.00
Cash	9.20
BALANCE	0.00

FROM CUSTOMER
TO CUSTOMER

Thank You

[Personal Customers](#)

[Small & Medium Business](#)

[Corporate & Public Sector](#)



Search

[Delivery Services](#)

[Marketing Services](#)

[Logistics Services](#)

[Discounts & Payment](#)



[Home](#)

[Home > Track and trace >](#)

[Track and trace](#)

[Sending tracked mail](#)

[Tracking your mail](#)

Top links

[Find a postcode](#)

[Postal prices](#)

[Shop](#)

[Track an item](#)

[A-Z](#)

[Work for us](#)

[Customer service](#)


Please enter your 13 character reference
e.g. AA000100019GB

ZW379648424GB

[Track item](#)

Public Access office

[How to find your reference number](#)



Your item with reference ZW379648424GB was delivered from our FULHAM Delivery Office on 22/09/09.

Thank you for using this service.

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

The electronic Proof of Delivery may not be available for this item yet. Please allow up to 72 hours after delivery before checking.

[View Proof of Delivery](#)