

Railtrack Limited

Introduction

Until reaching financial difficulty in 2002, much of Britain's railway infrastructure was operated by Railtrack plc. The company was sold to Network Rail.

The removal of 'Railtrack' from the Companies House register allowed John Hein to register Railtrack Ltd as a company in Scotland, and so Railtrack Ltd was born in May 2003.

Those looking up the company would note that the Registered Office is that of an Edinburgh tenement and that the company has remained dormant since incorporation.

The rebirth of Railtrack has caused confused solicitors, debt collectors and private individuals to address correspondence to Railtrack Ltd, and in turn, to receive entertaining replies.

Only replies to correspondence are shown. The original letters are not reproduced, but the nature of the original letter is inferred.

The first one

Kenny R Walker
25 Saville Road
South Shore
BLACKPOOL
FY1 6JP

22nd of May 2003

Dear Sir,

We refer to a letter received today from your solicitors Thurman and Leaver regarding a claim against us.

We repudiate this claim in its entirety and look forward to seeing you in court.

As you will appreciate, dealing with correspondence of this nature is time consuming and has a cost for ourselves. Accordingly, any further correspondence regarding this matter from either yourself or any agent acting for you will be charged by us at the undernoted rates and the sending of any further correspondence to us will amount to an acceptance of these charges.:

Perusal of letter - £20.

Answer thereto - £20.

Yours sincerely,

H White
for Railtrack Limited

Singh and dance...

KPMG Corporate Recovery
1 Forest Gate
Brighton Road
Crawley
RH11 9PT

14th of October 2003

Dear Sirs,

BUDH SINGH PANWAR (IN BANRUPTCY)
READING COUNTY COURT NO 24 OF 2002

We refer to your letter of the 30th ult.

Budh Singh Panwar has never had a shareholding in this company.

Yours faithfully,

H de Whit
Shareholder Records Manager

Damp Squibb

David George Squibb
6 Sandbourne Road
WEYMOUTH
Dorset
DT3 6QG

21st of October 2003

Dear Sir,

THOMPSONS - SOLICITORS

We have recently received a letter from Thompsons who claim to be acting for you.

Thompsons have managed to get Railtrack Limited (a Private Limited Company incorporated in Scotland on 8th of May 2003 - two years after the date of your incident) confused with Railtrack PLC (a Public Limited Company incorporated in England and Wales on 28th of February 1994 and now, following re-registration as a Private Limited Company on 3rd February 2003, known as Network Rail Infrastructure Limited).

Quite honestly, we would suggest that you replace them with a competent firm of solicitors - preferably a firm which can also pen a literate letter.

We wish you luck with any legal action you may take and offer our sympathy over what we realise must have been a most distressing experience.

Yours faithfully,

J White
Office Manager

Pigeon fancier

Mrs Rita Littlewood
26 Underhill
Worsborough Bridge
Barnsley
S70 5DR

5th of March 2004

Dear Mrs Littlewood,

We have recently received intimation of a claim against us from your solicitors Raleys in connection with your slipping on some pigeon shite and doing yourself an injury.

From my knowledge of the area, I would have thought that anybody walking under a railway bridge in Barnsley would have been a bit more careful (especially a person of your age and life experience) but that really isn't relevant.

This company doesn't have any interest in any property in Barnsley. Although I did once have a pint with the late Dr Liam Lannigan who you may remember used to hold his surgeries (if one could call them that) in a local public house with the car parked on a yellow line outside. Nice chap - shame he took a header down the stairs in one of his rare moments of sobriety.

I'm afraid that your numpity bunch of ambulance chasing solicitors have been incompetent: they've written to the wrong company. They have managed to get Railtrack Limited (a Private Limited Company incorporated in Scotland on 8th of May 2003) confused with Railtrack PLC (a Public Limited Company incorporated in England and Wales on 28th of February 1994 and now, following re-registration as a Private Limited Company on 3rd February 2003, known as Network Rail Infrastructure Limited). It's a fairly elementary mistake to make and one that the Law Society would probably snigger at.

So, you aren't going to get a penny from us.

If you really want some free money from the bridge owners, I suggest you get yourself a decent firm of solicitors (if such a thing exists in Barnsley).

Yours sincerely,

J White
Secretary

Rates

G Bandy
Head of Financial Services
Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council
Colonnades House
Duke Street
DONCASTER
DN1 1ER

19th of June 2003

Dear Sir,

We refer to the Non-Domestic Rates Bills which you sent to us recently in respect of Property Reference Number: 0035800022002.

We do not owe you any money and will not pay you.

As you will appreciate, dealing with correspondence of this nature is time consuming and has a cost for ourselves. Accordingly, any further correspondence regarding this matter from either yourself or any agent acting for you will be charged by us at the undernoted rates and the sending of any further correspondence to us will amount to an acceptance of these charges.:

Perusal of letter - £20.

Answer thereto - £20.

Yours faithfully,

H White
for Railtrack Limited

Planning permission

Irena Spence & Co
68-70 Castle Street
Cambridge
CB3 0AJ

Dear Sirs,

LAND AT LONDON ROAD, FLETTON

We refer to your letter of the 19th inst.

Insofar as we have interest, if any, in the said land, we hereby state that we have no objection to the proposed development.

Yours faithfully,

J White
Secretary

Raleys, again

Mrs Rita Littlewood
26 Underhill
Worsbrough Bridge
Barnsley
S70 5DR

10th of March 2004

Dear Mrs Littlewood,

We were rather surprised, this morning, to receive a somewhat pompous and humourless letter from your solicitors, Raleys.

We were surprised because, in the light of our previous letter to you, we would have thought that you might have taken the opportunity to look elsewhere for legal representation.

We were not, however, surprised to see that Raleys still can't get things right in that they note that Network Rail was formerly Railtrack Ltd. The difference between a Limited Company and a PLC is something that is likely to be taught even in the first year Accountancy and Business Law course at the former Barnsley Polytechnic (if Barnsley ever ran to such an establishment). For a supposedly grown up firm of lawyers like Raleys to make such a mistake really says it all! Especially when they were in receipt of our letter to you which went into the position in exhaustive detail.

Raleys claim that our letter to you caused you "a great deal of distress". If this was occasioned by our language and style, then we unreservedly apologise. If it was occasioned by your discovering the quality of the legal firm acting for you, then that's hardly our fault and it is Raleys who owe you an apology.

We cannot stress too much that we have no argument with you. Like us, you are a totally innocent victim of manifest legal incompetence.

We would point out that we at Railtrack Limited have also been distressed by Raleys's actions in writing to us. When the original totally unwarranted thirty page intimation of claim was thrust through the letterflap by our postie, it landed with somewhat of a thud immediately behind Bad, our much loved office cat. As poor old Bad, who went blind a year ago, is suffering from end stage renal failure, we can't actually prove a causal link between the thud and what happened next. But we certainly don't blame the dear old puss for it and the letter has now completely dried out.

Then, consider the effect on the corporate sphincter muscle of Railtrack Limited when we discovered that Raleys's considered professional opinion was that we owed you an unspecified but doubtless shitload of money (especially when their fees were taken into consideration).

According to Raleys (if we are to rely on anything they say) you work as a cleaner. It is indeed unfortunate that you were not at our premises on The Day The Claim Landed as

your competent professional services would have proved most useful. Unlike those of Raleys.

We have no intention of replying directly to Raleys's unprofessional letters. It has always been our practice to deal directly with the organ grinder (if we may take the liberty of referring to you as such). However, if you are in contact again with Raleys, perhaps you could refer them to the answer in the case of Arkell v Pressdram. We trust that they will know what we mean and if they don't, they can always ask a more competent firm for advice.

In conclusion, as we don't expect to hear again from Raleys or your good self (in which case you won't hear from us), may we take this opportunity of wishing you a very happy 64th birthday next month.

Yours sincerely,

J White
Secretary

PS We think that the public house mentioned in our previous letter was called The Greyhound. But it was a long time ago and it may well have been turned into a trendy winebar by now.

PPS We enclose a photograph of Bad which we took this morning.



