

The Rt. Hon. Alan Johnson, MP  
Home Secretary  
Home Office  
2 Marsham Street  
London SW1P 4DF

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

Sir Paul Stephenson  
Metropolitan Police Commissioner  
Scotland Yard  
Broadway  
London SW1

See my follow-on letter to both of them, of 2 Dec 09, and the follow-on of 3 Dec 09 from the Office of Sir Paul Stephenson, followed by the 8 Dec 09 (posted on 16 Dec) from the Directorate of Professional Standards and my follow-on letter of 2 Feb 2010

1 (By 'Special Delivery')

2 28 November 2009

3 Dear Sirs

4 NEED FOR ACTION

5 Mr Johnson, when you announced the Crime Bill last week, you said "*police officers must visit every*  
6 *victim of crime*". The outcome of my extensive first-hand experience with my local police, Kensington &  
7 Chelsea (K&C), leads me to say that there are far more important issues that require urgent action - to  
8 not only address my situation, but also protect others from being subjected to the same treatment:

9 Sir Paul, you stated on BBC1 news, on 2 October 2009 "*Events at the G20 demonstration have created a*  
10 *gulf, a distrust of the police by the public...I can assure you: we are on your side*". My experience with  
11 K&C police overwhelmingly demonstrates that it is most definitely NOT "*on my side*". The following is a  
12 brief outline of my experience with K&C police in 2002, 2003 and 2007 – supported by documents to  
13 provide the detail – trusting that, as the Met's Commissioner, you will take the necessary actions to  
14 ensure that the police performs as per its mandate – as well as the laws of the land.

15 1. In 2002, I was suffering harassment, that included numerous anonymous phone calls over several  
16 days (all traced by BT); being forced in, as well as pushed in the entrance corridor to Jefferson  
17 House, 11 Basil Street, SW3, where I own a leasehold flat; pressing of my door bell late at night;  
18 object thrown at my windows, also late at night - and identified to K&C police Andrew Ladsky as the  
19 perpetrator, who is the owner / front man for Jefferson House.

20 At the time, the 'handling' of my complaint – which included, among others, ignoring a significant part  
21 of it; lies; fabrications; overlooking the evidence; the use of bullying and intimidation in an attempt to  
22 make me drop my complaint; dismissing the fact that at least four of my fellow leaseholders had also  
23 complained to K&C police of suffering harassment from Andrew Ladsky - led me to conclude that  
24 K&C police was protecting Ladsky.

25 The 2002 police report, CR:5604102/02, I obtained in July 2009, following filing my enclosed 28 May  
26 2009 Subject Access Request <sup>1</sup> under the Data Protection Act 1998, as well as reports  
27 CR:5602261/03 and CR:5605839/07 in relation to the 2003 and 2007 so-called 'complaints' by  
28 Ladsky against me, added to the outcome of the correspondence to date with the police - has further  
29 reinforced this belief.

---

<sup>1</sup> My 28 May 2009 Subject Access Request to the police – under the Data Protection Act 1998

1 2. In 2003, Ladsky reported me to K&C police for “harassment”. BEFORE even contacting me, K&C  
 2 police: **(1)** falsely recorded his ‘complaint’ as “harassment” (still recorded as such to this date on the  
 3 police systems); **(2)** in his 27 January 2003 letter, PC Neil Watson PC206BS, Crime Investigator,  
 4 threatened me by stating “Please avoid (if you can) any confrontation with Mr Ladsky or there may be  
 5 further consequences”. (My question as to the ‘previous consequences’ which, by implication, I  
 6 suffered, remains unanswered to this day).

7 The outcome of my asking, in my 11 February 2003 reply, for “precise detail of the accusation against  
 8 me – in writing” was never acknowledged – while, as evidenced by the police report CR:5602261/03,  
 9 PC Neil Watson falsely captured on the police database that I did not respond.

10 3. In 2007, in the context of another so-called ‘complaint’ concocted against me by Ladsky et.al.  
 11 comprising of totally unsupported accusations against me - WITHOUT contacting me, TDC Simon J  
 12 Dowling, of K&C police’s ‘Community Support Unit’, approached my American website Host (my site  
 13 <http://www.leasehold-outrage.com>) implying, in his 16 March 2007 email that I had ‘committed a  
 14 crime’ by making totally unsupported malicious and libellous accusations against me.

