

9. In any one un-regular occasion over the duration of the weekend I can understand the noise nuisance and distress to neighbors this can cause if the allegations were to be true and not fabricated by police as I can prove. I was not the organizer of the event.

The case is based on what the respondent based it upon and in my case this is the organisation of illegal raves not the organisation of raves:-

1. I proved that indoor parties are not illegal unless there is a breach of the licensing act 2003 as this is the law for entertainment.
2. That the word rave can not be used in a building as section 63 requires as a key element unless trespass has taken place.
3. I proved that I was not the organizer of the events as I was not.
4. That I never took part in any anti social behavior or intended or encouraged any other person to neither.
5. Anti social behavior was not clearly caused as a result of the Progress Way by myself or my actions as I was only a visitor who never caused any offence.

I feel as my solicitor you should have my best interest at heart and if you know a police officer to be caught for being corrupt for, the evidence that they have supported so that your client faced a wrongful conviction of any sort you should not encourage them to not stand up for what is correct and right, so I do not understand why you would ask me to reconsider whether the attached document should be served on the Respondent.

The amendments I made have all ready been served on the 22/02/2016 and the Judge ask for the respondent to answer them questions from the 01/02/2016 and the respondent refuse to do so.

I do insist for the challenges to be answered as it is my life that has been tarnished for civil proceedings so I do confirm this on writing.

I feel that the meeting has been left by yourself to the last minute I have been requesting this in a multitude of emails to be achieved well in advance to the date that you have now sited a few days before the appeal, when I know that you have had ample amounts of time, so if this is the earliest time I will take it and I look forward to meeting Mr Andy Locke, thank you.

I do not see how the case will not get re listed due to lack of disclosure to be quite frank.

I do not understand why any solicitor would encourage me to go to trial or appeal and not draft out the police corruption that you can clearly see in turn making me accept the clearly fabricated evidence and wrongful conditions that I know have been imposed on myself under section 63 with no trespass taking place, this being said as for any of the incidents contained in the Asbo and with you knowing the true facts of them incidents being contained in private air.

There is also that of the clearly fabricated evidence I am standing against as for sure any solicitor works in Co Hurst towards the understanding of noun precedent in relation to the weight of any evidence put towards a client.

I am concerned about the case, relying sole on hearsay by police. Is this correct in procedure?

However I do understand and take note, that all resident parties contained within the respondents bundle, were held on single occasions and in places of residence and were not held as a running commercial business by myself or by any other to my knowledge. I have also read that any person is entitled to have a house or resident party in private air under the licensing act 2003 or where they reside. To my understanding, each accused incident in the respondents bundle is a place of residence and was in fact different people holding their own private parties at their places of residence.

Alone there may have been complaints in regards to issues of concern about them house parties I was not the occupier of any of the accused locations; neither was I the hire of equipment and surely not the organizer.

I was establishing a hire company around the dates of the accused events and have provided evidence of the work I had been committing myself to. I was not trading at the time and whenever hiring out equipment I do with due care and responsibility, however I do not accept responsibility for other people's actions when hiring out such equipment in good faith. I do take legal action for any persons when breaking my terms and conditions. I do not hire out equipment to any person without being in the constraints of the law and in good business practice or without the correct ID.

On one occasion I did hire out a sound system in good faith on a pro Bono basis, this being of the understanding that no laws were being broken and as a Ltd company acting responsible. I know that I should not be liable for them persons actions when hiring out equipment and having the correct protocols in place as I clearly do.

I do not feel that it is right for the respondent to obtain criminal punishments such as section 63 of the crime and disorder act 1994 and for that section to be then imposed against my freedom of movement and many other Human Right that have been breached by being pro-claimed under wrongful civil proceedings, as for a multitude of incorrect procedures and legislation that I have occurred, for instance I have no previous nature offences of a similar sort as required by law when applying a stand alone Asbo on a persons statue, as I do feel I should of have had the right to challenge the allegations under a true Criminal investigation, especially when referring to the organisation of illegal raves as the respondent has clearly headlined the offence to be.