

1

offer of D in court + potentially giving evidence.

2

Police - no objections

Probable case will run over until tomorrow.

6 wit. of fact

1 officer in case.

Tab 6 - 22 - Core statements.

3

at come into possession of new into a Facebook  
 of it bundles before Court, but should be  
 showing into suggesting were organised by other  
 people nothing to do w/ D.

4

interim ASBO made - case has been well won

5

This evidence shows that ~~the~~ Rave on 06/06/  
 was nothing to do w/ D.

MRS Cordell (mother has carried out her own  
 investigation be she was not happy w/ results  
 of instructing SAs).

A large bundle to get through.

If material can be viewed later + Pros (Met) then  
~~we will~~ decide on admissibility of the evidence

trial. not acceptable.

Det Polio

Chrystian  
Thyan

1st State

He's made app for ASBO.

Inspector Hamill to lead..

vit I - Insp Hamill - R.O - 11:15am. ETC  
Statement contained in Tab 9 - lead.

Det XEX

Intell wld be by open source checked by an officer but  
~~to~~ was not done by me.

The Race was taking place indoors. I have not personally  
spoken to owners of venue. My saw D on the  
evening of the 7th (Saturday)

I did not go inside - gates were closed - I did not  
see any vehicles.

D's Van Reg. IS known to the police but I would not  
personally know.

There were vehicles parked but I did not notice white  
D's van was there.

was not aware of people squadding in that building  
at that time.

Knowledge of officer's confirming D @ venue but those  
not present here today.

There was a Race on an adjacent rd but not on that  
day.

it I

two calls received were not relating to Crown Rd zone, or that day.

in the day in question phone calls rec'd related to this particular zone.

JFO.

let Pol: 6 ~~Re~~ Re-xe

my understanding is that door staff @ gate business to m D - the event organiser.

referring to pg 184 - 7140 re: collar reporting incident

it II

no SM opp raised previously.

RT

VO.

it II - PC Miles - R.O - 11:54 a.m - EIC

it X-Ex

Henceed venue on 7th alone - ~~did~~ did not look @ Jell before attending. did not speak to owners. so not know who Frank Benjamin.

it III - PC Skinner - Bundle tabs: 12 & 13 - read stat 1 (tab 13)

in 7th duty officer & worked through estate & saw x van but did not recognise van. He saw D however who admitted he was the organiser of that race.

I had to call for Bette intervention to call to my house.  
I answered D's people dispersed + then I was later  
D was released. Rape did not take place.  
No doubt Rape would have continued had he not arrested D.

### Def X ex.

19th July event @ copyright company - building was  
empty. Saw spears + other heavy loading equipment  
inside.

Details of car ~~not~~ taken but no ~~car~~ D.

Carper night was padlocked w/ metal barrier.

Other car parks had a 7 entrance.

I was Senior Officer attending venue. Later in  
I was instructed Sergeant to contact the owners.

F. later saw D getting out of the car. I can remember  
that I may have updated others in relation to  
~~the~~ D coming out of car. But I may or may not  
have updated system.

On 21st July D made admissions to me. <sup>NOT aware of</sup> ~~The house~~  
Squatter on that Indust. estate.

### Met Rex.

Refers to statement on page 76.

Unit TV PC - Edgecase - R. O 12.14 pm 'EIC - Read

Stat. Tab 21.

Incident on 24th July: I was in the vehicle that saw  
D's vehicle. NO threat to break D's window or anything  
about drug's issues.

C  
J17 V1 - PC King - Affirmation - 12.28 pm ETC.

Tab 15/16)

Stat. Pag. 41

Witness has only met D once before and D has always been polite and never had any problem w/D.  
D was very eloquent & clearly knows the law.

J17 VI - PC ANES - Acting Sargeant - R.O - 12.46 pm - ETC.

XET XEX

event was outdoors. Saw some equip. Suggest  
speakers poss. approx. size of witness box but  
can't remember much & he was distracted by  
people.

NFGS.

