The Appellant will state that the description of events on this day has been altered and recorded in a biased way towards him.

The Appellant requests full details of the original intelligence report inputted on 25th May 2014 and also reasons why there was a need to update this report on 19th June 2014. The Intelligence report should not be allowed in evidence under the hearsay rules as it is prejudicial to him. The report has been amended.

(A) PROGRESS WAY 6TH, 7TH AND 8TH JUNE 2014

The Appellant disputes any involvement whatsoever in the event at Progress Way.

The Appellant accepts that he approached the gates with a view to dropping off house keys to a friend. The Appellant did not enter the premises / venue at Progress Way.

The Appellant did not provide any sound equipment, speakers, generators to any person inside Progress Way.

The Appellant will state that he is being wrongly accused of organising this rave/ event. The Appellant will state his brother is also wrongly named as being involved. The Appellant will state that his brother was severely disabled at the time and in a wheelchair following a very serious road traffic accident.

The Appellant questions the accuracy and truthfulness of the statements, CADS etc served in support of the above. The Appellant questions why some of the CAD reports have been redacted. The Appellant believes that the CAD's may well confirm the names of the real organisers, vehicle registrations etc that will confirm no vehicle belonging to the Appellant being inside the venue. The Appellant also questions the chronological sequence of the CAD messages.

The Appellant believes that some of the complainants are police officers and no civilians. The Appellant believes that some of the CADs may relate to completely different areas but are being added in to and wrongly linked to Progress Way.

In the interests of a fair hearing the Appellant requests all CAD's cross linked and referred to should be served in unedited. Any CAD's that refer to a different location should be removed from the Respondent's bundle as they are too prejudicial.

The Appellant will state that this is yet another example of the police manipulating the evidence to paint him in a bad light. The Appellant strongly believes that the police are presenting their evidence to persuade the court that he was an organiser of this event.