

**Subject:** Re: Your client (further clarification required please) / GDPR SAR / SRA Ref: CDT/1297395-2020 / ICO [Ref. RFA0926086]

**From:** Jason Earl <jaseearl@googlemail.com>

**Date:** 20/01/2021, 03:50

**To:** Patrick Tedstone <Patrick.Tedstone@orj.co.uk>, Jason Earl <jaseearl@googlemail.com>

**CC:** "casework@ico.org.uk" <casework@ico.org.uk>, Sharon.Rust@sra.org.uk

Patrick,

I've copied in the SRA & ICO, so they are aware you still ignore my requests.

Do not make further deceptive intimidations towards me. No court would be in a position to enforce any order against me as you propose. As you were intent on haranguing me over what a judge would think of my alleged actions, I can only presume a judge would probably laugh at you for requesting such order after not following through on my GDPR DSAR's. If you don't like my repeated emails, may I suggest you try acting on the original request, instead of lecturing me about my sleep patterns?

I have asked many times, but you still have not provided the phone you recorded between us in Nov 2019. I requested it via GDPR as my voice is unequivocally personally identifiable information. It is now a full year after the deadline.

Preceding this call, in the email dated 11th Oct 2019, ORJ claimed: "our client is the major shareholder of The JET Group Limited". At that time, Companies House it indicates that I was the sole director and shareholder.

While you have failed in your duties in providing a copy of this phone call, I know the SRA have a copy of this call. There is no denying that in this call you gaslighted me into surrendering various access codes including those for The JET Group Limited. There is no ambiguity here because your client had the access codes for the sister company, The JET Group Services Limited when they tried to place it into administration questionably; despite HMRC petitioning the court for a wind-up order.

As it has been a while, can I also remind you I requested last Aug that ORJ proves that its client had a stakeholding in The JET Group Limited. You have asserted in your previous email the dispute still exists. If this were to be accurate, then it is not unreasonable to request evidence. Such transfer of ownership would need documentation signed by me. As signatures are personally identifiable, I placed a second GDPR request.

You have failed to respond now to both GDPR requests. One can only conclude a failure to provide evidence and lack of apology illustrates the brazen attempt by ORJ of deliberate misrepresentation.

You saw my requests. You were belligerent enough to try and silence me by improperly suggesting police involvement, falsely implying I threatened your family. I previously pointed out to you, either you know such dishonest threats are an abuse of power, or you are a moron with little understanding of the law. Either way, your cute threats will not scare me.

As you suggested police reports got raised, please provide me with a crime reference number.

In the disputed Nov 2019 call you recorded, you taunted me over my apparent lack of legal representation, while gloating over your senior position at ORJ. These repeated abuses of power underline the reason why The Sword of Damocles now hangs above you.

Mr Tedstone, despite your gloating, it now appears that you seem to be a pathetic excuse for a solicitor. If there is any redemption for you, please do what I requested. Provide me with:

- The recorded phone call from Nov 2019.
- Proof of ownership that your client had ownership of The JET Group Limited.
- A crime reference number for police so I engage with them.
- A formal apology from you, as requested from my email dated 3rd Aug 2020.

Please do not make out there is a case that prohibits you from providing the above. We all know this is not true. Action would have been taken by now if the claim was valid. It is evident your client there was no intention of going to court because you can't even prove their ownership of The JET Group Limited. ORJ's actions are merely a feeble attempt to blackmail me into surrendering access codes to further your client's criminal agenda.

Your client has failed to pay the £12'800 disputed. You and your client incited these false claims against me, so to state I am the vexatious party is frankly ludicrous.

Regards,  
Jase

On 06/10/2020 08:40, Patrick Tedstone wrote:

Mr. Earl

It is simply inexcusable for you to write to all these people at 5 in the morning. This email precedes emails sent by you to me and many people in my firm at midnight and in the early hours of the morning. I think it's clear that your motives are vexatious.

I will take steps to see to it that your emails are blocked, to protect my staff.

You are not my client. On our instructions (which you may or may not oppose, but which seem eminently reasonable) your conduct was not honest or candid. The dispute between you and our clients remains.

Having repeatedly told you that neither this firm or its staff or I should be asked to tolerate your behaviour it has endured. I don't think any court will countenance such conduct in if it comes to it I shall seek an order to regularise the position.

