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34. **Introduction**

Dear Mr, Will Wraxall & any other person this correspondence may have relevance towards.

1. We write in response to your dated email of the **20/09/2022.** I received a copy of your email on the **27/09/2022** and this is my response as so far.
2. I, Mr. Simon Paul Cordell, am setting out my concerns of complaint as requested to the Enfield Councils Complaints departments alongside with my family members even clear than past verbal and wrote complaints prior.
3. Before I address these issues in bullet points as asked, I would like you to adhere to any conflicting issues that may arise through case proceedings and alert you to any practical solutions that should help if implemented into procedures beforehand.
4. **The 30/09/2022 Future Issues of Concern**
5. Mutable members of staff about the Enfield Council and that of its subsidiary’s companies have committed misconduct inside of the work premises.
6. And the monitoring office should suspend with immediate action the listed staff pending to these investigations.

* **File Temp Link Location**
* <https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Groups-of-Involved-People-List/>

1. This name for this is “Suspension Pending Enquiry” and we will issue the suspension order along with charge-sheets.
2. The Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell requests that all Enfield Council employees that we accuse or has to attend in a Court of law for any criminal or civil offences, the concerned authority that is liable for them will suspend those employees, under suspension pending Court’s proceedings and/or any ongoing enquiry, because of the severity of the claims made against themselves.
3. **Company Directors Disqualification Act 1986 And Failed Companies**
4. Disqualification proceedings are a civil and not criminal process.
5. The Enfield Council Chief Executive Directors Failed to perform their duties honestly and/or responsibly.
6. Enfield Council staff did not make sure the department inclusive of his / her offices complied within the laws and all relevant regulations of the United Kingdom’s Land, when managing the cases attached to Mr. S. P. Cordell the Now Claimant.
7. The Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell can prove beyond reasonable doubt that the Chief Executive directors and specific staff of the Enfield Council failed to exercise adequate skill and care with proper regard of the interests of the company’s creditors, customers, shareholders and the public and for their reckless actions must face being disqualified from becoming a director of a company, directly or indirectly or as being concerned or taking part in the promotion, formation or management of the following listed below Company structures without permission from the Court: -
8. Privilege Of Limited Liability Companies.
9. Limited Liability Partnerships (LLPS) Companies.
10. General Partnerships Companies.
11. Building Societies Companies.
12. Incorporated Friendly Societies Companies.
13. NHS Foundation Trusts Companies.
14. Registered Societies Companies.
15. Charitable Incorporated Organisations Companies.
16. Further Education Bodies Companies.
17. Protected Cell Companies.
18. The ban should last no longer than 15 years.
19. **In Criminal Proceedings We Oppose Bail**
20. Bail, in criminal proceedings, is government governed by the Bail Act **1976** ("BA"). “Bail is defined in s.1(1) of that Act.”
21. “Bail” is an accused status when a defendant is to remain permitted at liberty (i.e., not imprisoned) pending the conclusion of their case, subjected to bail conditions.
22. In the more than likely circumstances of a criminal investigations taking a place the Now Claimant requests the case handlers to refuse bail for any defender’s liberties, so, that the accused defendants will remain remanded in custody as when having regard to the public interest there is good reasons for refusing bail such as:
23. The accused does not abscond (do a runner) as if in fail to turn up at their future Court dates when they ought to
24. The severity of the crimes.
25. Because of the well-known fact of the length of the sentences that any defendants will find if found guilty.
26. Since a long time can elapse between the first appearance and (eventual) trial.
27. Reprisals to the victim Such as nobble the witnesses, or otherwise obstruct the course of justice (whatever that might entail)
28. Commit any further offences while on bail.
29. If any person of authority somehow agrees to grant bail, then the Now Claimant asks that stringent bail conditions are then sort for and then placed upon the accused and that the defendants do take the Conditions of bail seriously throughout any pending enquiry.
30. The decisions on bail, in criminal proceedings, represent an important stage in the Prosecution process. The results of the decision of bail will have negative consequences for the victim a Mr. S. P. Cordell and that of the public in general.
31. **The Now Claimant Request That the Following Bail Conditions Get Imposed at The Minimal, Upon the Accused.**
32. Electronic monitoring (having to wear a tag)
33. Not to contact directly or indirectly certain people involved in the criminal case (not speaking to, communicating on social media, phoning, sending a text message or sending any other message).
34. Having to report to a police station at certain times.
35. Restriction from entering certain areas.
36. Surrender (give) passport or travel documents to the police.
