

Pc Elsmore, couldn't say, why there was a decrease in raves.
Correspondence of consultation - so far this relies wrongfully on weak evidence.
Met on points of how then the statutory test, in relation to raves and into what is required.

DJ

Delivery of judgment @ 15:32pm

Satisfied so that she is sure, that the D acted, during the dates in a manner so for the ABSBO to be Granted.

Order necessary for reasons:

- (1) Nature of conduct of these parties's
- (2) Noise of ?????/? of ?????? civil
- (3) Police officers have to attend in large numbers.
- (4) Since interim order there has been a decrease in this type of activity.
- (5) Satisfied D has acted in as manner, of such conduct, that he caused harassment alarm, distress.
- (6) Conduct is necessary to protect residents of Enfield, from anti social acts, from Simon Cordell.

DJ

Need to ensure probations are precise to award.

DEF

D's attendance at raves is not an issue and places unreasonable burden on him for attending parties when 20 people attended and what appears to be illegal then turns out to be legal, also places D in a difficult position if false steps are made to legality of parties, ASBO must be prevelitive

DJ

D can carry out legitimate and licensed business.

Point D: "or local authority addition"

DJ "To a period of 5 years"

Propitiations are precise and plain.

Term's of the Order.

D to upset then left room but lawyer present.

Terms need adding

END OF THE COPY OF THE Highbury Magistrates Court Transcripts.

On Monday, 23 May 2016, 3:18, Rewired Rewired <re_wired@ymail.com> wrote:

Dear Josephine;

How are you, I hope all is well? After all, things considered, I will get straight into business, this letter is, furthermore, towards our conversations, however I would appreciate it if you can reply to my questions below, as soon as practically possible and with due time before you finish your contract and leave office, so that we can conclude the case files and agreed activities, such as taking the case to court, so that to be sure that the conditions are imposed and defined within accordance of jurisdiction of the law, as you have all ready agreed to do so, this is also inclusive of all information ready for the next representative of Michael Carroll's office, who will be the new case handler, so that he or she can be prepared to instruct any barrister for any court herrings, as per-listed.

Some of the questions are in relation to the understanding of the on goings that did occur, at and in the court mentioning at wood green crown court, on the 22nd 23rd this is also inclusive of the 24th 02/2016.

On that date mentioned the company, who you are acting for, that is, representing myself Mr. Simon Cordell, and further named as Michael Carroll & co solicitors, that you do or did represent a contract with till the 2nd June 2016,

This information was also inclusive of the understanding of the solicitor firms running objectives towards the ongoing of this case, that in this instance is being brought against myself Mr. Simon Cordell by the commissioner of the metropolitan police and his acting officers, this is also inclusive of any other local authorities governing body's, one mentioned as Enfield council. This being quoted being of an application representing a stand alone Anti Social Behavior Order 2003, an Act to make further provision in relation to criminal justice and disorder act 1994.

It is being said that Miss Josephine Ward, at a point of time before the date of the said trial hearing at Court, that was postponed and did not go ahead, that she undoubtedly mentioned, when giving her legal guidance too, such accusations of incidents, that does refer to the organisation of illegal raves, that still said "acting in my defense."

It is being said that you did in fact explain before the date of the hearing, I quote; explain being of information regarding to the past representing barrister a Mr. Andy Lock, relating to that of Intel stating that he would not be able to attend court and act for myself as he did previously at the magistrates court, due to being away on leave and this being off the only issue raised by yourself, said to be regarded myself of your concern.

On the date of the hearing another barrister did apply to the judge, in aid of my acting solicitors yourself, so to be sure, that of you, having to no longer represent me in the court proceedings, due to a break down in communication between our self's, the judge ruled that Michael Carroll and co's solicitors, must act till the conclusion of the case, the overall Point I am highlighting as referred to is that the judge, "on the whole" has ordered the company to act for myself Mr. Simon Cordell.

First Question and request is;

In that understanding, I ask and request for you to direct the case to be carried out in such a manner, if what is being request is legal to do so. I request that being off; at the day of my trial, to act litigant with my mother as a McKenzie friend and for a barrister that we do select together, to represent me inclusive, so for he or she to be well instructed to represent myself (in