

From: Rewired Rewired <re_wired@ymail.com>
Sent time: 23/05/2016 03:31:31 AM
To: Rewired Rewired <re_wired@ymail.com>
Subject: Re: Letter

Please see a copy of the court transcripts as listed below;

R v Cordell
1

Def

Mother of D in court + potentially giving evidence.

Met

Police – No objections.

Probably case will go over till tomorrow.

6 Witness of facts.

1. Officer in the case.

To be 6 witness + 22 case statements.

Def

Just gave possession of new info on face book, not in bundles before court, but should be. Shows info suggesting never organised but other people did, nothing to do with w/d.

DJ

Interim ASBO made case by been well ?nan?

DEF

This evidence shows that Rave on 6th 7th 8th June 2014 was nothing to do with w/d.

Miss Cordell mother has carried out her own investigations as she was not happy with results of investigating officer / so/s.

This is a large bundle to get through this late.

If the material can be vied by the DJ and then if (Possible metered) then DJ can decide on admissibility of the evidence.

DJ

Producing material, however relevant, 10 minutes before a trial is not acceptable.

Met Police

1st Statement

DEF;

Has made a application for an ASBO Order.

Inspector Hamill to lead....

Witness 1 – Inspector Hamill – 11.15am

Statement contained in tab 9-lead

DEF XEX

Intel would be by open source, checked by an officer but was not done by me.

The rave was taking place indoors.

I have not personal spoken to the owners of the venue.

I only see the D on the Saturday on the evening of the 7th Saturday.

I did not go inside, the gates were closed.

I did not see any vehicles.

D'S Van registration is known to the police but I would not personally know.

There were vehicles parked but I did not notice whether defendants van was there.

He was not aware of people squatting in that building at that time.

R v Cordell
2

Hearsay of officers continues.

D @ venue but officer not present here today.

There was a rave on an adjourning RD but not on that day.

Phone calls received were not relating to Crown Rd Rave on that day.

On the day in question phone calls related to this particular rave.(Progress Way.)

Met Police RE-XE

My understanding is the door staff @ gate presented D as the event organiser, referring too page 184 Info re: caller reporting incident.

DJ

Was ?SH? opp raised previously.

DEF

No.

Witness 2 Pc Miles – RO – 11:45 Am EIC

Attended venue on the 7th alone – did look @ Intel before attending.

Officer did not speak to any of the owner's.

Did not know D was with Tyrone Benjamin.

WITNESS 3 – PC Skinner – Bundle Tabs 12 of 13 Lead

Statement 1 Tab 13

On the 7th Duty officer + walked in to Estate and saw a van but did not recognise van.

He saw D however who admitted he was the organiser of therave.

Statement 2 Tab 12

Youths were committing shop lifting out of the petrol station.

I had to call for reserve intervention.

I arrested D and people dispersed and D was realised.

Rave did not take place.

No dought the rave would have continued had he not arrested D.

DEF XEX.

19TH July event @ Carpet right company building was occupied.

Saw speakers – Intel were loading equipment indoors.

Details of van taken but was not D.
Carpet right was padlock round metal barrier.
Other car park had a front entrance.
I was senior officer attending the venue.
Latter on I instructed the sergeant to contact the owners.
I latter see the defendant getting out the van.
I can't remember that, I may have updated others in relation to D getting out of van. But I may or may not have updated the system.
On the 7th June D made admissions to me not aware of squatters.

Met XEX

Refers to statement on page 76

**Witness Pc Edgoose – R.O 12:14pm EIC Read
Statement 21**

Incident of 24th July:

I was in a vehicle that stopped D's Vehicle.
No threat to break defendant's window (ok)
It was all about drug issues.

Witness VI – Pc King 12:28pm EIC

Tab 15/16

RV CORDELL

3

Statement Page 41

Officer has only met D once before.
D has all ways been polite.
Has never had any problem with the defendant.
D was rely eloquent of clearly knows the how.

Witness Pc Ames – Acting sergeant – R.O -12:46 Pm EIC

DEF XEX

Event was out doors.
Saw sound equipment substance speakers box.
Approximately the size of witness box, but could not remember really as he was distracted by people.
No further questions.