15 In the process, TDC Simon J Dowling also libellously branded me “a Nazi” – thereby also  
 16 demonstrating that, in addition to utter contempt for the laws of the land, K&C police also has utter  
 17 contempt for the Met’s policy that “MPS personnel must not use MPS systems to author, transmit or  
 18 store documents such as electronic email...containing racist, defamatory, offensive, illegal material”

19 As result of being challenged by my website Host who asked “Are you aware that there are laws  
 20 against making false accusations?” TDC Simon J Dowling replied in his 20 March 2007 email that he  
 21 was – and backed down from his previous libellous accusations by stating “there is nothing we as a  
 22 police force can do...”

23 Of course, as evidenced in the report CR:5605839/07, the reply from my website Host has NOT been  
 24 captured in the police records – and, therefore, NOR has the fact that Dowling sent his 20 March  
 25 2007 email. This is a continuation of a policy by K&C police of not capturing ‘inconvenient’ evidence.

26 Determined to achieve his objective, on the day he sent his libellous 16 March 2007 email to my  
 27 website Host, Dowling captured “I believe she may have some mental issues so will  
 28 be speaking to social services to see if they are aware of her” I view this as  
 29 an attempt to secure the ‘ultimate solution’: getting me sectioned. (I am aware of the police’s power to  
 30 have somebody locked-up in a mental institution - without evidence: Scotland Yard’s Fixated Threat  
 31 Assessment Centre (FTAC) which, in light of my experience to date with the police (and awareness of  
 32 its actions in relation to other people) I now suspect, would not be averse to manipulating to meet its  
 33 needs). (FTAC reported in The Evening Standard article of 27 May 2007 “Revealed: Blair’s secret  
 34 stalker squad” – accessible through <http://www.abovetopsecret.com/forum/thread284391/pg1>)

35 Although the attempt to scare my website Host had failed, TDC Simon J Dowling et.al. were evidently  
 36 not giving up on the possibility of getting my website closed down as, his entry under 18 March 2007  
 37 reads “I am still trying to get the website closed down”

38 **From beginning to end, K&C police NEVER contacted me in relation to this so-called**  
 39 **‘complaint’** by Ladsky. It is abundantly clear that the objective of Dowling’s email of 16 March 2007  
 40 was to scare my website Host into closing down my website – because it is very damning of Ladsky,  
 41 his aides and their so-called ‘professional’ associations; the local public sector departments  
 42 comprising of K&C police, West London County Court, Wandsworth County Court and K&C council;  
 43 other public sector departments comprising of the London Leasehold Valuation Tribunal, HMCS  
 44 complaints department, the Legal Services Ombudsman, the Local Government Ombudsman, etc.

45 (‘Very conveniently’, ALL overlook: the root cause of events: fraud by Ladsky and his aides; the fact  
 46 that, in 2003, “for the sake of bringing the dispute to an end”, I accepted his ‘offer’ of £6,350 (v. the  
 47 original demand of £14,400) – even though, legally, I did not owe this amount either – but, he would

see e.g. Introduction to My Diary - Year 2009

1 not leave it at that and bombarded me with **more bogus invoices;** the part they played by repeatedly  
 2 telling me to 'get lost' when I turned to them for help – leading me, after FIVE YEARS of this hell, to  
 3 launch my website out of utter despair - as a means of putting pressure on resolving my situation).

- 4 4. I responded comprehensively to the police reports CR:5604102/02, CR:5602261/03 and  
 5 CR:5605839/07, in my enclosed 38-page letter of 13 August 2009<sup>2</sup> to the Public Access Office - in  
 6 which, among others, I highlight numerous breaches of my rights under the Data Protection Act 1998,  
 7 as well as failure to address practically all my 28 May 2009 requests. I also supplied a 100 page  
 8 bundle of 49 documents as supporting evidence to my reply.

9 At the end of my 1 page of 'Overall conclusions', I state: *"It leads me to ask: **What gives Andrew***  
 10 ***Ladsky control over Kensington & Chelsea police?"** I pose this question to you Sir Paul.*

- 11 5. It led to the enclosed, 25 August 2009 'reply' from Jenna Neville, Public Access Office<sup>3</sup> I view this  
 12 'reply' as highly dismissive, contemptuous and arrogant, as it implies that K&C police considers itself  
 13 exempt from complying with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998.