37. Surety (a defendant, relative or friend shows the Court or police they have an amount of money), the surety may get an order of a Judge to pay this amount of money to the Court if the person did not turn up to the Court or police station.
38. Attend and take part in bail support, bail support and supervision, Intensive Supervision and Surveillance (ISS) programme.
39. **Courts Powers Imposing Bail Conditions**
40. This section outlines the Courts' powers to grant bail, as opposed to police bail and our request for conditions imposed at all stages. Courts should impose conditions of bail if they are necessary to make sure.
41. The accused surrenders to custody and turn up at Court.
42. The accused does not commit an offence while on bail.
43. The accused does not interfere with witnesses or otherwise obstruct the course of justice (does not contact witnesses or try to stop the criminal Court case happening).
44. The accused makes themselves available for the making of inquiries or a report to help the Court with sentencing.
45. The accused attends an appointment with a legal representative.
46. The accused stay safe for their own welfare.
47. And with utmost importance and Under the Policing and Crime Act **2017**, section **(D. a)** the Now Claimant a M. S. P. Cordell requests that a condition meaning the accused persons must surrender all of his or her travel documents or all of his or her travel documents that are of a particular kind, is overviewed in the decision process and the after enforced as imposed.
48. **Freezing Orders**
49. At his topmost of requested the Now Claimant a M. S. P. Cordell requests that an interim injunction order to Freeze all personal assets will wisely be acquiesced by management against the defendants in the likelihood of recovered cost as this will prohibit the potential of the defendants in criminal or civil litigation proceedings from dissipating their assets when considering the next steps forward.
50. **Settlement Agreements [Clause 1]**
51. The Now Claimant and his Support Network introduce into these proceedings the opportunity of an out of Court settlement.
52. The out of Court settlement would be an agreement made in a document form that will be a legally binding Document.
53. The Legal Binding Document would be based on terms agreed.
54. In this sample settlement agreement, the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell would waive his legal right to bring a financial claim against the Enfield Council & that of their Subsidiary companies and in return, the Enfield Council & Subsidiary companies will supply a more than reasonable financial payment to the Now Claimant.
55. All parties could make this agreement voluntarily through a negotiation process.
56. **A Reference Towards the Time Limitation Act 1980**
57. “In the Table at The Bottom of This Document Below is **[Exhibit C]**
58. An example of the Time Limitation Act and its relevance in these proceedings is the following: -
59. A claim in fraud against the trustee of a trust is not subject to any limitation
60. There is no time limit under the time limitation Act **1996** - **1980** when accounting for certain aspects of the law and this includes fraud and denial.
61. Throughout a large part of the Now Claimants life the Members of the Metropolitan Police Force and the Enfield Council Staff undermined the Now Claimant from any Justice so that he could bring a case against themselves, the Members of the Metropolitan Police Force and the Enfield Council Staff achieved stopping the Now Claimant by using an: - “abuse of process,” Malfeasance in Public Office” “Targeted Malicious,” and this is what caused a pro longed delay in this claim. The actions of these officers broke mutable laws and just to name one we would say: - “the Interference with the course of justice **1963.”**
62. The Now Claimant produces considerable evidence within this document that accounts for: - “Extraordinary Circumstances,” which is the key element to continue ahead with this claim as it was not the Now Claimants fault for these prolonged delays.
63. **Selling Copyright in these Proceedings [Clause 2]**
64. The Now Claimant has the legal Right to the Copyright of these materials and agrees that if the Defendants agree to an out of Court Settlement, he is willing to sell his Copy Rights on terms agreed.
65. Within the United Kingdom copyright protection is automatic to the Author**.**
66. No Citizen has to apply or pay a fee for copy Right as there is no register of copyright works in the UK.
67. Citizen of the United Kingdom automatically get copyright protection when they create: original literary, dramatic, musical, and artistic work, including illustration and photography.
68. The Government of the United Kingdom state: – “If a fellow citizen decides to sell or transfer their copyright they would need to have drafted and signed a written contract, proving a transfer has taken place.
69. If any parties agree to a Contractual Legal Binding Document being adhered towards then they can contact the Now Claimant within his personal correspondence attached herein: - Re\_wired@ymail.com
70. **The Duty of Candour for Public Authorities**
71. In UK public law, the duty of candour is the duty imposed on a public authority 'not to seek to win [a] litigation at all costs but to assist the court in reaching the correct result and thereby to improve standards in public administration'.
72. Lord Donaldson MR in R v Lancashire County Council ex p. Huddleston stated that public servants should be willing 'to explain fully what has occurred and why'.