Witness – Pc Elsmore – R.O – 14:10 EIC

Tab 6 – pg

DEF XEX

The Council is confused that of the PNC info of the statements, Council adds no probationary value of info Re: Witness being "afraid of D" Which he puts down to the way he worded, but he meant that people actually are afraid of possibly giving evidence in court.

DEF

Counsel argues that officers statement is designed to cause on evidence reaction of this of no value and speculative in nature.

DJ

How many calls from public did police receive?

Witness

In excess of 15 calls – how many to the same venue and not other address.
Officer does not know the number of callers in relation to each of these occasions.
On page 15 – Allegations re: Mill marsh Lane, evidence from officer not first hand – relied on cads and other Intel.
Query Re: "3 massive nitrous tanks"

DJ

Were did you get such info officer

Witness

From Page 65 – sergeant King – Crimit's Re reports, other Intel but not from people at the venue.

COUNSEL

Officer you signed a statement of truth ==to other witness statements.

DJ

We all know that on ASBO apps hearsay is allowed.

Counsel

Why did officer no and rely on Pc Kings Statements later than on the Crimit's reported.

RV CORDELL

4

Officer no and involved in taking info from Pc King.
Confesses he did it.
Did not, notice the discrepancy on statements.
Have heard of Every Decibel Matters – They were advertising and I believe the D knows a member of the above company.
No evidence D is involved in running there operations.
No attempt has been made to speak to directors of company.
No reason to why you didn't /contact the company.
I think from memory have met D once @ Edmonton police station.

At Page 16 1st paragraph – not consistent to fact that he met him on the 7/6/2014

All notes with cad number were listed from reports not officers own words – same applies from Cads that had no input.

Has not made any attempts to contact owners of premises.

Officers unable to assist courts in relation to why statements were not signed on note books profiles.

Another example of doings put in statements to blacken Mr Cordell's evidence in statement @ point 12, No convictions that of class A drugs unlike what's written in

Statements – another example of untrue cut and past.

DJ

Ill ignore because no convections of class A drugs or supplying.

Counsel

You can not assist with witness reliability of info contained, can you?
Can Intel be wrongfully inaccurate? No

Officer

On that particular re post, it appears to be right.
I did not speak to Parcell he is force @ 7 boroughs.
I believe he was not included in the email, because Intel **(text missing)** Email sent to LDE only.
Searched **(text missing)** for info on Cordell's convections.
Moving on to statement on Page 30
Does PO investigating unit have more info than it is letting on?

Officer

No
Are you aware that Miss Cordell has spoken to other officers Re: Rave?
Suggests that you do not want DS Tanner to be examined on these proceedings because she has information Re knowledge of raves and them not being connected to W/D
Spoke to Pc Tanner but not written what – spoke to **(text missing)** this year.
You have no recorded that you emailed her but then spoken to her.
Emails have been deleted and no copies keep on record.

Met police

XEX OF Witness vii

Done oath seductions:
Nothing in the contents of this report is inaccurate to my knowledge.

DEF

Hopefully the 2 witnesses on behalf of D should be able to give evidence tomorrow.

Witness viii

Miss Cordell ATT – 16:05 – EIC

R V CORDELL

5

D (her son) lives separately from me but I have been trying to help him sort out inaccuracies with both his PNC and other police matters.
Police is still popping around to his house - Simon tells me and also I physically get to his flat before police have left.
He is being harassed by police.

DJ

Are 6 officers not reliant – on witness statement - there for putting a line though RD.?

DEF

Material deters with PNC that was included by Met – There fore right to challenge. Plus PNC in evidence not correct.

DJ

Very little weight will be given to PNC.

DJ

Miss Cordell

Met XEX

Bottom of Page 8 – Leaving party for Dwayne Edwards.
I got there at 7:30PM and left about 9:30 Pm 6th – 8th June – D was also with Dwayne the days of Saturday and Sunday as well.
He was at my house for a 1 hour and half on Saturday and 1 hour on Sunday during the day. I agree I did not include it in my statement.
On Sunday it was around midday.
I was not with D from about 2AM on Sunday, no I was not.
Nor at 2AM on Saturday either.

On the 7th June I did see my son and so did all my family members that were at the party.

At Page 14

“Police did not have 101 books “

2 and 3 paragraphs

Accepts that was told to me by DS Chapman.