14 Indeed, the letter states *"I have forwarded your concerns on to the Investigating Officer who will if he*  
 15 *feels necessary update the report... If this is completed I will forward you a updated version... I can*  
 16 *confirm after making enquiries there is no further information we can provide you with".*

- 17 6. It led me to write the enclosed 38-page, 20 September 2009<sup>4</sup> response to Jenna Neville, Public  
 18 Access Office, comprehensively outlining my rights under the Data Protection Act 1998 – and  
 19 referring back to the points in my 13 August 2009 response, heading them:

- 20 ■ *"2.1 You hold data about me that are trumped-up accusations, unlawful, malicious, vicious*  
 21 *attacks on my name, character and reputation.*
- 22 ■ *2.2 You hold data about me that is false, a scurrilous, libellous, malicious attack on my name,*  
 23 *character and reputation.*
- 24 ■ *2.3 You hold data about me that is biased, corrupted, false, deceitful, conveys a false,*  
 25 *misleading impression of me.*
- 26 ■ *2.4 Highly pertinent evidence has been withheld to cover-up 'inconvenient' events, and as a*  
 27 *means of disparaging me and discrediting me."*

28 I also state, *"If you persist in failing to comply with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998,*  
 29 *and hence persist in causing me distress, as well as damage, I will contact the Office of the*  
 30 *Information Commissioner to request that an Enforcement Notice under s.42 of the Act is served on*  
 31 *Chief Superintendent Mark Heath. In this context, I will also ask the Information Commissioner to take*  
 32 *into consideration my rights under the Human Rights Act 1998. If this proves necessary, I will follow*  
 33 *this with legal proceedings as per my rights under s.14 of the Act".*

- 34 7. The highly contemptuous, dismissive attitude in the 25 August 2009 letter prompted me to also send  
 35 the enclosed 20 September 2009<sup>5</sup> letter to Chief Superintendent Mark Heath, Borough Commander,  
 36 Kensington police, heading it *"Kensington & Chelsea police is not exempt from compliance with the*  
 37 *requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998".*

38 In this letter, I relate events – supported by documents - and head a series of questions with *"In light*  
 39 *of events, I would also like to know what gives officers under your control. The right to "* – under which

---

<sup>2</sup> My 13 August 2009 response to the three computer printouts: CR:5604102/02; CR:5602261/03; CR:5605839/07

<sup>3</sup> 25 August 2009 'reply' from Jenna Neville, MPS Public Access Office, to my 13 August 2009 response

<sup>4</sup> My 20 September 2009 reply to Jenna Neville, MPS Public Access Office 'response' of 25 August 2009

<sup>5</sup> My 20 September 2009 letter to Chief Superintendent Mark Heath, Borough Commander, K&C police

1 I include *“Last but not least – as your officers have familiarised themselves with the content of my*  
 2 *website - the right to turn a blind eye to criminal offences committed against me by Andrew Ladsky,*  
 3 *including through ‘his puppets’ who “acted under his instructions”.* I follow this by listing: *“The*  
 4 *Protection from Harassment Act 1997; the Fraud Act 2006; the Malicious Communications Act 1988;*  
 5 *the Theft Act 1968 / Theft Amendment Act 1996; the Money Laundering Regulations / Proceeds of*  
 6 *Crime Act 2002; the Criminal Justice Act & Public Order Act 1994. Etc.”*

7 **I pose the same question to you Sir Paul: what gives K&C police the right to ignore criminal**  
 8 **offences committed against me?** And the following: **How come that Andrew Ladsky evidently**  
 9 **has carte blanche to do exactly as he pleases – without fear of sanction by the police? What**  
 10 **gives him the right to totally destroy my life, make me lose everything I have worked for and**  
 11 **subject me to years of ongoing mental torture?**

12 Repeating my intention to contact the Information Commissioner, and proceed to a court action if  
 13 necessary, I also ask that *“a letter is immediately sent to my website Host to retrieve all the malicious,*  
 14 *scurrilous and libellous accusations against me”*

15 I conclude my letter by asking *“As the above are very clearly in breach of, among others, the Police*  
 16 *Professional Standards, as Head of K&C police: what are you going to do in the face of this litany of*  
 17 *outrageous, gross misconduct?”*

- 18 8. It led to the enclosed brief ‘reply’ of 22 September 2009 <sup>6</sup> from Steve McSorley, Acting Chief  
 19 Inspector, who, while he did not specify it, I discovered through my research, is responsible for  
 20 ‘Professional Standards and Performance’ at K&C police. The letter is said to be in ‘response’ to mine  
 21 of 20 September 2009 to Mark Heath.