* <https://www.cps.gov.uk/legal-guidance/appeals-judicial-review-cps-prosecuting-decisions>
* <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/285368/Tsol_discharging_1_.pdf>

**Health and Social Care**

1. There is also a contractual duty of candour imposed on all NHS and non-NHS providers to patients in the UK and that is for them to provide their users and that of any other relevant person with a service that provides and supports all relevant information' in the event that a 'reportable patient safety incident' occurs.
2. A reportable patient safety incident' is one which could have or did result in: - “Moderate” or: - “Severe Harm” or: - “Death.”
3. The duty of candour deals with complaints about: - “Negligent” or: - “Poor Standards” of Care in accordance with NHS hospitals while in pursuit of Regulation 20 of the Health and Social Care Act **2008** and “Regulated Activities” in the **2014** Regulations.
4. **What I and Others Can Prove Has Occurred We have All Got to Take into Perception.**
5. **Disrepair Issues and Bad Management by My Housing Team!**

* **Disrepair Issues**

1. Start Date **11/08/2006**
2. End Date **14/11/2022**
3. The Enfield Council alongside with the Enfield Homes & the Safer neighbourhood watch teams failed their obligations to the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell when guaranteeing his Security of tenure while managing housing affairs.
4. Maintenance failures meant that necessary works did not finish in his home to a high standard or time limit through the years of **2006** till date **30/09/2022**.
5. The history of my living circumstances is: -
6. Years have faded away and without the qualifying repairs taking a place since the Now Claimant signed his tenancy and the problems still protest today.

