

be a time on the back. My son's barrister had also PC G about the ticket issues and PC G said he did not have it in court, the judge stated at the start of the hearing he was on the understanding the notebook had been used.

The judge was really not happy and told PC G to leave the court room but not the court building, and that he wanted all the original document in court for him to see regarding this case.

The judges heard the summing up and went out to decide. The CPS went outside in this time I believe to speak to PC G. As when the Judges came back in and said my son had won his appeal and that he was not happy with what had gone on in this case, the CPS stated to the judge this was a paper based file case and things get mislaid in this sort of files. The judge asked if the audio could be kept and placed on file in case it needed to be used later. Which we agreed to, and we then left the court.

It was not until we got the 1st report from the DPS and the notebook was in there that it was confirmed there was in fact a notebook all a long so why did PC G lie to us and the judges saying it was only a proformer and the statement he wrote when he got back to the police station.

Until we got the DPS report the only word we had that PC G used his notebook on that day was my son.

And I am sorry but it does not cut it that PC G could get away with saying his arrest was needed due to uncertainty as to the address provided. When a person is stopped or spoken to the police like my son was a radio check would be carried out to check to see if the person was wanted or anything else. The police have my son's address on there system so the address my son gave would have been checked and shown as correct on the police system.

My son did not need to lie he give PC G his insurance cert with no problem he had done nothing wrong, so would have had no need to give a wrong address as he would know it would have shown on the police system, why would my son say he was homeless? It was not my son that lied it was PC G and I believe that has already been proven.

I believe 3 weeks is enough time for PC G to come forward and is acceptable.

If the inspector had done his job when he come to the road side when my son asked if one could have been called this could have all been avoided, but instead he just went with what the police officer said and did not brother to check what my son was saying.