

From: Rewired Rewired <re_wired@ymail.com>
Sent time: 26/04/2017 12:27:04 PM
Subject: eee

support team put into place, the acting solicitors were made aware of this, and so was the Court in the September 2016, when the Appellant was due to attend.

On 16 September 2016 the case was listed for a mention hearing for Non-Disclosure, and also a meeting with Mr Locke the Appellant Barrister as he had not seen any barrister since the 04/08/2015 hearing at the Magistrate's Court when the Antisocial Behaviour Order was granted by the Judge with no legality found.

The Appellant was told by his acting solicitors to be at Court by 09:30 hours, but later this was changed to 09:00 hours, this was so he could have a meeting with his barrister, which he did agreed to do.

On the agreed court date the Appellant arrived at Court for 09:00, his barrister did not arrive until around 09:40, disappointingly. On arrival The Appellants barrister and him himself inclusive of his mother all went together into a side room for a pre talk. Before any desiccations in relation to the case could be discussed, Mr Locke said he was sorry he was not feeling very well and that he also had some emails from Ms Ward, that he had to read first, on trying to open the emails he realized he could not and subsequently went out of the room to call Ms Ward.

At around 10:00 hours the Appellant was called into Court, Mr Locke came back into the room from after making his phone

call to Miss Ward, so for himself to be able to have collected his things and he then hurried and started to walk back out of the room we all was supposed to have a meeting but on stead he hurried in towards the Court room. The Appellant tried to stop him, so to have explained to him, what his concerns were. (“As we had not yet at this point in time had a moment to talk”) and the Appellant was also concerned about the disclosure that was going to be asked for.

The Appellant asked Mr Locke if he could ask the Judge to adjourn the case for five or ten minutes, so that we all could speak with each other, which he replied “no that the hearing was only for disclosure about the schedule”, The Appellant said that:- “He knew this was not correct and this was one of the reasons that he wanted to speak with him about.” The Appellant again asked: - “if the barrister would ask the Judge to postpone for ten minutes again” he yet again said “no”, at which point the Appellant asked “why Mr Locke did not want to speak to him, and should he act for himself ”?

The Barrister Mr Locke had no time to talk to The Appellant at the time and spent around four minutes talking to Ms Ward on the phone, before ending his call, he asked the Appellant if he the Appellant was dismissing his solicitors, to which the Appellant replied:- “No”, Mr Locke then started to walk towards the Courtroom, we followed the barrister into Court and on entering the Court in a raised voice, The Appellant said to Mr Locke:- (“who was ahead of him”) so am I acting for myself then.? Mr Locke never replied to the Appellant and just proceeded to talk to the Judge and then he walked toward the courtroom door and ushered out. At this point the Appellant

had no idea what was going on but proceeded to follow him outside the Court room, it was at this point of time when Mr Locke turned around and said quite curtly “I do not want you to speak anymore”, as we got closer to him he also informed the Appellant it was not good to shout out, “in open Court,” to which the Appellant had to agree with, but the Appellant felt so let down as it seemed his barrister did not even want to talk to him, since the Appellant had last seen him in 2014 and this is another part of the reasons that the Appellant wanted to speak with him, as so much had already gone wrong with this case and the Appellant felt very nervous as he did not know what was going on, or what would be said as he had not spoken to his barrister.

The Appellants mother, who had witnessed all of this, did try to explain to the Appellants barrister, what the Appellant wanted to say, in reference to the receipt of the requested Non-disclosure and asked Mr Locke to explain what the schedule is about before we all went back into court.

The Appellant also asked about the two article 6's that had been issued by the court, which had never been addressed:- “by the Court,” which pertains to The Appellants Human Rights and importantly his rights to a fair and speedy trial, to what had not happened. The Article 6 the right to a fair and speedy trial had been handed to the Court at earlier hearings, as The Appellants knew Mr Locke knew nothing about this and other information that had happened, so he felt it important to explain this to him at the time. Mr Locke explained that the schedule was what the Judge had asked for on the 04/04/2016, my mother replied this was not all the Judge had asked for,

without replying Mr Locke walked towards the Courtroom and we all followed, it was at this point The Appellant said to the barrister I feel I should represent myself because he felt he was not being heard.

All that the Appellant wanted was to be able to speak to his barrister, so that he knew what had been said at the earlier hearing of the 04/04/2016, and show him the document that was handed to the Judge, on that date.

On entering the Court the Appellant barrister Mr Locke addressed the Judge and said the Appellant did not want him to act for him, but this was not fully the case the Appellant only wanted to be able to speak to his barrister.