* **2006**

1. The flat rented to the Now Claimant a M. S. P. Cordell on the date of **11/08/2006** and by December **2006**, the Now Claimant was already complaining about Disrepair Issues.
2. When the Now Claimant first moved into his rented flat issued by the Enfield Council the flat never seemed to be in a bad state of a living condition due to the Enfield Council recently having it painted so, to be ready for the Now Claimant to move into it.
3. Straight away of moving inside of the flat the Now Claimant realised that there was an extraordinarily strong damp smell but thought it was normal and that the flat just needed airing out aloe he could also smell fresh paint.
4. Within the first few months of living inside of the flat the Now Claimant became use to the extraordinary overpowering smell and soon after started to notice the walls and ceilings were getting covered in a toxic mould and this meant that his rented property suffered with damages alongside with himself and private property.
5. The Now Claimant decided that he had had enough after one too many things of his were destroyed causing him to suffer and at no fault of his own and this is what forced him to start acting on top of any extra cleaning chores caused by the damp. These actions of the Now Claimant involved: = “taking picture evidence” “Contacting the relevant People,” about his sufferings caused from the: - “Rented Flat.”
6. “These pictures are in the Table at The Bottom of This Document **Exhibited** as \*\*\*\*.”
7. As soon as they could the Now Claimant and his support network notified the Enfield Council and the relevant corresponding companies by way of telephone calls about the really bad damp growing inside of the rented flat and they all talked about his spoiled belongings & the damp causing him bad health.
8. Enfield Council at first sent different surveyors out to the Address of 109 Burncroft Avenue and the surveyors explained that the damp and mould existed because of a bad air flow through circulation within the premise but while on the telephone the Enfield Councils employees were saying that the disrepair was caused by condensation being created as the windows needed to be opened more.
9. The Now Claimant could not keep his windows opened all year around as in the winter it became too cold.
10. The windows fitted into the property are double glazed and have an air flow system built within their design and these vents were always keep open as well as the windows as much as they could but the damp keep growing and this meant that the window vents were not adequate and even aloe the Now claimant done what was requested by the Council of him by keeping them open.
11. The Now Claimant done what the Enfield Council asked of him but as day by day went past the damp continued to flourish.
12. The now Claimant was washing his walls as well as ceilings and he done this at least once a week, but the damp keep coming back and washing of the building become a regime for him and this happened until the Enfield Council closed the on his bedroom giving him less rooms to wash but the damage was already caused to him and his belongings and by the Council just closing the bedroom door they left the damp to only get worse.
13. The Now Claimant lost the Complete use of the bedroom and had no choice but to sleep in the front room even when it was a one-bedroom flat.
14. The damp was not contained in just the bedroom, but the bedroom was the most effected room.
15. No matter what room the now claimant tried to keep safe in the damp keep making him ill and, in more ways, than just one but no matter what was explained to the Enfield Council they blamed the problem to be because of bad condensation and tried to make the Now Claimant feel responsible and all while still refusing to help him.
16. Throughout this time the main mother board in my boiler kept blowing up, which the Enfield Council had to keep replacing.
17. When the Councils engineers came to the flat to start works on the Boiler, they would always explain that the boiler was showing low in water pressure and gave a guide on how to keep it toped up. The Now Claimant always listened to their advice and made filling up the boiler to the correct limits a standard practice.

* **Sound Proofing 2006 till 2022**

1. Whin weeks of living inside 109 Burncroft Avenue the Now Claimant also kept noticing the soundproofing issues with the premises were extensively bad.
2. The impulsive sounds of neighbors’ personal conversations become an intrusion of his and their privacy causing any chance of a private family life to become a non.
3. The intrusive Soundproofing issues within 109 Burncroft Avenue sustains itself at an inadequate to fair standard of living and
4. The Private Conversations that occupiers or guests can hear when inside a Burncroft Avenue flat are too clear to be private.
5. Quite a couple of the Enfield councils’ rented homes within the Burncroft Avenue Housing estate are not up to the correct ISO standards, and the Enfield Council housing estate manager also agreed to this fact in writing when she took out an inspection of the homes
6. We also herein induce **Exhibit 000** as documented below: -

04 May 2015 13:22

Sent: 10/06/2015 - 21: 13

Sent: 03 November 2015 14:39

Sent: 06 February 2017 13:33 flooring

Sent: 07/02/2017 - 17:02 flooring

06/02/2017 :08/02/2017:

Sent: 08/02/2017 - 16:08

1. We entered the property so that Steve Stirk could test the water taps in the kitchen and bathroom.
2. There was no flooring laid except for a rug in the living room (the kitchen was accessed through here) and the floorboards made a significant amount of noise as we stepped on them.
3. The resident from the property underneath, Mr Simon Cordell, heard us in the property and came upstairs.
4. Steve Stirk and I were outside the property at this point as the locksmith started to undertake the work to install new locks on to the door (he was inside the hallway).

