they only pay out after the May 2013 claim is it due that someone was arrested and they could put both claims over to the court case of Simon. As if you look at the dates of the insurance part it does not make any sense as the last date shows April 2013 yet it says they are paying out both claims, how could they pay out both claims when the party in May had not even happened yet. Or is it the case there was a next party after Feb 2013 and before May 2013.

6. What was the costs of damage to the building in Feb 2013 and the value of the items taken.
7. What was the damage to the building in May 2013 and the value of the items taken.

In short how could the property have been stolen in May 2013 if it had already been stolen in Feb 2013 as the invoice is the same?
Also the damage to the building from Feb 2013 seems to have been added to the costs to the May 2013 but yet Simon has not been charged with the party in Feb 2013.
It seems they have mixed both cases together and Simon is taking the blame for all of it within the costs.
The Crown does need to give us all the information to the Feb 2013 case including pictures so we can see ourselves the damage to the building and they need to tell us if anyone was changed in Feb 2013 and what was the outcome.
If the crown does not do this then this is an unfair trail they will be holding as to Simon case.
Also we need to see all the insurance claims to see the total costs of damage in Feb 2013 and also for the claim in May 2013 and the reasons as to why both cases have been linked together by the insurance company.
Also where is the insurance claim for the items within the warehouse that was meant to have been taken as so far I can only see a claim for the damage to the building?
Any claim would need to include a list of the items that where taken and would need to be replaced.
Someone cannot just come up with a figure of a cost for items that where taken and so far it seems as if that has what has been done in both cases Feb 2013 and May 2013.
Lorraine / Simon

From: Lorraine Cordell [mailto:lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk]
Sent: 28 November 2013 19:54
To: 'JOSEPHINE WARD'
Subject: RE: CPS response to secondary disclosure and confirmation of conference

Hi Josey
Thank you for the email I just got it so will let simon look over this tomorrow.
Can I ask something the receipt from Li-Lo Leisure is that the receipt for the 16/02/2013 or the 04/05/2013 as it seems to be the same receipt.
What we want is a full list of items and amounts that were taken on the 04/05/2013 and also the same for the 16/02/2013 someone cant say an amount in £s of damage and items where taken yet not have a full list, or are they saying on each of the receipts for the 04/05/2013 and the 16/02/2013 all of the items listed on the receipts where taken it does not make sense as they seem to be the same receipts. There is also no invoices for the repair of the damage on the 16/02/2013 or the 04/05/2013 for someone to come up with the amounts that they have for the damages to the this so called building on the 04/05/2013, Which he would have had to get invoices for his insurance companies.
Also there is no information as to really anything for the 16/02/2013, And no information as to the people that were arrested and what happened to them.
There is also nothing to show any work was carried out on the building from 16/02/2013 so show anything was fixed as I am sure there should have been.
There is far to much data that is missing.
And I wonder why how can a police officer not have any full lists of items that were taken yet be able to have a total amount of damage that were caused how could they come to these sums?
There seems to me a lot in this case is being covered up by the police and I would like this addressed as how can someone have a fair tail without the full facts.
Lorraine

From: JOSEPHINE WARD [mailto:josephinewardsolicitor@gmail.com]
Sent: 28 November 2013 17:30
To: too smooth; Lorraine Cordell
Subject: CPS response to secondary disclosure and confirmation of conference

Dear Simon / Lorraine

Please see the CPS response to our defence case statement. This was received in the DX today. It does not advance our case.