DS Tanner called me on 11th or 12th. I believe they have a lot more information.

I am aware of full **(text missing)** Alleged involvement but not raves.

I do believe that met have a vendetta against my whole family including Tyrone – Harassment: pull them out for no reason, I would not say from every officer.

Miss Cordell continues

I am saying that there may be some truth but allegations of my son organising raves is horrendous.

Been scribbled out?

About medical statements of info has not been contained re question: D had been stabbed and was in hospital

Been scribbled out?

20th June couldn't give evidence as to D were about but believe he had been arrested on the 19th 20th July not witness him – did not give detailed route in statement because did not think it was relevant.

Problems with service of docs with police and would not take bundle because **(text missing)** with police, he panics and rings me every time he is stopped.

I have so **(text missing)** and right down all encounters with police all low not in the bundle.

DEF XEX

R V CORDELL

6

I accept involvement of police – they interact with her son and family.
You said Met police have a lot of info of you said “accepted involvement but not raves “
I have involvement with police of lots of data practically with Simon, but not in regards to raves, issues other than raves.
I don't accept he is involved in organisation of raves.

Case Continues Tomorrow.

R V CORDELL

2/2 DAYS

1

Witness XEX

So you are not yet Charity registered “Too Smooth”
Company were young eutrepures can advertise there Business.

Retail brunches relating to music, sound equipment and co involved in provision of sound equipment.

Never took profit money from company.

Page 87

Deposit of £700-.00 daily rate is £100.

It is my signature at the end of this (text missing) the figures have not been edited - Page 88

All deposits are non returnable under any circumstances on this mandatory if the equipment got confiscated, I did not make any profit, and I just did it to get to no people.

Non profit it is just a hobby.

Statement from Page 2 – Bottom of Page:

You state that I accept and aim was to rent equipment.

Its being suggested to you that the business you was designed was to make a profit.

DJ

As you own entertainment equipment – Yes –

I was not renting out equipment – being it a lot suggested that primary aim was to make a profit.

Renting him out sound equipment," no I was not at all."

Are you aware that music is a licensed activity and beliefs need a licence to play music?

I need a licence for both premises -Yes –

I would not check if lending equipment to a private party.

Too Smooth Is registered but not trading because of the ASBO including Interim Order, my reputation has been ruined.

Interim App on 18th 2014 so before then June 2014? 4th? September

Were any business transaction conducted during them periods.

I sold Business transactions.

I have lent to councils but not for business transactions, as a friend only.

It's incorrect that I was setting up raves.

Page 50 – bundle tab 9 – Inspector Hamill

I walked from Great Cambridge Rd towards them, it would be, impossible for door staff to get me for I was on the other side of Rd, never on the premises.

"Yes" it is incorrect.

R V CORDELL

7

"Yes" POs mistaken.

Page 38 – Tab 13 – Detective Skinner 2 events

Page 75 – Tab 24

D denies knowing people alleged to have worked for him on the night – either Pc or person mentioned in statement is wrong.

Reason why you're found in these raves is because you help organise them.

Page 141

Vehicle was owned by me but was sold and now brought back.

Statement Page 3

Page 104

I was not with Holly Field on that day.

Page 99

Accept I was there in the van inside the unit.

The report is wrong; I had 2 boxes in the van – No speakers – I was not in the premises.

Did not help organise Rave and sound equipment was not mine.

I have tried to hire equipment but organisation of event – Birthday party nothing to do with me.

Is **Pc Chandlers** report wrong as well? "Yes"

9 / 10 – August 2014

Bottom Page 7 (Statement)

Accept I attended venue – for Birthday dinner – I was invited

200 People turning up had nothing to do with me.

With social networking it is easy for some one to have 200friends.

I had cylinders in my vehicle, requires legal authorisations, I have them on my car, for welding - I do welding continuously. I do it as a hobby.

I was not at the location for a large rave.

I do remember many people turning up.

I remember police being in attendance.

I would never shout @ crowd – to busy talking to the police.

Pc statements are wrong.

There's a possibility that I did say to police that it was a private conference.

DJ

Do you no that 20 people is the maximum – Yes

Def XEX

Was Pc Edgoose out of car? – I know two of them come out of car and approached me.