J17 VII - PC ELSMERE R.O - 14.10 ETC

(Tab 6 - pg 41)

DET XEX

g15

counsel argues that PNC into on statement adds no  
substantive value & into re: witness being "afraid of D"  
which he puts down to the way he was asked but he meant  
that people actually are afraid of process of  
giving evidence in court.

Cont.  
Def.

Council argues that Officer's statement is ~~not~~ designed to ~~give~~ an cause an emotive reaction & is of no value & speculative in nature.

of

How many calls from public did ~~he~~ receive?

WIT/WT

In excess of 15 calls - may relate to some of venues + not others.

Does not know nr calls in relation to each of these occasions.

On Pg 15 - allegations re: Millmarsh Lane. Evidence from Officer not 1st hand - relied on CAD & other intell.

Query re: "3 massive nitrous oxide tanks"

of

Where did you get such info Officer?

WIT/WT

From Pg 65 - Sergeant King - circumstantial reports, other intell but not from people at the venue.

Council

Officer signed a statement of truth ≠ to other witness statements.

of

We all know that on ASBOS apps hearsay is allow.

founder

Ward Officer not ~~asked~~ rely on Pc King's statement other than on crime report.

Officer not involved ~~to~~ in taking it to from Pc King.

offenses he didn't.

did not notice the discrepancy in statements.

are head of every decided matters - they were advertising and I believe he knows a member of above company.

NO evidence D is involved in running their operations.

NO attempt has been made to speak to Directors of Co. NO reason why you didn't contact the company.

I think from memory have met D only @ Emory's police station.

At Pg. 16 1st para - not consistent w/ fact that he met him only 01/06.

the report

All notes w/ YER number were lifted from reports not officer's own words - some applies from CAD but had no ~~input~~ <sup>input</sup>.

Has not made ~~attempt~~ to contact owners of premises.

Officer unable to assist Court in relation to why statements were not signed on note books provide.

Another example of things put in statement to block

in statement @ Point 12

NO convictions from class A Drugs unlike what's written in statement - another example of cut & past.

DJ

I'll ignore bc no convs of class A or Supply.

Q: Counsel

You cannot assist Court w/ reliability of info contained, are you?

Can intell be highly inaccurate? NO?

Q: Officer

On that particular report, it appears to be right.

I did not speak to Purcell, he is from a 7 borough. I believe he was not included in the e-mail. - bc initial blanket e-mail sent to LDE only.

Searched system for info on Corbett's convs.

Turning on to statement on pg 30a.

Q: Officer

Does Point 12 unit has more info that it is let on?

Officer: NO.

Are you aware that US Corbett has spoken to other officers re: love?

Suggest that you do not want DS Tanner to examine on this proceedings bc she has more info & knowledge of Raes & their not being connected V/D.

int.

R V Cordell

-6-

You have no record - per e-mailed her but  
~~the~~ then spoke. e-mail ~~may~~ have been deleted  
no copies kept or printed.

let Polio

EX. of wit VII

~~at 11/08/14~~ Done through submission.

Nothing in the contents of this ~~interview~~ report is  
accurate to my knowledge.

↓

⊕

Hopeful the 2 witnesses on behalf of D should  
be able to give evidence tomorrow.

at VIII \* (MS Cordell - Aff: - 16.05pm - EIC)

→ (her son) lives separately from me but I've been  
trying to help him sort out inaccuracies with both  
N: PNC + other police matters.

Police is still popping around to his home - Simon  
tells me + also. I physically get to his flat before  
police have left. He's been harassed by police.

⊕

at 6 not relevant - on witness statement - kept  
out of a line through that.

⊕

alleged ~~statements~~ w/ PNC that was included by  
... in a report to challenge. This PNC is

28

Ms Cordell

Net XEX

Bottom of pg 8 - leaving party for Dwayne Edwards  
I got there @ 7:30 pm and left about 9:30 pm

6<sup>th</sup> - 8<sup>th</sup> June - ~~Monday~~ I was also around during  
the day on Saturday & Sunday as well.

