

[Sir Paul Stephenson](#)
Metropolitan Police Commissioner
Scotland Yard
Broadway
London SW1

Ms N Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé
[]
[]
[]

[The Rt. Hon. Alan Johnson, MP](#)
Home Secretary
Home Office
2 Marsham Street
London SW1P 4DF

[The Rt. Hon. Sir Malcolm Rifkind, MP](#)
House of Commons
London SW1A 0AA

[Mrs Ann Abraham](#)
Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman
Millbank Tower
Millbank
London SW1P 4QP

1 (ALL Addressees: By 'Recorded delivery')

2 2 February 2010

3 Dear Addressees

4 WHEN AM I DUE TO BE KILLED?

5 As all of you are aware (Mr Johnson and Sir Paul: my letter of [28 November 2009](#); Sir Malcolm: my
6 letters of [19 October 2009](#) and [7 November 2009](#); Mrs Abraham: my letter of [27 August 2009](#)) - on [15](#)
7 [June 2009](#), a cyclist, in Hyde Park, 'delivered' to me the message "Enjoy your life. You don't have long
8 to live".

9 I ask 'When am I due to be killed?' - as you ALL appear to have retreated to your communal bunker.

10 The sections and page location are:

11	1	Sir Paul Stephenson and the Rt. Hon. Alan Johnson, MP, Home Secretary	1
12	2	The Rt. Hon. Sir Malcolm Rifkind, MP	5
13	3	Mrs Ann Abraham, Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman	9
14	4	My 2 January 2010 Subject Access Request to the Ministry of 'Justice'	10
15	5	Other parties	16
16	6	At the end of my working life, I will NOT walk away having lost everything I have worked for – 17 through NO FAULT of my own – other than naïvely believe what the State told me	17
18	7	Parties copied on this letter	19

19 This letter includes comprehensive detail of events for the benefit of the parties copied on it.

20 **1** [Sir Paul Stephenson](#) and the [Rt. Hon. Alan Johnson, MP, Home Secretary](#)

21 In my [28 November 2009](#) letter to both of you, headed 'Need for action', I challenged **(1)** your recent
22 announcement, Mr Johnson, that "the police must visit every victim of crime", made following the tragic
23 suicide of Mrs Fiona Pilkington and her handicapped daughter, reported to have made a total of "33

1 *desperate calls to the police*” – and got no help, and **(2)** Sir Stephenson, your recent assertion,
2 following the police causing the death of Mr Ian Tomlinson at the G20 demonstration *“I can assure you*
3 *that we [the police] are on your side”* – by stating that my experience with [Kensington & Chelsea \(K&C\)](#)
4 police overwhelmingly demonstrates that it is most definitely NOT *“on my side”*.

5 I followed this by a brief overview of my experience with [K&C police in 2002, 2003 and 2007](#) – and
6 supported my letter by providing (both of you) with a copy of the following documents from which I
7 captured brief extracts in my letter to you - explaining my doing so by stating *“trusting that, as the Met’s*
8 *Commissioner, you will take the necessary actions to ensure that the police performs as per its*
9 *mandate – as well as the laws of the land”*. The enclosures to my letter were:

- 10 1. My [28 May 2009](#) Subject Access Request to the Metropolitan Police Public Access Office.
- 11 2. My [13 August 2009](#) response to the three computer printouts ([CR:5604102/02](#); [CR:5602261/03](#);
12 [CR:5605839/07](#)) received in response to my 28 May Request.
- 13 3. The [25 August 2009](#) ‘get lost’ reply ‘from’ Jenna Neville, MPS Public Office.
- 14 4. My [20 September 2009](#) reply to Jenna Neville reiterating the points in my 13 August 2009 reply,
15 and quoting extensively from the Data Protection Act 1998 in support of my demands.
- 16 5. My [20 September 2009](#) letter to Chief Superintendent Mark Heath, Borough Commander, K&C
17 police, which, as I stated in my letter to you, I headed with *“Kensington & Chelsea police is not*
18 *exempt from compliance with the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998”* and that I *“headed*
19 *a series of questions with “In light of events, I would also like to know what gives officers under*
20 *your control. The right to ” – under which I include “Last but not least – as your officers have*
21 *familiarised themselves with the content of my website - the right to turn a blind eye to criminal*
22 *offences committed against me by Andrew Ladsky, including through ‘his puppets’ who “acted*
23 *under his instructions”. I follow this by listing: “The Protection from Harassment Act 1997; the*
24 *Fraud Act 2006; the Malicious Communications Act 1988; the Theft Act 1968 / Theft Amendment*
25 *Act 1996; the Money Laundering Regulations / Proceeds of Crime Act 2002; the Criminal Justice*
26 *Act & Public Order Act 1994. Etc.”*
- 27 6. The [22 September 2009](#) ‘get lost’ reply from Steve McSorley, Acting Chief Inspector, who, as I
28 state in my letter to you: *“while he did not specify it, I discovered through my research, is*
29 *responsible for ‘Professional Standards and Performance’ at K&C police”*
- 30 7. My [8 October 2009](#) reply to McSorley which, as I wrote in my letter to you, I headed with *“In light of*
31 *your role at Kensington & Chelsea police: how do you explain your response of 22 September*
32 *2009?”* and wrote that, in the letter, *“I highlight what he has ignored – which is everything”*
- 33 8. My [8 October 2009](#) letter to Mark Heath, stating that I headed my letter to him with *“Do you*
34 *endorse the treatment I have and continue to be subjected to by Kensington & Chelsea police?”*
35 and that, *“Among others, I highlight “my rights, as confirmed e.g. on the Equality and Human*
36 *Rights Commission website (<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/fairer-britain>), under the*
37 *Human Rights Act 1998, I have the right to: “Being treated fairly and with dignity... means that*
38 *everybody should have access to public services...and the right to be treated fairly by those*
39 *services. This applies to all public services... UK law includes a range of human rights which*
40 *protect you from poor treatment and prejudice, and which require you to have equal and fair*
41 *treatment from public authorities”*
- 42 9. My 11 November 2009 chaser letters to [Mark Heath](#) and to [Steve McSorley](#).
- 43 10. The [17 November 2009](#) letter from Sergeant Dave Jones, Staff Officer to the Borough
44 Commander, that *“The Borough Commander has asked Chief Inspector McSorley to write again to*

1 you in order to outline the previous advice given". To this, I added in my letter to you "In other
2 words, evidently repeat to me the equivalent of the 'Get lost! We don't care!'"

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

7 I conclude my letter by stating "Mr Johnson, hopefully, you will understand why I snigger at your
8 recommendation that "police officers must visit every victim of crime", and that you and Sir Paul will
9 understand why I also snigger and feel contempt in relation to: (1) The Policing Pledge – Crime and
10 Justice - (on http://www.direct.gov.uk/en/CrimeJusticeAndTheLaw/ThePolice/DG_181995) which
11 starts with: "The police service in England and Wales will: 1. Work to keep you and your
12 neighbourhoods safe from harm; 2. Always treat you fairly, with dignity and respect, ensuring that you
13 have fair access to our services at all times"; (2) The Community Service Unit claims on the police
14 website (<http://www.met.police.uk/csu/whatcsu.htm>) "Every crime has a bad effect on the victim but
15 hate crimes are probably the most damaging...It's our job to identify what's happened and make sure
16 that appropriate action is taken"

17 And, in the last paragraph, wrote "I hope you will change my perceptions by taking immediate action in
18 relation to K&C police, and ensure the implementation of my rights: pursuing Andrew Ladsky and
19 parties he instructed for the offences they committed against me; ensuring that police records are
20 amended to reflect my feedback, and my outstanding questions answered"

21 In my letter of [2 December 2009](#), also to both of you, headed "Head of Kensington police approves of
22 illegal conduct by some of its officers", I quote extracts from the [20 November 2009](#) letter (posted 2nd
23 class on 23 November) from Acting Chief Inspector Steve McSorley, Professional Standards, said to
24 be in acknowledgement of my 8 October 2009 letter (hence, six weeks later) – namely:

25 "For the sake of clarity, may I stress that I do not accept that there has been any "gross
26 misconduct" by any of our officers in relation to the various crime reports in which you are
27 named. Nor do I accept that TDC Dowling made "malicious, scurrilous or libellous allegations"
28 when he contacted your website host. With regard to the wording of the crime reports, I am
29 satisfied that this represents an accurate account of what police were told at the time even if
30 you do not agree with what was said by third parties"

31 From this, I highlighted in my letter to you "I am satisfied that this represents an accurate account of
32 what police were told at the time...Consequently I... will not be making any alterations to the various
33 crime reports..." and added "**What a very damning indictment!** As I wrote in my [20 September 2009](#)
34 reply to Jenna Neville, Police Public Access Office, the requirements under the Data Protection Act
35 1998 include:

36 ■ **Fourth Principle** - "Duty of data controller to take reasonable steps to ensure the accuracy of the
37 data"

38 ■ **First Principle** - Information Commissioner: "When obtaining data from a third person **the data**
39 **controller has an overriding duty to process personal data fairly and lawfully**. The fact that
40 the data controller has had to expend a substantial amount of effort and/or cost in providing the
41 information does not necessarily mean that the Commissioner will reach the decision that the data
42 controller can legitimately rely upon the disproportionate effort exception. In certain circumstances,
43 the Commissioner would consider that such an effort could reasonably be expected".

