



RICS

the mark of
property
professionalism
worldwide

Regulation

Our ref: INV-TF/24294

Your ref:

PLEASE QUOTE OUR REFERENCE ON ALL CORRESPONDENCE

20 January 2011

PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL

Ms Noëlle Rawé

Dear Ms Rawé

Your complaint concerning Martin Russell Jones

I am writing further to my colleague, Sue Dowdeswell's letter dated 06 January 2011 and can confirm that your letter dated 16 December 2010 has been passed to me to consider further.

I am sorry that you are dissatisfied with Martin Russell Jones who appear to be the managing agents for the property in which you reside and acting on the instructions of the freeholder of the building.

Before, I respond to the points raised in your letter of complaint, I would first like to explain the role and remit of RICS Regulation. RICS Regulation only has powers to deal with breaches of our Bye-laws, Rules, Practice Statements and other compulsory regulations that apply to our Members and Regulated Firms. RICS cannot become involved in disputes, complaints or claims between member firms and the general public as we do not have the jurisdiction to do so.

I note that your dispute with Ms Joan Hathaway MRICS and Mr Barrie Martin FRICS of Martin Russell Jones has been on-going for several years and that your latest letter of complaint concerns an invoice which you have received for £24,034.42. You have alleged this invoice to be fraudulent.

RICS are unable to assist you in resolving your dispute concerning this invoice. Furthermore, we are unable to determine whether a firm or Member has acted fraudulently, this can only be determined by a Court. *

I note that you have previously referred your complaints to the Leasehold Valuation Tribunal (LVT) (http://www.rpts.gov.uk/about_us/lvt.htm) and I would suggest that you contact them again to see if they are able to resolve your latest dispute.

If you choose to go to the LVT and during the tribunal, Martin Russell Jones are criticised, then RICS maybe able to investigate this criticism further provided a transcript of the LVT decision is available.

In your letter dated 17 November 2010 addressed to Ms Hathaway, you have reported that the LVT determined that the firm's previous demand was "most definitely 'unreasonable'".

Royal Institution of
Chartered Surveyors

Surveyor Court
Westwood Way
Coventry
CV4 8JE
United Kingdom

t +44 (0)20 7695 1670
f +44 (0)20 7334 3746
e regulation@rics.org
rics.org/regulation

So that you can get seriously shafted again: London LVT; My Diary 2011-Intro - and we get rid of you bloody Bitch



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

v. "Matters RICS investigates", pg 2

= doit yourself And then we might do something

NO, I did not. MRJ And Ladsky filed Application to LVT



RICS

the mark of
property
professionalism
worldwide

Regulation

At this stage, it is not clear whether this statement requires further investigation. Therefore, I will be writing to the firm, enclosing a copy of your complaint and requesting their comments. *

I appreciate that you may be disappointed with this letter, particularly as I am unable to assist you in resolving your dispute with the firm. I would like to assure you that your complaint has been thoroughly considered and thank you for bringing this matter to RICS' attention.

Once I have received the firm's comments, I will write to you again and advise you whether I can investigate matters further.

Yours sincerely

Tanya Fella
Investigations Officer
RICS Regulation

T+44 (0)20 7695 1698
F+44 (0)20 7334 3746
tfella@rics.org

enc. How to complain about RICS Members and Firms

* Contrast that with the evidence contained, among others, in my 17 Nov 10 and 16 Dec 10 letters to MKJ on which I copied the RICS

And add to that the massive amount of evidence I had supplied to the RICS with my 2 Feb 05 complaint - supported by a bundle of 220 documents.

- See the RICS' definition of its 'Regulatory Role' in its August 2010 'Rules of Conduct' and 'help sheet' on 'how to complain'.

- To my lasting MKJ's breaches of statutes some of which are punishable by imprisonment, the RICS wrote in its March 2005 letter that I should pursue these through civil or criminal proceedings, 'yeah!' and then (a) my 'memorandum of understanding' e.g. the one between the Law Society and the police - and (b) evidenced by my experience with the tribunal, the courts and the police.