

Lorraine Cordell

From: JOSEPHINE WARD [josephinewardsolicitor@gmail.com]
Sent: 12 February 2014 11:43
To: Lorraine Cordell; too smooth
Subject: Fwd: Regina v Simon Cordell CL ref 5005393 (patel)
Attachments: STATEMENT PATEL PART 2.pdf; INDICTMENT AND PATEL STATEMENT PT 1.pdf

Lorraine / Simon

Please see forwarded email that I sent to Mr Trevor Allway.

Regards

Josephine

----- Forwarded message -----

From: JOSEPHINE WARD <josephinewardsolicitor@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Feb 12, 2014 at 11:38 AM
Subject: Re: Regina v Simon Cordell CL ref 5005393 (patel)
To: "Allaway, Trevor" <Trevor.Allaway@cl-uk.com>

Dear Mr Allway

Thank you for your email.

This case is listed for mention at Woolwich Crown Court on 18th February 2014. It is my understanding that you have been contacted directly by Mr Simon Cordell and Miss Lorraine Cordell in relation to ongoing legal proceedings.

Thank you for the indication that an application under section 35 of the Data Protection Act 1998 would be viewed favourably.

We make this application under section 35 of the Data Protection Act 1998 to request details of all insurance claims submitted by Mr Rakesh Patel in relation to a burglary committed at Unit 3 Horrisons Industrial Estate. Mr Patel alleged in a section 9 statement to the Metropolitan Police that a burglary was committed between 1st May 2013 and 8th May 2013. He alleges that goods to the value of £8220 were stolen and damage to the walls estimated to be between £8,000 - £10,000.

Our client disputes involvement in the burglary but states that he did hire out his sound equipment in order for a private party to place arranged by persons legally squatting at the premises. Mr Cordell was forensically linked to the premises by DNA on a can of drink. Mr Cordell gave an explanation for this in that he stated that he oversaw the persons using his equipment. Mr Cordell has stated that when he arrived damage had already been caused and he has produced Facebook pictures purporting to be of the alleged premises. It is our understanding that you are in possession of photographs from previous burglaries at the same premises and the damage cited by Mr Patel in his statement to the police actually relates to damage already caused during a previous burglary and not May 2013 as Mr Patel alleges.

We rely on paragraph section 35 (2)(a) and (b) which states:

Personal data are exempt from the non-disclosure provisions where the disclosure is necessary -

12/02/2014