

The Judge decided to go ahead in the absence of The Appellant with the Appeal; he heard the witness statements from police on this date.

On 19 January 2017 again The Appellant and his family did not attend Court this case has made The Appellant so unwell, at the end of this day the Judge dismissed the Appeal against conviction, but he changed a few of the conditions that The Appellant was under, the conditions are still a breach of The Appellant's human rights. Schedule of prohibitions are listed below.

Schedule of prohibitions:-

You must not:-

1. Be concerned in the organisation of a rave as defined by s.63 (1) or s63 (1A) of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994.
2. Knowingly use or supply property, personal or otherwise, for use in a rave as defined by s.63 (1) of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994.
3. Enter or remain in any disused or abandoned building unless invited to do so in writing by a registered charitable organisation or local authority or owner of the premises.
4. Enter any non-residential private property (by which words buildings and an open enclosed and are intended to be individual) or an industrial estate between the hours of 22:00 and 07:00 without written permissions from the owner and an leaseholder of such property. If you can demonstrate that the purpose of your entry of such property is to purchase goods or services from any shop or garage or fuel supplier which is open to the public at such times. Then in such event, you may enter but you must not remain on such property for longer than 30 minutes and you may do so on only one occasion during each separate nine hour period between 22:00 and 07:00 daily.
5. Provide any service in respect of any licensable activity in any unlicensed premises.

For the sake of clarity, nothing in this order prevents the defendant from assisting, preparing for, engaging in licensed licensable activities,

This order expires on the 3 August 2020:-

This order and its requirements amends' a previous order imposed by Highbury Corner Magistrates Court.

Condition 4 states:-

Enter any non-residential private property (by which words buildings and an open enclosed and are intended to be individual) or an industrial estate between the hours of 22:00 and 07:00 without written permissions from the owner and an leaseholder of such property.

If you can demonstrate that the purpose of your entry of such property is to purchase goods or services from any shop or garage or fuel supplier which is open to the public at such times. Then in such event, you may enter but you must not remain on such property for longer than 30 minutes and you may do so on only one occasion during each separate nine hour period between 22:00 and 07:00 daily. With this condition in place, it would mean that any non-residential property The Appellant would not be able to attend unless it was for no less than 30 minutes on any one occasion, during a separate nine hour period:

This would include hospitals, police stations, 24-hour supermarkets, petrol stations, cinemas, restaurants, bars, night clubs and any other public place open to the public between these times, that is non-residential, The Appellant would only have a 30 minute window to be able to enter any non-residential building, however is not feasible within that 30 minutes to:-

1. The Appellant could not be seen in a hospital within 30 minutes,
2. How would it be feasible if The Appellant went to dinner at a restaurant they would be completed within 30 minutes?
3. How would it be feasible if The Appellant wanted to go to a nightclub or late-night bar as it would only have 30 minutes?
4. Places that are open to the public should not be restricted to The Appellant how is The Appellant meant to have a normal family life?
5. The Appellant cannot go to without written permission which would be degrading for The Appellant to have to ask each time he wanted to go somewhere and explain why he needed it to be confirmed in writing by the owner and/or leaseholder of the property, how this condition could be applied by any Judge and state it is not a breach of someone human rights must be wrong.

6. jiojiojioj

Conditions 2 states knowingly using or supplying property personal or otherwise for the use of a rave as defined under section 63.1 of the criminal justice and public order act,

The Appellants has spent the last 10 years building his business saving every penny and help from family it is within the entertainment industry, he will hires equipment out and his services, The Appellants business would seriously be affected, because if he hired his equipment and it ended up in an illegal rave The Appellant would be in breach of the conditions. When hiring out equipment you do asked what is going to be used for, and you do have a contract that is in place, but what the person tells you their reason for hiring the equipment out is not always the correct reason and is not used for the purpose the person told you The Appellant would be in breach of these conditions. Also if The Appellant loaned someone any personal belongings and that person ended up at an illegal rave then The Appellant would again be in breach of his conditions, even if the item was something that did not even constitute as being for an illegal rave.

Conditions 5 states provide any service in respect of any licensable activity in an unlicensed premises.

How is The Appellant meant to run his business, The Appellant would not be able to obtain a licence that has already been clarified by the police and councils due to the Antisocial Behaviour Order that is in place, The Appellant would not be able to offer his services also due to the restriction that he has only 30 minutes within a non-residential building, most events go to the late hours in the morning so even if there was a licensed premises and someone wanted to hire the services of The Appellant The Appellant would not be able to do this. The Appellant was also offered contracts within two nightclubs to be the manager if The Appellant was again offered contracts within nightclubs or late-night bars The Appellant would not be able to accept these contracts. I cannot even say why condition 5 has been imposed because condition 4 conflicts with condition 5 in certain parts. And who would want to hire or take on The Appellant if he had to ask for written permission which would be degrading for The Appellant to have to ask each time he wanted to go somewhere or had a contact and had to explain why he needed it to be confirmed in writing by the owner and/or leaseholder of the property, These are just a few concerns with the conditions that The Appellant is under, there is other concerns with other conditions set at by the Courts that are of concern.

When the Appeal hearing was over the conditions was not served on The Appellant, they were posted to him in the post.

The Appellant mother has put an application into the Crown Court on forms EX-105 and EX-107 requesting the Tape/Disc Transcription for all hearings, and is waiting to hear back from the court, to see if it will be granted.

The Appellant mother has also put an application into the police under a subject access request to get all The Appellant history with the police which will show the data protection errors and more data that has been inputted incorrectly by the police, it will also show a history of how much the police does not leave The Appellant alone.

Also how many complaints has had to be put into the police regarding how the police have treated

The Appellant over many years which when asked in this ASBO application case by the judge was any of this the truth they replied no to. The Judge also asked if anyone else had had an ASBO application against them for an ASBO on the dates held within the ASBO application, the Judge did not get a reply and it was not asked again.

The police have not only done this to The Appellant but The Appellant whole family so each family member have requested there records. So far the police have refused The Appellant application and his brothers, they have allowed The Appellant mother and The Appellant sister but only part of the information has been supplied. This has been passed to the ICO to address, but due to the backlog