44 **It certainly IS "reasonably expected" of the police to investigate third party claims,**
45 **including obtaining supporting evidence. And it IS likewise "reasonably expected" of the**
46 **police to do this BEFORE accusing an individual of having committed criminal actions"**

1 Following on from this, I wrote *"this letter amounts to wholesale endorsement by McSorley, and by*
 2 *implication, Mark Heath, of the gross misconduct by the officers involved in the [2002, 2003 and 2007](#)*
 3 *[complaints to K&C police](#)".* I then listed a total 21 conclusions, preceded by *"It follows from this that, as*
 4 *Chief Superintendent and Borough Commander for Kensington & Chelsea police, Mark Heath –" e.g.*

5 *"(1) Approves of his officers NOT contacting me – AT ANY POINT IN TIME – in relation to the 2007 so-*
 6 *called 'complaint' against me 'by [Andrew Ladsky](#)' – giving them free rein to communicate unlawful,*
 7 *fabricated lies against me to third parties, as well as record them on the police systems"*

8 *"(2) Approves of his officers defaming my name, character and reputation to a third party by making –*
 9 *totally unsupported - unlawful, libellous and malicious accusations against me to my website*
 10 *Host...[NB: my website: <http://www.leasehold-outrage.com>]"*

11 *"(3) Approves of his officers making unlawful, racist, xenophobic comments by branding me "a Nazi"..."*

12 *"(4) Approves of his officers recording on the police systems expressions of opinion about my mental*
 13 *health that are malicious, scurrilous and libellous. Concurrently, of approaching social services, in what*
 14 *I conclude, was part of an attempt at getting me sectioned – with the ultimate objective of gaining the*
 15 *closure of my website..."*

16 *"(7) Approves of his officers bullying me and intimidating me into dropping my 2002 complaint..."*

17 *"(9) Approves of his officers totally failing to challenge Ladsky on the veracity of his accusations against*
 18 *me, including failing to obtain supporting evidence - as it would discredit his complaints against me"*

19 *"(12) Approves of his officers failing to record correspondence – because 'inconvenient' to Ladsky / his*
 20 *officers, and / or in order to disparage me / discredit me / lessen my complaint..."*

21 *"(15) Approves of his officers lying; knowingly record false data; telling me / writing one thing to me,*
 22 *and capturing something totally different in the police database – with the aim of covering-up events /*
 23 *avoid capturing 'inconvenient' data / disparaging me and discrediting me..."*

24 *"(19) Approves of his officers – who claimed to have 'looked' at my website - turning a blind eye to the*
 25 *'mountain' of overwhelming 'black on white' evidence of breaches of numerous Acts, that are*
 26 *punishable by imprisonment, such as the [Protection from Harassment Act 1997; the Fraud Act 2006;](#)*
 27 *[the Malicious Communications Act 1988; the Theft Act 1968; the Money Laundering Regulations /](#)*
 28 *[Proceeds of Crime Act 2002; the Criminal Justice Act & Public Order Act 1994, etc.](#)"*

29 In the last paragraph I wrote: ***"In a nutshell: Mark Heath approves of his officers providing***
 30 ***assistance to a crook in shutting-up his victim - by whatever means"***

31 I forgot to add another conclusion: Mark Heath evidently approves of TDC Simon J Dowling, a
 32 'Community Support Officer', impersonating a police officer, as he wrote in his [16 March 2007](#) email to
 33 my website Host *"I am the police officer dealing with this crime"* (and then backed
 34 down on his accusations as a result of being challenged by my website Host who asked *"Are you*
 35 *aware that there are laws against making false accusations?"*, as Dowling wrote in his [20 March 2007](#)
 36 email to my website Host *"Thanks for your reply, yes there are laws relating to*
 37 *false reporting. If you are unable to close the site down I will let the*
 38 *victim know as there is nothing we as a police force can do except class it*
 39 *as a racist incident..."* - while still making an unsupported, libellous accusation: *"racist*
 40 *incident"*)

41 I know from e.g. the Channel 4 programme, Dispatches, on 21 September 2009, during which Paul
 42 McKeever, chairman of the Police Federation said *"We don't know what PCSOs are doing on a case-*
 43 *by-case basis across the forces. There are 43 different models out there... They were brought in for*
 44 *the best of reasons but I think it was a deeply flawed experiment..."* and, from the Mail on Sunday

1 article of 20 September 2009 "[How 'plastic bobbies' can fine you for fly-posting in Leicester, but not in](#)
2 [London](#)" that the role of a Community Support Officer is not standard – but I am sure that it does not
3 include "investigating a crime".

4 The follow-up to my two letters was:

5 (1) From your Office, Mr Johnson: a [23 December 2009](#) letter from the Direct Communications Unit,
6 stating "In writing to Sir Paul Stephenson you have taken the right course of action. It is the Chief
7 Officer who is responsible for the day to day operational management of the force and not the Home
8 Office. The Home Officer and its Ministers are not able to act as an avenue of appeal, and have no
9 power to influence or intervene in any investigations"

10 (2) From your Office, Sir Stephenson: a [3 December 2009](#) letter that my "letters dated [28th November](#)
11 [and 2nd December](#)" have "been forwarded to Inspector Campbell McKelvie, Directorate of Professional
12 Standards Customer Service Team"

13 It was followed by an [8 December 2009](#) letter from Hema Patel, Caseworker, Directorate of
14 Professional Standards, Customer Service Team – posted eight days later - on 16 December 2009,
15 enclosing a one-page photocopy headed "What happens next?", described in the letter as "an
16 information leaflet explaining the various processes" - and asking me for a telephone number on which
17 I can be contacted. I took delivery of the letter on the 24th, and replied on [28 December](#).

18 What has happened since then? **TOTAL SILENCE!**

19 → I am reporting that (1) I am the victim of crime – supporting my claim with a 'mountain' of 'black on
20 white' evidence; (2) my local police station has not only opted to turn a blind eye and a deaf ear to the
21 evidence, it has blatantly sided with my attacker; (3) I have a death threat hanging over my head...

22 ...and THAT is your response Sir Stephenson?!? That is your interpretation of your department's legal
23 remit? WHY? Are you counting on "my not having long to live"?

24 → Mr Johnson, I remind you that I am a law-abiding, British National who, since arriving in this country,
25 has paid over £500,000 in tax – tax that has gone towards, among others, paying for the police service
26 and the Home Office. This gives me the right to expect that, when I approach the police for assistance
27 it will perform as per its stated legal remit – and therefore the right to demand that, as the Home
28 Secretary, you ensure that this take place.

29 **2** [The Rt. Hon. Sir Malcolm Rifkind, MP](#)

Subsequent note: 'cc'd [David Cameron](#), who replied on [26 Oct](#)

30 Sir Malcolm I headed my [19 October 2009](#) letter **to you** "Considering that you are my Member of
31 Parliament: why are you colluding with the parties from which I have and continue to suffer
32 wrongdoings – and by extension with [Andrew Ladsky et.al.](#)?"

33 My letter was a follow-up to yours of [30 September 2009](#) for the purpose of copying me on the [22](#)
34 [September 2009](#) letter 'from' Pamela Micallef, Customer Services Officer, Parliamentary and Health
35 Service Ombudsman (discussed in section 3, below).

36 In support of my header, I state, among others:

37 1. "You turned a blind eye to the evidence contained in my [7 March 2009](#) letter – which, in your [11](#)
38 [March 2009](#) reply you claimed to "have read carefully" – by stating, in this letter, "As matters
39 stand, I believe you have exhausted your options; the only advice I can offer, however, is that if
40 you have new evidence you should take legal advice"

41 2. It led me to challenge you in my [24 March 2009](#) response, by expanding even more on events. I
42 also quoted from: (1) "How does your MP deal with your problems", contained in the House of

- 1 Commons Factsheet M1-2008, 'You and your MP' – which specifically refers to “maladministration”
 2 – for which I provided the dictionary definition: “manage or administer badly or dishonestly”...
 3 Furthermore, in addition to specifically identifying instances of, at best, ‘maladministration’, I
 4 likewise highlighted the breach of the Ombudsman’s principles in various parts of my letter.
- 5 3. In your [23 April 2009](#) reply, you stated that I had “repeated [my] concerns in [my] 24 March letter”.
 6 Yes, because you forced me to do this by being deliberately blinkered and continuing to push me
 7 away. (In the process, you cost me many more hours of my time, as well as other costs).
- 8 4. And you continued with your attitude - by stating in this letter “Members of Parliament are not able
 9 to intervene in the decisions that have been taken by courts of law. If a member of the public feels
 10 they have been wrongly treated, then they have the right to appeal to a higher level of court and
 11 that is something you must discuss with your legal advisers. If you feel you have already done that,
 12 or are unable to do so, then I am afraid there is no further action that can be taken”
- 13 5. In my [8 May 2009](#) reply, headed “Why are you refusing to refer my complaint to the Parliamentary
 14 Ombudsman?”...and, yet again, highlighted numerous events that amount to, at best, serious
 15 maladministration.
- 16 6. Evidently, you – and clearly: ‘et.al.’ - did not like my reply as, one month later, ‘you’ still had not
 17 responded – which led me to send you a chaser letter on [6 June 2009](#).
- 18 7. As ‘you’ maintained your silence, on [15 June 2009](#), I opted to contact the [Parliamentary](#)
 19 [Ombudsman](#) – using as my header a quote from your Party Leader, David Cameron “I, “the
 20 Powerless”, am opting “To take the power from the powerful”...and stating: “I am going over the
 21 head of my Tory MP, Sir Malcolm Rifkind, as he has evidently decided that you should not consider
 22 my complaint against the Court Service and the Leasehold Valuation Tribunal”. I copied [you](#) on
 23 this letter, as well as [David Cameron](#) – also on 15 June 2009.
- 24 8. It finally led to the [17 June 2009](#) letter from ‘your Office’ which shamelessly states “Sir Malcolm has
 25 not refused to take the issue to the Parliamentary Ombudsman because he believed that you had
 26 already done so”. That “In [my] letter of [7 March](#) [I] quoted [my] dissatisfaction of endless battles
 27 with the “regulators, watchdogs/ombudsmen, other government departments”
- 28 9. As I stated in my [1 July 2009](#) reply “As I said to your Private Secretary when I returned her call: a
 29 complaint can only be referred to the Parliamentary Ombudsman through a constituent’s MP; you
 30 have been my MP since 2005; since then, I have suffered horrendous treatment by central
 31 government departments; until my [7 March 2009](#) letter, I had never contacted you. In addition, I
 32 headed my [8 May 2009](#) letter to you “Why are you refusing to refer my complaint to the
 33 Parliamentary Ombudsman?” Five weeks later, in spite of a chaser letter after four weeks of
 34 waiting for a reply, I had not received a response”
- 35 As to ‘your’ shameless excuse: it is fascinating to note that, when I inform you, my MP, that my
 36 complaints against various parties – including against some: in your patch, under your watch -
 37 have resulted in my having to engage in endless battles with regulators, watchdogs/ombudsmen
 38 and other government departments – all with the outcome that amounts to a ‘get lost’ – it is of no
 39 interest to you. How do you explain that?
- 40 10. In relation to the police, in your [23 April 2009](#) letter you stated that if I “have not made any
 41 complaint directly to the police or the IPCC, then I would be happy to forward the papers on your
 42 behalf”
- 43 In my [8 May 2009](#) reply, I asked “Other than just post my complaint, what would be your role?” You
 44 ignored my question in your eventual ‘response’ of [17 June 2009](#). My assumption is that you were
 45 somehow informed that I had filed a Subject Access Request with the police on [28 May 2009](#)
 46 ([Kensington & Chelsea police](#) is in your patch)...