In Conciliatory Mood

Ms S Tiernan
Conciliator
Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service
North West Region
1st Floor
Commercial Union House
2-10 Albert Square
MANCHESTER
M60 8AD

25th of March 2004

Dear Ms Tiernan,

EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNAL CASE
Mr SM Kaye v Railtrack Ltd (Case Number 2900401/2004)

Thank you for your kind letter of the 19th inst and your offer to attempt conciliation in this case.

However, we doubt if you can help.

The main problem is that Mr Kaye's fuckwit solicitors are suing the wrong company. They have managed to get Railtrack Limited (a Private Limited Company incorporated in Scotland on 8th of May 2003) confused with Railtrack PLC (a Public Limited Company incorporated in England and Wales on 28th of February 1994 and now, following re-registration as a Private Limited Company on 3rd February 2003, known as Network Rail Infrastructure Limited).

Thompsons should really be au fait with the situation by now, having made the same mistake, last year, with a Mr Squibb from Weymouth.

Now, suing us is bad enough, but when our Company Secretary, Reverend Baxter, spoke to Mr Kaye on the phone the other day, Mr Kaye pointed out that he'd never worked for the former Railtrack PLC either.

It looks very much as if Mr Kaye's solicitors, Thompsons, have got hold of a copy of "The Ian Allan Book Of Railway Companies" and have randomly added companies listed therein to the action. We are not chuffed (or whatever it is that diesel or electric traction does nowadays)..

Mr Kaye is also underimpressed with Thompsons - he told our Rev Baxter that he is only using them because his Trades Union insists. Which doesn't hold out much hope for the future of Trades Unionism in Mr Blair's Britain, does it?

We'd assumed that Mr Kaye would have had a word with his solicitors by now and that they'd have got round to dropping us from the action. However, this appears not to have happened. God only knows what Rev Baxter is going to say to the Chair of the Tribunal if he has to get out of his bed before Noon and trail over to a hearing in some

distant part of the country. I certainly have no intention of being anywhere near and I would advise you to do likewise.

Yours in the Spirit of St Dominic (and Jarvis plc) "Kill them all for the Lord will know his own",

J White
Secretary

The Skeleton Argument

Mrs J Skelton
Damage Claims Officer
British Telecommunications plc
Repayment Works
TH10
Telephone House
Charter Square
SHEFFIELD
S1 1BA

20th of May 2004

Dear Mrs Skelton,

ALLEGED DAMAGE TO BT PLANT

We refer to your letter of the 17th inst (Ref TH10/HLCDJ7RR/HS/21).

We repudiate your claim in its entirety as not only are "Direct Work" not our sub-contractors but they have never carried out work on our behalf. If they are as clumsy as you claim, this is probably a good thing.

We note Section 4 of your damage report which claims that "Colin of Railtrack" admitted causing or being responsible for the damage. We have never employed a Colin, so it is not possible that a person of this name could have made any admission of liability on our behalf.

We did once think of employing a Colleen, but, although Fair, she turned out to be from Llanfairpwllgwyngyllgogerychwyrndrobwlantysiliogogoch (or it might have been Caerydd) and her ability to spell Scottish place names was as poor as yours. We can just about understand why you rendered "Edinburgh" as "Edinborough" being aware that there are a number of Yorkshire place names which end in this way and we suppose it is confusing for anybody who is unfamiliar with the name of the Capital City of Scotland. But "Mid Lothian" was somewhat of a novelty to us.

We note that BT intends to conduct this claim in accordance with the Pre-Litigation Protocol to Dispose of Damage to Network Claims. We have no intention of running up our telephone bill by faxing the number you quote in order to obtain a copy. Or, for that matter, clogging up our broadband connection. Or wasting our paper. But you may send us a copy if you like.

Yours sincerely,

J White
Secretary

Eye Off The Ball

Mrs Amanda Ball
Legal, Democratic & Development Services
Slough Borough Council
Town Hall
Bath Road
SLOUGH
Berkshire
SL1 3UQ

24th of April 2004

Dear Mrs Ball,

EDWARDS BUILDERS MERCHANTS, SLOUGH, BERKSHIRE. SL4 3NN

We write anent your letter of the 21st inst which was sent to Railtrack plc at this address and has been passed to us for attention.

You ask Rairtrack plc to state the nature of their interest in the above named property. Perhaps the view of Railtrack Limited will suffice? We find it as interesting as any other property in Stoke Poges Lane but marginally more so in that it would appear from the plan that there is a set of trailing points which lead straight into the subjects. We do hope that these are properly locked or scotched to avoid any possibility of a train setting back and entering the subjects inadvertently.

As to the interests of any other person known to us as having an interest in the subjects, we have made diligent enquiry around the office, but most people we have spoken to seem to be more interested in Swindon which is probably confirmed by the prevailing house prices. We are given to understand that the Supermarine Club there does a good pint but is best avoided on the second Saturday in August.

Please convey our compliments to the Liberal Group on the Council.

Yours sincerely,

J White
Secretary

Mrs Amanda Ball
Legal, Democratic & Development Services
Slough Borough Council
Town Hall
Bath Road
SLOUGH
Berkshire
SL1 3UQ

26th of May 2004

Dear Mrs Ball,

EDWARDS BUILDERS MERCHANTS, SLOUGH, BERKSHIRE. SL4 3NN

We write anent your letter of the 24th inst.

We refer to our letter of the 24th ult (copy enclosed) in which we state our interest in the property and to which we did not receive a reply.

We note that you claim that "This communication affects your property".

From this, we take it that you are stating that these Portakabins belong to us. Are we to assume that this is a present from Slough Borough Council? If so, could you please arrange for them to be delivered (free of charge to ourselves) to our offices in Edinburgh where they will be fumigated before use. Whilst not wishing to look a gift horse in the mouth, one can never be too careful about these things especially when one does not know exactly where in Berkshire the equine mouth has been.

As to any appeal against your enforcement notice, if you deliver the Portakabins up here, we won't rock the boat.

Yours sincerely,

J White
Secretary

PPS Did you ever find out if the points we mentioned were properly secured? It would be a shame if our new property came to grief before we had a chance to enjoy it.

PPS Could you please copy this correspondence to the Liberal Group (Cllrs Munkley, Stokes and Stockton) for information.

The Gasman Cometh...

The Occupier
45 Copthorne Road
Croxley Green
Rickmansworth
Hertfordshire
WD3 4AH

7th of May 2004

Dear Sir/Madam,

We understand that you live next door to Mark Clare who is a Director of British Gas Trading.

Recently, we received a letter from Anna Ugbowanko (a Customer Billing Representative employed by British Gas Trading Limited in Oxford) which was addressed to "New Occupier (Ref:373182), c/o Railtrack, 78 Montgomery Street, Edingburgh. EH7 5JA".

The letter referred to premises at 71 Commerce Street, Glasgow and asked us to make payment of £224.77 in respect of electricity supplied thereto. As we have no connection with this address, we don't intend to pay the bill.

And we don't think that you should either. Unless you really want to.

Perhaps you'd care to pop next door and tell Mr Clare this.

On the other hand, maybe your next door neighbour is another Mr Clare, in which case our writing to you is as relevant as Ms Ugbowanko writing to us in the first place.

Could you also ask Mr Clare to inform Ms Ogbowanko that Edinburgh has only one G and not as she rendered it. Ogbowanko is not a Scots name, so perhaps she has never had cause to write to Edinburgh before and is confusing it with somewhere else which does have two G's although we have been unable to find it on the map.

Yours faithfully,

J White
Secretary

PS We would have telephoned Ms Ugbowanko on the Freephone number provided in her letter - but this turned out to be a Lo-call number and, being a Scottish Company, we didn't wish to run up our telephone bill.

Crapita

Gordon Mark Hurst
Company Secretary
The Capita Group plc
The Manor House
Reading Road
Padworth Common
READING
Berkshire
RG7 4QG

15th of June 2004

Dear Sir,

INVOICE PAYMENTS

We enclose a copy of an undated letter sent to us by Capita Business Services Ltd (who seem to be acting as debt collectors for Mission Testing Europe Ltd) outlining desired methods of cheque and BACS payment.

