

take instructions due to the weekend.

The new solicitor firm said that they would send a barrister to Court on the 17/01/2017, to asked for an adjournment, so that they could act in the best interest of the client, as that is what they are there to do and so that the legal aid could be addressed and then passed over to them or a new application would need to be applied for.

The Appellant's health had deteriorated, when The Appellant's mother told The Appellant she believed she had found a solicitor to take the Appeal on this did bring his mood up a little bit, but he felt so much had gone wrong within the Asbo case that there would be a high chance of more going wrong at that point of time, he agreed that he would attend Court and meet the barrister that the new solicitors was sending, the problem was that this person could change at any time.

The Appellant does not leave his home which he treats as his prison cell due to the Asbo case and prudery the police have committed and no disciplinary action, punishment, being brought into motion for there wrongful actions.

On the 17 January 2016, the Appellant and his mother attended the Court, the new barrister was there also for The Appellant, so was the Appellants uncle, we all went into a side room and the barrister spoke to The Appellant, this was in regards to what the plans were for the case in turn what the new barrister was going to ask the Judge for, which was an adjournment, the reason being they needed an adjournment so that they could act in the best interest of their client, so that they could go over the complete case bundles, take instructions, make sure legal aid was in place correctly, and instruct a barrister who would be dealing with the Appeal for The Appellant, The Appellant agreed that an adjournment could be asked for, again it was stated to the barrister that we did not feel the Judge would grant an adjournment, the barrister stated that the Judge should understand that an adjournment would be needed for the new solicitors to act in a professional manner for their client and be able to get everything ready and have time to understand fully what the case was about, that an Appeal should be fair for all sides.

We were called into Court and the barrister spoke to the Judge, explained the situation and that he was asking for an adjournment, he spoke to the Judge in regards to the legal aid, and having the appeal ready for there new client and having time to be able to deal with it in a professional manner for there client. The Judge stated that he believed legal aid was still in place and it could just be transferred, the barrister stated if legal aid had been revoked then it would take at least two weeks for it to be put back in place, the Judge adjourned the hearing so that the barrister could contact the legal aid department to check the status of the legal aid, the barrister made calls to the legal aid department, but the legal aid department could not confirm whether legal aid had been revoked. Calls was also made to Michael Carroll and Co who stated that when they was removed from the record that the legal aid that was in place at the time had been revoked.

The case was called back into Court and the barrister explained that the legal aid department could not say whether or not the legal aid had been revoked, but when a call was placed to the old solicitors Michael Carroll and co they had said that the legal aid that was in place had been revoked. The Judge handed the barrister a certificate of legal aid, the barrister stated that the certificate was not proof that the legal aid had not been revoked.

The Judge stated I'm sure that you can be ready for the Appeal to go ahead by tomorrow, the barrister stated that they have a professional obligation to act in the best interest of the client and that they would not have enough time in order to go over all the bundles take instructions from the client, and instruct a barrister within half a day, and also to check fully whether a new legal aid application would have been need to be applied for.

At this the Judge stated, well if you cannot be ready by tomorrow, then The Appellant will have to act for himself, we will not adjourn the Appeal again.

It seems again The Appellant was being put at blame for the delay in the Appeal, but it was not due to The Appellant, The Appellant only wanted a fair hearing and Appeal from when this started in 2014 and from what was going on this clearly had not been.

The barrister tried his hardest to get an adjournment of the Appeal but the Judge would not allow an adjournment, the Judge started talking about the conditions that was imposed by the Magistrates Court, he stated that he felt that parts was disproportionate, but he could see nothing wrong with the timescale of the Antisocial Behaviour Order of 5 years. This was not the first time the Judge had mentioned the conditions that The Appellant was under, but this time the Judge went further to include what sections he thought were disproportionate, to the people in the Court The Appellant, Mr A Cordell, Miss L Cordell, and The Appellants barrister, the only way of looking at what the Judge was stating he had already made his mind up that he thought the conditions was the only problem. But this was before the Appeal had even been heard, why a Judge would state this without even hearing the Appeal.

The Judge would not allow an adjournment and stated The Appellant could represent himself if the barrister could not be ready by 10 O'clock the next morning, the Judge raised and left the Courtroom.

The Appellant was in such a state when we left the Courtroom he stated he knew the Judge would not allow the adjournment and felt the Judge did not want him to have representation and this is why the Judge removed his old solicitors, he felt very let down and just wanted to go home.

The barrister called us into a side room and had to ask The Appellant due to what the Judge has said, if they were to change the conditions to something appropriate would The Appellant accept it. This put further stress on The Appellant, The Appellant knew he had done nothing wrong and had not done what the police was saying he had done and The Appellant knew that if the disclosure had been given it would have proven this. The police have been unwilling to give any disclosure since this case started.

The Appellant was not willing to accept having the conditions changed and accepting the Antisocial Behaviour Order as this would have said he was guilty; The Appellant was not willing to accept something he knew he was not guilty of.

The Appellant was so distressed all the way home, he felt he would never get justice.

Later that day The Appellant's mother contacted the solicitors to see if anything could be done, but due to the Judge not allowing the adjournment the solicitors stated they could not take the case on and could not attend Court the next day, the reason given was because they would be putting their company reputation at risk by not having enough time in order to prepare for the Appeal to be able to act in a professional and correct way for their client. The Appellant's and his mother could totally understand this.

A vulnerable person should not be forced into a position where they have to act on their own behalf, in the opinion of many practitioners, detrimental to the administration of justice. But this is exactly what had happened, The Appellant and The Appellant mothers and others cannot understand or see any reason why the Judge did not allow for a short adjournment so that The Appellant had proper representation in place, especially when there was a solicitors company willing to take on the Appeal hearing, in turn to allow a fair Appeal hearing.

The Appellant's and his mother had not stopped since the removal of the old solicitors in September 2016, they continued to try and find a solicitors firm company, to take the Appeal hearing on, many calls were made to solicitors companies, advice lines, citizens advice, even in the search of a pro bono solicitors, the reason why the pro bono unit would not take the case on, is because The Appellant was entitled to legal aid, if The Appellant or his family could have afforded to pay privately for a solicitors company to act for The Appellant this would have been done a long time ago. Justice is meant to be fair but in the case of The Appellant Asbo this is not the case.

On 18th January 2017 The Appellant was so unwell he did not attend Court on this day, nor did Mr A Cordell, or Miss L Cordell, Miss L Cordell did however write a letter to the Judge and in that letter it asked for a stay on proceedings for the Appeal until it was taken to judicial review in regards to what had gone on.