* **2007**

1. By the year of **2007**, the Enfield Council was still sending out a different surveyor every time we contacted them and without starting any works to complete the rid of the High-Risk damp disrepair issue that persisted to isolate rooms and grow in its own dormancies.
2. The flat of 109 Burncroft Avenue had become in less than a year a: - “Toxic Hell” and the Enfield Council staff left the Now Claimant to live inside of it and the Exhibits evidence these claims.
3. The smell created within the humidity of the damp & mouldy flat cannot be smelt by the presented Exhibits, but as any person who has suffered from extremely bad damp and/or mould and/or may have an occupational interest in these positions would know the smell caused by these hazards is extremely awful and awful to an extent that the allergen fragments floating in the air that are created from the spores that cause the Damp & Mouldy smells, actually makes a person become ill from its toxic substances, but still the official persons just left the Now Claimant to live and coupe on his own in his exhibited rented hell of a living home.
4. The different surveyors who had all repeatedly stated the obvious that the flat suffered from: -
5. Bad air circulation in the flat caused the flat to have bad ventilation and therefore created a perfect living condition for fungal spores to grow.
6. The days finally turned into what we thought would be one of the last times we saw an Enfield Council surveyors at 109 Burncroft Avenue and on his attendance he agreed to replace the order for the works to start so that the workers could start fixing the walls and the work would include stripped them back to the bricks and then treating the walls to be re plastered again.
7. The surveyors stated that the workers would install an air ventilation system into every room via the windows and walls in the flat.
8. He continued by explaining that they would need to place a large industrial humidifier in the bedroom as this was the worse room suffering with the damp and mould, for them to be able to remove any unwanted water out of the flat and this would happen before the walls could be treated.
9. The Now Claimant agreed with the survivor and the needed works were scheduled to take place.
10. After a few more days passing by the Enfield Council staff arrived at the Now Claimants front door of 109 Burncroft Avenue with an industrial humidifier and they were allowed to install it in the bedroom but before the staff left they gave the Now Claimant instructions on how to maintain the industrial machine until works concluded and when he asked how long this would be for the staff explained for about three months.
11. In the meantime, the large industrial humidifiers operated to remove the water that had built up in the internal and external walls of the flat and this also included the flats grounds that laid underneath.
12. The damp flat meant that the only time the Now Claimant could enter into his bedroom was to empty a bucket of water that the humidifier “machine” collected.
13. He can remember that in the beginning of the machine getting placed inside of his bedroom that the water bucket for the humidifier used to fill up many times a day, on an average of three times a day and he also, remembers that as the months did continue to pass by the amount of unneeded stored water in the machine became less and less the Now Claimant states the chore took up a lot of his time.
14. The Now Claimant had to manage to maintain the machine himself and found this hard to achieve for such a lengthy time aloe he did not have any major incidents, this meant that he had to always be present at certain times of the day to complete this job in hand and this was right up until the council and the Enfield homes reasonable persons where able to finally start their works.