As Railtrack Ltd has heretofore had no business relationship whatsoever with Mission Testing Europe Ltd, Capita Business Services Ltd or The Capita Group plc, we were somewhat surprised to receive this letter which addresses us as "Dear Customer".

On reflection, however, we soon realised that there was no reason to suppose that the computer systems and services which you have provided for your own internal use are any better than the overpriced crap you sell to the gullible.

We can assure you that, unlike our government, we have no intention of purchasing services from you.

If, on the other hand, we can advise you on how to clean your database so that your company can save on postage and stationery, please do not hesitate to get in touch with us.

Yours faithfully,

J White
Secretary

Gardner's Question Time

Samuel Gardner
91 Crondall Street
Moss Side
MANCHESTER
M14 4TZ

17th of July 2004

Dear Mr Gardner,

BROWN DUNNE & GRAY - SOLICITORS

We refer to a letter we have received from your solicitors intimating a claim for damages arising from a road accident occasioned by your 12'6" vehicle coming into contact with a railway overbridge signposted 13'.

You have our sympathy for your whiplash type injuries and we hope that the "Damage to any clothing caused by the accident" was not too extensive.

However, you aren't going to get any money from us or our insurers.

This is because your drongo solicitors have written to the wrong company. They have confused us with Railtrack PLC (company number 2904587) which changed its name on 3rd of February 2003 to Network Rail Infrastructure Limited.

Regrettably, this is not the first time that Brown Dunne & Gray have made this fairly elementary mistake. We enclose, for your information, our letter of 29th May 2004 to Mr Bakabadio, one of their other unfortunate clients.

Whilst we presume from your address that your first reaction to our letter might be to visit Brown Dunn & Gray's offices in Altrincham to sort them out, we would suggest that you merely find another firm of solicitors to represent you.

We wouldn't trust this shower of useless cuntpieces to make a cup of tea let alone represent our legal interests.

Yours sincerely,

J White
Secretary

The Cuntpieces Respond... Uselessly!

Vincent Gray
Partner
Brown, Dunne & Gray
Solicitors
Albert Buildings
1-3 Oxford Road
ALTRINCHAM
WA14 2DY

30th of August 2004

Dear Vincent Gray,

We refer to your letter of the 26th inst. anent your client Samuel Gardner and our correspondence with him dated 17th ult.

Frankly, we were surprised to see you describe Mr Gardner as your client rather than your former client - but it would seem that the language contained in our letter was too sophisticated for him to understand fully. Or you could just be fibbing.

We note that you ask that we "do not write to our client direct and in future refer all correspondence via ourselves".

Primo: We will address our correspondence as we consider appropriate.

Secundo: If we were to write to you instead of directly to your client, what assurances do we have that they would ever see any of our correspondence if it related to your incompetence? Let's face it, that is all we have ever had occasion to write to your clients about.

Tertio: As when we did write to you directly on the 5th of June 2004 (copy enclosed) concerning one of your other clients we did not receive the courtesy of a reply, what's the point?

We would remind you that the animals still await your remittance. Were you to get your hand into your trousers and send them some money, it would do your soul much good although, at this point, I don't think there is much you can do to salvage your firm's reputation.

Yours sincerely,

J White
Secretary

More Dependency

Mr Richard Marsden
Planning Inspectorate
3/06b Kite Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
BRISTOL
BS1 6PN

9th of July 2004

Dear Betty,

APP/J0350/C/04/1153015

We refer to the above numbered planning appeal in Slough in which MJ Edwards are the appellants.

This has been a most distressing experience for us as Slough Borough Council have been guilty of gross maladministration in that they appear to have totally ignored all our correspondence with them. We enclose copies of our letters to the Council and refer to them for their terms which are held to be repeated herein brevity causa.

We would support the appeal on the following grounds:

1. Slough is such a midden that even the most dilapidated Portakabin would improve the place.
2. The Local Plan for Slough (2004) is, at best, a load of unmitigated bollocks.
3. If the state of the Portakabins is considered a bit shabby, could Edwards not just paint them magnolia and they would then fade into the urban landscape. Alternatively, a shitty brown might be more appropriate and then they would be indistinguishable from the senior management of Slough's Development Control Section..

We would be pleased if you could formally acknowledge this correspondence which is more than Slough Borough Council can be bothered to do - bunch of unprofessional timeservers that they are. Could we also formally request you to send us a copy of the decision letter in due course because we don't want to find the Portakabins arriving here without any warning which is what might well happen if these scunners at the Council get a chance.

Yours sincerely,

J White
Secretary

PS If these are not in fact Portakabins, but some other inferior type of building, our support of the appeal still stands.

Ah, Bisto!

Beryl May Brennan
21 Sharon Close
Ashton Under Lyne
Tameside
OL7 0DW

17th of September 2004

Dear Ms Brennan,

We have recently received a letter from Davis Blank Furniss of 90 Deansgate, Manchester who purport to be acting on your behalf.

Firstly, let us express our sympathy over the broken right wrist and bruised thigh which they claim you sustained as a result of slipping "on some gravy type substance" outside the entrance to Manchester Picadilly Railway Station on the 20th ult.

However, please don't let our corporate grief at your broken body in any way let you think that you're even going to begin to get on the Gravy Train at our expense.

Firstly: Why didn't you look where you were going? As a half century old denizen of Tameside, you should have been well aware that the mean streets of Manchester are full of gravy type substances which should be avoided at all costs by careful pedestrians.

Secondly: As you do not appear to be French, we presume that you selected Davis Blank Furniss at random from the telephone directory. Not a good move as they have been so grossly incompetent that they've written to the wrong company. They have managed to get Railtrack Limited (a Private Limited Company incorporated in Scotland on 8th of May 2003) confused with Railtrack PLC (a Public Limited Company incorporated in England and Wales on 28th of February 1994 and now, following re-registration as a Private Limited Company on 3rd February 2003, known as Network Rail Infrastructure Limited). But it's probably yet another company which is now responsible for the mess which has been made of the once decent architecture of Picadilly Station

In conclusion, we're not paying you a bean. So, you will just have to collect the juices and thicken with a roux somewhere else.

Yours sincerely,

J White
Secretary

PS Have you ever considered that it might have been soup? One of our colleagues was in that grubby little place just up the road from Morgans only the other week and he says that he could well imagine confusion arising over the exact description of anything liquid they might have sold to unsuspecting members of the public.

Sent printed in RED...

Ms Pauline McGillivray
Enforcement Officer
Development & Regeneration Services
Glasgow City Council
229 George Street
GLASGOW
G1 1QU

6th of October 2004

Dear Madam,

PLANNING ENFORCEMENT NOTICE

We refer to your letter of the 23rd ult (Ref: DC/PMG/02/00605/EN and 04/00673/EN).

We thank you for the copy of a letter which was sent to your Chief Executive and note your comments that you "are unsure whether this letter has been sent from your offices, however, as it does not appear to be on official headed paper, there is dubiety over whether the letter is genuine".

Unlike your profligate council, we have no intention of running up a large print bill to produce "official headed paper". You are clearly not used to the disciplines of the private sector where we have to count every penny in order to maintain shareholder value.

We also wonder what the not inconsiderable number of supporters of the Rangers Football Club in Glasgow think of your choices of colour? Green and yellow is surely a somewhat insensitive and possibly sectarian choice.

Yours sincerely,

J White
Secretary

Goodbye, Sailor!

Russell G Epton
Sailors Return
Orby Road
Addlethorpe
Lincolnshire
PE24 4TR

6th of October 2004

Dear Sir,

We refer to your letter of the 23rd ult enquiring about your shareholding in Railtrack Limited and any compensation due.

We have made exhaustive enquiry and can find no trace of you having any shareholding in this company at your current address or your previous addresses at the Royal Naval College or 8 Mountbatten Court.

Accordingly, whilst we can well appreciate that you may not be very chuffed at this, we are unable to assist you further.

Yours sincerely,

J White
Secretary

Russell G Epton
Sailors Return
Orby Road
Addlethorpe
Lincolnshire
PE24 4TR

9th of October 2004

Dear Sir,

We refer to our letter of the 6th inst.

