



Address: The Internet www.regulatorwatch.co.uk

Telephone:

Email: complaints@regulatorwatch.co.uk

Your ref: LC/jb

Our ref: dorksunited/anothersucker/calleja/plaskitt/completetwats

Simons Muirhead and Burton
8 Firth Street
Soho
London
W1D 3JB

26th August 2010

Dear Sirs

Re: Elizabeth Calleja

We act on behalf of the 'entity' Regulator Watch who is presently unable to respond directly to any matters regarding the website www.regulatorwatch.co.uk.

We are in possession of your letter to Webfusion dated 18th August 2010 regarding Regulator Watch, a web based blog.

We represent the owners of Regulator Watch and you are advised to forward any further correspondence directly to complaints@regulatorwatch.co.uk. They will be happy to receive any correspondence directly, which to date you and your client Calleja have failed to contact directly, which is disappointing and unfortunate in terms of legal protocols governing civil actions/disputes, of which you will be fully aware. It is also of concern that you did not contact Pixelmakers prior to your correspondence with Webfusion.

Indeed you rather aggressively and RECKLESSLY apply threats which you knowingly you must at least suspect to have possibly no merit or indeed likelihood of success in the High Court, or indeed in any criminal matter in either the Magistrates or Crown Court.

Please desist from such further alleged threats to such avenues of recourse unless you can very seriously and only then with very substantial evidence, substantiate such a threat as set out in your letter of the above mentioned date.

We will remind you that **Mrs Calleja has been arrested and is on conditional police bail pending further enquiries regarding harassment**. This is however unrelated to Regulator Watch but I trust you will appreciate the concern that your client's complaints might be that she '**protests too greatly.**'

Furthermore we are advised that your client has made various police complaints about Regulator Watch which it has been deemed by those authorities to have no merit and would therefore never amount to **your assertion of harassment**, or any other criminal complaint. She has likewise made complaints to the General Social Care Council (GSCC) based on the assumed identity of the Blog authors/contributors and similarly to the Information Commissioners Office (ICO), both of whom dismiss her concerns. As such any infringement of her (Mrs Calleja) "statutory data rights and privacy rights" is without any substance whatsoever.

However, we are instructed to take an independent overview of your client's complaint and in due course we will revert to you.

It has been agreed with Webfusion and Pixelmakers as follows:

- In the interim Regulator Watch will be reinstated but the alleged offending paragraphs (set out in your letter) will be password protected until we review matters; Pixelmakers will retain the password and not release the same until satisfied that our review is complete and reasonable;
- Any relevant amendments/deletions will be made, in consequence of such review;
- A revision and any amendments made to the Regulator Watch "Terms" (guidance to contributors) to enforce the importance of and compliance with reasonable comments within the blog.

We are however instructed to ensure that in our review there is no curtailing of free speech in compliance with the relevant UK and European laws, freedom of the press, acting in the public interest, the reporting of facts and reasonable defence in expressing opinion.

Furthermore, Regulator Watch does not fetter the opinions of others and your client is always free to publish her own views via this blog – she has never done so. She has however been very willing to publish (as Mrs "A" & Mrs "C" and numerous other avatars) either directly or via/with her former MP, Plaskitt, numerous press reports based on her, it is sincerely believed (and we accept perverse) unique analysis.

The rest of the world, with considerable evidence in substance (including signed statements), regard her as without merit, whatsoever, and is regarded as vexatious. As such the further defence in civil proceedings of no loss of professional/personal

standing will be tested in our audit. In fact your client is it seems is 'despised' widespread, and as such it would be impossible, it is alleged, to defame her as she has no reputation to defend.

As such your threats and assertions have, at this point subject to further review, initially it appears, to have no merit.

We will revert to you in due course.

In the interim we ask that you refrain from further contact with Webfusion or Pixelmakers and direct any further correspondence to complaints@regulatorwatch.co.uk. We are authorised to represent Regulator Watch in this regard.

Be advised.

Yours faithfully,

Salty Dog