Patrick Tedstone

**Patrick Tedstone**  
Senior Partner

**Tel:** (Stafford) 01785 223440  
**Tel:** (B'ham) 0121 481 2545  
**Direct Dial:** 01785 275353  
**Mobile:** 07740 593240

**ORJ Solicitors LLP:**  
Queensville House | Stafford | ST17 4NL  
One Victoria Square | Birmingham | B1 1BD  
**Email:** patrick.tedstone@orj.co.uk



**Disclaimer:** This email and its attachments may be confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. Any views or opinions expressed are solely for those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of ORJ Solicitors LLP. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you must take no action based upon it nor must you copy or show it to anyone. Please contact the sender if you believe you have received this email in error. We use the word 'partner' to refer to a member of the LLP, or an employee or consultant with equivalent standing and qualifications. A list of the Members of the LLP is displayed at the Registered Address: Queensville House, Stafford ST17 4NL. ORJ Solicitors LLP is registered in England and Wales as a Limited Liability Partnership Registered No. OC310561. Authorised and Regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority. SRA Number 408913 Registered office above. To see the SRA website [click here](#).

**From:** Jason Earl <[jaseearl@googlemail.com](mailto:jaseearl@googlemail.com)>

**Sent:** 06 October 2020 05:36

**To:** Patrick Tedstone <[Patrick.Tedstone@orj.co.uk](mailto:Patrick.Tedstone@orj.co.uk)>

**Cc:** [casework@ico.org.uk](mailto:casework@ico.org.uk); Harvinder Thandi <[Harvinder.Thandi@sra.org.uk](mailto:Harvinder.Thandi@sra.org.uk)>;

[staffordboroughpolice@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk](mailto:staffordboroughpolice@staffordshire.pnn.police.uk); Witney Tully <[witney.tully@orj.co.uk](mailto:witney.tully@orj.co.uk)>; Deborah

Turner <[Deborah.Turner@orj.co.uk](mailto:Deborah.Turner@orj.co.uk)>; Mike Smyth <[Mike.Smyth@orj.co.uk](mailto:Mike.Smyth@orj.co.uk)>; Lorraine Smith

<[Lorraine.Smith@orj.co.uk](mailto:Lorraine.Smith@orj.co.uk)>; Lesley White <[Lesley.White@orj.co.uk](mailto:Lesley.White@orj.co.uk)>

**Subject:** Re: Your client (further clarification required please) / GDPR SAR / SRA Ref: CDT/1297395-2020 / ICO [Ref. RFA0926086]

Patrick,

I will not be intimidated or fooled by your threats of police action. Your handling of the situation has turned you into a Court Jester. However, I'm sure your activities fail to entertain the regulators and the police. I have previously made it clear you should know the police are there to "keep the peace", and therefore to thuggishly suggest they are there to panda to your personal whims is an abuse of power.

As previously stated, ORJ stupidly claimed your client owned The JET Group Limited from the email dated 11th Oct 2019. You have not shown any evidence of this, given you have ignored my second GDPR request. It was evident at the time I was the sole director/shareholder. I have stated if your client held any claim to this company, then paperwork would need to exist showing assignment from myself. Such paperwork would require my signature, which is a personally identifiable piece of information. My GDPR SAR dated 27th Aug 2020 outlined this. You replied to this email, but have failed once again to provide a satisfactory reply by the required deadline. **I fail to understand under what authority you or your client held back in Nov 2019 to intimidate me on a recorded phone call? You provided no evidence of ownership. Therefore, I have come to the conclusion the key objective of your phone call last Nov was to intimidate me. Something you have no authority to do.**

It means that there are now two occasions you have flouted my GDPR requests. You should not be surprised to learn this is now why you now face an investigation by another regulator, the ICO. I believe Ms Ceri Hall from the ICO will question you over the matter in the not too distant future. It is despite several matters currently investigated by the SRA. I have CC'ed both regulators again such that they are privy to your use of unwarranted police threats in your email below to prevent me from my lawful right to defend myself from you and your client.

As you have made out on record that I threatened your family as the justification of contacting the police, I thought I would save you the hassle of reaching out to the police. Therefore, I also have CC'ed in Staffordshire Police for further transparency. As previously stated, I'm willing for the police to take up the issue should they feel it is within their remit. They can reach out to me on this email, and I will be happy to cooperate with them. I am confident this will not happen as I have never

communicated with any member of your family. Therefore your statement is a barefaced dishonest lie, something you can not prove to the regulators or the police. Maybe the police would like to investigate the actions of your client, Mr Busfield, who's activities I strongly believe fall under the realm of police investigatory powers?

As you can not justify the grounds in which your company initially threatened me, or comply with my GDPR SAR's, I would very much like to see the written apology I requested in my email dated 3rd Aug 2020. It should outline to me and the regulators the mistakes made and how you, as the senior partner of ORJ, will put measures in place to prevent these misjudgements happening in future.

You are now showing contempt for me, and the regulators in front of your staff. As you have not disclosed the recording of the phone call to me, maybe you would like to share it with your team who are witness to this email? I do recall you briefly gloating on that call how many staff leave your firm due to disagreements with your conduct. I can finally understand and only sympathise with those staff who have sought work elsewhere, such as Mr Peck.

Instead of arguing, please provide the material I have requested. You have no excuse.

Many thanks,  
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](mailto: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 11<sup>th</sup> 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.