

Exhibit ref.

1st Statement *of the* Defendant
Miss Irene Sara Spalletti

Case ref: M00ED350

IN THE COUNTY COURT AT EDMONTON

IN THE TRUSTS OF LAND AND
APPOINTMENT OF TRUSTEES ACT 1996

BETWEEN:

Mr Alexander Michael Luke Wolf Walker

Claimant

– and –

Miss Irene Sara Spalletti

Defendant

Contributions – Renovations

*Exhibited in response to para. 23
of the Claimant's 1st Statement*

Since our relationship came to an end in the summer of last year, my primary focus has simply been to finalise the works that need to be carried out so that the house can be readied for sale to enable Irene and I to each go our separate ways. I have been prevented from visiting the house since 2 September 2024, but as far as I can recall the following essential works need to be completed. (...)

Ms Sarah Walker
Hughes Fowler Carruthers
Academy Court
94 Chancery Lane
London
WC2A 1DT

Your Ref: BJ.SW.bs.WAL023

04 April 2025

WITHOUT PREJUDICE SAVE AS TO COSTS

Dear Ms Walker

Re: 92 Ollerton Road, London, N11 2LA

I apologise for the delay. I had instructed my solicitor over two weeks ago; however, she only informed me today that she would not be taking my case. Going forward, I request that all communication from you be limited to one response per letter sent from me, and that it be directed to this email address: property_92@yahoo.com.

Ms. Walker, I had previously requested in December that you fact-check your statements before making certain accusations, and I would appreciate it if you could begin doing so.

"There is much in your letter that my client does not agree with, but my client will not run up unnecessary costs responding to every point. Where he has not addressed something in your letter that should not be taken as acceptance by him of a particular point. It is, however, important to him to respond to your accusation that he has attempted to "exert undue pressure" on you by proposing that you buy him out of his share of the house. This is simply not correct; my client made this proposal because he thought you might like to stay in the house, and he thought your parents may have been able to assist you financially (as they have done in the past) to achieve this. This was absolutely not an attempt by him to "secure an advantage by intimidating" you as you state and was in fact intended to be conciliatory. In any event my client only proposed this after you repeatedly failed to engage with him about selling the property and because your mother had suggested to him that you would like to stay in the house."

Your client's proposal that I buy him out was not only absurd but had already been rejected as early as July 2024.

- i. Your client was fully aware that my financial situation does not allow me to buy him out, nor would I be able to take over the mortgage on an income of £400 per month in Universal Credit payments.
- ii. The proposed overinflated house valuation of £903,000, sourced from the internet without formal valuation, is wholly inconsistent with paragraph 4 (Proportionality) of the Practice Direction on Pre-Action Conduct and Protocols (PDPAC).
- iii. Your client's additional demand for £15,000 in compensation. Given that your client is currently facing criminal allegations for domestic abuse, coercive control, financial abuse, and harassment, it is entirely unreasonable for him to claim additional financial compensation

This offer was never a viable option, and your client's insistence on reintroducing it is both coercive and an attempt to exert undue pressure on me. This has already been explained in the [WP Letter, 19 February 2025, \(p.03\)](#).

Your client's demand that "All furniture and chattels must be divided equally by value" despite having no claim to any of the furniture, as well as compensation requests in relation to assets that do not

belong to him confirms that your client's original demand was nothing more than an attempt to inflate his financial claim and exert further pressure on me as he initially insisted that the entire contents of the 133-square-meter, three-story house be divided equally. Your client's own recent Schedule of Chattels, contradicts this, proving that he was never entitled to claim compensation for the furniture as he owns none, as documented in my [1st statement_Exhibits 040-059, 25 October 2024, \(p.60\)](#). Your client's own statements and actions unequivocally demonstrate he never genuinely intended to build a home or a future together in this property and that his primary motivation was financial gain, not the establishment of a shared household.

"Since your relationship with my client came to an end in the summer of last year, my client's primary focus has simply been to finalise the works that need to be carried out so the house can be readied for sale to enable you and my client to each go your separate ways."

- i. My [1st statement_Exhibits 060-066, 25 October 2024, \(pp.03-17\)](#), included a detailed breakdown of essential works to prepare the property for sale, as multiple builder's quotes.
- ii. Since then, neither your client nor your firm has engaged in any discussions regarding the renovations until now, 10 March 2025—nearly five months later
- iii. On 11 December 2024, I contacted Mr. Jones to seek clarification on Mr. Walker's intentions regarding these necessary works clearly demonstrating my eagerness to proceed.

"Dear Mr. Jones, I would like to understand what Alex's intentions are when it comes to house renovations; we have essential house works that need to be done urgently, such as painting, carpets and flooring, totalling around £10,000. There are also extra non-essential jobs - such as bathroom renovations, top floor and window replacement - all quotes for these jobs are in my last exhibit folder." – sent on 11 December 2024 15:39.

- iv. On 13 December, instead of responding constructively, your firm ignored the renovation issue entirely and, rather than engaging with the matter, proceeded with a TOLATA application — a move that was both premature and unreasonable, as the property could not have been marketed for sale in its then-current condition as mentioned in my [1st statement, 25 October 2024, \(p.43\)](#).
- v. It is therefore entirely disingenuous for you to attempt to place blame on me for delays caused solely by your client's failure to act. The inaction from your side has been the primary cause of delay, and the failure to engage with necessary renovation discussions has obstructed the sale process rather than facilitated it. I was actively attempting to prepare the property for sale, including getting quotes for the building work and getting valuations from various estate agents. This further calls into question whether your client's primary intention was ever to sell the property in a fair and reasonable manner, or whether his application was strategically designed to exert financial pressure and harassment upon me.
- vi. Had your client responded in good faith at the time, the essential works would now be completed, and the property could be ready for sale.
- vii. Rather than continually requesting compensation for your client, we must urgently address the building works in order to proceed with the sale of the property. It is now April and, regrettably, no progress has been made.

