

applicant's application towards an Anti Social behavior order that I Mr. Simon Cordell is being wrongfully accused of being that of falsely created and audited evidence. Provided below and contained within this document is a summary of the incidents co siding with official dates that is also inclusive of cad numbers and relevant supported evidence being referred too.

<b>13<sup>th</sup> August 2014</b>	The Asbo application was created by Steve Elsmore
<b>13<sup>th</sup> August 2014</b>	A meeting was held with Steve Hodgson who is a representative for Enfield Local Authority Council and Jane Johnson on behalf of the Metropolitan police along side others.
<b>12<sup>th</sup> September 2014</b>	A bundle is said too have been served on Mr Simon Cordell at 109 Burncroft Avenue, to which he disputes. In reference to police complaint 1 of 3 contained at the top of the document.

06/10/2014	Mr Simon Cordell was meant to have a hearing for an interim Order but legal aid had not been granted. Michael Carroll acting solicitor came to court, the judge overturned and granted legal aid. The application for the Interim hearing the judge would not hear.
22/10/2014	Interim hearing but could not go ahead due to Andy Locke Acting Barrister had a flood at his home address.
05/11/2014	Interim hearing and the order was granted.
02/12/2014	Mr Simon Cordell's mother has a note on her mobile phone, stating he was in court at Highbury Corner not sure what they was for.
09 <sup>th</sup> 10 <sup>th</sup> 11 <sup>th</sup> 03/2015	Meant to have been set for trial but the court only booked 1 day hearing, this was then put off until the 03 <sup>rd</sup> and 04 <sup>th</sup> Aug 2015
03 <sup>rd</sup> 4 <sup>th</sup> 08/2015	Highbury Corner trial case part proven on the 04 <sup>th</sup> 08/2015
26/10/2015	1 <sup>st</sup> hearing at Wood Green Crown to see if case was ready for appeal on the
09/11/2015	Was 1 <sup>st</sup> appeal date which was set for an 1 hour hearing
22 <sup>nd</sup> 23 <sup>rd</sup> and 24 <sup>th</sup> 02/2016	Set for appeal at the crown court.

It is said that Mr Cordell had been found guilty on the 3<sup>rd</sup> 4<sup>th</sup> August 2015, to which he disputes to be correct, evidence of Mr. Simon Cordell Barristers submissions inclusive of the court transcripts of the day of trial. The respondent's case is that Mr Simon Cordell has been accused of being integrally involved in the organisation of illegal raves in Enfield.

Part of the Barrister submissions that represented Simon Cordell, had been that the allegations were that he was involved in the organizing of illegal raves, but the applicant hadn't adduced evidence, of trespass or evidence of breach of the licensing Act 2003 which is a requirement for proving, that an indoor rave was illegal. The Deputy District Judge ruled that the applicant did not need to prove illegality, - all the needed to prove was he had acted in an anti social manner. In the view of the barrister this was a very questionable decision: firstly, the applicant based their case on the illegality of the raves rather than the fact of the raves themselves and secondly, without proof of illegality the presumption of innocence leads to the conclusion that the raves were legal, and thus, Simon being prohibited from engaging in an ostensibly lawful activity requires more careful consideration on issues of proportionality.

It should be agreed with the barrister statement as when dealing with this case Mr Simon Cordell was addressing the applicant's case to prove that he had not been involved in organizing illegal raves, as this is what the application against him was.

In total to date 19/04/2016 the Asbo application has been brought before the courts inclusive of magistrates and crown a total of 9 times the 10<sup>th</sup> to be in September 2016 to which I still do not understand how any person could stand a fair trial with such questions as has been referred to regarding article 5.2 of my continental human rights as for the fact of the supported application being that of my self Mr. Simon Cordell being legally deprived of such rights as Article 5(2) requires that anyone arrested must be promptly informed as to why he or she has been arrested and what the charge against them is.

This must be conveyed to them in a language which he or she understands.

The defendant questions the facts that of him self not being arrested for allegations of a criminal offence that do clearly state that they are of an