

**From:** Rewired Rewired <re\_wired@ymail.com>  
**Sent time:** 20/02/2016 04:32:54 PM  
**To:** Josephine Ward <josie@michaelcarrollandco.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Appellant response to respondent's

---

The applicants case is that i organised illegal raves which caused alarm harm and distress. To which there is no breach of the licencing 2003 Act or no breach to section 63 present such as tress pass. The incidents in question are not of a consecutive manner over a long time pirod and any person not in breach of licencing acts or trespassing is entitled to have a party with out local authority permission for as long as their is no health and safety risks.

Not that i organised legal moving in or out House party's or birthday party's, with or for others. that caused alarm harm and distress, as there is not breach of law in doing so with out a warning of the local council. With regards to statement i no you have helped me and i have taken a lot of your advice in so many different aspects of the case already, but strongly believe it is in my best interest to confront the police statements and point out the consistences as they seem to be mislead to the truth.

as for the Time stamps do i stand a fair trial or would any other person do so if presented with such errors in the evidence, when police solely rely on as the case against my self with no civil witness mentioning my self to be present or acting in a manner likely to cause alarm harm or distress.

I would also like to point out that as my acting solicitor and that of you having a copy of my criminal record, you would no if i had been arrested on the dates in question for acting anti social, no matter if civil or criminal.

And i do listing to you and respect you and what you say to me, i just some time question it.

On Saturday, 20 February 2016, 16:02, Josephine Ward <josie@michaelcarrollandco.com> wrote:

Simon

With regards to your statement I have tried to help you with this. I have explained what is not helpful etc. You simply disagree with the advice that I am giving and this has always been the case. You are misinterpreting the Respondent's case which is simply that the raves / parties whether legal or not cause anti-social behaviour - i.e. sleepless nights, noise, nuisance etc. You dispute that you are the organiser and that is the only facts that I requested information about. The court is not looking at one isolated date but all dates and the conduct on each of the dates. I have also explained to you the events that cause you problems and the reasons why. Organisation is not simply providing equipment, manning the gate but also sourcing premises and I have explained that this can be inferred. Even if a section 144 LAPSO is up there can still be antisocial behaviour albeit the event is not a rave under the legislation.

I have made it very clear the irrelevant points and aspects that do not assist you. You do not accept the advice.

Josephine

On 20 February 2016 at 15:41 Rewired Rewired <re\_wired@ymail.com> wrote:

no Josie i am not happy, i did not write this with you or was not involved in the making of it, you want to deal with the applicants skeleton bundle but i have yet been able to put my updated deference statements in towards the police statements which the applicant clearly states, that they rely upon in the skeleton bundle point 2. i did send them to you but could not draft them, with the skills need by a person of your profession. i listen to your legal guidance and it is up to me to make the decision to which way i decide to steer my case and evidence. I do trust in you but it is legally right for the decision to be mine. I would like the legal point's of my defense added as the back bone to my statements such as a copy of the licencing act 2003, copy of the magistrates court transcripts, a copy of a section 144 a copy of a environmental section 80 abatement notice, Adr carriage of dangerous gas's, parliaments official documentation regarding the word (rave) so the acting barrister can clearly state out the points of law relevant to my plea of innocents, i would also like it noted that i do not. i have made a bundle of but would like to go over it with you if and when possible please.

On Saturday, 20 February 2016, 14:29, Josephine Ward <josie@michaelcarrollandco.com> wrote:

Lorraine / Simon

I am attaching the response to the Respondent's skeleton argument.

Can you please sign if you are happy with the content and email straight back to me as I need this to be forwarded to the Public Defender.

Thanks

Josephine