22 In relation to my 20 September 2009 reply to Jenna Neville, McSorley wrote *“As you quite rightly point*  
 23 *out, the Information Commissioner may serve an enforcement notice if he considers the Data*  
 24 *Protection Act is breached and if you are dissatisfied with her response I would suggest you contact*  
 25 *the office of the Information Commissioner”* – and followed this by providing the address.

26 I view this letter as a blatant ‘Get lost! We don’t care!’ Considering the content of my 13 August 2009  
 27 and 20 September 2009 correspondence, it is most definitely NOT the reply one would expect from  
 28 an individual responsible for ensuring ‘professional standards’.

- 29 9. I replied to McSorley in my enclosed 8 October 2009 <sup>7</sup> letter, heading it *“In light of your role at*  
 30 *Kensington & Chelsea police: how do you explain your response of 22 September 2009?”* I highlight  
 31 what he has ignored – which is everything. I quote his comment in his 22 September 2009 letter *“I*  
 32 *note that you have quite clearly expressed your concerns about accuracy to Jenna Neville at the*  
 33 *Metropolitan Police Public Access Office”* and state that *“it evidently cannot be the reason for your*  
 34 *ignoring all of my correspondence”.*

- 35 10. I copied this letter to Mark Heath, heading my enclosed 8 October 2009 <sup>8</sup> letter to him with *“Do you*  
 36 *endorse the treatment I have and continue to be subjected to by Kensington & Chelsea police?”*

37 Among others, I highlight *“my rights, as confirmed e.g. on the Equality and Human Rights*  
 38 *Commission website (<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/fairer-britain>), that under the Human*  
 39 *Rights Act 1998, I have the right to: “Being treated fairly and with dignity... means that everybody*  
 40 *should have access to public services...and the right to be treated fairly by those services. This*  
 41 *applies to all public services... UK law includes a range of human rights which protect you from poor*

<sup>6</sup> 22 September 2009 ‘response’ from Acting Chief Inspector Steve McSorley, K&C police ‘Professional Standards & Performance’

<sup>7</sup> My 8 October 2009 letter to Acting Chief Inspector Steve McSorley, K&C police ‘Professional Standards & Performance’

<sup>8</sup> My 8 October 2009 letter to Chief Superintendent Mark Heath, Borough Commander, K&C police

1 *treatment and prejudice, and which require you to have equal and fair treatment from public*  
2 *authorities”*

3 11. More than one month later, lack of response from either, led me to send the enclosed chaser letter of  
4 11 November 2009<sup>9</sup> to Mark Heath, and 11 November 2009<sup>10</sup> chaser letter to McSorley.

5 12. It led to the enclosed reply of 17 November 2009<sup>11</sup> from Sergeant Dave Jones, Staff Officer to the  
6 Borough Commander, that *“The Borough Commander has asked Chief Inspector McSorley to write*  
7 *again to you in order to outline the previous advice given”*. In other words, evidently repeat to me the  
8 equivalent of the ‘Get lost! We don’t care!’. This is the last correspondence at the time of writing.

9 **Under the Data Protection Act 1998, I have the right to seek – and obtain – an end to the**  
10 **processing of data “likely to cause damage or distress”, as well as obtain correction of data to**  
11 **ensure that it is “fair, lawful and accurate”.**

12 Furthermore, the current guidelines from the Association of Chief Police Officers recommend that the  
13 information about an individual is retained *“until the individual reaches 100 years of age”*. It means that  
14 my personal data will be ‘processed’ by a multitude of individuals.

15 This is in addition to the risk that the misleading, false, scurrilous and unlawful data about me hands-up in  
16 the wrong hands – as the police has shown that it cannot even prevent the loss of data on its own staff  
17 e.g. *“Laptop thief lands the bank details of 15,000 policemen”*, Daily Mail, 21 Nov 06  
18 ([http://www.dailymail.co.uk/pages/live/articles/news/news.html?in\\_article\\_id=417840&in\\_page\\_id=1770](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/pages/live/articles/news/news.html?in_article_id=417840&in_page_id=1770))

19 As it stands, given the conduct to date of K&C police, the likelihood is that I am going to have to contact  
20 the Information Commissioner and will probably need to follow this by issuing proceedings against K&C  
21 police. So, in addition to the costs to me, more taxpayer money will be wasted, on top of the astronomical  
22 amount that must have so far been spent to scheme me against me (incl. with non-public sector parties),  
23 planning and implementing the highly vicious, perverse vendetta against me, developing and coordinating  
24 the replies to my correspondence, monitoring me as though I were a terrorist, etc. **How much taxpayer**  
25 **money has so far been spent doing that Sir Paul? Why is the police monitoring me?**

see e.g.  
Intro to  
My Diary  
2009

26 Given the propensity to discredit me, I am quoting the following examples as supporting evidence.

27 Wasting vast amounts of taxpayer money in the pursuit of revenge, to cover-up its blunders, failings, etc.  
28 is one of the trademarks of the police e.g.

