

2. On the invoices the address that the items in the invoice was not delivered to the address the party were held in, in Feb 2013 and also May 2013 they were delivered to Marks wholesale which is a big shop, so how did they get to the address the party were held in I am sure Marks wholesale would have storage space and it does seem very funny that they would move items that were ordered to sell at one of his large shops?
3. There has never been a list of items that Mr Petal said was taken in May just an invoice so is Mr Petal saying that all the items on the list was taken at the party in May 2013
4. So far we do not even know the list of items that were taken in Feb 2013, and seeing at Mr Petal seems to be using the same invoice for both dates there should be 2 lists of items that where taken
5. what was the cost of the damage to the building in Feb 2013 as it seems from the emails Mr Petal has listed from his insurance they have put both claims into one which in fact would then go over to the date Simon hired his sound system out in May 2013-12-02
6. Why did the insurance company not pay the Feb 2013 claim out till after the claim in May 2013? Why did 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.
7. What was the costs of damage to the building in Feb 2013 and the value of the items taken.
8. 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.