The Judge informed the Appellants barrister to remain in the Courtroom, the Judge asked what the case was listed for and the prosecuting barrister addressed the Court, answering the questions, he then also handed the schedule to the Applicants barrister, they also said to the Judge that the Appellant had been sending letters to the Court and the prosecution himself,

which stated: - "I Simon Cordell throughout the document."

This is not the case and the Appellant did not understand their comment or what document the prosecuting barrister was talking about. The Judge then addressed the Appellant and asked the Appellant did the Appellant still want the barrister to act for the Appellant, the Appellant replied "Yes" to the Judge that he did want the barrister to act for him; the Appellant stated that he only wanted time to speak to his barrister, as he had not spoken to a barrister since the Magistrate's hearing.

The Judge then addressed the Appellant barrister he said that the Appellant still wanted the barrister to act for the Appellant, the Appellant barrister agreed to this. The Judge also stated he felt he was not the best person to be hearing this case and passed it back over to the Judge that was hearing the Appeal.

On leaving the Courtroom the Appellant and his mother proceeded to go into a side room to talk with the Appellant barrister, we explained that a letter had been handed to the Judge on the 04/04/2016, the barrister said he knew nothing of this letter, so we handed him a copy for him to read. Once he read this he said he knew nothing about this and had only seen one document that kept saying I Simon Cordell, ("The Appellant has no idea of what this I Simon Cordell letter is.")

The Appellants mother proceeded to explain this is why the Appellant wanted to talk to Mr Locke before going into Court, as this is part of the Non-disclosure being requested.

The barrister explained he only knew about the schedule, to which the Appellant mother replied, the schedule had been

asked for by the Judge in addition to the letter that had been handed in and this was also when the Judge said it could be used as the Appellants skeleton argument and that this had happened when Miss Ward was in the Court on the date of the 04/04/2016 when she was also taking notes, so Miss Ward knew exactly what the Judge had asked for.

The Appellants mother had made a call to the Appellants solicitor and enquired as to what the Judge had asked for on the 04/04/2016 in regards to the disclosure, Ms Ward stated she could not remember, the Appellant mother being dumbfounded by this said in reply to her:- “you was sitting in the back of the Courtroom taking notes,” and continued to explain that only last week from the date in mention, will have everything that the Judge had asked for in his original disclosure, plus what was asked for in the Appellants letter, that was handed to the judge and Miss Ward also explained that the Judge had made other addictions in addition to the mentioned.

At no point did Ms Ward ever make the Appellants mother feel she did not know what was due to be disclosed, before and while still on the phone, if she had ever done this the Appellant and the Appellant mother would have asked her to relist the case to the Court and asked for this to be clarified, as the disclosure that we was asking for was very important to the ongoings of the Appeal.

The Appellant mother then handed the Appellant the phone the Appellant asked Ms Ward about the letter he was supposed to have sent to the Court and the prosecuting barrister, the Appellant was still thinking she was talking about the letter

handed to the Judge on the 04/04/2016 when Miss Ward was not.

Also in Court on this date, it was said the Appellant had written this letter himself, which was not the case.

In truth The Appellant agreed for a letter that Miss Ward had written in reply to the Judge's letter for the Appellant to be amended, he had amended it himself and it was to be handed into the court, the Appellant solicitor was at Court so she knew the Appellant had amended the letter, this is to be inclusive of it being sent to her by email, as she was in the court on this date to.

On this date when Miss Ward was a court she said to the judge that the Appellant had drafted the letter when the Appellant had only amended it, Miss Ward continued to say, that she did not draft the Letter and that the Appellant wrote it, this is not true, at this the Appellant did call Miss ward a liar as the Appellant knew Miss Ward had drafted the letter herself at first.

The Appellant later explained to Miss Ward on the phone that he could prove the truth and said, I have the emails you sent to me and my mother of the letter we talk about and me amending it, in return for you. It was also explained to all that we have kept copies of all other correspondence between our persons and this is to include (Since the start of the Court proceedings.

The Appellant mother has checked the dates for when this letter was drafted by The Appellant solicitor and then returned to her, the date was on the 03/04/2016 please see attached email

and letter (marked 03/04/2016 Ms Ward).

The Appellant barrister was listening to the phone call and after the Appellant ended the barrister got up and said I will need to think about still representing you as you called your solicitors a liar, the Appellant stated that he can prove that Miss Ward wrote the letter and she's denying as to doing so and further expressed himself in question the line of investigation by saying:- "how would anyone body else's feel, if she had lied about them," the Appellant barrister then replied that if he was still going to represent the Appellant then there would need to be a meeting at the Appellant barrister chambers, at this point the meeting concluded, with nothing else really spoke of about the Appellant Appeal yet again, this was days before the Appeal hearing was due to start once again.

