From: Rewired Rewired <re_wired@ymail.com>

Sent time: 26/04/2017 06:58:10 PM

In the High Court of Justice Queen's Bench Division

Royal Courts of Justice Strand, London, WC2A 2II

Date: 17/04/2017

Between:

THE QUEEN ON THE APPLICATION OF	
SIMON CORDELL	CLAIMANT
- AND -	
THE COMMISSIONER OF THE POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS	
	DEFENDANT
THE COMMISSIONER OF THE POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS	
METTOT GEIG	INTERESTED PARTY

SKELETON ARGUMENT INTRODUCTION:

- 1. This application is to have the following decisions/orders reviewed and reversed in order to prevail in the right to and in justice.
- 2. A decision/order to make an application for an Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order against the Appellant as named above was agreed in a conference at the Enfield civic centre on the 00/00/2014 alongside their employed staff and members of the Metropolis police.
- 3. On the 5th November 2014, the Appellant defends in his defence that a guilty verdict was wrongfully decided at Highbury Magistrates Court, this was in order for the Commissioner of the Metropolis Police.
- 4. The Appellant asks for the case to be reopened and reviewed in its decision that is made by order of the Magistrates Court, so for the verdict to be overturned in his favour to be declared as void making the decision an error in law.
- 5. The Appellant's human rights have now been breached. And;
- 6. The Appellant's right to due process has also been breached. This lead to the Appellant's right to a fair trial also being breached.
- 7. The ongoing of the Asbo case are a clear miscarriage of justice that has been allowed to happen, even once reported.
- 8. The Appellant's rights in the data protection act 1998 have also been breached in relation towards the ongoings of the Anti Social Behaviour order.
- 9. The Appellant requests the decision/order that was placed upon his statue of liberty's to make the interim order a full Antisocial Behaviour order on 4th August 2015 by Highbury Corner Magistrates Court, in order for the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis to be revoked.
- 10. The Appellant asks for the case to be reopened and reviewed in its decision that is made by order of the Magistrates Court, so for the verdict to be overturned in his favour to be declared as void making the decision an error in law.
- 11. The Appellant's human rights have now been breached. And;
- 12. The Appellant's right to due process has also been breached. This lead to the Appellant's right to a fair trial also being breached.
- 13. The ongoing of the Asbo case are a clear miscarriage of justice that has been allowed to happen, even once reported.
- 14. The Appellant's rights in the data protection act 1998 have also been breached in relation towards the ongoings of the Anti Social Behaviour order.
- 15. The Appellant requests for the decision/order made at Wood Green Crown Court on 19th January 2017 in relation to the Appeal against conviction, of the Antisocial Behaviour Order to be dismissed also.
- 16. The Appellant asks for the case to be reopened and reviewed in its decision that is made by order of the Magistrates Court, so for the verdict to be overturned in his favour to be declared as void making the decision an error in law.
- 17. The Appellant's human rights have now been breached. And;
- 18. The Appellant's right to due process has also been breached. This lead to the Appellant's right to a fair trial also being breached.
- 19. The ongoing of the Asbo case are a clear miscarriage of justice that has been allowed to happen, even once reported.
- 20. The Appellant's rights in the data protection act 1998 have also been breached in relation towards the ongoings of the Anti-Social Behaviour order
- 21. It is said that on the on the 12th September 2014 the police attended The Appellant home address of 109 Burncroft, Avenue, Enfield, EN3 7JQ, they knocked on the door, the Appellant was not expecting anyone, the Appellant approached his front door and looked through his spy hole he could see people who appeared to be police officers, and asked them through the door what they wanted, the police stated they needed to speak to him, the Appellant opened his front door very slightly then the police officers started to try a force an object into the front door, he soon came to the understanding he was being tricked so for the officers to be able to serve some