24th May Incident - Do you remember speaking with Pc Jackson? Do not remember names.

Paragraph of T and C'S Re Falcon Park (Statement)

Deposit does go back unless damage or loss stopping due to breach of agreement.

Amount = No Fee

NFO

DEF

Additional witness not here, statement can be read but less weight because witness not here.

Witness 2 can be here in 1 half hours

Half evidence

R V CORDELL

8

13:30pm

DEF

N.F Witness.

Case closing subs.

Statutory test key:

- 1) Whether D has acted in an Anti Social Manner: Alarm / Distress.
- 2) Astonishing of council to make that whole 11 officers were wrong.
- 3) D's evidence is also not meritable and neither his witness statements.

- 4) D's Mothers evidence – totally irrelevant – her evidence is based on conspiracy police have against her family.
- 5) 7th June Witness Inspector Hamill and Sos .Miles witness, Cordell (D). Inspector Hamill miles points, to D being the organiser.
- 6) Disruption and concern Rave caused that is outlined by Cad Reports and officers statements.
- 7) 19th July Inspector Skinner describes a rave and Cordell being organiser, another statement as far as D is concerned, which is totally wrong,
- 8) Crimit's reports show D as organiser, of large raves according to officer's statements.
- 9) Test mode out of submissions above.
- 10) Consistent Patten of behaviour as by of D concerned.

1).Test of Public Nuisance? Does not **(text missing)** delaminates? Of fact, but from Cad's Re: alarm distress etc. Shows this has happened. The impact this has on police resources looking @ noise levels and potentially speculating out of control. – Disorder due to shutting events down.

2) Pc Elsmore: Description **(of crime)** levels after the D was subject to order has reduced – only 3 – when D was active was significant more.

3) The order is necessary and attention drawn to carefully word interim order.

Def Closing subs

1) Test to be passed can the allegations be proven? Deceived that alleged it may be illegal, it does not need to cause Alarm harm or Distress.

Page 2 and 3,

Hearsay from Steve Elsmore is a copy and paste job.

Pc Parcel not correct to file evidence, of Crimit's, which contained incorrect evidence that can not be backed up, of D known for class A drugs and or supply – info is widely inaccurate.

Totality of evidence is hearsay as well as reports at Cannery Wharf.

No proof this was an illegal rave, as S.63 CJO 1994, No proof of Trespass – determination not proved to Criminal Legal Standards.

I did XEX Officer of @ no time did he indicate where info had come from, 24/05/2014.

2nd Allegations – Application relies on Hearsay again and Crimit's **Pages 104 – 107**, noted from evidence.

2nd Could hearsay from Josher Holyfield, who allegedly confessed that was looking to set up raves ---

(A large section of court transcripts are missing)

Crimit's, "steward not her again."

R V CORDELL

8

Page 98-100 – hearsay – from a Pc again – all in 3rd person, no indication that Pc attended himself.

No evidence that it was illegal rave.

Show determination in view of illegal rave and no proof hasbeen submitted or covers witness as victim.

No allegations where app. Produced 1st hand evidence.

The particulars of allegations, states illegal rave and no proof of the required standards has been submitted, nothing adduced.

It may be unlikely for presumption that given but it's possible.

In XEX.

App **(text missing)** del failed to Enfield Council, who did not pursue.

Does it show the organiser or just some one getting involved in things he shouldn't.

Hearsay be **(text missing)** Grounds are not here. =====

No evidence police confirmed D to be organiser.

D spoke to police; he gives reasonable Intel, calming he can't keep his mouth shut.

A man who state's his someone else's lawyer.

This is a rave said to have lasted 3 days but evidence is weak.

Tyrone's presence was untrue, due to life threatening injuries. No competent evidence.

Police had Intel, Re: Every Decibel Matters, with no further line of investigation.

Additional hearsay, only evidence is a van of equipment hired equipment for free.

19/07/2014

Carpet Right – Inspector Skinners evidence – the indoor test of legality is proof of trespass and nothing adducted.

Mystery why no statement was taken from owner of keys? Also whether or not consultation's had been given to access the premises.

On another occasion: Mr Cordell gave explanations to his presents.

