

Mr. Simon Cordell has and still is in the police legal frame work, as he challenges and disputes the evidence presented that he were an organiser.

1. It is, Mr. Simon Cordell case that this ASBO was imposed upon him unlawfully for the following reasons:

(a) He was never consulted / or warned prior to the Metropolitan Police Commissioner applying for an ASBO and this is in breach of the Guidance.

(b) The imposition of the ASBO was wrong in law, because nowhere in the Respondent's case has the Respondent proved that Mr. Simon Cordell engaged in any acts of anti-social behaviour as defined under section 1(1) of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.

The dates as cited in the Respondent's application dating from 12th January 2013 up to 19th July 2014 do not specifically refer to any acts of anti social behaviour.

Mr. Simon Cordell was and has not been arrested for any offences on the dates in question, also supporting the fact being that of the respondents case stating and being that of "The organisation of illegal raves" under section 63 which is a criminal Act and that of the word illegal being used when there is no breach under the licensing act 2003.

This leads to a clear breach of police enforcement of their police of codes of conduct of power regarding residences private homes, equalling to issues of wrongful jurisdiction that does concern "private house party's" under the Licensing act 2003 as in apex 4 of the 2003 licensing act it clearly state as printed below;

Private Events 15.3, events that are held in private are not licensable unless those attending are charged for the entertainment with a view to making a profit (including raising money for charity). For example, a party held in a private dwelling for friends featuring live music, where a charge or contribution is made solely to cover the costs of the entertainment would not be regulated entertainment. Similarly, any charge made to the organiser of a private event by musicians, other performers, or their agents does not of itself make that entertainment licensable – it would only do so if the guests attending were themselves charged by the organiser for that entertainment with a view to achieving a profit.

The fact that this might inadvertently result in the organiser making a profit would be irrelevant, as long as there had not been an intention to make a profit. 15.4 Schedule 1 to the 2003 Act also makes it clear that before entertainment is regarded as being provided for consideration, a charge has