1 ...I see other MPs coming to the assistance of their constituents who are suffering appalling
 2 treatment and injustice at the hands of government departments, are being ripped-off by rogue
 3 landlords and their equally rogue aides, and are unable to implement their rights, etc". I then give
 4 examples of what the following MPs: Daniel Kawczynski, Tory; Jacqui Lait, Tory; Barry Gardiner,
 5 Labour; Simon Hughes, LibDems; Edward Davey, LibDems; Barry Sheerman, Labour; Vince
 6 Cable, Treasury Spokesman for the LibDems; John Mann, Labour – have done to help their
 7 constituents...

8 ...and state: "and I look at your claim under [//accessible.malcolmrifkind.org.uk](http://accessible.malcolmrifkind.org.uk) "I am the Member
 9 of Parliament for Kensington & Chelsea...I... will do all I can to help you as a constituent with any
 10 problem"...and I ask myself: Why, in the face of 'my mountain' of 'black on white' evidence of
 11 unbelievable injustice, of being subjected to the most horrendous, vicious, perverse, barbaric
 12 treatment – a very significant part of which is attributable to three government departments located
 13 in your constituency: [West London County Court](#), [Kensington & Chelsea police](#) (and [Kensington &
 14 Chelsea housing](#)), departments that have the mandate to protect me and help me get justice and
 15 redress from my attackers – not collude with them – you are not assisting me?"

16 I follow this by: "In fact, as evidenced by events since my [7 March 2009](#) letter, not only are you not
 17 coming to my assistance, you are actually acting against me. Why? Very tellingly, you have not
 18 even offered to meet with me.

19 The whole world can see from the 'black on white' evidence that I am the innocent victim of crime.
 20 How come you can't see that or, more appropriately: why are you turning a blind eye to it? Why
 21 are you, by implication, endorsing my being punished and persecuted for 'daring' to challenge a
 22 crook and his aides unlawfully deciding that I (and my fellow leaseholders) should pay for the
 23 [construction of a penthouse flat and addition of three other flats to Jefferson House](#), as well as
 24 related costs – so that this vermin could realise a **multi-million Pound jackpot?** e.g. [My Diary 6 May 08](#)

25 Why are you opting to assist the insane, highly vicious vendetta against me? I have done
 26 NOTHING wrong. I AM THE VICTIM, NOT the criminal. Your 'friends and protégé' don't like having
 27 a mirror held to their face – because it reflects their incompetence, maladministration, malpractice,
 28 collusion, deceit, corruption and fraud. Whose fault is it?... "

29 I followed this by repeating what I wrote in my previous letters to you amply demonstrating that I
 30 am the innocent victim of organised crime who, among others, on [19 December 2003](#), accepted
 31 'Steel Services' i.e. [Andrew Ladsky's 21 October 2003](#) 'offer' of £6,350 (v. the original [17 July 2002](#)
 32 demand of £14,400) "for the sake of bringing the dispute to an end" – even though, legally, I did not
 33 owe this amount either. IN VAIN! I again highlighted the persecution I have continued to be
 34 subjected to since then for 'daring' to challenge the fraudulent service charges demanded of me.

35 I then stated: "In May 2007, one of my fellow constituents wrote on the site
 36 www.theyworkforyou.com/mp/malcolm_rifkind/kensington_and_chelsea#numbers "...Rifkind
 37 has never represented my constituency for anything since I have been watching him. He is a
 38 deadbeat useless blood-sucker who is usurping his position as MP", while in March 2008, he wrote
 39 "I am not sure who Malcolm Rifkind speaks for...and I don't believe he represents me or any of my
 40 countrymen... he's rarely spoken about Kensington & Chelsea affairs..."

41 And followed this by: "I share this constituent's view about your not representing Kensington &
 42 Chelsea. In fact, judging from your occasional comment in the House of Commons, and press
 43 articles, your main interest appears to be foreign policy – in spite of the fact that you last held a role
 44 in this area in the mid 90s.

45 As to your interest in particular constituents, any fair minded, reasonable person with integrity
 46 would, I am sure, agree with me that, based on my experience with you: it is highly biased and
 47 prejudiced. On pages 4 and 5 of my [27 August 2009](#) reply to the [Parliamentary Ombudsman](#), and

1 page 20 of my [20 September 2009](#) response to the Police Public Access Office, I listed several
2 factors in support of my conclusion as to why I have and continue to suffer prejudice and bias from,
3 among others, public sector departments in your constituency. I hold the view that they equally
4 apply in your case. As I concluded in my letter to the Parliamentary Ombudsman "Had I been a
5 well connected, wealthy man, prepared to generously line the pockets of City lawyers et. al., I
6 would definitely not have been treated as I have by the LVT and the courts. In fact, as I am dealing
7 with cowards, it is highly improbable that I would have found myself in this situation".

8 Your Office's [23 October 2009](#) reply to my [19 October](#) letter was "I acknowledge receipt of your letter of
9 19th October addressed to Sir Malcolm. Your case is now with the Ombudsman and we will have to
10 await her decision. Yours sincerely".

Subsequent
note: 'and
cc'd David
Cameron on
[7 Nov 09](#)

I replied on [7 November 2009](#), heading my letter "Since when has [Andrew Ladsky](#) been 'ruler of
Kensington & Chelsea?" stating: "Considering what I wrote in my letter (let alone in my previous
correspondence), I believe that any fair minded, reasonable person with integrity looking at the
evidence would understand why it leads me to the conclusion that, like the [local police](#), [council](#) and
[court](#), you appear to also answer to Andrew Ladsky. I wonder why.

16 When was he elected 'Ruler of Kensington & Chelsea'? By whom? When and how was he - and
17 concurrently [his aides](#) that he "instructed" and continues to "instruct" - given the right to operate above
18 the laws of the land e.g. [Protection from Harassment Act 1997](#); [Fraud Act 2006](#); [Theft Act 1968 / Theft](#)
19 [Amendment Act 1996](#); [Malicious Communications Act 1988](#); [Money Laundering Regulations /](#)
20 [Proceeds of Crime Act 2002](#); [Courts and Legal Services Act](#); [Criminal Justice Act & Public Order Act](#)
21 [1994, etc...](#)

[London LVT](#); West London County Court [in 2002-04](#); [in 2007-08](#); [30 Jan 09 SCCO 'hearing](#)

22 ...as well as the Civil Procedure Rules e.g. [repeated contempt of court and tribunal](#), incl. false
23 statements of truth, false claims in expert witness reports, etc. – and hence, given the right to –
24 repeatedly - treat Her Majesty's Court Service with absolute, utter contempt?

25 As a member of Her Majesty's Parliament, and a 'Sir' [NB: I forgot to say 'and a Queen's Counsel'],
26 how do you explain that, in your constituency of Kensington & Chelsea – under your watch - [Andrew](#)
27 [Ladsky](#) and [his aides](#) are allowed to use Her Majesty's public sector departments for their fraudulent
28 aims – and thereby treat these departments with absolute, utter contempt? Is Ladsky more important
29 than Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second? Should I therefore bin my Affirmation of Allegiance to
30 Her Majesty?

31 In the conclusions to my first letter to you of [7 March 2009](#) I asked "What gives Mr Andrew Ladsky and
32 his aides the right to control the authorities by getting them to deny me my rights - thereby helping
33 them with their fraudulent activities? As a British taxpayer (who has so far paid c. £500,000 in tax in
34 this country) - and victim of their criminal actions – I have the right to know. To be the victim of crime is
35 one thing. (There are criminals everywhere). But to be victimized and persecuted by State departments
36 with the mandate to ensure my rights for justice, redress and protection (which, as a taxpayer, I am
37 entitled to expect), and see these departments side against me with the perpetrators - is absolutely
38 outrageous"

39 For 35 years I happily paid tax that was spent, among other, on the remuneration package and other
40 expenses of individuals in the courts, the police, council, Parliament (hence, including yourself), etc., in
41 the understandable belief that they would be there for me if I ever needed to call on them to act as per
42 their stated mandate. What happened after 35 years of doing this, when I knocked on their door and
43 said "I need your help now"? Not only have I – and continue – to receive a consistent 'Get lost!', I find
44 that they are colluding with my attackers against me.

