

9 January 2015

To

Rainer Hughes Solicitors

Darren Rawlins

Dear Sir,

Thank you for your letter dated 7 January 2015. I would like to clarify certain points:

**“The Court sealed the draft order of HHJ Walden-Smith”.**

The hearing was held on 11 December 2014 and HHJ Walden-Smith advised you during the court hearing to draft her order, send it to parties for approval and afterwards to the court for it to be sealed. You admit that you have drafted the order (without our approval) and the court sealed it. Pursuant to CPR, you should have sent the draft order for us to confirm our agreement to the so that it can be provided to the Court for approval and sealing. HHJ Walden-Smith did advise you to do so pursuant to Rule 40b. Your explanation does not make sense as we requested you for the draft order on 15/12/2014 and instead of sending us the order itself, you knowingly and maliciously sent the draft order! This is an unprofessional and intentional act. In accordance to the general rule, the court will serve judgments and orders, however, where a judgement or order has been drawn up by a party, the party must retain a copy at the court and sufficient copies on himself and on the other parties. Once order is sealed, then the order is served by the court. As you have not served your drafted order on the same day you drew it up, you have breached your duties under Rule 6.3.

On 15 December 2014, you agreed that you made an application for the court to have the possession order transferred to the High court. You still did not serve the application on us and neither urgent order you received from the court. You drafted the order on the N244 for the possession order to be transferred to the high court and that order was not served on us prior to putting it in front of DJ Judge North.

You indicated that your firm has followed the proper procedures to gain possession of the property. This is wholly incorrect. You agreed in your letter that you acted upon the instructions of RHP Services and not Ismail Natha. RHP Services is a service provider of Newham council under S17 Children Act 1989. As such, in the round, you confirm that Newham council has advised RHP Services to seek possession of the property. In short, you represented Newham Council in this possession proceedings, and to avoid any dispute of Human Rights, you used Ismail Natha's name.

As the above confirms, you have not used the proper channels to seek repossession. You have instead used deception. You further instructed RHP Services to proceed with an illegal entry on 10<sup>th</sup> November 2014 despite knowing that a high court order was obtained to stay the eviction. Furthermore, you communicated with the Home office, Mr Clifford Kirsch, to start possession proceedings / notice to quit etc...

You provided false information in court on 11 September 2014 despite we informed the judge. You deliberately misled the judge by your false representations such as; you have not been instructed by RHP Services. Now in your letter, you are clearly confirming that you were as you believe that the case is finished. This is deception. If the court transferred the possession order to the high court on 15 December 2014, you should have served this order on us or informed us before seeking a direction from Master Eyre. You have used deception to reach unlawful aims.

Can you confirm who attended the meeting with Master Eyre on 16 December 2014?


The case is not closed and your actins should be examined by Solicitors Regulations Authority as we understand that your subsequent actions after the complaint have been carried out only to obstruct the course of justice and the complaint.

We urge the SRA to carefully look into Rainer Hughes Solicitors conduct in this case. More precisely, we request the SRA to:

- Investigate why draft orders were served to the court without consent of all parties?
- Investigate the actions of Rainer Hughes Solicitors in this particular case.
- Investigate the communications Rainer Hughes had with the home office and the Newham council in this particular case.
- If RHP Services has instructed Rainer Hughes, why this was not put forward on 11 September 2014 and denied by them?

I have provided some evidences to show how Rainer Hughes used deception in this case.

An inquiry into their actions is a requirement.



Darren is familiar with the District and Circuit Judges on the South Eastern Circuit.

He also has a vast amount of experience of advocacy before **Queen's Bench Masters,**

**Chancery Masters** at the Royal Courts of Justice.



Convinced Master Eyre to order a writ of possession without notice to us

Yours faithfully,

Mr and Mrs Ismail