I was at my work for an 1/2 on Saturday &  
1 hr on Sunday during day. I agree I did not  
include it in my statement.

On Sunday it was around midday.  
I was not w/ D from about 2 am on Sunday, no  
I was not  
nor at 2 am on Saturday either.

~~Monday~~  
on 7<sup>th</sup> June pg 8 (bottom) I did see me for + so  
and all my family that were @ party.

At pg 14

Police did not have 107 book"

2 + 3<sup>rd</sup> Pages.

Accept that was told to me by DS Chapman.

DS Tanner called me on 11 or 12. I believe they have  
a lot more information - I am aware of full bullet  
and ~~that~~ alleged involvement but not Dates.

I do believe that must have a vendetta against my  
whole family including Trone - Harassment: pull

R Cordell's cont.

I am saying that there may be some truth but allegations of my son arranging rapes is ludicrous.

~~My son's own statements that he had been stabbed and was in hospital~~

20<sup>th</sup> June - can't give evidence as to D's whereabouts but believe he had been arrested on 19<sup>th</sup>.

at 7<sup>th</sup> July - not w/ him - did not give detailed route in statement be and not think it relevant.

Problems w/ service of docs from Police & would not take bundle be frightened of police. He panics & things he even be time he's stopped.

I have got memory & write down all encounters w/ police although not in the bundle.

Be + XEX

I accept involvement of police - their interaction w/ my son / family.

You said that police have lot of info ~~to~~ & you said "I accept involvement but not Bone's"

I met involvement w/ police & lot of data particularly w/ Simon. but ~~not~~ in regards to rape - issues ~~do~~ Rapes.

I must accept that he's involved in organisations

R V CORDELL  
(2/2 days)  
- 1 -

04/08/15

at CORDELL ( R.O - 10.45AM - EIC )

LET XEX

so you are not yet Charity Registered. "Too smooth" company where young entrepreneurs can advertise their businesses.

g 77

written items relating to music - sound equip and Co. involved in provision of sound equipment. Never took profit money from company

g 87

deposit of £700.00 daily rate £100. it is my signature at the end of this document ~~is~~ but figures have not been edited. → Pg 88

All deposits are non returnable under any circumstances. In this transaction the equipment got confiscated. I did take deposit of £700. in case of loss and never made any money.

I did not make any profit, just trying to get to know people. - Non-profit - just a hobby. - Statement Pg 2 → bottom page! You state that I accept.... and aim was to rent equipment.

It's being suggested to you that the business

Was not letting out equipment - buying it along  
Suggested that primary aim was to make a profit  
than buying out sound equipment - NO - not  
at all.

Aware that music is a licensed activity &  
premises need a licence to play music

I had a licence for both premises. yes.

I would not check if lending equip for a private  
party.

Co. "Too Smooth" - registered but not trading  
because of ASBO - since interim order.

The reputation has been ruined.

Interim App BN 1st Dept 2014 so before then  
Jan '14 - 4th September - were any business  
transactions conducted during that period?  
1 sole business transaction.

Have been to council ~~but not~~ business transactions.  
As a friend only.

It's incorrect that I was setting up Rows.

Pg 50 - bundle Tab 21. Denies having made  
comments as alleged on PC EDGOOSE statement.

Pg 33 - Tab 9 - Insp Havel. - I walked  
near Great Cambridge Road towards her.

Impossible for door staff to get me to I  
was on other side of rd. Never on the  
premises. yes, it is incorrect. yes, P.O is mistaken

Pg 38 - Tab 13 - Detective Skinner - 2 events.

§ 75 - Tab 24

I denies knowing people alleged to have worked  
on him on the night - either PC or person mentioned  
in the statement are wrong.

reason why you're found in these lanes is bc you  
were organising them.

§ 141

vehicle was owned by me but sold & now bought  
back.

statement Pg 3.

§ 104

I was not at W1 Holly - Field on that day.

§ 99

Accept I was there in the van inside unit.