45 If only I could have received a tenth of the support and devotion Andrew Ladsky and his aides have –
46 and continue - to receive from 'the system'.

1 *Evidently, in spite of the endless number of lifelines I have thrown in an attempt to resolve my situation*
2 *– instead of meeting my objectives - the course is set on fighting me until I have somehow been*
3 *annihilated – in the process continuing to waste a vast amount of taxpayer money. (How much*
4 *taxpayer money has so far been wasted to scheme me against me (incl. with non-public sector*
5 *parties), planning and implementing the highly vicious, perverse vendetta against me, developing and*
6 *coordinating the replies to my correspondence, monitoring me, etc.? It must be an astronomical*
7 *amount)”*

8 In the concluding paragraph of my letter I wrote: “As my MP, will you be ‘The One’ who – finally -
9 *demonstrates intelligence and common sense and say ‘Enough is Enough!’ and help me achieve my*
10 *objectives – thereby seizing on the opportunity you still have to take the credit for resolving my*
11 *situation?...”*

12 Your Office’s [10 November 2009](#) reply was “I acknowledge receipt of your letter of 7th November
13 addressed to Sir Malcolm. Yours sincerely”

14 → In other words: the answer to my offer is ‘NO!...in the expectation that?’

15 **3 [Mrs Ann Abraham, Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman](#)**

16 After a four-month battle with [Sir Malcolm Rifkind](#) (as detailed above), I finally managed to file a [12 July](#)
17 [2009](#) complaint with your Office, against the [London Leasehold Valuation Tribunal](#), [West London](#)
18 [County Court](#), [Wandsworth County Court](#) and [HMCS ‘Customer Service’](#). As supporting evidence, I
19 supplied a [390 page bundle](#) comprising of 164 documents – referenced, as relevant, in my complaint.

20 In ‘her’ [29 July 2009](#) letter to Sir Malcolm, Pamela Micallef, Customer Services Officer, stated that she
21 had “*carefully considered the papers you sent*” and followed this by “*I have made enquiries with both*
22 *organisations and it is clear that Ms Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawe has not completed HMCS and RPTS*
23 *complaints procedures*”

24 As I wrote in my [19 October 2009](#) letter to Sir Malcolm, in light of what he wrote in his [17 June 2009](#)
25 letter to me “*The Ombudsman will need confirmation that you have followed the appropriate complaints*
26 *procedures*” - I anticipated that you would use this fabrication to throw my complaint back at me.

27 In my [27 August 2009](#) reply, I demonstrated that ‘Pamela Micallef’ very clearly did NOT “*consider*” my
28 complaint – stating “*Your assertion is quite extraordinary considering that it is blatantly obvious from*
29 *the information contained in my reply to section 5 of your form – with evidence in support from the*
30 *bundle - that I have gone through ALL the stages of this “3 tier system”.*

31 Costing me several hours of my life, ‘her’ ‘response’ forced me to refer to the very specific detail I
32 provided in my [12 August 2009](#) complaint – by, among others, identifying the page and line numbers
33 that refute ‘her’ assertions, as well as, as relevant, the supporting document number and name, from
34 the bundle of 164 documents I supplied with my complaint.

35 In my letter I also quoted from your Office’s “[Introduction to the Principles](#)” by stating that “*the evidence*
36 *overwhelmingly qualifies for your taking action for “maladministration, nor acting properly or fairly”*

37 I also referred to your claim in the same overview document, that “*we focus on the individual’s*
38 *experience as a human being... we will also have regard to the human rights context. Taking account*
39 *of basic human rights principles of fairness, respect, equality, dignity...”* and, after this, quoted from the
40 Equalities and Human Rights Commission website ([http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/fairer-](http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/fairer-britain)
41 [britain](http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/fairer-britain)) - under the Human Rights Act 1998 (as detailed above, under section 1):

42 I followed this by stating “*The horrendous, inhumane and very traumatic treatment I have been*
43 *subjected to by the courts, and the subsequent treatment by HMCS following my complaints - very*
44 *clearly stems from prejudice and bias”.*

1 It led a [22 September 2009](#) reply 'from' Pamela Micallef stating, among others "We have carried out a
2 preliminary assessment of your complaint and have concluded that it now needs more detailed
3 consideration before can decide whether the Ombudsman should carry out a formal investigation" v.
4 what she wrote in 'her' [29 July 2009](#) 'response' "We have carefully considered the papers..." (NB: In
5 the process, my complaint has been given "a new reference number": 69099 v. previous: 62245).

6 As I wrote in my [19 October 2009](#) letter to Sir Malcolm "As my complaint has not changed since the [12](#)
7 [July 2009](#) complaint, it follows that, contrary to her claims, in her 29 July 2009 letter, of having
8 "carefully considered the papers", Ms Micallef opted to totally overlook my complaint – and hoped to
9 get rid of me and put me back on the treadmill by stating that I needed to get back to "HMCS and
10 RPTS to complete the complaints procedures"

11 I also wrote: "And I can tell from the 22 September 2009 letter that more excuses are yet to come to
12 avoid dealing properly with my complaint – with the aim of protecting the parties from which I have
13 suffered wrongdoings – and by extension, [Andrew Ladsky](#) and [his aides](#)"

14 At the date of writing i.e. SEVEN MONTHS since filing my [12 July 2009](#) complaint, my prediction has
15 yet to materialise, as the other typical public sector tactic (e.g. the MPS – as detailed above; [West](#)
16 [London County Court](#) between September 2007 and January 2008, following my [2 October 2007](#) letter)
17 - has kicked in: **TOTAL SILENCE**. Indeed, the only contact since 22 September 2009 has been a
18 message on my mobile from Michelle Robinson, on Friday 20 November 2009, asking me to phone
19 her. I did this on Monday 23 November and was told that it was "her day off". The following day,
20 Tuesday 24 November, I was told "She is off-sick". Recognising my voice from the previous day, her
21 colleague said that she would leave a message for Ms Robinson to phone me back. She did not.

22 →That's your interpretation of what you wrote in [your Annual Report 2007-08](#) Mrs Abraham?

23 "Our aim and vision – To provide an independent, high quality complaint handling service that rights
24 individual wrongs, drives improvements in public services and informs public policy. Our values shape
25 our behaviour, both as an organisation and as individuals working in PHSO, and incorporate our
26 [Principles of Good Administration](#)"

27 "Excellence – We pursue excellence in all that we do in order to provide the best possible service:
28 ...We operate thorough and rigorous processes to reach sound, evidence-based judgments..."

29 "Leadership – We lead by example so that our work will have a positive impact: We set high standards
30 for ourselves and others. We are an exemplar and provide expert advice in complaint handling..."

31 "Integrity – We are open, honest and straightforward in all our dealings, and use time, money and
32 resources effectively: We are consistent and transparent in our actions and decisions. We take
33 responsibility for our actions and hold ourselves accountable for all that we do. We treat people fairly"

34 →For how long will you remain silent Mrs Abraham? What are you counting on? My "not having long
35 to live"? What's the consensus in the communal bunker?

36 I conclude that, as in the case of the police, the silence is due in part / mainly (?) to the 'mountain' of
37 very damning 'black on white' evidence I have against various parties in the London Leasehold
38 Valuation Tribunal and the courts.

39 **4 My 2 January 2010 Subject Access Request to the Ministry of 'Justice'**

40 As you are all no doubt aware, I have filed a [2 January 2010](#) Subject Access Request with the Ministry
41 of 'Justice' - which means that, under the Data Protection Act 1998 requirements: I must be supplied
42 with a response within 40 days. (Ref number: DPA/63076/10/AL)

43 It was prompted in part by my experience with the PHSO (as detailed above), and because I want to
44 know why - as a law-abiding, taxpaying, British VICTIM OF CRIME - three courts and a tribunal

1 concluded that they could ignore their legal remit by denying me justice and redress, in the process:
2 (1) turning a blind eye and a deaf ear to blatant breaches of: Civil Procedure Rules (CPR); numerous
3 Acts, including of my statutory rights; of my rights under the terms of my lease; (2) holding the view
4 that they could subject me to 43 months of unbelievably vicious, perverse and cruel treatment.

5 With the aim of limiting the response, as well as cause annoyance, the [11 January 2010](#) follow-up
6 letter asked me the outrageous and laughable question of *"identifying which parts of the Department*
7 *you wish me to conduct the searches e.g. such as a specific office of the Tribunals Service or court..."*

8 This question is 'outrageous and laughable' because, as I highlight in my [19 January 2010](#) reply, the
9 front page of my document lists the individual locations, and the second page identifies the individuals
10 concerned, for each location. Furthermore, the front page and following page of my document contains
11 a list headed *"The sections and page location are"* – listing all the sections in the document with their
12 corresponding page number – and have sections headed *"Information request from..."* e.g. *"West*
13 *London Court Court – for 2002-04"*, *"West London County Court – for 2007-08"*.

14 Also for the benefit of the parties copied on this letter, I include below some of the numerous points of
15 note in relation to events with the tribunal and the courts. (NB: Not all are contained in my [12 July 2009](#)
16 complaint to the PHSO because, as I was reminded 'by' Pamela Micallef in 'her' [29 July 2009](#) 'reply' *"I*
17 *should point out that the Ombudsman is only able to consider the administrative actions of HMCS and*
18 *RPTS, and cannot consider complaints about decisions on cases, or the way in which a committee or*
19 *tribunal conducted proceedings"*):

20 ■ Regarding the London [Leasehold Valuation Tribunal \(LVT\) in 2002-03](#), in the context of the [7](#)
21 [August 2002](#) Application filed by [Martin Russell Jones \(MRJ\)](#), 'managing' agents for Jefferson
22 House, Basil Street, London SW3, on behalf of '[Steel Services' \(SS\) = Andrew David Ladsky](#)
23 [et.al.](#), *"to determine the reasonableness of the global sum demanded of £736,207"* - there are
24 numerous points of note.