Sound Proofing **2006** till **2022**

* **2008**

1. In the early months of the year of **2008** the machine and the Now Claimant were still collecting water, when on one of the trips to empty the bucket, something knew happened.
2. The Now Claimants foot disappeared as he and his foot sunk into the ground, he had been walking out of his bedroom door with the bucket full of water in his hands and as he walked into his front hallway heading for the bathroom with the need of emptying the water away, the floor had given away.
3. This caused the Now Claimant a sharp pain that almost made him throw the bucket onto the floor and scream for help, but he knew if he had done this, he would have had to clean up the mess. Before the Now Claimant knew what had happened, he placed the bucket safely on the floor and look down at his foot to see the damage the floor had caused.
4. Drawn blood from grazes and bruised skin from the chipboard was the result but if it had not been for the concreate underneath being so shallow the injuries would have been worse.
5. After inspecting the wounds and analysing the damage to the property the Now Claimant knew he was not to blame and decided to phone his mother for help and advice.
6. The Now Claimant mother advised him to call the Enfield council right away as floors giving away means that there is something very wrong as 109 Burncroft Avenue had become a hazarded place to be as it was a work site and not a safe home.
7. The Now Clamant then after his call to his mother spoke to the Enfield Council by way of a telephone call about the floor giving away and to his and his mother’s shock a surveyor arrived within 1 hour.
8. The surveyor took one glimpse with his eyes at the sinking floor and sharply agreed to the Now Claimant that he immediately needed to place an order for disrepair works to be instated and as he said so, he walked towards the door and left the flat while on his telephone, the telephone call he made was to order the emergency works to be completed.
9. Later the same day a different worker arrived at the flat and proceeded to lift the hazarded floorboards away from the bedroom, bathroom, and the hallway of the Now Claimants flat.
10. While the worker was removing the hazarded floorboards away, he came across an issue, he realised that the heating system had fractured the cooper pipe that lays under the floorboards and between the bedroom and bathroom that joins causing a sprung water leak.
11. It became obvious that the sprung water leak had just got worse over the years and concealing itself until this point of time.
12. The Now Claimant and the Workman spoke and conclude that this is why the damp had been taking over the flat in part and that the fractured water pipe was more than likely leaking before the Now Claimant moved into the property due to the damage it had caused.
13. The worker immediately shut down the heating system and made the leek stop while explain to the Now Claimant that he could no longer use the heating system until it was fixed.
14. Whin a few hours passing by the worker had completed what he said he could do by lifting up all the hazardous floorboards in the three rooms and shutting the heating system of.
15. The Now Claimants floors were left with no floorboards and he had to walk along or in between the wood beams to be able to empty the bucket of water produced by the industrial humidifier and while the bedroom was sealed as unstable due to mould and mushrooms growing the rest of the rooms in the flat were also suffering as they were also covered in different coloured moulds growing and not to forget that the heating was non-existent, while an air ventilation system still needed to be installed for a better air quality to exist.
16. Temporary floor was necessary to be laid but this was not provided by the Enfield Council staff.
17. The flat of 109 Burncroft Avenue stayed in such a state of disrepair that the Now Claimant mother had to attend the premisses a few days afterwards to be able to inspect the situation for herself and she found herself so upset when she saw the condition the Enfield Council had left her son to live withinside and the damage caused to him and his goods.
18. The now Claimants mother knew it to be best to contact the Enfield Council and question them in regard to their decision of leaving her son or any person for these facts to have to deal with such dangerous conditions and their staff replied by arranged for another workman to attend the flat on the day of this telephone call but just to fix the floors..
19. Another worker arrived very soon after the telephone call had finished and laid some temporary chipboard down so the floor could be walked on till the heating system and our other mentioned disrepair issues could be fixed but this became the permanent floor in the end.
20. While the flat continued to dry out the Now Claimant did not have a home fit for use for more reasons than one and the Enfield Council did not seem at all bothered.
21. Late in the last months of **2008** and after many more telephone calls to the Enfield Council they agreed that the flat had dried out enough for the needed disrepair works to be completed and the Enfield Council worker started to strip the walls back to brick treat them and then re plaster them. But this still left damaged floorboards and no wooden flooring, No Heating System, and an air ventilation system still to be installed as well as damage caused by the disrepair issues caused to the Now Claimant and his belongings.
22. At the same time as the walls being completed more workers arrived at 109 Burncroft Avenue and they had with them two new double glassed panes of glass ready to fit into their places and with holes cut into them ready for the air system to be fitted, one glass pane was for the bathroom and the second one was for the kitchen.
23. After the work man had fitted the windows, they said that another company that may have the named of: - “Air Flow,” will shortly arrive and fit the Ventilation System.”
24. The Now Claimant waited in doors and no other person came to his home to fit the system into the holes in the windows and this led to more problems because the flat had become unsafe due to the considerable risk of trespassers easily detecting one of the holes.
25. The reason a trespasser could easily detect the holes is because the flat the Now Claimant bathroom window leads straight into the main street for all visiting the Housing estate to see as the now Claimants flat is directly opposite the main entrance into the Estate for traffic and pedestrians and is one of the first thing they see, while the kitchen widow is only accessible from the back garden.
26. It came to the Now Claimant and his mother of no surprise when they contacted the Enfield Council, and they said that the air ventilation systems equipment that was needed for the installation had faced delays.
27. The needed works the Enfield Council needed to complete for the Air Ventilation System to be fitted shockingly took them until the year of **2010** to complete as they explained to the now Claimant and his mother that the lack in work has occurred due to a shortage of supplies of the needed equipment.

