

understand why any solicitor would encourage me to go to trial or appeal and not draft out the police corruption that you can clearly see in turn making me accept the clearly fabricated evidence and wrongful conditions that I know have been imposed on myself under section 63 with no trespass taking place, this being said as for any of the incidents contained in the Asbo and with you knowing the true facts of them incidents being contained in private air. There is also that of the clearly fabricated evidence I am standing against as for sure any solicitor works in Co Hurst towards the understanding of noun precedent in relation to the weight of any evidence put towards a client. I am concerned about the case, relying sole on hearsay by police. Is this correct in procedure? However I do understand and take note, that all resident parties contained within the respondents bundle, were held on single occasions and in places of residence and were not held as a running commercial business by myself or by any other to my knowledge. I have also read that any person is entitled to have a house or resident party in private air under the licensing act 2003 or where they reside. To my understanding, each accused incident in the respondents bundle is a place of residence and was in fact different people holding their own private parties at their places of residence. Aloe there may have been complaints in regards to issues of concern about them house parties I was not the occupier of any of the accused locations; neither was I the hire of equipment and surely not the organizer. I was establishing a hire company around the dates of the accused events and have provided evidence of the work I had been committing myself to. I was not trading at the time and whenever hiring out equipment I do with due care and responsibility, however I do not accept responsibility for other people's actions when hiring out such equipment in good faith. I do take legal action for any persons when breaking my terms and conditions. I do not hire out equipment to any person without being in the constraints of the law and in good business practice or without the correct ID. On one occasion I did hire out a sound system in good faith on a pro Bono basis, this being of the understanding that no laws were being broken and as a Ltd company acting responsible. I know that I should not be liable for them persons actions when hiring out equipment and having the correct protocols in place as I clearly do. I do not feel that it is right for the respondent to obtain criminal punishments such as section 63 of the crime and disorder act 1994 and for that section to be then imposed against my freedom of movement and many other Human Right that have been breached by being pro-claimed under wrongful civil proceedings, as for a multitude of incorrect procedures and legislation that I have occurred, for instance I have no previous nature offences of a similar sort as required by law when applying a stand alone Asbo on a persons statue, as I do feel I should of have had the right to challenge the allegations under a true Criminal investigation, especially when referring to the organisation of illegal raves as the respondent has clearly headlined the offence to be. RE: SIMON CORDELL V. THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS APPEAL AGAINST THE IMPOSITION OF AN ASBO – 26TH SEPTEMBER 2016 AT 10:00 AM I write even further with concerns regarding: Your issues of concern dated 08/09/2016 that was received by email at the time: 06:00pm, So as towards the letter drafted by yourself and amended by myself is the response as detailed below, with the listed concerns.

1. I understand that the correct protocols for the offences I am being accused of should be carried out in a manner to be of a high professional standard as required by law, so for me to be able to defended myself.
2. I am therefore not happy with the issues of police corruption not being addressed, by you self and all other legal persons, as I know I can not stand a fair trial or appeal without them issues being rectified first and this is why the amendments have been made to your letter to Sally Guill Hurst.
3. I have suffered since 2014 for conditions that have been wrongfully imposed upon myself and still awaiting an appeal.

1.1 As my acting solicitor