- 29 ■ In 2003 Kensington police was widely reported in the media as having spent £5-7million of taxpayer  
30 money investigating one of its own, then Superintendent Ali Dizaei. The inquiry ended in ignominy for  
31 the Met when the only remaining actual charge, fiddling £270 mileage expenses, was dropped.
- 32 ■ Instead of immediately apologising to the relatives of Mr Jean Charles de Menezes and negotiate  
33 compensation with them, the initial reaction of Ian Blair, the ex-Met Commissioner, was to deny any  
34 failings on the part of the police, and block an external investigation. The family battled for four years  
35 in search of justice. In its 23 Nov 09 article, *“The final insult: How family of innocent Brazilian shot*  
36 *dead on Tube will get just a fraction of £400k pay-off for blundering Met boss Blair”*  
37 ([http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1230067/Jean-Charles-Menezes-Family-Brazilian-shot-dead-](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1230067/Jean-Charles-Menezes-Family-Brazilian-shot-dead-tube-just-fraction-400k-pay-blundering-Met-boss-Blair.html)  
38 [tube-just-fraction-400k-pay-blundering-Met-boss-Blair.html](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1230067/Jean-Charles-Menezes-Family-Brazilian-shot-dead-tube-just-fraction-400k-pay-blundering-Met-boss-Blair.html)) the Daily Mail reports that *“The three-*  
39 *month inquest followed a £300,000 investigation by the IPCC and a £1million trial at which the Met*

See # 9  
under  
K&C  
police  
section

---

<sup>9</sup> My 11 November 2009 chaser letter to Chief Superintendent Mark Heath, Borough Commander, K&C police

<sup>10</sup> My 11 November 2009 chaser letter to Acting Chief Inspector Steve McSorley, K&C police ‘Professional Standards & Performance’

<sup>11</sup> 17 November 2009 ‘response’ from Sergeant Dave Jones, Staff Officer to the Borough Commander, K&C police

1 was found guilty of health and safety failings and fined £175,000. Legal costs for the inquest, paid for  
2 by taxpayers, are expected to reach £8million”.

3 ■ Concurrently, the Canadian Lady who was hounded by the police and locked-up in a police cell for  
4 ‘daring’ to reveal detail of what actually took place in relation to the shooting of Mr de Menezes.  
5 According to the media, over £100,000 of taxpayer money was spent pursuing this whistleblower.

6 ■ Employment of lawyers by Leicestershire police to attempt to get a ban on reporting the case of Fiona  
7 Pilkington who, last month, committed suicide with her daughter. Mrs Pilkington is reported to have  
8 made a total of “33 desperate calls to the police” – and got no help (“As police begin armed patrols, a  
9 campaigner deplores the Government’s disturbing plan to make inquests secret”, The Mail on  
10 Sunday, 25 Oct 09 – [http://www.dailymail.co.uk/debate/article-1222760/HELEN-SHAW-If-somebody-  
11 dies-MUST-know--Its-vital-inquests-stay-public.html](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/debate/article-1222760/HELEN-SHAW-If-somebody-dies-MUST-know--Its-vital-inquests-stay-public.html))

12 ■ The journalist who was also hounded by the police (followed, phone tapped, etc) for ‘daring’ to  
13 expose events relating to the police which, apparently, were already in the public domain; ended-up  
14 being prosecuted - and, mercifully, faced a decent judge who threw the case out. The journalist was  
15 reported in the media as saying that a total of c. £1 million of taxpayer money was spent pursuing her.

For detail,  
see My  
Diary w/c  
4 Feb 08

16 As to situations when the police is faced with evidence it cannot deny and wriggle out of, it lies, falsifies  
17 the evidence – in my case, and in e.g. that of Mr de Menezes, when the inquest jury branded the police  
18 marksmen as liars, and one of the police officer was exposed for **tempering** with the evidence. In relation  
19 to the latter, the media reported that the ‘Independent’ Police Complaints Commission had concluded that  
20 “the officer had acted naïvely, but found no evidence of deliberate deception” – providing further evidence  
21 that the IPCC appears to perceive its role as slapping whitewash over misconduct.

