

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 setting out equipment - buying it along
Suggested that primary aim was to make a profit
from hiring 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 on 1st Sept 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
from 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 help 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 speaker - 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 EDGGESE 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 ^{criminal} legal standard.

I did see officer + @ no time did he indicate where into had come from.

24/05/14

2nd Allegation - app. relies on hearsay again + Circumst pgs 104 - 107 - no real evidence.

2nd 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 3rd 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

1st allegation where app. produced 18th 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 enquiry.

Additional hearsay. only evidence of use 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 added.

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. hearsay evidence - & no Pcs called to give evidence.

Intending that ~~that~~ someone other than D led a ~~per~~.

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 ones on security 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 & circum 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. & circum.

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 needs

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 + licenced 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 it w/o reason. exc.

... his ... order ...

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

~~Request~~

"

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

Pct increase of net fire li - 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.