Up to here for now

A while after the Solicitor wrote a letter and sent it to the Appellant and the Appellants mother, the date of this received email is dated 20/09/2016 and a copy had also been sent to the Court, this application was put in so for the acting solicitor to once again attempt to be removed from the record this was done to our surprise and was listed in Court to be heard on the 21/09/2016.

There were large sections of this letter that were incorrect and did not happen so therefore are not true; this can also be proven by the Court transcripts from the 16/09/2016.

On the 21/01/2016 we were on our way to Court and got caught in traffic, we contacted the Court to get a message to the Judge to say that we were going to be five to ten minutes late, “I know the Judge got the message.”

When we got to the Court, there was a barrister that Michael Carroll and Co had sent to the Court to deal with the application; this was so for them to be removed from the record for the second attempt.

The Barrister informed us she did not want to leave the Court before explaining what had happened it seemed the Judge had called this into Court without us being present and removed the solicitors from the record.

We question how could this have happened? Considering, the Appellant was not present at Court? And there was not a senior Partner from Michael Carroll and Co?; “this question is due to what had been previously said by His Honour Judge Morrison on 19/02/2016 in regards to this not being allowed to happen.”

The Barrister said the Judge wanted to see us and we would need to wait in Court until we were called, as the Judge was dealing with a trial and we would be called in after it.

Around 16:00 hours we were called into Court, the Respondent did make the Judge aware at this point that what had been said by His Honour Judge Morrison on the 19/02/2016 stating that a Senior Partner was not present at Court, the Judge replied that he could not force a solicitor to carry on with a case they clearly did not want to and that the Appellant could represent himself, he continued to state; that the case was in a much

better order now, but as is known the Appellant has learning difficulties and health problems which the Court are also well aware of, there were only a few days until the Appeal hearing was due to start once again, how could a Judge believe that a person with learning difficulties and health problems could be ready and cope with dealing with a three-day Appeal hearing on his own?.

We did try to get the Judge to adjourn the Appeal hearing so we could try and get representation put in place due to knowing the Appellant could not cope or handle this case on his own, which was due to start on the 26/09/2016 for a three-day hearing, the Judge said he would not allow this and that the Appeal hearing would go ahead no matter what. It seems again that the Appellant was being blamed for what was ongoing in this case, when the Appellant and the Appellant mother had done all they could, so for them to have this case ready to be heard.

How can a Judge expect someone that is known to be ill and have learning difficulties to be able to handle this case on their own?, considering there were only four days until the three-day Appeal hearing was due to start. Nothing was put in place by the Judge to help the Appellant in any way. The Appellant was just meant to get on with the case all on his own under them circumstances.

Once again the solicitors had done nothing for this case and the Judge had allowed them to walk away when this was said to not be allowed and it seems as if everything was being blamed on the Appellant.

It was also noted while we had been waiting outside the Court that the bundles we had been working from was the very first set of the application bundles and since that time everything had been updated, without us being informed, this included more statements from the police officer in charge of the case, there were lots of documents missing from within the first bundle due to the update, so until he was given the updated bundles, the Appellant had never seen them additional documents.

It was stated by the respondent they had sent new bundles to the acting solicitors Michael Carroll and co three times since the being of January 2016, we had never been given a set of new bundles since this case had started in 2014, we had never been told about new bundles been sent and never given a new copy of any bundle. This meant that bundle we had would have had all wrong page numbers and been paginated totally different from the bundles that were being used by the prosecution barrister and Courts.

When we were in Court we did say this to the Judge about the bundles, the Judge ordered the clerk of the Court to contact Michael Carroll and Co solicitors and order the solicitors to bring the bundles to Court. the solicitors informed the clerk that the bundles were at Nexus Chambers, the Judge was shocked that the solicitors did not have a copy of the bundles at their office. The Appellant's uncle who was also at Court said to the Judge he was willing to go to Nexus Chambers and pick the bundles up.

The Judge listed this for the 22/09/2016 after 14:00 hours to make sure we were all working from them same set of bundles.

Upon The Appellant's uncle getting home it was seen that the bundle he had collected was not the full set of bundles and only had part of the applications Skeleton Bundle.

On the 22 September 2016 we attended Court to inform the Judge we still did not have the updated bundles and the Judge once again got the clerk of the Court to call Michael Carroll and co solicitors to find out what was going on within the bundles, the Judge was very upset that we still did not have the bundles for the case, the Judge asked for the bundles to be brought to Court before 4 PM, The Appellant's mother stated that it would be easier and faster for her to pick the bundles up from the solicitors on the way home from Court, the Judge asked if she was sure that he could get them brought to Court she stated that it be faster for her to pick the bundles up from the solicitors on my way home.