24/07/14

"D does not accept he organised", Pc Edgoose **Page 50** – statement said he "did organise illegal raves" Admissions alleged from evidence,

Entirely of conversations of others, not clear.

27/07/14

Same on Mill marsh Lane, hearsay evidence of a number of Pc's, who were called and gave evidence.

Interesting that some one other than D, (lost text) has supported evidence of people living and potentially other's on the land treating it as home.

Further evidence inaccurate regards shoplifters.

9/10 August

Evidence of Pc officers, does not match up with allegations in the application – on his duties, odd their being squatters, also did not try to contact

owner while on duty suggesting D there at private party – due to lack of suitable equipment, evidence D was attending a private party.

Councillor; ?

General credibility of witnesses was errors, because hearsay of Crimit's of no prominence taking into account weight of statement.

Page 32 ? day and event 2.

Inconsistencies that are bios of officers to include evidence that favours the application by being unreadable.

R V CORDELL

-09-

Allegation of 15 to 10 boys (text missing) to talk unrelative of conduct.

Fear of reprisals.

LTC when given evidence was to prove sound organisation possibly which D accepts.

If? D was polite on his case.

Investigation not performed with measurements as it should have been.

Vendetta families highlighted.

Inconsistence's between start of Crimit's, a complete absinth of follow up, "is simply worrying".

What other info is wrong, that we have not been able to check?

DJ

Mr Justio?? Pitons??? – sum ??? and ???

Test of???? – Not related to police resources.

Was ASBO serious and persistent?

Decrease in activity – "huge decrees since Interim ASBO "but no indication of trends: before – after and previous years.

Pc Elsmore, couldn't say, why there was a decrease in raves.

Correspondence of consultation - so far this relies wrongfully on weak evidence.

Met on points of how then the statutory test, in relation to raves and into what is required.

DJ

Delivery of judgment @ 15:32pm

Satisfied so that she is sure, that the D acted, during the dates in a manner so for the ABSBO to be Granted.

Order necessary for reasons:

- (1) Nature of conduct of these parties's
- (2) Noise of ?????/? of ?????? civil
- (3) Police officers have to attend in large numbers.
- (4) Since interim order there has been a decrease in this type of activity.
- (5) Satisfied D has acted in as manner, of such conduct, that he caused harassment alarm, distress.
- (6) Conduct is necessary to protect residents of Enfield, from anti social acts, from Simon Cordell.

DJ

Need to ensure probations are precise to award.

DEF

D's attendance at raves is not an issue and places unreasonable burden on him for attending parties when 20 people attended and what appears to be illegal then turns out to be legal, also places D in a difficult position if false steps are made to legality of parties, ASBO must be prevelitive

DJ

D can carry out legitimate and licensed business.

Point D; "or local authority addition"

DJ "To a period of 5 years"

Propitiations are precise and plain.

Term's of the Order.

D to upset then left room but lawyer present.

Terms need adding

END OF THE COPY OF THE Highbury Magistrates Court Transcripts.

On Monday, 23 May 2016, 3:18, Rewired Rewired <re_wired@ymail.com> wrote:

Dear Josephine;

How are you, I hope all is well? After all, things considered, I will get straight into business, this letter is, furthermore, towards our conversations, however I would appreciate it if you can reply to my questions below, as soon as practically possible and with due time before you finish your contract and leave office, so that we can conclude the case files and agreed activities, such as taking the case to court, so that to be sure that the conditions are imposed and defined within accordance of jurisdiction of the law, as you have all ready agreed to do so, this is also inclusive of all information ready for the next representative of Michael Carroll's office, who will be the new case handler, so that he or she can be prepared to instruct any barrister for any court herrings, as per-listed.

Some of the questions are in relation to the understanding of the on goings that did occur, at and in the court mentioning at wood green crown court, on the 22nd 23rd this is also inclusive of the 24th 02/2016.

On that date mentioned the company, who you are acting for, that is, representing myself Mr. Simon Cordell, and further named as Michael Carroll & co solicitors, that you do or did represent a contract with till the 2nd June 2016,

This information was also inclusive of the understanding of the solicitor firms running objectives towards the ongoing of this case, that in this instance is being brought against myself Mr. Simon Cordell by the commissioner of the metropolitan police and his acting officers, this is also inclusive of any other local authorities governing body's, one mentioned as Enfield council. This being quoted being of an application representing a stand alone Anti Social Behavior Order 2003, an Act to make further provision in relation to criminal justice and disorder act 1994.