London LVT
– Points of
note; Breach
my HR rights

25 1. Of these, the top level point is that the London LVT FAILED TO PERFORM ITS LEGAL REMIT -
26 as it did **NOT** include, in its [17 June 2003](#) report (ref LVT/SC/007/120/02 - [#992 on the LVT](#)
27 [database](#)), a summary of the impact of its determination on the global sum demanded. Its
28 President, Siobhan McGrath, refused my two requests to include a summary (and was backed-up
29 on this by the [then Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, John Prescott](#)).

30 Costing me an additional £1,800, I asked my RICS chartered surveyor to assess the impact of the
31 tribunal's findings – as detailed in its 17 June 2003 report - on the global sum demanded. The
32 outcome was a **reduction of c. £500,000** (including the contingency fund) of the global sum
33 demanded of £736,207 – hence, a reduction of nearly 70%. [London LVT # 4, # 6 and # 7](#)

34 It certainly would have been 'extremely inconvenient' for SS =Ladsky et.al to have this captured or,
35 to quote Siobhan McGrath's comment in her second 'no' letter of [26 November 2003](#) "(including a
36 summary) *may well be regarded as providing additional reasons*" Yes! £500,000 worth of
37 *"additional reasons"* to my fellow leaseholders to refuse to pay the fraudulent 'service charge'
38 demand / ask for a refund / go back to [West London County Court](#) for its role in abusing its power,
39 bullying them into paying monies NOT due and payable (detailed below). But of course, it would
40 have deprived Ladsky et.al of a multi-million Pound jackpot, starting with the [sale of the penthouse](#)
41 [flat for £3.9m – penthouse flat](#) which was *"categorically NOT going to be built"* ([Brian Gale, MRICS,](#)
42 [Ladsky's surveyor](#)) because *"it was not a viable proposition"* ([Joan Hathaway, MRICS, MRJ](#)).

43 The tribunal's failure to perform its legal remit meant that I was left with an open-ended report - that
44 had cost me £30,000 (*) to challenge a [£14,400](#) fraudulent service charge demand - and over
45 which I had to battle over the following year with Ladsky's 'puppets', [CKFT](#), and [WLCC](#).

1 (*) The £30,000 was the cost of employing a surveyor, solicitor and barrister I was eventually
2 forced to resort to doing as the [tribunal](#)'s Chairs and Clerk kept treating me as a non-entity,
3 ignoring all of my correspondence, and by implication – falsely – implied that I was a liar (even
4 though my fellow leaseholders were communicating the same thing to the tribunal). (My experience
5 clearly refutes Siobhan McGrath's claim (e.g. The Times, 3 October 2004) that "*the tribunals are an
6 affordable, local solution for landlords and leaseholders who are in dispute. We aim to provide an
7 accessible and cost-effective forum for resolving residential leasehold problems*")

8 2. 'Very conveniently' for [SS](#) - in addition to not including a summary of its determination in its report -
9 the tribunal made a categorical claim in [its report](#) about a "cost increase" - at a date that was **three**
10 **months** POST signing its report - and libellously blamed me for this so-called "increase". In spite of
11 my two requests to McGrath for "a factually accurate summary", since 2003, the tribunal has, on its
12 online public database, [a summary](#) that amounts to defamation of my name and of my character.

13 3. The [London LVT](#) took NO action when I repeatedly reported that [MRJ](#) was NOT complying with the
14 directions set by the tribunal - and it continued to take **no sanction whatsoever against SS**
15 **parties** – in spite of the fact that the outcome of the hearings had overwhelmingly demonstrated
16 that their submissions, including "[Expert Witness](#)" reports' to the tribunal, as well as
17 correspondence, were a pack of lies – hence, endorsing SS parties' absolute, utter contempt of
18 Her Majesty's tribunal.

19 4. [The tribunal](#) took steps to ensure limited challenge to **SS's 7 August 2002 Application** – in
20 **the process committing repeated breaches of our statutory rights** - by: (1) not informing
21 "some" of my fellow leaseholders of the action; (2) withholding from "some" of us, including myself,
22 critical documents supplied with the Application; (3) waiting more than two months to inform "some"
23 of us of a pre-trial hearing – resulting in a short notice that prevented some from attending.

24 ■ In relation to [West London County Court \(WLCC\) in 2002-04](#), of the numerous points of note:

[WLCC- Points
of note: My
Qs: Breach
my HR rights](#)

25 1. WLCC proceeded with the [29 November 2002 claim, ref. WL203537](#), filed by [Cawdery Kaye](#)
26 [Fireman & Taylor \(CKFT\)](#), London NW3 1QA, on behalf of '[Steel Services](#)' (SS) = [Andrew Ladsky](#)
27 [et.al.](#), against me [and 10 of my fellow leaseholders, representing a total of 14 flats](#). It did this **in**
28 **spite** of the fact that it was **an abuse of process of court** as the **same action** was being pursued
29 concurrently in the [London Leasehold Valuation Tribunal](#). I informed BOTH of this, and kept on
30 repeating it (seven letters over a period of seven months). They BOTH opted to turn a blind eye
31 and a deaf ear to this. (NB: Two firms of solicitors, acting for some of my fellow leaseholders – in
32 their correspondence - also held the view that the claim was an abuse of process of court).

33 2. WLCC proceeded with the claim **in spite** of having absolute knowledge that the London LVT had
34 specifically told me - and my fellow leaseholders - at the 29 October 2002 pre-trial hearing to **NOT**
35 **pay** the 'service charge' UNTIL the tribunal had issued its determination and it had been
36 implemented - and gave each of us [a leaflet](#) in support of this direction (which contained the ruling
37 from a Court of Appeal case: Daejan Properties v. LVTs). It resulted in at least SEVEN of my fellow
38 leaseholders being bullied in WLCC, among others, [by means of Charging Orders and Judgments](#)
39 into [paying - the FULL AMOUNT demanded](#) - BEFORE the tribunal had issued its [17 June 2003](#)
40 report - thereby breaching their statutory rights, as well as rights under the lease.

41 3. WLCC did this, also **in spite** of the fact that the **statement of truth** on the [Particulars of claim](#) was
42 **signed by** [Joan Doreen Hathaway, MRICS, Martin Russell Jones](#), 'managing' agent for
43 **Jefferson House**. Under CPR 22 3.1 "*An agent who manages the property...for the party cannot*
44 *sign a statement of truth. Consequences of failure to verify - 4.1 If a statement of case is not*
45 *verified by a statement of truth, the statement of case will remain effective unless it is struck out,*
46 *but a party may not rely on the contents of a statement of case as evidence until it has been*
47 *verified by a statement of truth*". (NB: I only discovered this as a result of having the – fraudulent

1 (proven) - [27 February 2007](#) claim filed against me by [Portner and Jaskel](#), in [WLCC](#) - as second
2 time round, I made a point of familiarising myself with CPR).

3 4. WLCC proceeded with the claim **in spite** of the fact that it had absolute knowledge that - contrary
4 to the claim made in the [Particulars of claim](#) - the **lease** supplied with the claim 'apparently' for [flat](#)
5 [23](#), **was NOT representative of the lease** - and imparted a highly material **false** obligation on my
6 part (and I am sure, my fellow leaseholders).

7 And that was 'the tone' during the following 20 months of absolute, sheer utter hell, during which I – the
8 VICTIM OF A FRAUDULENT CLAIM - was treated as: a non-entity, a piece of dirt, with the evidence I
9 supplied against the claim being repeatedly ignored.

10 ■ As a result of WLCC – **falsely** – claiming that [I was the defendant in a trial](#) due to take in
11 [Wandsworth County Court](#) in August **2004**, and the Wandsworth's court staff confirming it - I also
12 went through a further SEVEN WEEKS of horrendous mental torture - ending by being told, after
13 my repeated challenges to both courts ["You are not required to attend the hearing"](#) – in the process
14 being treated like an illiterate idiot.

15 ■ I was subjected to **even worse** treatment by the **WLCC** judges, court manager and other court
16 staff [in 2007-08](#) when the second - equally fraudulent - claim was filed against me by [Portner and](#)
17 [Jaskel](#), London W1U 2RA. Of the numerous points of note:

WLCC- Points
of note: My
Qs; Breach
my HR rights

18 1. [WLCC](#) accepted and proceeded with the [27 February 2007 claim, ref. 7WL00675](#), in spite of the
19 fact that: **two company names** are given for the "Claimant": ["Rootstock Overseas Corp"](#) and
20 ["Steel Services"](#); **both** claiming to be *"my landlord"*; **each** represented by a **different** firm of
21 solicitors: [Portner and Jaskel](#) and [CKFT](#); **each** claiming a **different** amount of money from me:
22 "£10,356.59" and "£8,933.28" - facts I went to great lengths to highlight in my [22 March 2007](#)
23 Acknowledgment of Service.

24 2. [WLCC](#) took **no action** as a result of my repeatedly highlighting the issue as to the identity of *"the*
25 *claimant"* and hence 'my landlord' - and consequently **the issue as to the legality of the claim**
26 **filed against me**. It let me raise this issue a total of **11 TIMES** - over a period of 14 months. (= a
27 repeat of what took place in relation to the 29 November 2002 claim when I flagged-up, to WLCC,
28 the LVT action a total of **7 TIMES** over a seven-month period: I was ignored. I was also ignored
29 when I raised it, one year later, with Wandsworth County Court).