Should  
read  
'tampering'

For detail,  
see My  
Diary 13  
Apr 08 -  
latter part

22 Or the police dismisses the accusation, as it has contemptuously and callously done in relation to causing  
23 the death of Ian Tomlinson who was trying to get home after a day’s work during the G20 demonstration –  
24 by stating to his relatives that “it would be “inappropriate” for the Metropolitan Police Authority... to take  
25 up their concerns. There is nothing any of us can say to reverse the situation of what happened last April”  
26 This is covered in The Guardian article of 5 Nov 09, “Investigation of G20 death ‘cover-up’ would be  
27 inappropriate, Ian Tomlinson’s family told” ([http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2009/nov/05/ian-tomlinson-  
28 police-watchdog](http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2009/nov/05/ian-tomlinson-police-watchdog)) which also reports “Within 24 hours of Tomlinson’s death, police became aware that  
29 their officers may have been involved in a physical altercation with him. However, in public, police refused  
30 to confirm there had been contact and resisted calls for an independent investigation until five days later,  
31 when the Guardian revealed video footage of the incident”

32 In his 15 Mar 09 article in the Daily Mail, headed “Criminals in the police? I have met plenty of them”  
33 ([http://www.dailymail.co.uk/debate/article1161978/BRIAN-PADDICK-Criminals-police-lve-met-plenty-  
34 them.html](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/debate/article1161978/BRIAN-PADDICK-Criminals-police-lve-met-plenty-them.html)) Brian Paddick, Former Met Commander, wrote “I can’t say I was surprised when the Liberal  
35 Democrats last week revealed that more than 1,000 service British police officers have criminal  
36 convictions for offences including violence, theft and perverting the course of justice”. Based on my first-  
37 hand experience with the police, as well as that of others: nor am I. It is frightening to think that somebody  
38 could end-up in court as an innocent defendant facing one of these police officers as a witness.

39 My first-hand experience and that of other members of the public demonstrates that we have now ended-  
40 up with an Orwellian police: a self-serving, self-regarding, ego-crazed, power-corrupted oligarchy that is  
41 out of control. It is not just me saying that.

42 In its report published in February 2009, the think-tank Reform (<http://www.reform.co.uk>) concluded that  
43 the police forces in England and Wales are “expensive, wasteful, obsolete”, that the “unaccountable chief  
44 constables should have their mini-empires broken apart”.

45 The alarming state of the police is frequently commented upon by journalists, as well as high profile  
46 individuals e.g. on 30 Nov 08, The Independent had an article headed “The police are a law unto  
47 themselves”. It certainly applies to K&C police which operates like a fiefdom, evidently perceiving itself to  
48 be above the laws of the land, as well as the Met’s policies / code of conduct.

1 Another example is The Sunday Times' article of 1 Mar 09 "*We have all been made criminals*"  
2 (<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/article5821803.ece#at>), in which it quotes the former MI5  
3 Chief, Dame Stella Rimington "*We now have more to fear from our police state than from terrorism*".

4 The same article states that we are "*sliding into a police state... A decade ago the police could arrest us*  
5 *only for serious crimes. Now they can arrest us for anything*".

6 In fact, we can also be arrested by the police (and taken to court) for changing our mind about committing  
7 suicide: "*Police charge 'suicide' man who delayed the trains for four hours*", The Mail on Sunday, 23 Aug  
8 09 (<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1208394/Police-charge-suicide-man-delayed-trains-hours.html>)

9 By contrast, Andrew Ladsky who commits / orders offences against me that are punishable by  
10 imprisonment goes scot-free, while I, the victim, am persecuted for 'daring' to stand-up to his scams.

11 In addition to the public, some Parliamentarians are also critical of the police. The 31 Mar 09 Daily Mail  
12 article "*Complaints against police rise 300% in three years*" states that "*the figures were released to the*  
13 *Parliament's Public Accounts Committee*" and that "*The PAC also criticised the IPCC for being unable to*  
14 *show if it is working effectively*".

15 On my telling people, who generally recoil at my saying it, that, on 15 June 2009, a cyclist, in Hyde Park,  
16 'delivered' to me the message "*Enjoy your life. You don't have long to live*" – they all ask me: "**Have you**  
17 **reported it to the police?**" I reply that there is no point – and give as evidence the outcome of my  
18 first-hand experience with K&C police.