It has been pointed out that this may have been less than helpful to you and may have caused you a trouser soiling moment at the thought of a major part of your pension steaming off down the line.

But, it serves you right for buying up part of a national asset at what you no doubt thought was a knockdown price.

What has happened is that you have managed to get Railtrack Limited (a Private Limited Company incorporated in Scotland on 8th of May 2003) confused with Railtrack PLC (a Public Limited Company incorporated in England and Wales on 28th of February 1994 and now, following re-registration as a Private Limited Company on 3rd February 2003, known as Network Rail Infrastructure Limited).

For your information, the Registered Office of Network Rail Infrastructure Limited is 40 Melton Street, London. NW1 2EE.

We trust that you have learned two things from this experience:

1. It's worthwhile learning how to do a proper Company Search.
2. Greed has its own rewards!

Yours sincerely,

J White
Secretary

The Rat Responds...

Robert McLoughlin
8 Flint Street
Droylsden
Manchester
M43 7HA

13th of October 2004

Dear Sir,

We have just had a whingeing letter in from your Solicitors, Rowlands.

They complain that when they attempted to contact the telephone number on our letter to you of the 6th inst, "it appeared to be the speaking clock". We suppose that we should give them full marks for observation on that one.

They also moan that "We are not even vaguely amused by the antics of one of your employees". Although we would point out that the antics of our employees aren't generally entered into for the benefit of the legal profession, they do sound a po faced Victorian bunch, don't they?

They're also pretty useless. But not in the same class as Brown, Dunne and Gray of Altrincham.

Perhaps you could point out to them that we have no intention of forwarding any correspondence to our insurers and would stand by our previously stated esto defence to your claim under addition of the averment that, at the material time, we were not occupiers of the land condescended upon. Accordingly, we would expect to be assolzied from the conclusion of any Writ that might be presented against us.

They state that "Should this accident turn out to be the responsibility of Rail Track, we will reserve the right to refer to this correspondence concerning any questions which may arise with regard to our client's costs". For our part, we will be glad to exhibit this correspondence concerning any questions which might arise as to their competence as solicitors.

Yours faithfully,

J White
Secretary

PS We've just noticed that their letter is headed "Strictly Private & Confidential". We therefore enclose a copy in case they are trying to keep you in the dark.

Getting More Ratty

Robert McLoughlin
8 Flint Street
Droylsden
Manchester
M43 7HA

8th of November 2004

Dear Sir,

Sorry to bother you again, but we've just received yet another otiose letter from your ? Solicitors?, Rowlands. We have warned you already as to how useless they are, but you do seem to insist on using them despite our best endeavours.

You'd think that these doolies would have realised by now that they are not going to hear from us or our insurers. But, at what they're no doubt charging per letter, we can see why they continue to try it on.

We've made it abundantly clear in our letters to you the nature of the defence we will run if Rowlands are stupid enough to raise an action against us, but it looks as if your case is still being attended to by an office junior who can't see past their word processor.

Yours faithfully,

J White
Secretary

Back into her court...

Mrs Amanda Ball
Legal, Democratic & Development Services
Slough Borough Council
Town Hall
Bath Road
SLOUGH
Berkshire
SL1 3UQ

9th of October 2004

Dear Ms Ball,

EDWARDS BUILDERS MERCHANTS, SLOUGH, BERKSHIRE. SL4 3NN

We refer to your totally unsatisfactory letter of the 8th inst which states "that the enforcement notice served in connection with the above has been withdrawn, as previously advised".

It is still not clear to us if the Enforcement Notice has been withdrawn against the other parties originally named therein. We specifically asked you to confirm this in our letter of the 9th Aug. If, as a result of your failure to unambiguously state the position on request, a party or deemed party in a planning matter has been disadvantaged in any way, it might well be that a claim of maladministration could be pursued against your council which would have undesirable cost implications for Council Tax payers.

There are also a number of outstanding questions which we asked in our correspondence to which we have received no reply. For your information, these are generally to be found in the sentences punctuated with the following character: "?". If you were to consider it helpful, we could send you copies of these letters again with the character "¿" at the beginning of the relevant sentences in the Spanish manner.

We note your remark that "this brings all correspondence to a close" but find your optimism somewhat misplaced in the circumstances.

Yours sincerely,

J White
Secretary

Acid Drops

Robert McLoughlin
8 Flint Street
Droylsden
Manchester
M43 7HA

6th of October 2004

Dear Sir,

We have recently received a letter from Rowlands, a firm of Solicitors who claim to be acting for you.

They purport to be lodging a claim for "damages for personal injuries and losses arising out of a tripping accident".

Taking illegal drugs isn't big or clever and we don't see how we can be held responsible for your irresponsible actions whilst tripping.

Accordingly, we are repudiating this claim in its entirety. Esto, the land on which you allegedly had your accident does not belong to us.

Yours faithfully,

J White
Secretary

Throw it in

Joy Yoxall
145 Blenheim Road
BARNSELEY
S70 6AX

3rd of January 2005

Dear Ms Yoxall,

TOWELLS - SOLICITORS

We enclose a copy of our formal response to a letter which we received recently from the above named solicitors who claim to be acting on your behalf.

What is it with you people in Barnsley? Last year we had correspondence from another firm of solicitors, Raleys, anent Mrs Rita Littlewood of 26 Underhill, Worsbrough Bridge, who went on her arse on some pigeon shite under a railway bridge.

Now, it wasn't really her fault except in the general sense that one should look where one is going - and that we would suggest is probably what you should have been doing even at 8.10am at Sheffield Midland Station taxi rank where Towells tell us you took a purler on the tarmac ramp ex adverso the taxi rank.

And it wasn't her fault either that she chose to obtain representation from a bunch of tossers masquerading as solicitors (or possibly vice versa) as have you. Like the lamentable Raleys (who even had the nerve to moan at us about our perfectly reasonable response to Mrs Underhill) Towells have written to the wrong company. They have managed to get Railtrack Limited (a Private Limited Company incorporated in Scotland on 8th of May 2003) confused with Railtrack PLC (a Public Limited Company incorporated in England and Wales on 28th of February 1994 and now, following re-registration as a Private Limited Company on 3rd February 2003, known as Network Rail Infrastructure Limited).

Towells claim on their notepaper to be 'Regulated by the Law Society?'. Makes you wonder, doesn't it?

Yours sincerely,

J White
Secretary

Forgiving those who trespass against us...

Brethertons
Solicitors
16 Church Street
Rugby
CV21 3PW

14th of April 2005

Dear Sirs,

LIAM STUART NEIL

We refer to your letter of the 17th of February 2005 intimating a claim against us on behalf of the above named client and we apologise for the delay in replying.

We note your averment that your client was electrocuted after swinging his legs against the 25kV power line whilst he was on the ledge of a footbridge leading across the main Euston to Manchester railway line and that he subsequently fell into a coal train underneath.

We note that he has suffered very serious burns below the waist, a broken arm and a fractured skull, has had numerous operations and much time in hospital, that he will have to wear pressure dressings for a period of at least two years and undergo physiotherapy, and that he may be mentally affected by the accident and require the assistance of a psychologist.

We note your claim that we were negligent and in breach of a statutory duty of care to the public at large and in particular to your client. We repudiate this claim in its entirety.

You state that it was well known in the area that children played on the footbridge and claim that warning signs should have been erected and/or that the parapet should have been made higher or a cage should have been erected.

If it was so well known in the area that children played there, we would have thought that any prudent and caring parent would have instructed their children not to trespass on railway property. It would seem that Ms Gleston failed to do so. One can only hope that young Liam has received a salutary lesson on the dangers of railway trespass and will not seek to repeat the experience.

In passing, we should note that his interference with the 25kV power supply will undoubtedly have caused delay to trains and inconvenience to railway customers as a result. Whilst his landing on a railway customer's coal thereby converting it to slack will also not have been without cost.

In view of the fact that your client was only 13 at the time of the incident, it is unlikely that any further action will be taken against him either in respect of his criminal trespass or the damage caused by him to the railway infrastructure. He and his mother should consider him lucky to be alive and not be seeking to extract damages from those who are not responsible in any way for the predicament in which he finds himself.