Portner # 33

WLCC- (D)
How the 'Clan'
sends people
me from...

30 3. The [9 April 2008](#) so-called 'case management directions' issued by District Judge Ryan TOTALLY
31 ignored my [14 March 2008](#) Allocation Questionnaire supported by three additional sheets in which
32 I - yet again - raised the critical issues I had already raised in my [12 September 2007](#) Defence i.e.
33 six months previously (and many, also in my [4 April 2007](#) Application to Contest Jurisdiction, and in
34 my [3 May 2007](#) Skeleton Argument – hence 11 months previously).

35 4. My [30 April 2008](#) Application to vary the [9 April 2008](#) 'case management directions' *"in the interests*
36 *of justice and efficiency"* was refused in a [1 May 2008](#) Order by District Judge Nicholson - leaving
37 me, as I had predicted in my [14 May 2008](#) reply to him, WITHOUT the information to which I am
38 legally entitled - **thereby seriously prejudicing my ability to defend myself against the claim**.

39 5. As I predicted in my [3 June 2008](#) Witness Statement - the 'claimants', *"Rootstock Overseas Corp,*
40 *Steel Services Ltd"* et.al. = Andrew Ladsy et.al. - FAILED to supply me with their witness
41 statement. This was a repeat of what took place with the [29 November 2002 claim](#) but, because
42 this time I was a Litigant in Person throughout the process i.e. **not** represented - thereby removing
43 the possibility of a 'behind the scene deal' - instead of the previous outcome which was a [21](#)
44 [October 2003](#) 'offer' (for £6,350 v. the original demand of [£14,400](#))...

45 ...the outcome second time round was a [6 June 2008](#) Notice of Discontinuance of "ALL" of the [27](#)
46 [February 2007](#) claim against me – **vindicating my position I had endlessly repeated in my**

1 **documents to WLCC over the previous 16 months: this claim was fraudulent** - making it the
2 second – fraudulent - claim filed against me in WLCC by [Ladsky et.al.](#) - and the second time that
3 WLCC IGNORED THE EVIDENCE I supplied against the claim.

4 **Of note:** The 29 November 2002 claim was preceded by [Lanny Silverstone, CKFT](#), [threatening me](#)
5 with “*forfeiture*” (taking the flat away from me) unless I immediately paid the £14,400, as well as
6 threatening to contact my mortgage lender. The 27 February 2007 claim was preceded by [Jeremy](#)
7 [Hershkorn, Portner and Jaskel](#), [threatening me](#) with “*bankruptcy proceedings, forfeiture and costs*”
8 if I failed to “*immediately pay £8,937*” to “*Rootstock Overseas Corp.*” - a company I had **never**
9 heard of. **Subsequent events provide undeniable evidence that: the threat of forfeiture, of**
10 **bankruptcy proceedings, as well as court claims are used as FRAUD TOOLS.** [My Diary 22 Nov 08](#)

11 Having received, [two months previously](#), my Application for a Detailed Assessment hearing (to claim
12 my costs following the 6 June 2008 Notice of Discontinuance), [four hours before](#) the [4 November 2009](#)
13 hearing, District Judge Nicholson issued an Order for the case to be transferred to the Supreme Court
14 Costs Office. (His excuse was “*the judge made an error*”).

15 ■ The **Supreme Court Costs Office** Detailed Assessment, so-called ‘hearing’, took place on [30](#)
16 [January 2009](#). Ahead of the hearing, I had served my [19 January 2009](#) response to “*Rootstock*
17 *Overseas Corp., Steel Services*” (= Ladsky et.al.) [Points of Dispute](#) (which, of course, challenged
18 everything in my claim). My document was preceded by a five-page summary very clearly detailing
19 why I believed to be entitled to – at a minimum - get all of my costs back.

20 I also supplied a [480 page bundle of 153 supporting documents](#) which, of course, included, among
21 others, ALL the documents I had served on [WLCC](#) from the time the claim was filed against me, as
22 well as all the correspondence – to which I referred in my 19 January 2009 reply.

23 Starting with immediate hostility, Deputy Master Hoffman did not allow me to refer to my 19
24 January 2009 document – and ultimately ONLY allowed me £2,507 of my costs, plus interest since
25 the 6 June 2008 Notice of Discontinuance – bringing the total to [£2,641](#) v. my costs of [£8,675](#).

26 Needless to say that, in line with [WLCC](#)’s ‘approach’, the word ‘sanction’ against “*Rootstock*
27 *Overseas Corp, Steel Services*” = [Ladsky et.al.](#), for filing what was a blatantly obvious, vexatious,
28 malicious, fraudulent claim against me – with no legally recognised ground - and making me go
29 through 16 months of absolute, sheer utter hell (for the second time) - was not uttered.

30 In fact, in addition to implying, in the context of the amount I claimed for writing my Defence that I
31 am a liar, Deputy Master Hoffman asked me in an hostile, condescending tone why I had returned
32 my [22 March 2007](#) Acknowledgment of Service with a copy of the first page of the [27 February](#)
33 [2007](#) claim, and of the first page of [Martin Russell Jones](#)’ invoice of 13 February 2007 supplied
34 with the Particulars of claim – on which I had made annotations.

35 I replied that I had done this for the purpose of highlighting the fact that there are TWO NAMES for
36 the ‘claimant’: “*Roostock (sic) Overseas Corp.*” and “*Steel Services*”. Reply (in an authoritarian
37 tone): “*You should not have done this. You should have only returned the form that the court sent*
38 *you*”. To which my response was “*I receive a claim that has TWO NAMES as the ‘claimant’, one of*
39 *which I have never heard of, both claiming to be my ‘landlord’, and both demanding that I pay over*
40 *£10,000 - and you expect me to not say anything?*” Reply (in a continuing, authoritarian,
41 condescending, hostile tone) “*You should not have done it!*”

42 My translation: “*My good friends in West London County Court are extremely angry that you have*
43 *this black on white evidence against them as they should not have proceeded with the claim*”.

44 ■ As to the outcome of my experience with HMCS ‘**Customer Service**’ following [my ‘cry for help’](#) to
45 Lord Falconer of Thoroton [in 2004](#), and in [my complaint in 2007](#) (which included [two ‘cries for](#)
46 [help’ to Jack Straw, ‘Justice’ Secretary](#)), this is what I captured in my [12 July 2009](#) complaint to the

2008

1 PHSO "Four years on, the replies I received to my 13 November 2007 complaint demonstrate the
2 same arrogant, dismissive, patronizing, condescending attitude, absolving itself of all responsibility
3 and accountability – with WLCC and the Court Service 'Customer Service' quite clearly closing
4 rank - and containing the all too familiar cover-ups, misrepresentations, fabrications and rejection
5 of responsibility and accountability. Hence: a clear breach of the Parliamentary Ombudsman'
6 Principles of Good Practice for "[Complaint Handling](#)" and "[Remedy](#)".

7 My take on why I was subjected to this treatment by the courts over a period of 43 months? Because:

- 8 ■ I 'DARED' [in 2002-04](#), and [in 2007-08](#), to challenge the – fraudulent - claim filed against me by the
9 'sacrosanct' landlord [Andrew Ladsky et. al.](#) and [their aides](#) - which, the evidence suggests, the
10 courts perceive as having the 'divine right' to defraud me - and my fellow leaseholders.
- 11 ■ I 'DARED' – as a Litigant in Person - in 2002-04, and in 2007-08 - in the process of fighting against
12 the fraudulent claims filed against me - to challenge the judges, court managers and other court
13 staff for their failure to do their job, hence: FAILURE TO PERFORM THEIR LEGAL REMIT.
- 14 ■ I 'DARED' out of utter despair - after FIVE YEARS - of absolute, sheer utter hell, facing a gigantic
15 wall of blind eyes and deaf ears, as well as blatantly obvious collusion and conniving between
16 parties in the public and private sector ([lawyers](#), [surveyors](#), [accountant](#)) to launch my website,
17 <http://www.leasehold-outrage.com> at the end of 2006, hoping that doing this would put pressure
18 on resolving my situation - leading me to close it within days, at most a few weeks after its launch.

19 In other words: I was hoping for intelligence and common sense. It proved to be A VAIN HOPE!
20 (NB: I purposely did not update my website for seven months, from May to December 2007 in
21 order to give ALL the opportunity to show common sense and intelligence by resolving my situation
22 – leading me to close the site, and leave the country, as I have been wanting to do since 2003.
23 They did NOT!) (I am doing the same thing now: I have not updated my website since July 2009).

- 24 ■ And last, but not least – which I regard as applying to ALL the parties I have and continue to
25 challenge in the public, as well as private sector - in the context of [my 30+ battles since 2002](#),
26 pursuing the rights I have been told by the legislators I have the right to demand – BECAUSE:
 - 27 ■ I am a woman, on my own, of foreign origin (e.g. TDC Simon J Dowling, K&C police branding
28 me [a "Nazi" because I am "franco-german in origin"](#)), challenging an overall,
29 extremely arrogant, self-regarding, self-serving, ego-crazed, power-corrupted, male dominated
30 environment - including, 'daring' to challenge a Jewish landlord and his Jewish aides – whose
31 supporters include, at high levels, individuals who are also Jewish;
 - 32 ■ of very limited financial means, and no influential connections – thereby making me an easy
33 prey for individuals with no morality and no honour, who close rank and hide within the network
34 of symbiotic relationships - instead of having the guts to stand-up and take responsibility for
35 their actions;
 - 36 ■ with strongly held moral principles of right and wrong from my Catholic upbringing, that led me
37 to, for as long as I could in the face of the horrendous and very traumatic treatment I was being
38 subjected to - refuse to be treated differently from my fellow leaseholders – by refusing to strike
39 a 'behind the scene' deal.
 - 40 ■ And it can also be said: because, contrary to what 'the system' evidently expects of me – I do
41 not behave like a schizophrenic: turning my moral principles 'on' when it comes to e.g.
42 declaring my income for tax purposes, 'off' when I am being ripped off / see others being ripped
43 off - by 'certain individuals'.