It is being said that Miss Josephine Ward, at a point of time before the date of the said trial hearing at Court, that was postponed and did not go ahead, that she undoubtedly mentioned, when giving her legal guidance too, such accusations of incidents, that does refer to the organisation of illegal raves, that still said "acting in my defense."

It is being said that you did in fact explain before the date of the hearing, I quote; explain being of information regarding to the past representing barrister a Mr. Andy Lock, relating to that of Intel stating that he would not be able to attend court and act for myself as he did previously at the magistrates court, due to being away on leave and this being off the only issue raised by yourself, said to be regarded myself of your concern.

On the date of the hearing another barrister did apply to the judge, in aid of my acting solicitors yourself, so to be sure, that of you, having to no longer represent me in the court proceedings, due to a break down in communication between our self's, the judge ruled that Michael Carroll and co's solicitors, must act till the conclusion of the case, the overall Point I am highlighting as referred to is that the judge, "on the whole" has ordered the company to act for myself Mr. Simon Cordell.

First Question and request is;

In that understanding, I ask and request for you to direct the case to be carried out in such a manner, if what is being request is legal to do so. I request that being off; at the day of my trial, to act litigant with my mother as a McKenzie friend and for a barrister that we do select together, to represent me inclusive, so for he or she to be well instructed to represent myself (in

the background" on the days of court.

Second Question is;

I also ask of you to set up a meeting and for this request to be inserted within one month of this dated letter, this meeting will and should be between who will be taking on the case, after you leave your office, alongside with the acting barrister chosen. I believe and understand that this is within the constraints of the law; I take my guidance from;

<https://www.gov.uk/represent-yourself-in-court/overview>

Second Request is;

I also request that you call for questioning the following officers and civilians;

- Josher Holyfield
- Superintendent Jane Johnson dated 30/ October 2014
- Steve Hodgson Dated 30th October 2014
- Dc Steve Elsmore Dated
- A/PS Charles Miles Dated 2nd August 2014
- A/Inspector Hamill Dated 6th August 2014
- Pc Donald Mcmillan Dated 14th August 2014 and 19th August 2014• A/Inspector Douglas Skinner Dated 15th August 2014 and 9th September 2014
- A/PS Jason Ames Dated 15th August 2014
- Pc Aaron King Dated 15th August 2014 and 7th September 2014
- Pc Jhon Anderson Dated 19th August 2014
- Pc Eric Baker Dated 19th August 2014
- Pc Edgoose Dated 31 August 2014
- Hugh Giles, Director of Legal Services Metropolitan Police Director of legal services.
- Sally Gilchrist Legal Executive

Third question is;

Would it, please be possible for you to send me the barrister's notes, submission that he wrote for the last hearing also inclusive of a copy of the submission he prepared for myself in regards to the admittance of hearsay in the ongoing of the respondent's, case.

Forth question is;

I also request the date of my up and coming appeal, I know it is in Sep 2016 at some point in time but I am not sure what date.

Fifth question is;

There is the fact of the matter, which leads me to the concern of the Judge at Wood Green Crown Court giving the respondent, until the 01/09/2016 to hand over anything that was needed and what the judge himself asked to be given, as this date set will give me and the representatives of Michael carol and co solicitors, very little time in order to go over anything that will be handed over to us and the court.

The question is why did no one say anything about that date as it is so close to the appeal?

Sixth question is;

As has all ready been mentioned, I would like to know where I stand; I know you are leaving Michael Carroll & Co on the 03/06/2016. So I would like to know the person that will be taking my case over at Michael Carroll's & CO after you leave, I ask is someone actually taking over my case at the office?

The worry I have is when I spoke to Michael Carroll at the office, when meeting you Miss Josephine Ward, is that Mr. Carroll then went down stairs "Outside of his office" and then spoke to my mother, there confiscation was; Mr. Carroll said he will not do anything more on my case, because too much money had already been spent. So to me he is only worried about money and not someone's life he is acting for.