Yours faithfully,

J White
Secretary

Contented in Ayr

Scott Brady
1 Content Avenue
AYR
KA8 0ET

23rd of April 2005

Dear Sir,

SCOTT BRADY v FIRST SCOTRAIL LIMITED AND ANOTHER

We have just received, without any previous correspondence, a Court of Session Citation from Thompsons, who purport to act as your solicitors.

They claim that, whilst walking to signal G656 to use the telephone there, you had a fall on the wooden ramp at the end of Kennishead Station because it was contaminated with dirt, oil, grease and slime. They further claim that you were injured as a result of your fall and that following the accident your wife "rendered necessary services" to you whilst you were "unable to render personal services at home".

May we start by observing that in our days on the track, the railway environment was frequently dirty, oily, greasy and slimy. It was something that you learned to live with and didn't moan your face off if you went on your arse whilst carrying out Rule 55. But, we suppose that days have changed and if your ambulance chasing solicitors can get you a few bob for you, then so be it. After all, with what the private sector is screwing out of what should still be a nationalised industry, your £20,000 is but a fart in the sweetie jar in which they all seem to have their fingers firmly wedged.

We were also considerably underimpressed by Thompsons feeling it necessary to make gratuitous reference to "services" rendered by your wife but no longer by yourself. They have given far too much information for a Saturday morning.

However, enough of this frivolity, let us get to the real point of our letter. We're sorry to have to inform you that you've chosen a spectacularly duff bunch of solicitors. They're suing the wrong company. We are a dormant company that has never traded and is not currently involved in the railway industry. They should probably have raised the action against Network Rail Limited (an English company) or even Network Rail Infrastructure Limited (formerly Railtrack plc). However, we're not going to do the research that you are no doubt going to be asked to grossly overpay them for (do make sure that you ask the Auditor of Court to tax their bill in due course).

It's not as if Thompsons haven't shown this sort of gross incompetence before, although it has never got to the stage of an actual Writ arriving on the doorstep. A sister company of ours in a similar position has at least twice had similar tedious correspondence with them.

Anyway, we've got rather better things to do than to waste our time trolling up to Parliament Square to enter appearance in the cause and pay a fee which we'll only have to eventually recover from you. Do you think that you could be good enough to have a quiet word with Thompsons and instruct them to drop us from the action and to confirm to

us, in writing, that this has been done? If they don't, and we do have to appear and wheech in a set of defences, then the Jennifer St Clair who issued the writ on your behalf is going to look a right doolie in front of their Lordships - of that you can be sure!

Yours faithfully,

J White
Secretary

PS We think it was a signalman at Strathbungo Junction (or it may have been another box on the GB&K - it was a Very Long Time Ago) who told us of the rule which, whilst never quite making it into the Rule Book, was observed to the letter by all railwaymen: "During fog and falling snow, into the bothy we shall go". Do you still have bothies or are they another of those things that the Health and Safety Nazis have taken away in your best interests?

Last Gasp

Raymond Williams
13 Feetham Court
Palmersville
Forest Hall
NE12 9QJ

9th of May 2005

Dear Sir,

We recently received a letter from a firm of solicitors, Mincoffs, who purport to act for you in connection with an Asbestosis claim against your former employers, British Rail. At first, we thought that this was some kind of joke in very poor taste in view of their name and your illness. However, having read the missive, it seems that this is not the case.

What is undoubtedly the case is that you have retained a lazy and/or incompetent solicitor.

Instead of doing some fairly elementary research to ascertain who is currently responsible for the residual employment liabilities of the British Railways Board, Ms Alison J Ainsley (who claims to be an Associate of Mincoffs - whatever that may mean) has merely dispatched a letter addressed to British Rail c/o ourselves.

We are a recently formed company which has never traded and wasn't even in existence when British Rail was running our railways and we've got rather better things to do with our valuable time than carrying out Ms Ainsley's work unpaid (or even monkeying about with it on a pro bono basis).

Perhaps you would care to so advise Ms Ainsley on her direct line: 0191-212 7716 or by E-mail: alisonainsley@mincoffs.co.uk

Whilst we wish you luck in your action, we would really suggest that you change your solicitors to a more reliable firm if you can find one on Tyneside.

Yours sincerely,

J White
Secretary

PS We note that Mincoffs are a Limited Liability Partnership. Isn't it amazing how the rogues and vagabonds who form so much of the legal profession are now permitted to escape the consequences of their actions by limiting their previously unlimited liability?

Inbreeding

Mrs Lorraine Chadwick
18 Ward Street
Crackenridge
Dewsbury
WF13 1RH

9th of May 2005

Dear Mrs Chadwick,

We have received a letter from John Barkers, a firm of solicitors from Grimsby, who intimate a claim against us in respect of an accident in which you were involved on 22nd March 2004 at the tunnel underneath the railway line on the footpath between Upper Peel Street and Crackenedge Lane.

They claim that you "had to walk down a set of steps which leads to a tunnel underneath the railway line where the Claimant fell 5-6 steps due the concrete being crumbled and in a poor state".

We note that your solicitors have sent a similar letter to Network Rail Limited. As we hereby repudiate your claim in its entirety, this is probably quite wise of them.

Yours sincerely,

J White
Secretary

PS What we would really like to know is: what on earth was a respectable middle aged housewife like yourself doing feeling steps in a public place in the first instance? It's the sort of thing that can easily get you locked up!

Hulled below the line...

Clerk to the Justices
Hull and Holderness Magistrates Court
The Law Courts
Market Place
Kingston upon Hull

22nd of June 2005

Dear Sir,

CASE 146

We refer to the above Summons issued by yourself.

If this case is not withdrawn prior to the Calling Date, our Company Secretary, Rev WA Baxter intends to attend Court.

If, for any reason, he does not arrive, we would be pleased if you could put the attached correspondence with the Pursuer before the Magistrate.

Yours sincerely,

J White
Secretary

Kim Ryley
Chief Executive
Kingston Upon Hull City Council
Guildhall
HULL
HU1 2AA

22nd of June 2005

Dear Sir,

We refer to a Summons issued by the Clerk to the Justices of Hull and Holderness Magistrates Court following a complaint by your lazy and incompetent Head of Revenues and Benefits, one Andrew Brown, FCCA, MAAT.

This has been issued in spite of a previous letter from ourselves explaining in the simple language appropriate to council officials that your council is clearly confusing Railtrack Limited (a Private Limited Company incorporated in Scotland on 8th of May 2003) with Railtrack PLC (a Public Limited Company incorporated in England and Wales on 28th of February 1994 and now, following re-registration as a Private Limited

Company on 3rd February 2003, known as Network Rail Infrastructure Limited).

We were heretofore completely unaware of the existence of the 319a Beverley Road, Hull condescended upon in the Summons and, furthermore, have never had any connection with Kingston Upon Hull that would give rise to any Non-Domestic Rate liability. In view of Mr Brown's manifest incompetence, it is probably worth sending an Office Junior out on their lunch hour to see if there is actually a door between 319 and 321 in the aforementioned road - we wouldn't be surprised if it proves to have never existed or to have fallen down when the last Humber Ferry steamed to the scrapyard or Hull Brewery brewed its final barrel of Mild (for which it used to be worth travelling from Scunthorpe).

We would seriously suggest that you get your overpaid boot up Mr Brown's posterior and get this one sorted out pronto. The alternative is our Company Secretary Rev WA Baxter BD DipEd CertAcc LLB (who is wiser and older than Mr Brown and undoubtedly better qualified) having to travel up from Nottingham at an un-Godly hour of the morning to compear before their Worships. We can assure you that his wrath will match the un-Godliness of the hour of his waking and Mr Brown, your goodself and the City of Kingston upon Hull Council will be publicly excoriated and exposed as being even more useless than the former cabin boy your City insists on electing as MP under the current First Past The Post system.

We look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Yours cordially,

J White
Secretary

Hull-o there!