1 **5 Other parties**

2 While the above demonstrates blatant collusion and blind determination to punish me / 'get me' for
3 'daring' to stand-up for my rights and, in the process, 'daring' to stand-up and challenge 'the system' -
4 other evidence of co-ordinated action against me includes, among others:

5 ■ On the medical side (as reported e.g. on page 18 and 19 of my [20 September 2009](#) reply to Jenny
6 Neville, MPS Public Access Office):

7 (1) Dr AG, my doctor (of 37 years) who, in April 2008, claimed to have no record of the
8 consultation I had with him in April 2007 when he prescribed me anti-depressants and
9 tranquilizers because of the state I was in as a result of the treatment I was being subjected to
10 at [KPMG](#), my then employer. (Treatment which, 'by coincidence', started 10 days after TDC
11 Simon J Dowling, K&C police, [failed to intimidate and bully my website Host](#) into closing down
12 my website). Instead of asking me what he had prescribed me, whether it had been of help, he
13 persisted in trying to determine whether I had recorded my conversations at KPMG. (He did
14 not get a reply). Having learnt a great deal as a result of my experience in this country since
15 2002, I had scanned his prescription, as well as the packagings for the medicines, and [sent](#)
16 [him a copy](#) "to ensure that my file is up-to-date". (Needless to say that I never saw him again).

17 (2) Dr MP, the psychiatrist I saw on 7 May 2008 for the purpose of filing a claim against KPMG,
18 following my resigning in January 2008 (after 10 years) – and being unable to work since due
19 to my experience. He was very clearly not interested in what I had to say, getting impatient
20 with me, hurrying me on, and, within less than half-an-hour of the 'consultation',
21 'recommended' that I "[should immediately book \[myself\] in a clinic for two weeks](#)". He also
22 asked me whether I had "family in France".

23 By 'amazing coincidence', at the time, I had to, among other, serve my Witness Statement by [4](#)
24 [June 2008](#) in [WLCC](#) i.e. within less than a month of my seeing this psychiatrist. As detailed
25 above, the outcome of my serving – as a Litigant in Person - [my Witness Statement](#), was the [6](#)
26 [June 2008](#) Notice of Discontinuance of "ALL" of the [27 February 2007](#) claim against me. Not
27 bad for somebody who should be "[immediately booked into a psychiatric clinic](#)". It sure would
28 have been 'very convenient' for Ladsky et.al. to have me out of action during that time!

29 Conclusion: 'Dare' to challenge a bunch of crooks and 'the system' that protects them - and
30 the message is 'Get thee to an asylum!'

31 Of note: knowing that my mobile phones are monitored, I went to Dr MP's office to make the
32 appointment = it provides further evidence that I am being followed.

33 Another 'amazing coincidence': one week after my visit to the psychiatrist, on [15 May 2008](#), as
34 I was coming out of Jefferson House at the same time as [Ladsky](#), he told me "[You are in very](#)
35 [serious need of help](#)".

36 It is clear that Ladsky is kept well informed of developments – and plans e.g.

37 (i) As I report in my [24 March 2009](#) letter to [Sir Malcolm Rifkind](#): within 48 hours of his
38 Constituency Office receiving my [7 March 2009](#) letter (my first letter), Ladsky had been
39 informed of it as, to make sure I heard him, he stood outside my windows expressing disbelief
40 to somebody at the fact that I had contacted Sir Malcolm.

41 (ii) Since the 27 February 2007 claim, I have not received anything from [Martin Russell Jones](#)
42 = 'another lot' that has gone into **TOTAL SILENCE mode!** Hence, among others, in breach
43 of my statutory rights, and rights under my lease, I have not been supplied with accounts for
44 Jefferson House since those for year-end 2004 – thereby ensuring that I remain a prisoner in
45 the flat... with the death threat hanging over my head of "[not having long to live](#)".

[My Diary](#)
[2009 -](#)
[Introduction](#)

1 (3) Miss JY, the specialist I saw on 7 August 2008 (who was standing in for one I (used) to see on
2 a yearly basis for check-ups, based in another location) who, on the basis of 12 months old
3 information, could not wait to get me on the operating table within the following week. I
4 subsequently saw a French doctor who simply could not understand this 'specialist's
5 assessment.

6 I believe that any fair minded, reasonable person with integrity will understand why the above,
7 added to TDC Simon Dowling's approach to social services – stated in the last part of the
8 16/03/2007 – 18h56 entry, in the police report, [CR:5605839/07](#): "*I believe she may have*
9 *some mental issues so will be speaking to social services to see if they*
10 *are aware of her*" – lead to me to conclude that it demonstrates a clear intention to 'put me
11 out of action'. And of course, the 15 June 2009 'message' "*Enjoy your life, you don't have long to*
12 *live*" provides further confirmation of this.

13 ■ The blatantly obvious 'games' played by Hutchison 3G, the 3 network mobile phone provider who
14 messed me around over a four-month period, ignoring my request for the Port Authorisation Code
15 (PAC) so that I could transfer my mobile phone number to another service provider. Under
16 regulations, a PAC (or the reason why it cannot be provided) must be sent to the customer within
17 two working days of the customer's request. (Evidently, my requesting a transfer to another
18 provider was perceived as 'inconvenient': need to 'spin the story about me' to a new entity).

My Diary

[29 Dec 08](#)

[23 Jan 09](#)

19 Lack of action, following four letters from me, including one to Hutchison 3G's CEO, led me to
20 contact Ofcom - which finally led to Hutchison supplying me with the PAC. As I wrote in my [20](#)
21 [February 2009](#) reply "*Your letter demonstrates that you (and unnamed parties) continue to*
22 *perceive me as an imbecile*"

23 **6 At the end of my working life, I will NOT walk away having lost everything I have worked for**
24 **– through NO FAULT of my own – other than naïvely believe what the State told me**

25 It is abundantly clear from events that I have been earmarked for maximum punishment, even
26 'annihilation', in part / mainly (?) because, in the context of fighting for the rights I have been told by the
27 legislators I have the right to demand – I am holding a mirror to the face of parties in the public and
28 private sector who do not like the reflection, as it reflects their / their friends' failure to do their job,
29 frequently amounting to failure to perform their legal remit / malpractice / collusion / corruption / fraud.

30 As I wrote to [Sir Malcolm Rifkind](#) in my [19 October 2009](#) letter "*Whose fault is it? Firstly, they brought it*
31 *on themselves*". As the second point, I remind him that, in [December 2003](#), I accepted [Ladsky's offer](#)
32 "*for the sake of bringing the dispute to an end. But Ladsky, 'Mr I Am So Important, So Superior to*
33 *Anybody Else, Entitled to Get My Every Wish and Take Whatever I Want from Others', decided that it*
34 *was not going to be the end of it. [Like the majority of my fellow leaseholders](#), I WOULD be made to pay*
35 *him whatever amount he deemed fit*". And I would be made to pay very dearly for 'daring' to stand-up
36 to him and his supporters.

Invoices

[21 Oct 04](#)

[16 Nov 04](#)

[Intro My](#)

[Diary 2009](#)

37 EVERYBODY 'very conveniently' overlooks the fact that [Ladsky et.al.](#) and [the puppets](#) they "*instructed*"
38 - are the ROOT CAUSE for ALL that has happened. WHY?

39 And, rather than address my objectives – as evidenced by the blatant blind determination to pursue a
40 'no surrender policy' (evidently not believing in the saying that 'judgment is passed not on the mistake,
41 but on the recovery) - EVERYBODY expects me to be 'a good little girl', and just "*walk away*" and
42 ignore the unbelievable injustice I have and continue to suffer, that has robbed me of the major part of
43 what I have worked for in my life. Of course, it's very easy to be generous with other people's money!

44 I will NOT 'walk away', because I have done NOTHING WRONG. IT IS THE STATE AND OTHER
45 PARTIES THAT HAVE WRONGED ME.

1 My 'crime' is that I had naïve blind trust and faith in what I was told by the State: that I had rights, I had
2 the right to demand, and that there was a system in place – I am paying for through taxes – I could call
3 on in time of need, ensuring that my rights would be upheld.

4 As the public was again reminded by one of the judges in the recent case of Mr Munir Hussain - people
5 must defer to the courts and *"let justice take its course"* otherwise *"the rule of law and our system of*
6 *criminal justice, which are the hallmarks of a civilised society would collapse"*

7 As the INNOCENT VICTIM OF CRIME - I HAVE deferred to the 'justice system' of this country, and
8 called upon other departments in the process of pursuing what I was told by the State - I 'needed to do,
9 and had the right to do'. Outcome? It has led me to go through, since 2002, absolute, sheer utter hell,
10 suffering unbelievably vicious, cruel, barbaric treatment. It has totally ruined my life and my prospects.
11 It has made me lose the major part of what worked for in my 40 years in this country, including the nest
12 egg I had accumulated through very hard work and big sacrifices to secure a very modest retirement.
13 WHY, as a law-abiding, taxpaying British National, have I and continue to be denied my rights?

