

Subject: Re: Your client (further clarification required please) / GDPR SAR
Date: Fri, 28 Aug 2020 19:22:19 +0000
From: Patrick Tedstone <Patrick.Tedstone@orj.co.uk>
To: Jason Earl <jaseearl@googlemail.com>
CC: Witney Tully <witney.tully@orj.co.uk>, Deborah Turner <Deborah.Turner@orj.co.uk>, Lesley White <Lesley.White@orj.co.uk>, Mike Smyth <Mike.Smyth@orj.co.uk>, Lorraine Smith <Lorraine.Smith@orj.co.uk>, Lauren Hylton <Lauren.Hylton@orj.co.uk>, Rachel Prince <Rachel.Prince@orj.co.uk>, Neil Holden <Neil.Holden@orj.co.uk>, Alex Stetson <Alex.Stetson@orj.co.uk>, Julie Tarbuck <Julie.Tarbuck@orj.co.uk>, Daniel Whitehouse <Daniel.Whitehouse@orj.co.uk>, Sapphire Uppal <Sapphire.Uppal@orj.co.uk>, Sam Polo-Tolley <Sam.Polo-Tolley@orj.co.uk>, Oliver Jackson <Oliver.Jackson@orj.co.uk>, Adam Smith <Adam.Smith@orj.co.uk>, Tom Wellings <Tom.Wellings@orj.co.uk>, Victoria Maher <Victoria.Maher@orj.co.uk>, Jane Webb <Jane.Webb@orj.co.uk>, Linda Potter <Linda.Potter@orj.co.uk>

Jason

As I have made clear I don't read your emails or take your calls. I have never acted for you only against you.

Contacting me at 2 in the morning or my colleagues on a bank holiday weekend is the kind of behaviour that will land you in trouble with the Police.

If your not sure about that - take some advice and perhaps something to calm your temper.

Your emails will be blocked hence forth. If we hear from you again we will inform the police without hesitation.

Patrick Tedstone

ORJ

On 28 Aug 2020, at 20:11, Jason Earl <jaseearl@googlemail.com> wrote:

Patrick,

I am baffled how your family or my circadian cycles come into the equation. Once again, you seem to be conflating things.

As a solicitor, you will know the police are there to "keep the peace", as the police oath suggests. My emails are making a GDPR subject access request. You are aware this is a lawful request and not a breach of the peace, as you are dishonestly insinuating. The fact that you are ignoring these lawful demands is the only reason I continue to correspond. To imply that this is breaching the peace or causing harm to your family is frankly deceptive. I don't know any member of your family and have never

communicated with them. The fact you are playing the victim card when you know very well your client is a liar that has left me out of pocket to the tune of £12'800 is frankly disgraceful behaviour.

To imply my actions require police intervention either highlight you have no understanding of the law. If that is the case, then I hate to state the obvious, but you seem to be in the wrong profession. Alternatively, it can be viewed that your statement intends to intimidate me from making simple requests that are permitted by law. The fact I have had to use sardonic wit to irk a response from you does not justify the police's involvement.

If you want to talk about harassment and intimidation, do I need to remind you which member of your firm decided to ruin my Sunday night by way of a premeditated recorded phone call last November?

Speaking of that call, as you were so keen to threaten me with what a judge would think of my hypothetical actions, let's transpose that concept to the misleading threats you've just made in the above email towards another judge in court? My layperson understanding of the law leads me to believe such threats could constitute an attempt to pervert the course of justice; something judges take a very dim on. Just because I'm not a judge does not entitle you to think that you can pull the wool over my eyes.

If you feel the need to refer the matter to the police, please be my guest. I have nothing to hide or fear. I have done nothing wrong. However, I do not believe the same holds for your client. If the police do take action, it will only shine the light back on your client, which is something I would openly welcome. I have liaised with the police on numerous occasions over the last few years, and don't believe they will take kindly to you preoccupying their time with petty false allegations when they have more pressing concerns.

I warned you last year repeatedly that your client is a liar, and was involved in numerous frauds. I did this because I was trying to alert you of the underlying reason your client instructed you. Your client is a vindictive narcissist that blames me for the termination of their pension because they claimed it fraudulently. The accusations you make against me are unwarranted and unverified lies spun by your client. You made no effort to understand the facts surrounding the claim. You proudly asserted this to Mr Patel and me on your 25th Oct 2019 email with statements like "I am struggling to make sense of the claims" and "Dow Jones isn't a real person". Maybe you want to tell me that Santa Claus isn't a real person while you are at it?

Despite your total inability to perform these tasks, you took it upon yourself to engage in a threatening recorded call with me, thinking you could easily take advantage of the fact I did not have legal representation. The nature of the call deceptively changed the agenda and made accusations that were not reflective of the real situation. On the call, you tried to insinuate the outcome by lecturing to me what a judge would think, when we both knew beyond any reasonable doubt there was no way your client had any intention of reaching a settlement or going to court. It became more evident as your client was reluctant to address matters via typical routes of settlement, such as mediation but instead wanted to falsely threaten court action from the outset in the hope it would fulfil their criminal agenda. I highlighted to you that this was just yet another fraud by your client, but it fell on deaf ears - something else you admitted in your March email when you subjectively corrected me about shouting and claimed to be "deaf". These threats are precisely why I called your client's bluff and highlighted that I would be happy for the matter to be escalated to the High Court or the police. In my 29th Oct 2019 email, I even offered to hold your client's hand as we walked into the

police station. Would you like me to do the same with you?