Stephen Barrett
Corporate Director
Kingston Upon Hull City Council
Guildhall
HULL
HU1 2AA

22nd of July 2005

Dear Sir,

I refer to your letter of the 21st inst addressed to the Rev Baxter.

Firstly, let me point out that my letter of the 22nd ult to which you refer was not addressed to you but rather to Kim Ryley, the Chief Executive of your council.

You state that you consider it to contain "insulting and inappropriate language" and that "due to its contents and tone" you wish to receive the Rev Baxter's comments.

Having had a wide ranging, frank and open discussion with the Rev Baxter this morning, during which the terms, "wankers", "local authority jobsworthlesses", "useless cunts", "lazy idle incompetent pompous bastards" and "just what you expect from the public sector" were freely banded about in relation to yourselves, Rev Baxter has directed me to apologise for the inexcusable factual error in my letter in relation to the Right Honourable Member for Hull East.

Railtrack Limited fully accepts that the said failed chef was never employed as a cabin boy and apologises unreservedly to the council for the hurt to its corporate fundament and damage to its public image caused by this false and calumnious statement.

I do trust that you will feel able to accept this apology in the spirit in which it is intended.

Yours cordially,

J White
Secretary

cc: Kim Ryley - Chief Executive
Andy Brown - Head of Revenues and Benefits
Margaret Taylor - Town Clerk

Hull-o again...

Margaret Taylor LLB MA DipLG
Chief Legal Officer/Monitoring Officer
Kingston Upon Hull City Council
Guildhall
HULL
HU1 2AA

4th of August 2005

Dear Madam,

I refer to your letter of the 2nd inst. in which you state that my letter of the 22nd ult. has been referred to you as the Council's statutory Monitoring Officer.

I further note that you consider "the language and tone" to be "completely unacceptable" and that "the Council will not enter into further correspondence with you".

You may be pleased to learn that, by way of celebration, we have broken out the case of Cava that we had been keeping in the office to mark the occasion of the planned re-opening of the Stirling and Dunfermline Railway and will be taking the afternoon off to recover.

Yours cordially,

J White
Secretary

PS My attention was drawn to your Chief Executive's unwarranted encomium in a recent edition of the Sunday Times. It seems that his considerably overrated and vastly overpaid leaden hand at the top of the pile of administrative dead wood has done little good in cutting back waste in that a considerable number of senior wage slaves at your council have been involved in this correspondence when a competent junior typist should have been able to sort the matter out in five minutes.

PPS I see that you are also the Town Clerk. Perhaps you have so many roles in the Council that you don't have time to read your correspondence as carefully as your large remuneration would dictate. For the record, I am not the Company Secretary of this company. But then accuracy and attention to detail was never a strong point of your Council which is how we got into this correspondence in the first place.

cc: Kim Ryley - Chief Executive
Andy Brown - Head of Revenues and Benefits
Stephen Barrett - Corporate Director

To Hull (and back)

Margaret Taylor LLB MA DipLG
Chief Legal Officer/Monitoring Officer
Kingston Upon Hull City Council
Guildhall
HULL
HU1 2AA

8th of November 2005

Dear Madam,

In your somewhat tetchy letter of 2nd August 2005, you stated that "the Council will not enter into further correspondence with you".

We had hoped that that would mean that you'd circularised all staff with a memo to that effect. But it seems you have lacked the competence so to do despite all the education at public expense implied by the letters after your name - a process sadly wasted as the vessel has evidently sailed empty.

Which is, no doubt the reason that your Business Rates section have recently sent several enquiry forms to our premises addressed to "Railtrack plc".

I thought we had made it abundantly clear to Mowgli, your Chief Executive, the position regarding our company and the former Railtrack plc. But it doesn't seem to have sunk into the corporate cranium.

Perhaps you would be good enough to inform us what we have to do to get your whole senior management team to nip down to Hull Paragon and familiarise themselves with the difference between a railway environment and an Edinburgh tenement? Although there is no need for them to fully re-enact the sad events of 14th February 1927 - unless they really want to.

Now, this gay badinage over, could you lot get your fingers out and ensure that your staff know their Railtrack Limited from their Railtrack plc (even if not their arse from their elbow - miracles just don't happen in local government)? Or do I need to set Keith Toon, the Liberal Group Leader on you?

Do please do let me know what you choose.

Yours cordially,

J White
Secretary

Duty of Claire?

Paula McNally
Design & Development Administrator
Claire's Accessories UK Ltd
Unit 4
Bromford Gate
Bromford Lane
BIRMINGHAM
B24 8DW

28th of October 2005

Dear Ms McNally,

CLAIRE'S - 98A HIGH STREET, SOUTHEND

Thank you for the copy Electrical Installation Certificate, Fire Detection & Alarm System Inspection & Servicing Report and Emergency Lighting Periodic Inspection & Testing Certificate for these premises which you send to us on 3rd August.

Whilst they would seem to be in order, please note that we do not require these documents to be exhibited to us in future.

Yours sincerely,

J White
Secretary

Merry Xmas Mr Williamson

Malcolm Williamson BSc (Hons) MRICS
Regional Property Surveyor
Jewson Limited
PO Box 36
96 Leeds Road
HUDDERSFIELD
West Yorkshire
HD1 4RH

25th of December 2005

Dear Sir,

**LAND AND BUILDINGS IN THE FORMER GOODS YARD AT EDENBRIDGE TOWN
STATION**

We refer to your letter of the 23rd inst which is a counter notice to a notice by Spacia dated 15th December 2005 under the terms of the Lease dated 24th October 2004 between Erith Limited and Railtrack plc and subsequently assigned to Jewson Limited to the effect that you do not agree to the rent proposed and suggest that the rent should be maintained at the passing rent of £34,000 pa for the period 14th March 2006 to 14th March 2009.

We consider your suggestion entirely reasonable and suggest that you take the matter up with Spacia.

Yours faithfully,

J White
Secretary

Dell Boy

Tony Trotter
Planning and Enforcement Officer
Comhairle Earra Ghaidheal agus Bhoid
Blairvadach
Shandon
by HELENSBURGH
G84 8ND

3rd of January 2006

Dear Sir,

MOSS ROAD AUTOMATIC HALF BARRIER LEVEL CROSSING

Thank you for your letter of the 1st ult (Ref: 02/00144/ENFOTH).

As we understand the position, planning permission was granted to Scottish Water to erect or extend the Helensburgh Waste Water Treatment Works at Ardmore subject to an upgraded automatic level crossing being provided. However, the Waste Water Treatment Works has become operational without any upgrading of the level crossing.

Having taken legal advice, we must inform you that this is really a matter between Scottish Water and yourselves and we are under no obligation to carry out any work now or in the future.

It may be that the best way for you to proceed is by seeking the closure and demolition of the Helensburgh Waste Water Treatment Works but whilst this is, of course, a matter entirely for yourselves, we would point out that it might well inconvenience the good Burghers of Helensburgh and is unlikely to be approved of by your political masters.

Yours faithfully,

J White
Secretary

A friend for life

Donna Nelson
11 Linnet Avenue
Johnstone
Renfrewshire
PA5 0SN

11th of January 2006

Dear Ms Nelson,

FRIENDS OF PAT ROBERTSON

We have today received through the agency of a firm of Sheriff Officers, what purports to be an Earnings Arrestment Schedule under Section 47 of The Debtors (Scotland) Act 1987 in respect of Decree obtained by the Bank of Scotland at Paisley Sheriff Court on the 5th of October 2005 in the sum of £26,379.31 against yourself.

If and when we can be bothered, we will write to the Governor and Company of the Bank of Scotland pointing out to them that, not only have you never been employed by us but that we would never employ anybody who had the misfortune to owe money to such a wunch of useless bankers as themselves.

Incorporated, as they are, by Royal Charter, it seems that they don't understand much about Companies incorporated under the Companies Act, have identified the Wrong Company as being your employers, and have attempted to involve us, a Non Trading company, in order to collect the money they claim you owe.

As we have no duty towards you whatsoever, we have already showed their Form 30 to our colleagues and several casual passers by at the top of Leith Walk. We also fully intend to pass it round many pubs over the weekend (a few of them in Dublin) and may well post it on the Internet and publish it elsewhere as we see fit.

