

given, as this date set will give me and the representatives of Michael carol and co solicitors, very little time in order to go over anything that will be handed over to us and the court.

The question is why did no one say anything about that date as it is so close to the appeal?

Sixth question is;

As has all ready been mentioned, I would like to know where I stand; I know you are leaving Michael Carroll & Co on the 03/06/2016. So I would like to know the person that will be taking my case over at Michael Carroll's & CO after you leave, I ask is someone actually taking over my case at the office?

The worry I have is when I spoke to Michael Carroll at the office, when meeting you Miss Josephine Ward, is that Mr. Carroll then went down stairs "Outside of his office" and then spoke to my mother, there confiscation was; Mr. Carroll said he will not do anything more on my case, because too much money had already been spent. So to me he is only worried about money and not someone's life he is acting for.

I have asked repeatedly for many issues to be addressed from the start of the on goings of the case which has never been done to date, issues such as defining the conditions that were wrongfully imposed, as in fact it is clearly omitted in section 63 of the Crime and public disorder act 1994, That stating section 63 is for outdoor events unless trespass has taken place and all incidents being referred to are indoors, also that being of the fact trespass clearly never happened.

The representing barrister clearly states in his submissions to you in paragraph (11) of his notes, "Quoted "that I was not found guilty under the respondent's case".

If such issues of concern had been addressed as listed in all of the copies of correspondence of emails as asked then I feel it would never have taken up so much of any person's time as listed in date 22nd May 2016, inclusive of the new up and coming Appeal hearing, as for sure my case would have already been rectified

I also believe I would not be feeling deprived of justice and not with an even further risk of a further date than the new set appeal date of September 2016.

I do believe you understand from the barrister submissions, which were sent after the hearing at Wood Green Crown Court to Michael carols office, this is also to be inclusive of all the emails that I and my mother have previously sent to Miss Josephine Ward in regards to my case, that being said in reference to myself handing to the judge on two different occasions, a copy of an article six containing evidence of police corruption in the development of the application you represent towards myself.

The issues listed and many other concerns previously listed have now piled up that must be addressed for myself to stand a fair and speedy trial, this work has then been added to the appeal costs and I feel that this has caused the cost to go up due to no fault of my own as I was never found guilty and the conditions were imposed wrongfully.

As if surely my concerns were managed before the start of the trial, when I and my mother were asked over and over again, the cost would have been added to the initial trial costs and not to the appeal costs. But it seems that I get the blame for this when I should not.

I believe since you have looked more into the case and what was being asked of you to be done for the trial, you have seen and noticed the reason(s) and even further to that why we wanted this addressed before the trial as it is real points that should have been dealt with at the trial, you or any person can see that parts of the respondents case inclusive of the jurisdiction of the law is imposed wrong, there file is totally incorrect and the timelines are not correspondent to their articles, sort after many other important parts which was never dealt with correctly, as for fact the police was allowed to pass such evidence off at the trial as being correct when clearly it was not correct.

Just listed are many important facts of this case, which should and will aid in myself to get a fair trial," which I never got at trial."