For the avoidance of doubt, I have seen your client blackmail and extort past members of staff to the point where one lost two million pounds worth of property, and another almost lost their home worth another million pounds. Mr Busfield also physically abused two former girlfriends (a coworker can back this up with photographic evidence sent to him), annexe other members shares, commit nearly £ 500'000 of pension fraud from IBM, a further £ 500'00 of bank wire transfer fraud from companies in dispute, perform acts of tax fraud that also tally six-figure sums all while using other people's identities to enact many of these actions. I'm aware Mr Busfield also employees ex-MI5 staff to spy on others and has personally threatened using them on me previously. The above doesn't even include the abuse I personally experienced at the hands of your client. The fact Mr Patel, Mr Singh, Mr Hayward and I have provided email communiqué regarding several of these events shows you have no regard to the truth, despite us highlighting this can be verified via 3rd parties. So, do forgive for the fact I want some fucking retribution in the form of good old-fashioned justice for what your client has done. Your propensity to follow your client's dishonesty underpins my emotions and has left me little choice regarding my actions. If you had any ability to empathise, you would have apologised.

I wouldn't normally engage in responding to a paltry reply like yours, but I despise bullies such as you and your client. I am compelled to write this reply as it underlines that I will not be silenced into submission when I've done nothing wrong. These threats of police action are an abuse of your power. You are just clutching at straws because your complete disregard for professional conduct is the principle reason you are now facing the scrutiny of your regulator. My actions have nothing to do with your negligence, so please do not hold me liable.

As you were so keen on the 3rd Nov phone call to discuss how misleading allegations against me would be seen in the eyes of a judge, maybe you would like to consider how a judge would view your actions against me at a Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal? The way you persist with these dishonest statements is making me think you are stupid enough to wish this outcome upon yourself! This is not the behaviour I expect from a managing partner who's practised law almost as long as I've been alive.

Now instead of engaging with these off-topic abusive threats and irrelevant ramblings about my circadian cycles, can you do your job and provide me with the information I asked for? I have CC'ed your partners in this email in the hope they can assist with my request if you are unable to. For the avoidance of doubt, I have no axe to grind with other staff at ORJ, so please do not make further false allegations of threats toward them or your family. I've made it clear to the regulator may complaints are exclusively concerning your conduct. Fundamentally, the concerns I raised to the SRA must hold some weight, if they have confirmed to me that the recording of your phone call warrants further investigation. The SRA has also told me to raise my GDPR concerns with the ICO. Furthermore, can I remind you I am still awaiting the formal written apology I asked for my email dated 3rd August 2020.

Kind regards,
Jase

On 24/08/2020 07:48, Patrick Tedstone wrote:

Mr earl

I don't read your emails but I note they are sent late at night or in the early hours of the morning.

They are clearly designed to intimidate or otherwise harass my family and I.

I am on holiday at the moment but I reserve the right to refer these matters to the Police.

I shall block all future emails

Patrick Tedstone

ORJ

On 24 Aug 2020, at 01:38, Jason Earl <jaseearl@googlemail.com> wrote:

Mr Tedstone,

I refer to the email dated 3rd Aug with the subject "Phonecall GDPR SAR / Ongoing SRA investigation POL/1283467-2020". I would like to thank you for taking the time to read it. I do appreciate the acknowledgement you sent back. It is very useful :-)

I know you have not complied with my previous request to provide a copy of the phone call in question from Nov 2019. That is a shame. I find it baffling as I believe it is a lawful requirement. The fact you are flouting this while being investigated by the SRA is illogical to say the least, but who am I to pass judgement on your actions?

I note in our exchange, by email and phone you assert to me (in a raised voice) "I am not your client". I have to say that is an interesting choice of words. I note in the email from 11th Oct 2019 titled "Our client Cynthia Busfield RE JET Group and JET Group Services" your firm asserts that your client is a majority shareholder and director of The JET Group Limited. Do correct me if I am wrong, but in Oct 2019 according to <https://beta.companieshouse.gov.uk/company/10344336/officers> it only has me listed as the sole director and shareholder of The JET Group Limited. In case you haven't realised this is what you call a paradox.

You'll be pleased to know; this leads me to my next request. If you do believe that I am not your client, please confirm the existence of, and provide copies of paperwork that supports the above claim by your client, such as (but not limited to) signed J30 stock transfer forms, deed of trust, or other similar paperwork.

For such paperwork to exist, it would need to have my signature on it, given I am the only listed director and shareholder on Companies House at the time of your Oct 2019 email.

I am of understanding you will need to provide this within the next 40 days. I do believe I may be entitled to a copy of this under GDPR SAR as my signature is a piece of personally identifiable information. Otherwise please provide an honest reason as to why you can not comply within the allocated time frame.

Also, please can you clarify **who** your client is? Thus far, communication from ORJ concerning this ambiguous. I know this question was posed to you previously in the email dated 07:47 am 5th Nov 2019 from Mr Patel. I know that on the 3rd Nov 2019 when George Busfield called me, you were also on the call. I know this because, in the recording of the follow-up call, we talk about George. When I mention George in the context of being your client, you did not attempt to refute my assertion.

Kind regards,
Jase.