We would most strongly suggest that you get in touch with the Bank pointing out that, as a result of their total incompetence (if not wuck fittedness), your private affairs have been broadcast willynilly and that you will be seeking substantial damages.

We would suggest that these damages could reasonably be put at not less than £26,379.31.

We do hope that we have been of assistance to you.

Yours faithfully,

J White
Secretary

The Unkindest Cut?

Southern Electric
Customer Service Centre
PO Box 7507
PERTH
PH1 3NT

8th of May 2006

Dear Sirs,

SUPPLY TO:
RAILTRACK XT METER CABINET, UXBRIDGE ROAD, SOUTHALL, MIDDLESEX.
CUSTOMER ACCOUNT NO: 71996 18016
REFERENCE: TARA/CM007D

Thank you for your recent letter and we note that you say that if we don't pay for electricity used, you may have to cut off the supply.

We do not require this supply and, as far as we are concerned, you may disconnect it.

Yours faithfully,

J White
Secretary

A cheque arrives...

Cash Management Team
Sweet & Maxwell
c/o Holbrook House
4th Floor
14 Great Queen Street
LONDON
WC2B 5DF

18th of May 2006

Dear Sirs,

Ref: LC1/GEE 45/010166/JH
Customer Account Number: 6983510000

I refer to your letter of the 25th ult addressed to Accounts Payable at Network Rail which has been passed to me for attention.

We have no record of the transactions to which you refer and are hereby returning your repayment cheque for £44.95.

However, if you were to re-issue this cheque - making it payable to "Edinburgh Dog and Cat Home" and sending it to us at the above address - this would be much appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

J White
Secretary

Creaming themselves

John Telfer Richmond
9 Viewpark Road
BIGGAR
Lanarkshire
ML12 6BG

26th of April 2006

Dear Sir,

I am writing to you in your capacity as Director and Company Secretary of Food Process Engineering Limited.

This morning, our Mr Hein was extracted from his monthly bath by the feeble front door knocking of two Sheriff Officers from Rutherford & Macpherson who served a Schedule of Arrestment into his dripping hand in connection with the action you are currently raising against Fastline Limited for £260,000.

It seems that your solicitors, McGrigors, seem to think that Fastline Limited may be addebted to us in respect of such a sum and wish us to Fence and Arrest all goods, gear and everything in our hands aye and until your opponents make sufficient caution and surety or you raise an action of furthcoming against us (if I may summarise the position - the notice does go on a bit).

As was made clear to the nice Mr Sutherland and his burly "friend", you lot are on a hiding to nothing with this one.

For the avoidance of doubt, Network Rail (Scotland) Limited is a Dormant Company which has not traded and has no assets. Consequently, we have had no dealings whatsoever with Fastline Limited as the most perfunctory of research at Companies House should have made abundantly clear even to the trainee solicitor who seems to have been put on your case (I would not have thought that a qualified solicitor would have admitted to such an elementary mistake).

I do trust that you will be snipping the cost of this abortive arrestment from the no doubt inflated bill of your incompetent agents.

Yours sincerely,

J White
Secretary

PS If Fastline Limited do, for any reason, send us any money, we'll leave it in the disused telephone kiosk in the front garden from whence you are free to collect it at any time of day or night. As you will appreciate, such storage will be entirely at your own risk and we cannot be responsible for unauthorised uplift by marauding Sheriff Officers or the local ASBOids.

Electrification

Bob Blackwell
Quality Manager
Eaton Electric Limited
Reddings Lane
Birmingham
B11 EZ

30th of May 2006

Dear Mr Blackwell,

PRODUCT SAFETY NOTIFICATION ON 160A & 200/250A FCS SWITCHES/FUSE SWITCHES MANUFACTURED PRIOR TO 1ST JANUARY 1996

We acknowledge your undated letter addressed to Intercity plc c/o ourselves anent the above mentioned electrical equipment which you state was supplied as part of a project at Bristol Temple Meads in 1994.

We note that this equipment, in the opinion of your company, poses a "risk of severe personal injury" as the switches may remain "live" when in the "off" position.

We also note that, even though you have supplied duff equipment which you state should be "replaced as soon as possible" you "will not be accepting responsibility for any direct or indirect costs related to the replacement of these switches".

We are not aware of having purchased any of your equipment in the past, but we can assure you that we will not be purchasing anything manufactured by your company in the future.

As to Intercity plc, that is a matter for them and you should write to them directly instead of attempting to use us as your unpaid messenger boys.

We feel we must put it on record that if we were manufacturers of electrical equipment which subsequently turned out to be defective, we would not be sending out speculative letters of the sort sent out by yourselves. Instead, we would be hammering at the door of Bristol Temple Meads and informing the maintenance staff there not to touch these lethal switches.

But then, you're not actually admitting any liability and dead electricians tell no tales. So you probably think you're being big and clever.

In our opinion, your company is a disgrace to the electrical manufacturing industry.

Yours shocked,

J White
Secretary

Bailiffs are Vulcans too...

Mr Tarplett
Rundle & Co Ltd
Certificated Bailiffs
The Globe Centre
St James' Square
Accrington
Lancashire
BB5 0RE

15th of September 2006

Dear Sir,

REF: 238570
CLIENT REF: 10000009549X

We refer to correspondence sent by you in March this year addressed to Railtrack plc.

We had intended to reply at that time as the tone seemed most urgent in your desire to recover an alleged outstanding debt of £1,432.92 on behalf of Medway Council. However, it is only now that we are able to give your letters the attention they deserve.

You say that you intend to (or have attempted to) visit Railtrack plc's premises with what is variously described as "a removal van and auctioneers", "a removal crew" and "transportation". It's a good thing that you didn't show up at 78 Montgomery Street as it is not and never has been one of Railtrack plc's premises and, in any case, there would be little point in you so doing unless you could add being a Sheriff Officer to your socially useful skills. We would query the need for more than one auctioneer for a debt of this size although we can see that one of Universal Studios's "Transporters" might have its uses to get you back to Lancashire before the pubs close.

If you are currently holding any goods which you have seized from Railtrack plc, it may be that we would be willing to purchase these from you by Private Treaty - no doubt you will send us a catalogue in due course.

We would also be interested to know if you ever did recover the full sum adduced to be owing to your client. It seems grossly irresponsible for a newly re-nationalised company not to pay its bills timeously. It's the sort of thing that gets Public Limited Liability Companies a bad name and the resultant ordure tends to spread onto Private Limited Liability Companies like ourselves.

If you or Mr Grant Vaughan, your Removal Bailiff in Charge, are ever passing this way, please do feel free to drop in for a chat and cup of tea although we're afraid that our stock of British Rail cheese sandwiches is sadly exhausted.

Yours faithfully,

J White
Secretary

Petty Sessions again...

Justices Clerk for the Inner London Area
Lambeth & Southwark Petty Sessional Area
Camberwell Green Magistrates Court
15 D'Eynsford Road
LONDON
SE5 7EB

14th of February 2007

Dear Sir/Madam,

SUMMONS 22261/33839/60

We refer to the above summons and to Summons 4142/14385/48 which would appear to relate to the same premises.

We FAXed you on 15th September 2006 (copy appended) in connection with the second summons and requested you to put information in front of the Magistrates dealing with the case. Unfortunately, either you failed to do so or the Magistrates concerned were too lazy or incompetent to be bothered with reading the file before granting Decree in favour of the Pursuers (or whatever you lot call it South of the Border).

This has merely confirmed our view of the English system of justice - a Scottish Sheriff would have managed at very least to read the correspondence and would, most probably have understood it (or have had it explained to them by the Clerk of Court). We'd be surprised to learn that your lot have progressed much beyond Janet and John although they do seem to be fairly adroit at wielding the rubber stamp from the John Bull Printing Kit (or maybe they aren't even trusted with that and you have an office junior in charge of stamp and inkpad?).

As a result of Decree being granted as craved, Southwark Council seem to think that it's worth winding up this company. We can assure you and them that it isn't and that they're on a hiding to nothing. But it would have been nice if you'd put them out of their misery in the first place. And we hate to think what it has done to our credit rating if we ever wanted to buy a box of matches and a gallon of paraffin on tick (although we should state, for the record, that we currently have no intention of so doing).