See My  
Diary 15  
Jun 09 for  
detail

19 I highlight the fact that K&C police claimed to have 'looked' at my website, [http://www.leasehold-](http://www.leasehold-outrage.com)  
20 [outrage.com](http://www.leasehold-outrage.com), and that, on the site, in My Diary (specifically referred to by the police), I provide  
21 comprehensive detail of other attempts to frighten me e.g. **(1)** a woman phoning me at work saying about  
22 Andrew Ladsky et.al. "*Don't worry, they won't kill you*" and state that, evidently there has now been a  
23 change of plan; **(2)** Ladsky telling me "*I am going to get you this year*"; **(3)** four men, after midnight, in a  
24 parked car, in a deserted street, waiting for me to arrive, on my own. As I was about to cross the street,  
25 they started the car and drove it straight at me; **(4)** being ambushed by a man when I was on my own, in  
26 a deserted street, after midnight; etc.

27 That in My Diary I also report the precautions I take when I go to bed, which include sleeping all dressed-  
28 up, with a kitchen knife by me in the bed, rucksack next to my pillow, ready to storm out.

29 I say that I also provide comprehensive detail of being repeatedly followed, and that when a car is  
30 involved, I state on the site that I have noted the number plate. That I likewise provide comprehensive  
31 detail of suffering other forms of harassment – at times supported by photographs: **(1)** several malicious  
32 leaks in my flat that caused considerable damage; **(2)** phone line cut-off; **(3)** hosing of my windows in the  
33 middle of the night; **(4)** no hot water and no heating – only in my flat during the Christmas holiday, etc.

34 I also tell them that throughout my website I provide 'a mountain' of overwhelming 'black on white'  
35 evidence of breaches of numerous Acts that are punishable by imprisonment, such as the Protection from  
36 Harassment Act 1997; the Fraud Act 2006; the Malicious Communications Act 1988; the Theft Act 1968;  
37 the Money Laundering Regulations / Proceeds of Crime Act 2002; the Criminal Justice Act & Public Order  
38 Act 1994. And that I keep repeating: I AM THE VICTIM OF CRIME, NOT THE CRIMINAL.

39 I then say: guess what the outcome of K&C police 'looking' at my website was? It NEVER contacted me.  
40 Instead – without providing any evidence in support - it libellously implied to my website Host that 'I' had  
41 'committed a crime', as well as branded me "*a Nazi*"! And, on top of that, it explored the possibility of  
42 evidently trying to get me locked-up in a mental institution by contacting social services. I then ask: See  
43 why I am saying there is no point my going to the police?

44 I also relate the 'response' I have had to date to my Subject Access Request which leads me to conclude  
45 an intention to force me to approach the Information Commissioner, and in all likelihood, find that I need

1 to issue court proceedings. I tell them that maybe the police is relying on my being murdered before my  
2 claim reaches the court / an order is issued. **Is that the game plan?**

3 I explain that, taking advantage of 'surveillance Britain', I wear this T-shirt every day wherever I go (which  
4 states 'Victim of leasehold fraud – [www.leasehold-outrage.com](http://www.leasehold-outrage.com)') - doing it: to defend myself against the  
5 lies, the smear campaign orchestrated against me - by advertising where the truth can be found, as I  
6 have nowhere to turn to for help; as a means of putting pressure on resolving my situation; in case I get  
7 killed. And say: that's what 'I' - the law-abiding, decent, honest victim of crime who has done nothing  
8 wrong - am reduced to doing. And this country is part of Europe! To this can be added that everyday,  
9 when I come across police officers walking in my local area, they either divert their eyes away from me, or  
10 look straight through me as though I were invisible.

11 As to coping with the 15 June 2009 death threat "*Enjoy your life. You don't have long to live*", I tell myself  
12 that we all have to die one day – and that if I end-up being murdered, I will die knowing that the fingers  
13 will - for ever - be pointed at ALL the parties who are, in one way or another connected to my case.