When we left Court due to the time and the circumstances we had been placed in The Appellant mother called Michael Carroll's office to say what time we would be there by, The Appellant mother was told that the office would be closed by the time we got there so The Appellant mother agreed to pick the bundles up first thing in the morning on 23 September 2016.

On 23-09-2016 The Appellant mother left home early in the morning to go to Michael Carroll's office and collect the bundles with her brother, Mr A Cordell they went into the office

together to get the bundles, when the solicitor came down the stairs he had a piece of paper that The Appellant mother needed to sign, stating that the bundles had been collected from the office.

Upon getting home and looking at the bundles, The Appellant mother noticed there is now at least 13 additional statements that The Appellant and The Appellant mother had never seen before from the Respondent bundle, this is a clear error as we knew that in the first bundle there were only 4 public witness statements and there now seems to be 16, when taking a closer look at the statements we noticed there are no members of the public's statements of truth and this also applied for the original 4 contained in the folder minus one, this also highlighted that each member of the public's statements are police officers only and have each put there signatures on two different statements each, in a pretence of portraying to own two houses each in Edmonton xxx Gardens and other surrounding roads in an around Progress way, the police officers are claiming to be victims of this case while on active duty.

So in understanding this, the Applicant contacted Edmonton police stations lost property room, so too for him to arrange collection of the original bundle, that was never served to him in accordance with the law. To his further upset and disappointment of justice he was to be told by another police officer deployed at the lost property room as the manager, that the bundle that the Appellant wanted to claim had been misplaced or stolen, this file clearly shows that there was only ever four potential members of the publics witness statements

attached within side of the original Asbo application.

Some of the statements added are all dated prior to the Magistrates Court trial. Upon looking at The Appellant's bundles it seemed this had not been updated or indexed since 2015, so all the new documents that had been submitted to be added to The Appellant's bundle was not in their as they should have been.

Over the days leading up to this, The Appellant mother had learned how important it was that all the bundles were paginated and indexed correctly and that all the bundles were the same as each other so that each person was working on them files was all in Co Hurst to each other, as there was always problems at court due to this not being completed correctly.

Though the case history multiple documents had been handed to the Court, and them documents did not get patronised correctly or indexed into The Appellant's bundles, this includes the court and the Respondent bundles that they were using also.

A whole weekend was spent trying to add missing documents to the Appellant's bundle and making copies so that on the Court date of the 26-09-2016; any missing files could be added to the Respondent bundle and the three Judge's bundles. The Appellant health had become very unstable due to him knowing that he was going to have to be dealing with this

himself.

The Appellant mother also spent part of the weekend also writing a letter to the Judge in regards to what had gone on with the breaches in The Appellant's human rights, his article 6 human rights the Applicants rights to a fair and speedy trial, there were also a list of other things that had gone on throughout the case since 2014 in regards to the nondisclosure, and other issues that was always being raised when at Court and the reason as to why legal aid had been granted:

Due to the complexity of the case.

Due to The Appellant's learning difficulties.

Due to the concerns of The Appellant health.

This letter was emailed to the Court and asked to be passed to the Judge.

Please see letter that was emailed to the judge

The 26 September 2016 the three-day Appeal hearing was due to start, The Appellant was so unwell that there was no way he could attend Court, Mr A Cordell and Miss L Cordell attended Court to speak to the Judge, when the Judge entered the Courtroom he stated that he had received a letter that had to be addressed, he stated that he felt this would go to judicial review, he stated he had three options:

Carry on with the Appeal in the hope that The Appellant would turn up the following day.

To Dismiss the Appeal.

Adjourn the Appeal to a new date.

The Judge went over the letter in great detail; he started around five times that he felt that this case was going to go to judicial review.

The Judge decided to adjourn the case until the 16/01/2017; this was later changed for the Appeal to start on the 17/01/2017. The Respondent had tried to object to the Appeal being adjourned. The Judge stated that we should try to find a new solicitor to take on the Appeal and that he would help and also make sure that legal aid was in place.

The Judge asked why The Appellant was not in Court. The Appellant mother stated The Appellant had become so unwell due to what was going on in this case and that he was not coping. Information was passed to the Judge that showed The Appellant was unwell.

Mentioned in court; was also the missing documents that was missing from The Appellant's bundle, and that there were no statements within the bundle, my mother stated to the Judge that she had spent a lot of the weekend trying to update The Appellant's bundle and make sure that it was indexed correctly,