Th po do 2) ha 3)

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 Tress Pass – 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.

 2^{nd} 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 3^{rd} person, no indication that Pc attended himself.

No evidence that it was illegal rave.

Show determination in view of illegal rave and no proof has been 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.