

From: JOSEPHINE WARD [josephinewardsolicitor@gmail.com]
Sent: 29 January 2014 15:57
To: Lorraine Cordell
Subject: Re: Regina v. Simon Cordell
Hi Lorraine / Simon

Sorry to hear that you have been unwell.

The date of 30th April 2013 is not significant and does not add to the prosecution case. This is the date preferred by the prosecution. As you are aware the premises being checked and being secured by Mr Patel will be open to rigorous cross-examination. The date used by me in my letter is the date specified in the indictment that is before the court.

I will amend my letter and specify that Simon was there to hire his equipment. It would be helpful if Simon can bring to the meeting on Friday a copy of the invoice confirming this and also any company accounts that he has kept since the start of his company to show that he is in business.

The statement from Nikki Diamond will follow after the Insurance company discloses the claims made by Mr Patel, whether voluntarily or by Third Party disclosure. I am in possession of the interview tape of Simon which you can listen to at my office. I will see if Anthony can burn a copy so that Simon can bring it to you.

I will update you once I receive confirmation from the insurance company.

Regards

Josephine

On Wed, Jan 29, 2014 at 3:32 PM, Lorraine Cordell <lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk> wrote:

Hi Josey

Sorry for the late reply to your email I have been very unwell; Simon can come for the meeting at your office on Friday.

As for the letter there is some mistakes please see below.

- Between 30th April 2013 and 9th May 2013 having entered a building, namely Unit 3, Horrisons Industrial Estate as a trespasser stole therein a chair and a gazebo.

The dates are wrong Mr Patel left the building at 14.00 on the 1st May 2013 and then did not return till 8th May 2013 at 10.30 so he knew the building was ok until the 1st May 2013 not sure why the 30th April 2013 has been put in. also Simon was charged with Burglary and this is what we have told the insurance company he was charged with when we had the meeting.

- Our client has denied any involvement in the burglary matter but concedes that he was a DJ at