

documents on him as they would never have been able to fit into any standard letterbox, due to the Appellant's learning difficulties he stated he would not accept anything and closed his door and then continued to state that he was not being rude in doing so.

22. It is a well-known fact on the police's system of government bodies that the Appellant does have learning difficulties and health problems.

23. The Appellant could hear the police talking outside his front door and the lady police officer then questioned her colleagues and said what shall we do now, a male police officer stated put it on the floor in front of the door referring to the application.

24. They then put some other pages into the Appellant's letterbox this totalled to four pages. The lady police officer then placed an A4 size folder on the floor outside the Appellant's front door as the male officer had instructed her to do.

25. The Appellant then made a phone call to his mother, who could not attend at the time this was until the following day when she attended the Appellant's home address. On her attendance, she found the folder was left opened on the floor where the police had left it. The Appellant's mother was very shocked when she looked inside the folder and saw the data that was within it.

26. The data that was within the A4 size folder was personal information and a breach of the data protection act 1998 by leaving such data in a commune area of the block of flats.

27. A letter of complaint was put to the police in the way in which they had left personal information on a doorstep in view of everyone that lived or who came into the block of flats, this was achieved on the 13th September 2014 and was hand delivered to Edmonton Green police station and a receipt was issued from them, at the same time as of when the complaint letter was handed in there was also that of the A4 bundle being referred to as the Asbo application and court summons which was also handed into the front desk of the police station.

28. The complaint has never been addressed and neither has there been that of a professional response concluding any outcome to the issues raised of concern, a total failure of a response from the police, providing any professionalism when dealing with complaints.

29. Please see a letter of the complaint and photos and receipt that was handed to Edmonton police station on 13th September 2014.

30. On 06th October 2014, the Appellant was due to appear in Court on this day, The Appellant had arranged for Michael Carroll and Co Solicitors, to act on his behalf, this included to have legal aid in place.

31. On the day of court legal aid had been applied for, but the legal aid had been refused, the Judge sitting overturned this and granted legal aid in the Applicants favour.

32. The reason for the Judge overturning and granting legal aid was due to the Appellant having known learning difficulties, health problems and due to the complexity of the case.

33. The disclosure was asked for so that the Appellant could stand a fair and speedy trial, but the requested disclosure never ever did come. The case was relisted for the 22/10/2014, for an interim Antisocial Behaviour Order hearing, all police officers were due to attend for the interim hearing.

34. On the 22nd October 2014, the Appellant was due in Court for the Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order to be heard, due to the Appellant barrister having a burst water pipe and his home being flooded he could not attend, the applicant still wanted the case to be heard which the Judge would not allow.

35. The Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order hearing was then set for the 05/11/2014.

36. On the 22nd October 2014, all police officers did attend Court for the Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order hearing. The disclosure was asked for on this date.

37. On 05th November 2014, the Appellant was due in Court for the Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order hearing; all police were due to attend but did not. The Appellant's barrister could not attend on this date due to the flooding that taken place at his home address, another barrister turned up to represent the Appellant but had no paperwork for the case only a skeleton argument to strike-out the Antisocial Behaviour Order application.

38. The skeleton argument, submitted on behalf of the Appellant, to strike out the application for the Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order. Arguments advanced in this respect, and those which rely upon the civil procedure rules, are not applicable to these proceedings. The civil procedure rules only apply to proceedings in the county Court, the high Court and the civil division of the Court of Appeal. As a result, the Magistrate's Court has no jurisdiction to consider an application to strike-out application.

39. The Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order hearing went ahead, The Appellant's barrister did not have the correct paperwork for the hearing, and knew very little about the case, no police officers turned up to Court on this day.

40. In the days prior to this hearing, The Appellant was rushed to the hospital due to kidney problems while he was still in hospital he was informed by his solicitor on the 04/11/2014 that if he did not attend Court on the 05/11/2014 the case would go ahead without his presence. The Appellant then discharged himself from the hospital, because he had no choice. (He was extremely unwell)

41. On this date, the Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order was granted by the District Judge Newham.

42. Upon delivering her judgment, District Judge Newham ruled that it is just to impose an Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order, and that regard had been taken of The Appellant's Article 6 and 8 rights, as well as The Appellants business. District Judge Newham ruled that there are no provisions contained within the (amended) proposed Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order which would prevent The Appellant from conducting legitimate business.

43. On this date, all police officers were due to attend. (They did not attend their reason was they were not told to attend, this was untrue as the application from 22/10/14 should still stand as the case had only been adjourned until this date for the Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order hearing)

44. The applicant's case also relied solely on hearsay, Magistrate's Courts (hearsay evidence in civil proceeding) rules 1999.

45. These are the conditions The Appellant was placed under and are for the whole of the UK:

46. The defendant is prohibited from:

- A. Attending a rave as defined by s.63 (1) of the criminal justice and public order act 1994;
- B. Being concerned in the organisation of a rave as defined by s.63(1) of the criminal justice and public order act 1994;
- C. Knowingly using or supplying property, personal or otherwise, for use in a rave as defined by s.63(1) of the criminal justice and public order act 1994;
- D. Entering or remaining in any disused or abandoned building unless invited to do so in writing by a registered charitable organisation;
- E. Entering or remaining on non-residential private property on an industrial estate between the hours of 10 pm and 7 am without written permission from the owner and/or leaseholder of the property; and:-
- F. Engaging in any licensable activity in any unlicensed premises.

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

48. This is untrue as we have since contacted council and police and told he would not be granted a licence to hold any events as long as the Antisocial Behaviour Order was in place other than when applying with Enfield Council. So The Appellant's entertainment business is seriously affected by the Antisocial Behaviour Order that was put in place.

49. Points to address regarding the conditions the Appellant is prohibited from doing.