Now, here we are again. If we were to send our Company Secretary, the Reverend WA Baxter BD LLB CertACC CertIT SCE G6SRZ, down to the Court to tell the Magistrates what a nedulous shower the London Borough of Southwark are (and most probably to murmur the Magistrates at the same time), we are aware that we wouldn't be able to recover his expenses and he'd moan for at least the next fortnight at the earliness of the hour. Similarly, if we were to engage a Solicitor, that would be Railtrack Limited's entire budget for the next ten years down the pan.

Enough of this frivolity. We trust you can manage to arouse your Bench enough to get into their thick crania that Railtrack Limited has never had any liability for National Non-Domestic Rates within their jurisdiction and that accordingly, we would respectfully Crave the Court that Decree of Absolvitor with expenses is the appropriate action for them to

take. At the very least, a Sist for Negotiation would be nice. If you don't understand these terms of art, no doubt the Sheriff Clerk of any Sheriffdom in Scotland would be prepared to explain. Or have a word with Derry Irvine (or, as he likes to call himself these days, Baron Irvine of Lairg - but we can well remember what he was called at school although it would be unkind for us to vouchsafe these details to his former lackeys). We understand that he can still understand Scots notwithstanding the fact that he appears to have lost the ability to speak it.

Yours faithfully,

J White
Secretary

PS We trust that you do realise that public funds are at stake?

I burned my foot on that loco at Rothesay Dock in 1975.... but no need to give him that much information!

David Thompson
Manager of the Court Funds Office & Official Solicitor and Public Trustee
22 Kingsway
London
WC2B 6LE

10th of May 2007

Dear Sir,

UNCLAIMED BALANCE: THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY FOR WALES RE: THE A/C OF THE REPUTED OWNER RAILTRACK PLC IN RESPECT OF DOLWYDDLEAN IN THE COUNTY OF GWYNEDD AND COLOURED PINK AND BLUE ON THE PLAN AND NUMBERED PLOT 6 6B & 6C

We write to you in connection with what we believe could be an attempted fraud involving your Office.

We have recently received a letter purporting to be signed by Walter Otim who claims to be employed in the Unclaimed Balances section of the Court Funds Office. We are most concerned that this may turn out to be what is known as a "419 Fraud" (although what this has to do with J.F. Mcintosh's fine blue Caledonian Railway Class 439 4-4-0T locomotive which bears its number somewhat escapes us).

In the letter, Mr Otim suggests that we should apply for an unclaimed balance of £4,036.67 which appears to be owed to Railtrack plc in respect of a compulsory purchase order.

Although Mr Otim makes no demand for payment to him of a percentage in advance (which we are led to understand is a feature of these 419 frauds), we do not think that acting on his suggestion would be legal (or, for that matter, moral) as we have no connection whatsoever (apart from the vague similarity of our name) with Railtrack PLC (company number 2904587) which changed its name on 3rd of February 2003 to Network Rail Infrastructure Limited.

If, on the other hand, you can think of any way in which we can get our hands on the dosh without finishing up in gaol, we would consider splitting it with you and cutting Mr Otim out of the equation altogether. Perhaps you would care to discuss the matter further over a £5 Tapas Lunch (includes soft drink, half pint of Deuchars IPA or glass of white wine) at Joe and David's excellent Sala Café Bar which is situated above the Edinburgh LGBT Centre? We would be happy to pick up the tab and you should feel free to invite your wife, civil partner or significant other (although please note that only Guide Dogs are permitted).

We look forward to receiving your comments in due course.

Yours sincerely,

J White
Secretary

PS We were interested to learn from your website that "The Court Funds Office was formally part of Her Majesty's Court Service". Could you please advise us what we should call it if we get to know you on a more intimate basis?

Not Quite The Hole Truth

P Davies
96 Park Hill
Moseley
BIRMINGHAM
B13 8DS

11th of July 2007

Dear Sir,

SECTION 50 APPLICATION

We refer to your letter of the 30th ult. asking us to provide information on any utilities or apparatus which may be present for the above address.

Unfortunately, the plan which you have so kindly provided is stated in a mixture of Imperial and Metric units and our engineers can make neither head nor tail of it.

Perhaps you would care to re-submit it in Imperial measure and our engineers will take another look at it.

In the meantime, we are unable to say one way or another and we would advise you to dig at your own risk in case you fall into a tunnel.

Yours faithfully,

J White
Secretary

Thornton Junction?

Thorntons
Solicitors
53 East High Street
FORFAR
DD8 2EL

11th of July 2007

Dear Sirs,

ZURICH ASSURANCE LTD
LEASE OF CONVEYOR BELT THROUGH U/B128, GOWRIE QUARRY, PERTSHIRE

Thank you for your letter of the 1st ult. giving notice of your client's wish to terminate an agreement between themselves and Railtrack plc in respect of the above conveyor belt.

We are sorry to hear that the quarry is worked out and that Cemex UK Materials Limited expect to complete the extraction of the consented reserves of sand and gravel by September/October 2007.

Could you please ensure that the conveyor belt is washed and returned to its owners in good condition and the original packaging at the end of the period of lease?

Yours faithfully,

J White
Secretary

More skite on arse problems...

Mrs Evelyn Aspin
Newlands
21 Greengate Lane
KNARESBOROUGH
HG5 9EW

10th of January 2008

Dear Madam,

ONE ARCH RAILWAY TUNNEL IN HARROGATE (PEDESTRIAN)

Thank you for your letter of the 9th inst addressed to our Managing Director in which you narrate that you recently slipped on ice in the entrance of the above named tunnel. We are sorry to hear that you resultantly spent several hours in Casualty and had to have several stitches in your face. We must admit that we dropped a few ourselves when we read your letter.

You claim that the ice was caused by leaking water which drips on the pavement and freezes overnight when the temperature drops to freezing. We would agree that this is most likely the cause of ice formation in the absence of credible evidence of the deliberate and malicious application of water and low temperature to the ground by party or parties unknown.

You ask what steps our company will take to ensure this does not happen again and also to claim damages for your injury to both your clothing and yourself as well as the time you have had to take off work.

If we were to take any steps we would certainly ensure that they were a lot more careful than the ones you took on 14th December. For goodness sake, woman, it was a freezing day from all accounts - couldn't you watch where you were going? Yorkshire is cold - maybe not as cold as Scotland - but still North of Watford - so you should (as a former Prime Minister would put it) have not inconsiderable experience of temperatures not exceeding 273.15 degrees Kelvin.

We hereby refute your claim in its entirety and suggest that, in future, you take responsibility for your own footlooseness and be more fancy free..

Yours faithfully,

J White
Secretary

PS Raleys, a firm of Solicitors elsewhere in Yorkshire, might, given half a chance, try to argue that an admixture of dihydrogen monoxide and pigeon excrement had a freezing temperature significantly different to that of dihydrogen monoxide simpliciter, but we are glad to see that you have wisely not attempted so to do. Or it may be that underbridge pigeon problems are largely confined to the Barnsley area. Please feel free to let us know what you think.

Green Ink!

Dwane Ahearn
President, Governor and project Manager
Dwayne's World, Dwayne's Gardens, Dwayne's Lanes and Milton Lane
111 King Street
Southsea
PORTSMOUTH
PO5 4EG

24th of January 2008

Dear Sir,

Thank you for your recent package containing photocopies of the front cover of The Portsmouth News for Tue Sep 14th 1993 and Fri Oct 2nd 1999 both of which seem to carry articles pertaining to a proposed soccer stadium along with page one of what appears to be some sort of Internet guide to Soccer stadia.

As there was no covering letter (apart from a compliments slip which boasts of what appear to be your gardening achievements - "World Champion of Gardening" - Working on the lane from 1990 to 2007 - Achievements: 30 medals, 30 trophies, 30 letters on achievements - etc) we are at a total loss as to what you wish us to do with this material.

No doubt you will let us know in due course.

Yours faithfully,

H White
Secretary