The report is wrong - I had 2 boxes in the van - no  
speakers - I was not inside the premises, and  
not help organize Rave + some equipment was not  
mine.

I have tried to hire equipment but organisation  
of event - B'day party, nothing to do w/ me.  
Is PC Chandler's report wrong as well? yes.

1/10 - August 2014

Bottom Pg 7 (statement.)

to do w/ me. w/ social networking easier for  
someone to have lots of friends.

I had Beylinder in my vehicle. - requires  
legal authorisations. I have them in my Car for  
helping - I do welding continuously. I do it  
as a hobby.

I was not at the location for a large time.

I do remember many people turning up.

I remember police being in attendance.

I ~~was~~ would never shout @ crowd - too  
busy talking to police.

PC's statements are wrong.

There's a possibility that I did see to  
police that it was a private container.

of

Do you know in law that do people is no law - ~~is~~!

Def xxEx

Was PC EDGROSE out of car? I know 2 of  
them came out of car & I approached me.

~~The officer~~

24th May incident - do you remember speaking  
w/ PC Jackson? Do not remember names.

? 1005 of T+CS re: Falcon Park (statement)

Deposit does go back unless damage or loss -  
staying with in agreement.

Amount £1000 = no fee.

NFE

27

additional witnesses not here.  
D's statement can be read but less weight be  
witnesses not here.

witness 2 can be here in 1 1/2 hrs.

1/2 evidence

1/2 alibi

3.30pm

27

JF witnesses.

28

losing subs.

Statutory test key:

1) Whether D has acted in anti-social manner - alarm / distress.

~~at~~  
2) assuming blame to make that whole II officers  
were wrong.

D's evidence also not credible + ≠ from his written  
statement.

Statement.

D's Mother's evidence - totally irrelevant - her evidence  
based on conspiracy police have against her +

7 June, with ev. insp. Hamil + Sgt. Miles recognize Cordell (D)

insp. Hamil accused as points to D being the organizer.

Disruption + concern Rose caused outlined by CAD

Another statement as far as D is concerned which is totally wrong.

Criminal reports show D as organizer of large rave's according to officer's statements.

Test made out of subscriptions above.

Consistent pattern of behavior as far as D's concerned.

2) Test of necessity - does not req. determination of fact, but from CAD re: alarm distress etc. Shows this has happened. Impact this has on police resources. Allocation of significant levels of police resources. Looking @ noise levels & potential spreading out of control - disorder due to setting event down.

?e Evidence: disruption levels over D was subject to order has reduced - only 3 - when D was active there was significant loss.

The order is necessary and attention drawn to carefully worded within order.

Def Closing subs

1) left to be passed Can allegations be proved? Required that although it may be illegal it does not need to cause alarm or distress.

Ps. 2 & 3 of bundle.

Headsay from PC Eshwar - copy & paste job.

PC Percell not asked to give evidence. & Criminal ~~however~~ which contain inaccurate entries that can't be backed up. & D not known for class A D's case @

Quality of evidence is hearsay as well as report of Canary Wharf.

No proof this was an illegal rave. as 563 CJO 1994

No proof of trespass - definition not proved to <sup>criminal</sup> legal standard.

I did ask Officer + @ no time did he indicate where into had come from.

24/05/14

2<sup>nd</sup> Allegation - app. relies on hearsay again + Circumst 104 - 107 - no real evidence.

2<sup>nd</sup> heard hearsay from John Holyfield who allegedly confessed that was looking to set up a rave - Circ. Standard not met again.

Pg 98-100 - hearsay - from a PC again - all in 3<sup>rd</sup> person. No indication that PC attended himself.

No evidence that it was illegal rave.

Strict definition in law of illegal rave + no proof has been submitted or cases with standard.

7/June 2014

1<sup>st</sup> allegation where app. produced 18<sup>th</sup> level evidence.

The particulars of allegation states illegal rave + no proof to required standard has been submitted. Nothing adduced.

It x Ex. app delegated to outfield Council who did not pursue.

Does it show he's the organizer or just someone getting involved in something he shouldn't.

