

messages he had asked his acting solicitor firm at the time to make sure of any reductions of wrongful accusations that has now been proven not to be correct, part of the reason why is because there is still CADs within the bundle that had nothing to do with the Appellant, what has already been clearly proven and should not stand as any part of a case against his person.

100. As can be seen in a copy of the Magistrates transcripts of the trial a police officer gave wrongful information while under oath, he stated that every CAD contained in the Asbo application on the dates of the 6<sup>th</sup> 7<sup>th</sup> 8<sup>th</sup> June 2014 is in fact related to Progress Way and there was not an illegal rave taking place on Crown Road on them same dates, he done this to help himself in aid of gaining a guilty verdict against the Appellant, what he stated to the district judge under cross-examination is not the truth as can be proven by a copy of a freedom of information request that was sent in receipt's to Enfield Council and ourselves, to further this the Judge then asked the same question was every CAD linked to the case of the application, and was given the exact same answer yes.

101. Attached is a copy of the freedom of information act which was obtained from Enfield Council.

102. In point of the facts there are multiple inconsistencies pertained within the CADs within the application, timestamps also do not match up within the CADs, there is also all the missing CADs. Some of the intelligence reports also have been updated with no reason as to why. There are also the breaches of data protection within the Appellants PNC record which are incorrect which also can be proven and should have never been contained without the right application granted by a judge, also contained within the police officer statements there are errors which can be proven as untrue and are therefore a breach of the data protection act.

103. We know the police knew about the illegal rave at Crown Road because police were deployed there. This can clearly be seen within the CADs which are within the application's bundle, but there is so much reduction within the CADs we believe there is a lot more that pertain to Crown Road, and we can not see due to the reductions.

Part of the Appellant's barrister submission had been that the allegations were that the Appellant was involved in the organising of illegal raves, but the applicant hadn't adduced evidence of trespass which is a requirement for proving that an indoor rave was illegal.

104. The district Judge ruled that the applicant did not need to prove illegality - all that needed to prove was the Appellant had acted in an Antisocial Manner.

105. In the Appellants barrister view this is a very questionable decision: firstly, the applicant based their case on the illegality of the raves rather than the fact of the rave's themselves and secondly, without proof of illegality the presumption of innocence leads to the conclusion that the rave's were legal, and thus the applicant being prohibited from engaging in an ostensibly lawful activity requires more careful consideration on issues of proportionality.

The barrister continued to state that the Applicant could go to judicial review in regards to the case, but gave his legal advice that he did not think this decision was in the Appellants best interest as he believed there is little merit in doing so, the reason he gave was because the Appellant would then lose his right to Appeal to the Crown Court and even if he succeeded in the high/div Court, they would merely remit it back to the Lower Court, who would then probably go through the motions of considering proportionality before coming to the same conclusion.

To summarise the Judge stated she did not need to prove illegality, but she proved the Appellant had acted in an Antisocial Manner, how the district Judge came to this conclusion we do not understand, not one police officer had stated the Appellant had acted in an Antisocial Manner towards them, is also a fact that any application for an Antisocial Behaviour Order has to be bought within six months of the dates, there were cases going back prior to the six months which should have only been used for reference, but the District Judge also included these cases to be proven.

Since this case started we knew the police and the public order investigation unit held information on the police systems that proved the Appellant was not the organiser of these illegal raves. In fact, the police knowingly went around to the known organiser's homes and also spoke with them on the telephone. This proves they have the information we were asking for in disclosure. (This was found out via social media and Google by the Appellant's mother) the Appellant's mother even called the public order investigation unit and spoke to DS Chapman, and Val Turner.

The Appellant had not been coping throughout this case and walked out of the Court, the Appellant's mother said to the District Judge you can clearly see he is not well and is not coping, which the district Judge confirmed she could clearly see that the Appellant was not well. But continued to ask the clerk to get the Appellant back in Court and she also informed that if appellant re-entered the Courtroom and was disruptive she would hold him in contempt of Court. The Appellants mother would not let the Appellant re-entered the Courtroom, as she knew the Appellant was so unwell and not coming and did not want him to be held in contempt of Court due to his health.

Because of this, the Appellant was not there to have the Antisocial Behaviour Order served on him, and the Antisocial Behaviour Order was served to the Appellant's mother on his behalf.

Upon proving the case District Judge Pigot granted all the applicants conditions. The applicants wanted to make this a lifetime Antisocial Behaviour Order, which district Judge Pigot did not allow and granted it for five years within the whole of the UK. With the stipulation that it could be reapplied for when the five years were concluded. She started the five years from the 04/08/2015; she did not count the time the Appellant had been on the Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order.

The Appellant's mother and the Appellant's barrister then asked the Judge if the conditions of the Antisocial Behaviour Order could be defined as there were many points of concern. the Judge was asked if the Appellant went to a Tesco or Tesco petrol station between the hours of 10 pm and 7 am would he be in breach of the conditions and subsequently arrested, the response from District Judge Pigot was dumbfounding she said "yes he would be arrested, taken to Court and would then have to prove he was going to get whatever petrol he required". I am guessing the same could be said for food and any other non-residential buildings, this would include hospitals, police stations, restaurants, cinemas etc. on hearing the Appellant's mother and barrister questioned this and said "so you think this is in accordance with the law,?" she replied to this "the conditions are precise and plain.

District Judge Pigot then left the Courtroom with her clerk to get the memorandum of an entry, so for them to be made up as soon as possible, this was due to the lateness of the day and the department who dealt with this kind of request would be closed, on her return the District Judge asked why the Appellants barrister was not in Court, the Appellants mother said that he had left because he was not told that he needed to stay, she handed the memorandum of an entry to the Appellants mother and a copy was then sent to the applicants barrister, on reviewing this the applicants barrister said there were multiple spelling mistakes and that the dates from 2013 should not be entered and needed to be removed. She said this would be amended and a new copy would be sent in the post, and until this day this has never happened even though the Appellants mother contacted the Court via emails in regards to them issues, the spelling mistakes were corrected but not the dates.

We have since found out that we also should have been handed a map showing all areas which the Antisocial Behaviour Order conditions encompassed, which we have also never been given, but this map would have just shown the whole of the UK, even low the extent of the problems only excised in Enfield and under Asbo guidance should never have been granted on such a geological wide scale without proof of contempt.

The Appellant's mother asked the Court for the transcripts, but was told at the Magistrate's Court does not record hearings, that the only notes that were kept were the clerks Court notes, the clerks Court notes were requested and the fee paid to obtain these. Upon looking at the clerk's notes there is a substantial amount is not included within them for the full two-day hearing for the Antisocial Behaviour Order hearing.