

Lorraine / Simon

From: Lorraine Cordell [mailto:lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk]
Sent: 28 November 2013 19:54
To: 'JOSEPHINE WARD'
Subject: RE: CPS response to secondary disclosure and confirmation of conference

Hi Josey

Thank you for the email I just got it so will let simon look over this tomorrow.

Can I ask something the receipt from Li-Lo Leisure is that the receipt for the 16/02/2013 or the 04/05/2013 as it seems to be the same receipt.

What we want is a full list of items and amounts that were taken on the 04/05/2013 and also the same for the 16/02/2013 someone cant say an amount in £s of damage and items where taken yet not have a full list, or are they saying on each of the receipts for the 04/05/2013 and the 16/02/2013 all of the items listed on the receipts where taken it does not make sense as they seem to be the same receipts. There is also no invoices for the repair of the damage on the 16/02/2013 or the 04/05/2013 for someone to come up with the amounts that they have for the damages to the this so called building on the 04/05/2013, Which he would have had to get invoices for his insurance companies.

Also there is no information as to really anything for the 16/02/2013, And no information as to the people that were arrested and what happened to them.

There is also nothing to show any work was carried out on the building from 16/02/2013 so show anything was fixed as I am sure there should have been.

There is far to much data that is missing.

And I wonder why how can a police officer not have any full lists of items that were taken yet be able to have a total amount of damage that were caused how could they come to these sums?

There seems to me a lot in this case is being covered up by the police and I would like this addressed as how can someone have a fair trial without the full facts.

Lorraine