

Mr Richard Goodbody  
TV Licensing  
Barton House  
Bond Street  
Bristol BS98 1TL

Dear Mr Goodbody

I wish to state that I object strongly to being harassed in my own home and the implication that I am one of those, quote "small significant minority" who require a search of their homes in order to satisfy your organisation that they are not lying to you and are not, in fact, breaking the law.

I was sure that in cases where you suspected people of breaking the law you would use your very sophisticated, accurate and highly publicised detection equipment to avoid troubling those who are not. I can see that this is not the case and that you not only intend to continue to send insulting and accusatory letters but also intend to disturb me in my home with unnecessary visits.

In your About TV Licensing document Chapter 1 Section 2 states:

If one of our Visiting Officers calls at your home they will:

- Stop the enquiry if asked to leave

The employee/contractor/agent who visited me 23 January 2007 did not leave when asked. I asked him to leave (politely) immediately he identified that he was with TV Licensing, but had to ask six or seven times in an increasingly insistent manner before he eventually got the message.

It is for these reasons that I now formally withdraw any implied right of access to my property to yourselves, your employees and any agents acting on your behalf.

If you should trespass on my property after this notice, then I must warn you that I will not hesitate to call the local police to have you removed from the property. I further warn you that any such trespassers will be cautioned in line with Police and Criminal Evidence guidelines and be questioned as to why the trespass is taking place and a statement will be written from contemporaneous notes and the statement may be given in evidence to obtain an injunction in order to prevent further harassment by yourselves or your agents/employees.

You will of course be expected to pay the costs for these proceedings.

I feel I must point out that there are many reasons why a citizen may not wish to allow total strangers access to their homes.

One reason, in this case, is that I would wish to know exactly what type of person is trying to gain access to my property. These people do not wish to enter as a normal guest would, but to search my premises.

I am aware of at least two of your employees, one, Mr David Clark, found guilty of assaulting one of your "customers", and two, Mr Richard John Llewellyn, who was found guilty on four counts of false accounting (falsifying witness statements and forging signatures), and one count of an act likely to pervert the cause of justice; all this whilst conducting your "business". I am aware also of many other complaints of a similar nature levelled against your employees/agents and would not like to do "business" with your company for these reasons.

I am very wary of identity theft, and do not wish my personal details to appear on any database unnecessarily, and as I have no business dealings with your company (Capita), this will be justified as reasonable.

I remind you that I have no obligation under law to even communicate with your company, and I draw your attention to the "written answers" in Parliament on Monday 15 May 2006 and a question that was asked regarding whether there was a legal requirement to communicate with your company or not.

Shaun Woodward  
Parliamentary Under-Secretary,  
Department for Culture, Media & Sport.  
answered: .

"A television licence is required to install or use a television receiver, as defined in regulations made by the Secretary of State, rather than a television set. Members of the public who do not require a television licence are under no obligation to inform TV Licensing of the fact."

I hope that you will appreciate that I am only communicating with you to avoid any unnecessary unpleasantness in the future. I do not wish to enter into either protracted correspondence or conversations.

Yours sincerely

The Legal Occupier of the above address