



RICS

the mark of
property
professionalism
worldwide

Regulation

Our ref: INV-TF/24294

Your ref:

PLEASE QUOTE OUR REFERENCE ON ALL CORRESPONDENCE

12 April 2011

PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL
Ms Noëlle Rawé

See my comments
attached

Dear Ms Rawé

Your complaint concerning Martin Russell Jones

I refer to my letter dated 20 January 2011 and would like to advise you that I have now concluded my further enquiries with Martin Russell Jones.

In your letter and supporting documentation received on 24 December 2010, you claim that the LVT found the Firm's service charge demand to be "most definitely unreasonable". However, you failed to provide RICS with a copy of the LVT decision which supports this claim.

As you are aware, RICS investigate allegations of professional misconduct to determine whether there is evidence of a breach of the Rules of Conduct. In my letter dated 20 January 2011 I explained that I would be contacting Martin Russell Jones to ask them to comment on this statement.

I have now received the firm's comments who have advised me that they do not agree with the above comment and do not believe that LVT have addressed criticism at their firm.

There does not appear to be any independent evidence to verify the accuracy of either person's interpretation of the facts. It is in effect one person's word against another's and is not suitable to be taken forward.

In the absence of any independent documentation to support your claim, I must inform you that there is insufficient evidence of a breach in the Rules of Conduct and I will therefore be closing my file.

Thank you for bringing this matter to RICS' attention.

Yours sincerely

Tanya Fella
Investigations Officer
RICS Regulation
T+44 (0)20

cc. Martin Russell Jones

**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



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

The Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) 'response' to my 16 December 2010 correspondence amounts to a continuation of its blatant failure to regulate its members.

Events with Joan Hathaway, MRICS, Martin Russell Jones (MRJ)

- 'Joan Hathaway, MRICS (=Andrew Ladsky) sent me a TOTALLY UNSUPPORTED 'service charge' demand, of £24,000, on behalf of "Rootstock Overseas Corp" - dated 9 July 2010.
- I replied on 15 July 2010 asking for evidence.
- By 2nd November, I had NOT received a reply. On that day, I confronted Hathaway on this when I saw her in Jefferson House. As per usual (e.g. her lie that was exposed during the London LVT hearing of 5 Feb 03 – pt #3), she falsely claimed to have acknowledged my letter. (NB: As with the 9 July 10 demand, she would have sent it to Jefferson House. Even if it had been sent to my PO Box, such a letter would not have been intercepted).
- On that day, 'Hathaway' posted another copy of the 'invoice' to me - dating it with the previous day's date - 1 November 2010 - without, of course, providing any supporting evidence. Hence, four months on, she was STILL ignoring my 15 Jul 10 letter
- I replied on 17 November 2010, listing some of her, and the rest of the cabal's major deceits - describing her and the rest of the cabal as "*operating as an organised crime 'mafia'*".
- Continuation of the silence about providing me with evidence in support of the demand, led me to send Hathaway a 16 December 2010 letter in which I re-emphasised some of her various breaches of my rights. (On the same day, I also wrote to Grant Shapps, housing minister; the RICS and Julian Knight, journalist at the Independent, in which I reported events, including providing copy of the correspondence since the 9 Jul 10 demand).

To the RICS, I wrote: "...in light of your 'regulatory performance' (*), I am sure you will agree [these documents] *justify considering Joan Hathaway, MRICS, for an 'RICS Surveyor of the Year Award'*" – (*) based on my experience with the RICS when I filed a complaint against MRJ in 2005.

- STILL ignoring my requests for supporting evidence, for the third time, 'Joan Hathaway' (=Andrew Ladsky) sent me the invoice - dated 18 January 2011.

Events with the RICS

- To my surprise, I received a 6 January 2011 letter from the RICS stating that it was **treating my 16 Dec 10 letter as "a complaint"**.
- This was followed by a 20 January 2011 letter stating:

"The RICS 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"

*"RICS are **unable to assist** you in resolving your dispute concerning the **MRJ invoice you allege to be fraudulent**"*

1. YES, I DO maintain - with 'black on white' evidence in support - that this demand of £24,000, sent to me 3 times (9 July 10; 1 Nov 10; 18 Jan 11) by Joan Hathaway, MRICS, is FRAUDULENT.

Evidence:

- For the 27 February 2007 claim, ref 7WL00675, filed against me in West London County Court, by Jeremy Hershkorn, then at Portner and Jaskel, MRJ supplied the Particulars - in an intentionally incomprehensible format - leading me to produce my own version.
- **ALL the charges**, service charge, reserve fund and ground rent **were to year-end 2006**. The electricity was to October 2006.

