

which stated: - "I Simon Cordell throughout the document."
This is not the case and the Appellant did not understand their comment or what document the prosecuting barrister was talking about. The Judge then addressed the Appellant and asked the Appellant did the Appellant still want the barrister to act for the Appellant, the Appellant replied "Yes" to the Judge that he did want the barrister to act for him; the Appellant stated that he only wanted time to speak to his barrister, as he had not spoken to a barrister since the Magistrate's hearing.

The Judge then addressed the Appellant barrister he said that the Appellant still wanted the barrister to act for the Appellant, the Appellant barrister agreed to this. The Judge also stated he felt he was not the best person to be hearing this case and passed it back over to the Judge that was hearing the Appeal.

On leaving the Courtroom the Appellant and his mother proceeded to go into a side room to talk with the Appellant barrister, we explained that a letter had been handed to the Judge on the 04/04/2016, the barrister said he knew nothing of this letter, so we handed him a copy for him to read. Once he read this he said he knew nothing about this and had only seen one document that kept saying I Simon Cordell, ("The Appellant has no idea of what this I Simon Cordell letter is.")

The Appellants mother proceeded to explain this is why the Appellant wanted to talk to Mr Locke before going into Court, as this is part of the Non-disclosure being requested.

The barrister explained he only knew about the schedule, to which the Appellant mother replied, the schedule had been