

**From:** JOSEPHINE WARD <josephinewardsolicitor@gmail.com>  
**Sent time:** 20/09/2016 01:29:02 AM  
**To:** Lorraine Cordell <lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk>; too smooth <re\_wired@ymail.com>  
**Subject:** Andrew Locke backsheet 16.09.2016  
**Attachments:** ANDREW LOCKE COURT NOTE SIMON CORDELL 16.09.2016.pdf

---

Lorraine / Simon

Please see attached a copy of Andrew Locke's back sheet for the hearing from Friday.

Yours sincerely

Josephine

16th Sept 2016: Mention

Coram: HHJ Lucas QC

Contra: Robert Talalay

IN THE WOOD GREEN CROWN COURT

**MET POLICE**

- v -

**SIMON CORDELL**

---

**BACKSHEET**

---

1. At court I met with SC and his mother. It was necessary to speak to my IS on the telephone to clarify the relevance and import of the emails and attachments I had been sent that morning. Whilst I was still discussing matters with my IS the case was called on. I tried to explain to SC that we needed to go into court but he was insistent that I had a conference with him. I explained that the court would not wait and the discussion became heated, during which he stated that he wished to represent himself. He was insisting that I argued for disclosure of a number of items but I had either not received the document requesting the same, or at least if it had been attached to the emails I had received a short time earlier, it would not open.
2. We had a further discussion when walking to the courtroom in which he accused my IS of lying and said "Don't be fooled by Josie's tricks" or "Josie is trying to trick you". Again he confirmed his desire to self rep.
3. I explained to the judge that I had been dismissed but he insisted that I remained in court. He allowed a short time for me to speak to SC outside court to attempt to resolve the differences. Once again matters became very fractious. SC is unable or unwilling to answer questions or listen to advice and he has a tendency to argue and engage in long confusing diatribes. For instance, he kept shouting "I writ(sic) an article 6 for HR Packard", which, I eventually worked out, was referring to a document he had sent to HHJ Pawlak regarding what SC believes to be infringements of his right to a fair trial. That is just a single example of how difficult it was to conduct an effective conference with him. In short, he was unable to listen without interruption for more than a few seconds and then any attempts I made to get the discussion back on track were met with raised voices and arguing. The discussion ended with him once again resolving to represent himself.
4. Back in court HHJ addressed SC directly and advised him that overriding or going behind his lawyer's advice was not advisable and that he must let his lawyers do their jobs using their training and professional skill and judgement. He reminded SC that he is not a lawyer.
5. Pros csl represented in court that the schedule of incidents was sent on 18th Sept but he agreed to provide another copy, which I later received from him. HHJ decided (correctly in my view) that **HHJ Pawlak should decide the disclosure arguments and he listed it for further mention on Weds 21st Sept not before 2pm. Appellant sols to submit written app for disclosure by 4pm on Monday 19th Sept with Resp to respond by 4pm the next day.**

**Andrew Locke**

**n e x u s**  
**C H A M B E R S**

**7 New Square  
Lincoln's Inn  
London WC2A 3QS  
DX: 391 LDE**

**Tel: 020 7404 1147  
Fax: 020 7242 9744**

**Solicitors: Michael Carroll**

6. I had a further conference with SC, in which he again accused my IS of lying, stating that he had been recording her conversations and she was not telling the truth. He also continued to bombard me with fast paced instructions which were incoherent and extremely difficult to follow. I literally could not get a word in edgewise without raising my voice, which only led to further difficulties between us. In short, with the continual interruptions and arguing, his inability or refusal to listen to my questions or advice without taking over the conversation, his criticisms of my professional judgements and the tangential monologues about what he believes the law is or should be, accusations of conspiracies/police corruption and impugning my IS's conduct, it was impossible to make any headway whatsoever with SC on the core issues in the case.
7. **I have given this matter serious consideration and regrettably, for the reasons given above, I will not be able to represent SC further in this matter.** Even leaving aside that it has been impossible to conduct an effective conference with without it descending into heated arguments, the difficulty in obtaining coherent instructions and SC's disagreement with/criticism of my approach to the case (i.e.: a general breakdown in the counsel/client relationship), he has seriously impugned my IS's conduct and integrity and so I consider myself to be professionally embarrassed. I believe my IS should also consider her position in the light of these issues. Nevertheless, I will have my clerks return the papers asap.

If I can assist my instructing solicitor further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Andrew Locke

Exp: £