

The Appellant will state that the description of events on this day has been altered and recorded in a biased way towards him.

The Appellant requests full details of the original intelligence report inputted on 25th May 2014 and also reasons why there was a need to update this report on 19th June 2014. The Intelligence report should not be allowed in evidence under the hearsay rules as it is prejudicial to him. The report has been amended.

(A) PROGRESS WAY 6TH, 7TH AND 8TH JUNE 2014

The Appellant disputes any involvement whatsoever in the event at Progress Way.

The Appellant accepts that he approached the gates on the 08th June 2014 with a view to dropping off house keys to a friend that had been left at his house on an earlier date. The Appellant did not enter the premises / venue at Progress Way.

The Appellant did not provide any sound equipment, speakers, generators to any person inside Progress Way.

The Appellant will state that he is being wrongly accused of organising this rave / event. The Appellant will state his brother is also wrongly named as being involved. The Appellant will state that his brother was severely disabled at the time and in a wheelchair following a very serious road traffic accident which the police are aware of.

The Appellant questions the accuracy and truthfulness of the statements, CADS etc served in support of the above. The Appellant questions why some of the CAD reports have been redacted. The Appellant believes that the CAD's may well confirm the names of the real organisers, vehicle registrations etc that will confirm no vehicle belonging to the Appellant being inside the venue. The Appellant also questions the chronological sequence of the CAD reports due to the time stamps.

CAD	Num	Date	Time	Page
CAD	2637	07/06/2014	08:18	Page 191 to 195
CAD	2672	07/06/2014	08:16	Page 196 to 198
CAD	3005	07/06/2014	09:22	Page 203 to 205
CAD	3037	07/06/2014	09:20	Page 179 to 183
CAD	10481	07/06/2014	22:47	Page 233 to 237
CAD	10506	07/06/2014	22:44	Page 238 to 241

The Appellant believes that some of the complainants are police officers and no civilians. The Appellant believes that some of the Cads' may relate to completely different areas but are being added incorrectly and linked to Progress Way.