14 With nothing left to lose, with God's help, I WILL keep on fighting until the last breath in my body,
15 because I will NOT stand injustice, losing everything I have worked for, and earned honestly, so that a
16 bunch of crooks can get away with a multi-million Pounds jackpot, and to spare the sorry skin of their
17 supporters who decided that they are entitled to get away with it.

18 And if I fail to achieve my personal objectives? I very dearly hope that my exposing chapter and verse
19 of my very shocking case will act as a trigger for change and spare other leaseholders from going
20 through the horrendous suffering I have and continue to endure since 2002. This will be my legacy, for
21 a cause which, thanks to my very bad luck in buying a leasehold flat in a block controlled by Ladsky
22 et.al. - chose me. As amply demonstrated by my experience, it will require a lot of guts and fierce
23 determination to prevent a repeat of what I have and continue to be subjected to - as it happens to be a
24 cause that adversely concerns some very powerful people in this country.

25 To the obvious cries of 'Off with her head!' I quote what I wrote in my [28 November 2009](#) letter to Sir
26 Paul and Mr Johnson: *"As to coping with the [15 June 2009](#) death threat "Enjoy your life. You don't
27 have long to live", I tell myself that we all have to die one day – and that if I end-up being murdered, I
28 will die knowing that the fingers will - for ever - be pointed at ALL the parties who are, in one way or
29 another connected to my case" ...*

30 ...and knowing that the only thing ALL these parties will be able to say is: 'I turned a blind eye and a
31 deaf ear / did what I did / said what I said / wrote what I wrote because Andrew Ladsky et. al. decided
32 that Noëlle (and her fellow leaseholders) were going to pay for the [construction of a penthouse flat and](#)
33 [addition of three other flats to Jefferson House](#) - costs for which Noëlle (and her fellow leaseholders)
34 are not liable - so that Ladsky et.al. could realise [a multi-million Pound jackpot](#). So, what can be said
35 about me? Not only do I approve of deceit and fraud, I also endorse the other illegal, and often criminal
36 tactics used against Noëlle (and her fellow leaseholders) in the pursuit of this objective: [harassment,](#)
37 [bullying, victimization, blackmail, extortion, intimidation, defamation of name and character, etc.](#)'

38 And as I wrote in my [19 October 2009](#) letter to Sir Malcolm *"Do you think that what has now become*
39 *the standard public sector's response in this type of situation: "There are lessons to be learnt" will wash*
40 *in my case?"* Thanks to what can only be described as sheer stupidity and arrogance by the parties
41 who decided to continue fighting me instead of resolving my situation, leading me to close down my
42 website and leave the country, tens of thousands of people have now seen the detail of my case on [my](#)
43 [website](#) – including the vendetta I am being subjected to since.

44 In his book, *"What next in the law?"*, Lord Denning wrote *"Whoever may be guilty of abuse of power, be*
45 *it the Government, State, employer, trade-union, or whoever, the law must provide a speedy remedy,*
46 *otherwise the victims will find their own remedy. There will be ~~an~~ anarchy"*

1 If I had children who saw me going through what I have gone through since 2002 – knowing that I am
2 the innocent victim of crime, that I am a law-abiding, honest, decent person with integrity and strongly
3 held moral principles – and seeing individuals in the public sector acting like pimps, prostituting Her
4 Majesty's departments and institutions for the benefit of crooks: what message would my experience
5 communicate to them? Would I have any chance of getting them to adopt my principles, of having
6 respect for the institutions? In fact, would I want them to? Knowing what I know now, for the sake of
7 their survival, I would have to answer: 'No'.

8 New Labour and the Tories talk of a 'broken society' and readily put the blame on various sections of
9 society. As a result of my experience since 2002, I now hold the view that the blame rests first and
10 foremost with the State, the Government: for treating people with the utmost contempt and disdain –
11 forgetting that we, the people, pay for their remuneration package and other expenses; acting like a
12 despotic, self-regarding, self-serving elite of 'untouchables', free to ignore their legal remit and the law
13 of the land; for crushing any valid criticism and ruthlessly stamping on morality. To plagiarize from
14 Norman Baker, Liberal Democrats MP, in his Mail on Sunday article of 24 January 2010 *"If you put
15 down the tracks, that's the way the train goes"*.

16 **7 Parties copied on this letter**

17 Having recently joined the Liberal Democrats Party, I am copying:

- 18 ■ Chris Huhne, Shadow Secretary of State for the Home Department
- 19 ■ David Howarth, Shadow Secretary of State for Justice
- 20 ■ Sarah Teather, Shadow Secretary of State for Housing
- 21 ■ Robin Meltzer, Prospective Parliamentary Candidate for Kensington who, in the local LibDem
22 newsletter, recently quoted Sir Malcolm Rifkind *"It is vital that the link between people and their
23 representatives be straightened and restored"*, and wrote: *"Perhaps Sir Malcolm would care to use
24 his next column to elaborate on quite how he does that in Kensington & Chelsea? No-one I have
25 spoken to can tell me. There is a tradition in the UK of holding advice surgeries so that local people
26 can ask for help. Sir Malcolm's website has no surgery times"*. Mr Meltzer also reports the outcome
27 of one my fellow constituents attempting to set a meeting with Sir Malcolm: *"an automated
28 message response "Thank you for contacting me"*.
- 29 ■ Rosalyn Gordon, Chair, LibDem Campaign for Gender Balance

30 as I assume that, with the impending general and local election, my experience will be of interest to
31 them: the level of decay that needs to be addressed is of mammoth proportions.

32 I am also copying:

- 33 ■ The Rt. Hon. Gordon Brown, Prime Minister, who was quoted in The Sunday Telegraph 24
34 2010 January 2009 as saying *"I strongly support the right of law-abiding people to defend themselves,
35 their families and their properties... As a country, all our instincts and sympathies rightly lie with
36 law-abiding citizens. Society sides with the victims of crime, so too should the system. And I am
37 determined that it will"*. Prime Minister: will you show your *"determination"* in my case?

38 Yours sincerely,

39

40

41 Noëlle Klosterkotter-Dit-Rawé

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

Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

South Kensington Station
41 Old Brompton Road

Stephenson

London
Greater London
SW7 3JG

Date and Time: 03/02/2010 17:21
Session Prefix: 3-2565883
Dest: UK (E.U.)
Quantity: 1
Weight: 0.100 kg

1st Class LgLetter £0.61
Recorded £0.75
Receipt £0.00
PrePaidAmount -£1.36

Total Cost of Services £0.00
Posted after Last Collection? Yes

Barcode: BR8521210458B

DESTINATION ADDRESS
Building Name or Number Postcode
MPC SW1H0BG
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

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

This is not a VAT receipt
Thank You

Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

South Kensington Station
41 Old Brompton Road

Johnson

London
Greater London
SW7 3JG

Date and Time: 03/02/2010 17:22
Session Prefix: 3-2565885
Dest: UK (E.U.)
Quantity: 1
Weight: 0.089 kg

1st Class LgLetter £0.61
Recorded £0.75
Receipt £0.00
PrePaidAmount -£1.36

Total Cost of Services £0.00
Posted after Last Collection? Yes

Barcode: BR8521210378B

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

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

This is not a VAT receipt
Thank You

Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

South Kensington Station
41 Old Brompton Road

Brown

London
Greater London
SW7 3JG

Date and Time: 03/02/2010 17:24
Session Prefix: 3-2565907
Dest: UK (E.U.)
Quantity: 1
Weight: 0.087 kg

1st Class LgLetter £0.61
Recorded £0.75
Receipt £0.00
PrePaidAmount -£1.36

Total Cost of Services £0.00
Posted after Last Collection? Yes

Barcode: BR8521210108B

DESTINATION ADDRESS
Building Name or Number Postcode
10 SW1A2AA
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

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

This is not a VAT receipt
Thank You

Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

South Kensington Station
41 Old Brompton Road

Palumbo

London
Greater London
SW7 3JG

Date and Time: 03/02/2010 17:25
Session Prefix: 3-2565915
Dest: UK (E.U.)
Quantity: 1
Weight: 0.097 kg
1st Class LgLetter £0.61
Recorded £0.75
Receipt £0.00
PrePaidAmount -£1.36

Total Cost of Services £0.00

Posted after Last Collection? Yes

Barcode: BR8521210546B

DESTINATION ADDRESS
Building Name or Number Postcode
HC SW1A0AA
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

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

This is not a VAT receipt
Thank You

Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

South Kensington Station
41 Old Brompton Road

Abraham

London
Greater London
SW7 3JG

Date and Time: 03/02/2010 17:23
Session Prefix: 3-2565887
Dest: UK (E.U.)
Quantity: 1
Weight: 0.007 kg
1st Class LgLetter £0.61
Recorded £0.75
Receipt £0.00
PrePaidAmount -£1.36

Total Cost of Services £0.00

Posted after Last Collection? Yes

Barcode: BR8521210236B

DESTINATION ADDRESS
Building Name or Number Postcode
NT SW1P4QP
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

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

This is not a VAT receipt
Thank You

Post Office Ltd.
Your Receipt

South Kensington Station
41 Old Brompton Road
London
Greater London
SW7 3JG

VAT REG No. 243 1700 02
03/02/2010 17:16
SESSION : 3-2565864-1

RSF 1st Large		
5 @ 1.36		6.80
RM Spd Bulk RSF		
1 @ 0.00		0.00
RM Spd Bulk RSF		
1 @ 0.00		0.00
RM Spd Bulk RSF		
1 @ 0.00		0.00
RM Spd Bulk RSF		
1 @ 0.00		0.00
RM Spd Bulk RSF		
1 @ 0.00		0.00

TOTAL DUE TO POST OFFICE 6.80

Cash	FROM CUSTOMER	10.00
Cash	TO CUSTOMER	3.20
BALANCE		0.00

Thank You