- In the [6 June 2008](#) Notice of Discontinuance "[Rootstock Overseas Corp / Steel Services / Sloan Development](#)" dropped "ALL of the claim" against me.
- Hence, according to 'Martin Russell Jones's [9 July 2010](#) 'invoice' my service charges - for 3.5 years (2007 to July 2010) - are £24,000! - **or an average of £6,857 per year!**

Contrast that with the fact that:

- As can be seen from the [2004 accounts](#), "my share" of the 'service charges' in 2004 was £1,750 – and they were a rip-off! (In blatant breach of my lease, I have NOT been supplied with accounts since 2004).
- The works [started in 2004](#), and finally completed in [May 2006](#): (1) led to the **addition of 4 flats** to Jefferson House, one of which is the [penthouse flat](#) ([Land Registry title](#)) that is **c.7 times the size of mine**; (2) entailed a [complete overhaul of the block](#)

(For other evidence of [FRAUD](#) connected with this demand, see [Martyn Gerrard, Advisors to Jefferson House, # 8](#) – who claim to be using information "supplied by Martin Russell Jones")

2. As to the RICS stating that it is "unable to assist", contrast that with pg 2 of its 'How to complain - Help sheet': "[Matters RICS investigates... Allegation... of a criminal offence](#)". 'Obviously - as it did before ([in 2005](#)) - the RICS does NOT consider offences under the [Fraud Act 2006](#), the [Malicious Communications Act 1998](#), the [Protection from Harassment Act 1997](#), the [Theft Act 1968](#), [s.17 False accounting](#) - as criminal). (See the top of the page on [the RICS](#) for how it described its "role" on its website in 2005 – and contrast that with my latest experience...and indeed my experience in 2005).

The [20 Jan 11](#) letter goes on to state:

"I note that you have previously referred your complaints to the Leasehold Valuation Tribunal"

(Wrong! I did NOT. [MRJ](#), on behalf of 'Steel Services' =[Andrew Ladsky](#) - filed a [7 August 2002](#) application to the [London LVT](#))

"I would suggest you contact them again"

(= So that you can get seriously shafted again ([London LVT](#); My Diary [2011-Intro](#)) - and we finally get rid of you bloody Bitch. Remember: [the housing minister, Grant Shapps, is 'our mate'](#)) (My Diary [4 Feb 11](#))

"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"

This is known as the 'one finger sign' as:

- As can be seen from sections 6 and 7 (points 130-173) of my [2 February 2005](#) complaint to the RICS against MRJ, I devoted 13 pages of my complaint to the [London LVT](#) events and outcome of the hearings - including very clearly detailing **the £500,000 overcharge** (inc. the £144k contingency fund). ([LVT # 4](#))
- Furthermore, as can also be seen from the list of [220 documents](#) I supplied as supporting documents to my complaint, I provided the RICS with a copy of the London LVT report of [17 June 2003](#) (# 156 in the list). (The outcome of my 2005 complaint was: "**Insufficient evidence. No misconduct**" = 'Get lost!') ([RICS # 5](#))

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

=Another one finger sign

"I appreciate that you may be disappointed with this letter..."

(NOP! Based on past experience, it is 'more than I expected' as, in fact, I was surprised to get a reply to my [16 Dec 10](#) letter. But heh! Why miss on an opportunity to have fun!)

"...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's attention"

(Written as they are laughing their head off)

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

As I anticipated, in the attached letter of **12 April 2011** letter, the RICS dismissed "my complaint"- using the same excuse as in 2005 "**insufficient evidence**". Among other:

"...you failed to provide the RICS with a copy of the decision which supports this claim"

Contrast that with the fact that:

- In its [20 Jan 11](#) letter (above) the RICS did NOT ask me to supply a copy of the [London LVT report](#).
- [I HAD supplied a copy](#) of the report to the RICS with my [2 Feb 05 complaint](#).
- In any case this report is accessible by the public on the [tribunal's online database](#) - which the RICS, of course, knows. (Note what e.g. the [ICAEW](#) caseworker wrote in his [6 Sep 05](#) letter to me: "*I note that the full LVT decision is available and I can confirm that as is standard in cases such as these I have already obtained a copy of the decision*") ([Pridie Brewster # 17](#))

As to **Martin Russell Jones** "**not agreeing** with [my] comment that the tribunal findings demonstrated that the sum demanded was most definitely unreasonable": Gee! What a surprise!

Contrast that with the London LVT findings under [point # 4](#): **a £500,000 reduction** (incl. the contingency fund) v. the [15 July 2002 demand of £736,200 sent BY Joan Hathaway, MRICS](#) (and her lie exposed during the 5 Feb 03 hearing - [LVT # 3](#)) - and of course, my very comprehensive complaint to the RICS [in 2005](#). And if it did not access it: I KNOW that the RICS looked at my website in great detail following receiving my [16 Dec 10](#) letter.

In this context, and the below rest of the letter - add to that as well the content of my [17 Nov 10](#) letter to Hathaway, on which [I copied the RICS](#) (as evidenced by the fact that it quotes from it in its [20 Jan 11](#) letter - as reported above).



"There does not appear to be independent evidence to verify the accuracy of either person's interpretation of the facts. It is in effect one person's word against another's and is not suitable to take forward"

"In the absence of any independent documentation to support your claim, I must inform you that there is insufficient evidence of a breach in the [Rules of Conduct](#) and will therefore be closing my file"

I did not reply to any of the letters. I KNEW from my previous experience [in 2005](#) that it would be a complete and utter waste of my time. (= As with ALL my numerous other complaints against other professions, as well as public sector authorities) (My Diary [6 May 08](#))

And Grant Shapps is "[not convinced of the case for further regulation of managing agents](#)"! (My Diary [4 Feb 11](#)) (NB: As there is [NO regulation of the residential leasehold sector and supporting infrastructure](#), use of "*further*" is misleading)