

and been paginated totally different from the bundles that were being used by the prosecution barrister and Courts.

When we were in Court we did say this to the Judge about the bundles, the Judge ordered the clerk of the Court to contact Michael Carroll and Co solicitors and order the solicitors to bring the bundles to Court. The solicitors informed the clerk that the bundles were at Nexus Chambers, the Judge was shocked that the solicitors did not have a copy of the bundles at their office. The Appellant's uncle who was also at Court said to the Judge he was willing to go to Nexus Chambers and pick the bundles up.

The Judge listed this for the 22/09/2016 after 14:00 hours to make sure we were all working from the same set of bundles.

Upon The Appellant's uncle getting home it was seen that the bundle he had collected was not the full set of bundles and only had part of the applications Skeleton Bundle.

On the 22 September 2016 we attended Court to inform the Judge we still did not have the updated bundles and the Judge once again got the clerk of the Court to call Michael Carroll and co solicitors to find out what was going on within the bundles, the Judge was very upset that we still did not have the bundles for the case, the Judge asked for the bundles to be brought to Court before 4 PM, The Appellant's mother stated that it would be easier and faster for her to pick the bundles up from the solicitors on the way home from Court, the Judge asked if she was sure that he could get them brought to Court she stated that it be faster for her to pick the bundles up from the solicitors on my way home.

When we left Court due to the time and the circumstances we had been placed in The Appellant mother called Michael Carroll's office to say what time we would be there by, The Appellant mother was told that the office would be closed by the time we got there so The Appellant mother agreed to pick the bundles up first thing in the morning on 23 September 2016.

On 23-09-2016 The Appellant mother left home early in the morning to go to Michael Carroll's office and collect the bundles with her brother, Mr A Cordell they went into the office together to get the bundles, when the solicitor came down the stairs he had a piece of paper that The Appellant mother needed to sign, stating that the bundles had been collected from the office.

Upon getting home and looking at the bundles, The Appellant mother noticed there is now at least 13 additional statements that The Appellant and The Appellant mother had never seen before from the Respondent bundle, this is a clear error as we knew that in the first bundle there were only 4 public witness statements and there now seems to be 16, when taking a closer look at the statements we noticed there are no members of the public's statements of truth and this also applied for the original 4 contained in the folder minus one, this also highlighted that each member of the public's statements are police officers only and have each put their signatures on two different statements each, in a pretence of portraying to own two houses each in Edmonton xxx Gardens and other surrounding roads in an around Progress way, the police officers are claiming to be victims of this case while on active duty.

So in understanding this, the Applicant contacted Edmonton police stations lost property room, so too for him to arrange collection of the original bundle, that was never served to him in accordance with the law. To his further upset and disappointment of justice he was to be told by another police officer deployed at the lost property room as the manager, that the bundle that the Appellant wanted to claim had been misplaced or stolen, this file clearly shows that there was only ever four potential members of the public's witness statements attached within side of the original Asbo application.

Some of the statements added are all dated prior to the Magistrates Court trial. Upon looking at The Appellant's bundles it seemed this had not been updated or indexed since 2015, so all the new documents that had been submitted to be added to The Appellant's bundle was not in their as they should have been.

Over the days leading up to this, The Appellant mother had learned how important it was that all the bundles were paginated and indexed correctly and that all the bundles were the same as each other so that each person was working on them files was all in Co Hurst to each other, as there was always problems at court due to this not being completed correctly.

Though the case history multiple documents had been handed to the Court and those documents did not get patronised correctly or indexed into The Appellant's bundles, this includes the court and the Respondent bundles that they were using also.

A whole weekend was spent trying to add missing documents to the Appellant's bundle and making copies so that on the Court date of the 26-09-2016; any missing files could be added to the Respondent bundle and the three Judge's bundles. The Appellant health had become very unstable due to him knowing that he was going to have to be dealing with this himself.

The Appellant mother also spent part of the weekend also writing a letter to the Judge in regards to what had gone on with the breaches in The Appellant's human rights, his article 6 human rights the Applicants rights to a fair and speedy trial, there were also a list of other things that had gone on throughout the case since 2014 in regards to the nondisclosure, and other issues that was always being raised when at Court and the reason as to why legal aid had been granted:-

- Due to the complexity of the case:-
- Due to The Appellant's learning difficulties:-
- Due to the concerns of The Appellant health.

This letter was emailed to the Court and asked to be passed to the Judge.

Please see letter that was emailed to the judge:-

The 26 September 2016 the three-day Appeal hearing was due to start, The Appellant was so unwell that there was no way he could attend Court, Mr A Cordell and Miss L Cordell attended Court to speak to the Judge, when the Judge entered the Courtroom he stated that he had received a letter that had to be addressed, he stated that he felt this would go to judicial review, he stated he had three options:

Carry on with the Appeal in the hope that The Appellant would turn up the following day.

- To Dismiss the Appeal:-
- Adjourn the Appeal to a new date.

The Judge went over the letter in great detail; he started around five times that he felt that this case was going to go to judicial review.

The Judge decided to adjourn the case until the 16/01/2017; this was later changed for the Appeal to start on the 17/01/2017. The Respondent had tried to object to the Appeal being adjourned. The Judge stated that we should try to find a new solicitor to take on the Appeal and that he would help and also make sure that legal aid was in place.

The Judge asked why The Appellant was not in Court. The Appellant mother stated The Appellant had become so unwell due to what was going on in this case and that he was not coping. Information was passed to the Judge that showed The Appellant was unwell.

Mentioned in court; was also the missing documents that was missing from The Appellant's bundle, and that there were no statements within the bundle, my mother stated to the Judge that she had spent a lot of the weekend trying to update The Appellant's bundle and make sure that it was indexed correctly. The Appellant handed the documents in to the court that The Appellant mother was able to get ready with the new indexing, the Appellant mother also stated that she knew there was still documents missing from The Appellant's bundle, which she was not sure about neither had she been given time in which to add them. The Appellant mother also stated that there was around thirteen statements that had never been seen and that were now contained within the Respondent bundle that was dated prior to the Magistrate's trial.

The Judge was very unhappy and passed the Applicants mother his own bundle for her to check by seeing if the Courts bundles had been updated, upon looking into the Judge's bundle, she noticed that his bundle had also not been updated since 2015, the Appellant mother passed the Judge's bundle back up the judge while explaining to him that his folder had not been updated. At this the Respondent stated they would make new copies of the bundles and have copies sent to us and the Judge.