However the security funds are not here.

No evidence police continued to the organizer.

D spoke to police. - he gives reasonable info saying he can't keep his mouth shut.

A man who butts in someone else's lawyer.

This is a Rave said to have lasted 3 days but evidence is very weak.

Tyburn's presence was unlawful due to life-threatening info - no cogent evidence.

Police had intell re: every possible matter & to further line of Enq.

Additional hearsay. only evidence of var. of equipment of handling equipment for free.

19/07/14

Carpet mat - Insp. Skimmer's evidence - indoor. test of legality is proof of trespass + nothing adduced.

Witness was not statement taken from owner of Keys.?? And whether or not ~~permitted~~ authorization had been given to use the permits.

R v Coddell

- 5 -

In another occasion: Mr Coddell gave explanation to his presence.

24/07/14 - D accepted he organised. PC Edsoose P.S. 50 - statement said he "did organise Rave's" admissions alleged ≠ from evidence.

Existence of conversation w/ officers not clear

27/7/14

issue of his (Mr C) Law. leaves evidence - & no PCs called to give evidence.

Intending that ~~the~~ someone other than D led a ~~car~~.

evidence of people having keys, potentially stored on that land nearby it is how

Further evid. Macnamara / Stoppiness.

7/10 Aug 14

Evidence of PC officers does not meet up w/ allegations in application - on this date, two - did have been spectators. was attempt to contact one of officers to clarify.

Suggesting a private party - due to lack of

Evidence was affecting a path

Capitv: carbon dioxide. not nitrate dioxide.

General credibility of witnesses - many errors  
be hearsay & circumst of no prominence.

Take into account length of statement.

Pg. 32 ~~group~~. Statement date + event 2

Unconscious bias for officers to inc. evidence that  
favours app being used.

Allegation of 15-10 boys daily to talk (unrelated)  
& connect.

Fear of reprisals.

LIC when given evidence was to prove sand  
by possess which I accept.

if true I was police on his case

~~Tendency~~ Inv. not pursued w/ rigour as it  
should have been.

Various failures highlighted

inconsistencies between stat. & circumst.

Complete absence of follow up is simply  
barring

What other info is being that we have not  
been able to check?

J. MR Justice FICONS. - scrupulous & fair

ASBO granted :

~~the~~ order granted

Order necessary for reason:

Nature of conduct of these parties

Noise & ~~part~~ of petty crime

Police officers have to attend in large nrs.

Since interim order there has been a decrease in this type of activity.

~~shown~~

D has acted in AS manner & such conduct causes harassment, alarm, distress.

Conclude order needed

to protect residents of CV from antisocial acts from Simon Corbell.

~~of~~  
Need to ensure prohibitions are precise to avoid breach.

~~of~~

D's attendance at Rave's is not an issue - and places unreasonable burden on him for attending parties where 200+ people attend - and what appears to be legal then turns out to be illegal. Also, places D in difficult position if false reps are made as to legality of parties.

D

offending label:

Can carry out legitimate + licensed business.

Point D - "or local authority..." addition.

D "for a period of 5 years"

~~And they are~~

Prohibitions are precise + plain

Terms of order.

D' decided to object then get new but lawyer present

Terms

Proh. alt Rave S.63. CJA PA 1994

Concerned organisati.

Period of 5 years.

S.

Nothing is this order

unable to explain consequences of breach to him  
wets onto D's Sols if w/o reason. exc.

... his ... order ...

~~Test~~ of necessity - not related to Police resource.  
Was ASB direct + persistent?

~~Answer~~

"

Decrease in activity - huge decrease since Martin  
ASBO" but no indication of trends: before - after  
and previous years.

Pctlosure of net fire hi - and a difference -  
he did not know.

either, can't say why decrease in rates.

Correspondence & consultation. - 3 solar this year,  
working weak evidence.

Met on point of law

Statutory test in relation to rate is only what  
is required.

J - delivery of judgment @ 15:32 pm

Satisfied so that she has seen... that D  
acted during dates in AS manner.