

instead your own document was served at your insistence and contrary to the advice given by both Mr Andrew Morris and myself.

Please confirm any dates that you are not available so that this conference can be arranged.

The meeting was never arranged with Mr Locke, the Appellant's agreed barrister, until just before the Appeal date hearing, even though we kept asking for this to be arranged.

I would like to say that no option was given to us about a preferred barrister and if any person was to notice the date of the email then they would also notice that in a period of time it was once upon a time three whole months that had escalated since the said: "mention hearing" referring to the date of the 04/04/2016, this is even through multiple emails were continually being sent to Miss Ward, asking for things to be addressed and dealt with in this case.

Emails were going unanswered for months by the acting solicitor firm, in fact since the start of time in this case, which started in 2014.

As for the list of police officer the Appellant wanted to call Miss Ward had been told over and over the officer's names required to be listed in the Asbo application case, this list of names contained officers from the Public Order Investigation unit at Scotland Yard and maybe another officer such as Superintendent Specialist Operations Adrian Coombs.

On the 14th August 2016 the Appellant was sectioned under section 2 of the mental health act, he was then released later in August 2016, after a tribunal hearing and this was also due to agreeing that he would work with the mental health doctors and teams, that was put in place, he stated he would be willing to stay in hospital voluntarily, but due to bed shortages, he was discharged home a day later, with a support team put into place, the acting solicitors were made aware of this, and so was the Court in the September 2016, when the Appellant was due to attend.

On 16 September 2016 the case was listed for a mention hearing for Non-Disclosure, and also a meeting with Mr Locke the Appellant Barrister as he had not seen any barrister since the 04/08/2015 hearing at the Magistrate's Court when the Antisocial Behaviour Order was granted by the Judge with no legality found.

The Appellant was told by his acting solicitors to be at Court by 09:30 hours, but later this was changed to 09:00 hours, this was so he could have a meeting with his barrister, which he did agree to do.

On the agreed court date the Appellant arrived at Court for 09:00, his barrister did not arrive until around 09:40, disappointingly.

On arrival The Appellant's barrister and him himself inclusive of his mother all went together into a side room for a pre talk. Before any desiccations in relation to the case could be discussed, Mr Locke said he was sorry he was not feeling very well and that he also had some emails from Ms Ward, that he had to read first, on trying to open the emails he realized he could not and subsequently went out of the room to call Ms Ward.

At around 10:00 hours the Appellant was called into Court, Mr Locke came back into the room from after making his phone call to Miss Ward, so for himself to be able to have collected his things and he then hurried and started to walk back out of the room we all was supposed to have a meeting but on the other hand he hurried in towards the Court room. The Appellant tried to stop him, so to have explained to him, what his concerns were. ("As we had not yet at this point in time had a moment to talk") and the Appellant was also concerned about the disclosure that was going to be asked for.

The Appellant asked Mr Locke if he could ask the Judge to adjourn the case for five or ten minutes, so that we all could speak with each other, which he replied "no that the hearing was only for disclosure about the schedule", The Appellant said that: "He knew this was not correct and this was one of the reasons that he wanted to speak with him about." The Appellant again asked: "if the barrister would ask the Judge to postpone for ten minutes again" he yet again said "no", at which point the Appellant asked "why Mr Locke did not want to speak to him, and should he act for himself"?

The Barrister Mr Locke had no time to talk to The Appellant at the time and spent around four minutes talking to Ms Ward on the phone, before ending his call, he asked the Appellant if he the Appellant was dismissing his solicitors, to which the Appellant replied: "No", Mr Locke then started to walk towards the Courtroom, we followed the barrister into Court and on entering the Court in a raised voice, The Appellant said to Mr Locke: ("who was ahead of him") so am I acting for myself then.? Mr Locke never replied to the Appellant and just proceeded to talk to the Judge and then he walked toward the courtroom door and ushered out. At this point the Appellant had no idea what was going on but proceeded to follow him outside the Court room, it was at this point of time when Mr Locke turned around and said quite curtly "I do not want you to speak anymore", as we got closer to him he also informed the Appellant it was not good to shout out, "in open Court," to which the Appellant had to agree with, but the Appellant felt so let down as it seemed his barrister did not even want to talk to him, since the Appellant had last seen him in 2014 and this is another part of the reasons that the Appellant wanted to speak with him, as so much had already gone wrong with this case and the Appellant felt very nervous as he did not know what was going on, or what would be said as he had not spoken to his barrister.

The Appellant's mother, who had witnessed all of this, did try to explain to the Appellant's barrister, what the Appellant wanted to say, in reference to the receipt of the requested Non-disclosure and asked Mr Locke to explain what the schedule is about before we all went back into court.

The Appellant also asked about the two article 6's that had been issued by the court, which had never been addressed: "by the Court," which pertains to The Appellant's Human Rights and importantly his rights to a fair and speedy trial, to what had not happened. The Article 6 the right to a fair and speedy trial had been handed to the Court at earlier hearings, as The Appellant's knew Mr Locke knew nothing about this and other information that had happened, so he felt it important to explain this to him at the time. Mr Locke explained that the schedule was what the Judge had asked for on the 04/04/2016, my mother replied this was not all the Judge had asked for, without replying Mr Locke walked towards the Courtroom and we all followed, it was at this point The Appellant said to the barrister I feel I should represent myself because he felt he was not being heard.

All that the Appellant wanted was to be able to speak to his barrister, so that he knew what had been said at the earlier hearing of the 04/04/2016, and show him the document that was handed to the Judge, on that date.

On entering the Court the Appellant's barrister Mr Locke addressed the Judge and said the Appellant did not want him to act for him, but this was not fully the case the Appellant only wanted to be able to speak to his barrister.

The Judge informed the Appellant's barrister to remain in the Courtroom, the Judge asked what the case was listed for and the prosecuting barrister addressed the Court, answering the questions, he then also handed the schedule to the Appellant's barrister, they also said to the Judge that the Appellant had been sending letters to the Court and the prosecution himself, 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 if the Appellant still wanted 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's barrister he said that the Appellant still wanted the barrister to act for the Appellant, the Appellant's 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's 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.")