14 Mr Johnson, hopefully, you will understand why I snigger at your recommendation that "*police officers  
15 must visit every victim of crime*", and that you and Sir Paul will understand why I also snigger and feel  
16 contempt in relation to:

17 ■ The Policing Pledge, under the section headed 'Crime and Justice – The policing pledge' (on  
18 [http://www.direct.gov.uk/en/CrimeJusticeAndTheLaw/ThePolice/DG\\_181995](http://www.direct.gov.uk/en/CrimeJusticeAndTheLaw/ThePolice/DG_181995)) which starts with: "*The  
19 police service in England and Wales will: 1. Work to keep you and your neighbourhoods safe from  
20 harm; 2. Always treat you fairly, with dignity and respect, ensuring that you have fair access to our  
21 services at all times*"

22 ■ The Community Service Unit claims on the police website (<http://www.met.police.uk/csu/whatcsu.htm>)  
23 "*Every crime has a bad effect on the victim but hate crimes are probably the most damaging. They  
24 happen when a person hates someone else enough to abuse them, attack them or commit some  
25 other offence against them... The more we know about these crimes and who commits them, the  
26 better we can work to prevent, detect and investigate them in the future. It's our job to identify what's  
27 happened and make sure that appropriate action is taken*".

28 ■ The 6 May 2009 claim from the previous Home Office Secretary, Jacqui Smith: "*Inciting hate, people  
29 to commit criminal acts...*" etc. are "*unacceptable; against the standards and values of this country*".  
30 Whilst it is certainly against the standards and values of the majority of the people of this country –  
31 my very extensive first-hand experience amply demonstrates that, for the purpose of feeding the  
32 greed of 'certain individuals', this conduct is very clearly regarded by various parties in the public  
33 sector (among others) - as "*acceptable*" and "*part of their standards and values*".

34 ■ Given the highly vicious, perverse vendetta orchestrated against me for 'daring' to seek justice and  
35 redress – as a result of which I expose failings and wrongdoings by the public sector - I also snigger  
36 and feel utter contempt at the **Civil Service claims** in e.g. its recruitment ad of 4 Oct 09, in The  
37 Sunday Times for, among others, the Ministry of (In)Justice "***We value objectivity, honesty,  
38 integrity and impartiality***".

39 I hope you will change my perceptions by taking immediate action in relation to K&C police, and ensure  
40 the implementation of my rights: pursuing Andrew Ladsky and parties he instructed for the offences they  
41 committed against me; ensuring that police records are amended to reflect my feedback, and my  
42 outstanding questions answered.

43 Yours sincerely,

44 N Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé

45 <http://www.leasehold-outrage.com>

My Diary  
6 May 09



Post Office Ltd.  
Your Receipt

South Kensington Station  
41 Old Brompton Road

London  
Greater London  
SW7 3JG

Date and Time: 28/11/2009 09:58  
Session Prefix: 3-2497697  
Dest: UK (E.U.)  
Quantity: 1  
Weight: 0.315 kg  
Special D by 1 £5.40

Total Cost of Services £5.40

Posted after Last Collection? No

Barcode: ZW4559078786B

DESTINATION ADDRESS  
Building Name or Number Postcode  
SCOTLAND YARD SW13BH  
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](http://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

South Kensington Station  
41 Old Brompton Road

London  
Greater London  
SW7 3JG

Date and Time: 28/11/2009 09:56  
Session Prefix: 3-2497691  
Dest: UK (E.U.)  
Quantity: 1  
Weight: 0.456 kg  
Special D by 1 £5.40

Total Cost of Services £5.40

Posted after Last Collection? No

Barcode: ZW4559078646B

DESTINATION ADDRESS  
Building Name or Number Postcode  
2 SW1P4DF  
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](http://www.postoffice.co.uk) or call 08459 272100 quoting your ref number.

This is not a VAT receipt  
Thank You

Post Label SD 5.40  
1 @ 5.40  
Post Label SD 5.40  
1 @ 5.40  
TOTAL DUE TO POST OFFICE 10.80  
FROM CUSTOMER 21.00  
CASH TO CUSTOMER 10.20  
BALANCE 0.00

Thank You

VAT REG No: 243 1700 02  
28/11/2009 09:59  
SESSION : 3-2497691-3

Post Office Ltd.  
Your Receipt  
South Kensington Station  
41 Old Brompton Road  
London  
Greater London  
SW7 3JG





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

## Track it down

Please enter your 13 character reference  
e.g. AA000100019GB

ZW455907864GB

Track item



[How to find your reference number](#)

## Delivered

Your item with reference ZW455907864GB was delivered from our SOUTH WEST LONDON Delivery Office on 30/11/09 .

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](#)



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

# Track it down


Please enter your 13 character reference  
e.g. AA000100019GB

ZW455907878GB

Track item



[How to find your reference number](#)



Your item with reference ZW455907878GB has been delivered.

If the item is being delivered to you at work, and you have not received it, please check with the mailroom or your colleagues.

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

View Proof of Delivery