I have asked repeatedly for many issues to be addressed from the start of the on goings of the case which has never been done to date, issues such as defining the conditions that were wrongfully imposed, as in fact it is clearly omitted in section 63 of the Crime and public disorder act 1994, That stating section 63 is for outdoor events unless trespass has taken place and all incidents being referred to are indoors, also that being of the fact trespass clearly never happened.

The representing barrister clearly states in his submissions to you in paragraph (11) of his notes, "Quoted "that I was not found guilty under the respondent's case".

If such issues of concern had been addressed as listed in all of the copies of correspondence of emails as asked then I feel it would never have taken up so much of any person's time as listed in date 22nd May 2016, inclusive of the new up and coming Appeal hearing, as for sure my case would have already been rectified

I also believe I would not be feeling deprived of justice and not with an even further risk of a further date than the new set appeal date of September 2016.

I do believe you understand from the barrister submissions, which were sent after the hearing at Wood Green Crown Court to Michael carols office, this is also to be inclusive of all the emails that I and my mother have previously sent to Miss Josephine Ward in regards to my case, that being said in reference to myself handing to the judge on two different

occasions, a copy of an article six containing evidence of police corruption in the development of the application you represent towards myself.

The issues listed and many other concerns previously listed have now piled up that must be addressed for myself to stand a fair and speedy trial, this work has then been added to the appeal costs and I feel that this has caused the cost to go up due to no fault of my own as I was never found guilty and the conditions were imposed wrongfully.

As if surely my concerns were managed before the start of the trial, when I and my mother were asked over and over again, the cost would have been added to the initial trial costs and not to the appeal costs. But it seems that I get the blame for this when I should not.

I believe since you have looked more into the case and what was being asked of you to be done for the trial, you have seen and noticed the reason(s) and even further to that why we wanted this addressed before the trial as it is real points that should have been dealt with at the trial, you or any person can see that parts of the respondents case inclusive of the jurisdiction of the law is imposed wrong, there file is totally incorrect and the timelines are not correspondent to their articles, sort after many other important parts which was never dealt with correctly, as for fact the police was allowed to pass such evidence off at the trial as being correct when clearly it was not correct.

Just listed are many important facts of this case, which should and will aid in myself to get a fair trial," which I never got at trial."

- Seventh question is;

Could I also be forwarded the trial cost invoice for legal aid so I can see it please?

- Eighth question is;

I have spoken to Michael Carroll on the phone the other day and he is also not willing to do any other work on this case, and states that the case is ready for appeal, how can it be ready when there is still information to come from the CPS not later than the 01/09/2016 ordered by the Judge?

- Ninth question is;

So where am I left with this no acting solicitor to act on my behalf to deal with my appeal as Michael Carroll clearly does not want to do anything and only says to me to talk to you, but I know you are leaving the company so where does this leave me? And I feel I will never get a fair appeal why because of costs, because things were not done, which I asked to be done and my mother asked for them to be done, why do I feel the way I do about this case and the worry I have had to suffer?

- Tenth question is;

There are real big issues, I know that Michael Carroll & Co does not wish to deal with this Appeal is this due to the mess up due to things not being addressed at trial? I know Michael and you want to get broken away from this appeal and the judge never allowed this to happen, yet when you leave will Michael Carroll asked for this again? How am I to know anything how am I not meant to worry?

This is my life and I have asked time and time again and so has my mother since this case started for the conditions to be defined, for this to be taken back to court and get them defined no one has done this in the case.

Even at trial Andy Locke tried to get this dealt with and the judge would not deal with this. Why can't these conditions be defined by the court why have I got to suffer not going out in fear the police will arrest me due to these conditions an avoiding tribunal and disciplinary action.

- Eleventh question is;

I keep explaining that I do not understand the conditions also that being of how they were legally put in place, so I ask you, if you yourself can see the conditions are wrong in law and if so why?

- Twelfth question is;

I have also attached a copy of the court transcripts of the day at Highbury Magistrates Court and request that you verify them to be true articles and submit them to the respondent, in support of the evidence of my trial, and confirm so?

I am left on conditions that have never been defined that are a beach to my human rights and nothing has been done, yet we have asked over and over again for this to be addressed.

I would like the above issues addressed before you leave the company on the 03/06/2016 so I know where I stand for the appeal please.

Yours fifthly
Mr. Simon Cordell