Sound Proofing **2006** till **2022**

* **2009**

1. Into the year of **2009** the issues would not stop, and this was with the: -
2. **Flooring:** As the Enfield Council still had not fixed the flooring still correctly due to the leak.
3. **Heating System****:** Was still Non-existent.
4. **Large Holes Cut into The Windows:** The Enfield council had left holes in the windows so the now claimant or someone from his support network had to occupy the premises for security reasons and this all went on for around another 6 months, or more until the year of **2010.**
5. **The Air Ventilation System Installation:** The air ventilation system for the flat was still a nightmare to get hold of.
6. **Damp Smell:**
7. and this was even aloe the Council had just plastered the bedroom.
8. The Now Claimant still did not feel comfortable in the bedroom as he had never been able to use it other than the first 2 months of moving into the flat a due to the damage the damp had caused alongside other issues with his next-door neighbour Hazzan Ozman renting the room out beside.
9. The Enfield Council acted with no care towards the Now Claimant and any other contact made to themselves by his mother and this was no matter how many times they both contacted the Endfield Councils Repair teams the air vent workers just never showed up.
10. Telephone calls after calls were also, made in regard to having no heating system, and only surveyor after surveyors attended 109 Burncroft Avenue and when they arrived, they had no worker or replacement heating system with them and tended to say the work would be conducted soon afterwards but the disrepair woks were never done.
11. The Enfield Council just left the Now Claimant freezing in his unsatisfactory rented flat with holes in the windows and no heating system.

* **2010**

1. **Years was just going by** with no heating system within the flat it was freezing and making the Now Claimant extremely ill the Now Claimants rented flat was so cold it would never go fully warm, and the damp smell was so horrendous guest could not be invited around.
2. Contacting the Enfield Council sent the Now Claimant and his mother on a non-joyous adventure of get the Disrepair issues fixed to be able to live a fair standard of life.
3. Eventually the Now Claimant and his mother were so sick of calling and putting in complains over the telephone phone that the Now Claimant felt that he might as well live in a squat, when one day the Enfield Council made contact and said that the ventilation system was final ready to be installed, A date was arranged and a workman attended the flat to then afterwards installed the system into the holes in the windows and then finally this disrepair job was completed.
4. The flat of 109 still continued to suffer with more knock-on effect issues and as an example we will start with

Sound Proofing **2006** till **2022**

* **2011, 2012**

1. The following years slowly went by **2010**, **2011**, **2012**: -- The Enfield Council changed the Now Claimants life as they turned it for him into a living hell with the mentioned disrepair issues still presiding as abandoned.
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The Now Claimant

The Now Claimant His Belongings

* **2013**

1. The now claimant had to live inside of 109 Burncroft avenue more than he usually would because the police wrongfully accused him of an offence that he later won at court, and this meant that the disrepair within the flat became a problem that he wanted to solve.
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* **2014**

1. We herein introduce **Exhibit:** - “The Now Claimants Diary”
2. The Now Claimants Diary exhibits a large multitude of correspondences that are mostly emails, video, and Audio recordings that the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police Force himself and his mother were all sending backwards and forwards amongst each other.
3. In reference to the Emails contained in the diary quite a few of the emails sent by any person deal with more than one subject **E.g.** An email sent to the Enfield Council on the **00/00/2014** to a case handler named as Dawn Alan raises the concerns of disrepair but in the same email the complaint also ask the Enfield Council to manage the Now Claimants members of Neighbours who were wound up by the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police Force when they publicised information about the Now Claimant that the Government Officials had gained by setting him up fraudulently and by manipulating the law causing members of his neighbours to vigorously try and make him move away from them at any cost out of his life.
4. On the **00/00/0014** The Enfield Council and the Metropolitan police took out a frauded attack on the now claimant’s life and this enrolled member of his neighbours to join in as **Exhibited as** \*\*\*\*
5. Then came the water pressure issue
6. Disrepair work was also, conducted on the Now Claimants rented flat re replacing the complete electrical system, they wired in fire alarms and a **Carbon Monoxide** alarm incorrectly,
7. I made mutable calls to the Enfield Council to say to them that the Safety Alarms Systems had not been installed correctly, and due to this the Now Claimant suffered with carbon monoxide poisoning as there was a fault with the boiler and the Carbon Monoxide alarm not working. when they did come out in **Nov 2014** I was left with no boiler for weeks until parts could be ordered

* **EXHIBIT D6**

This **Exhibit** D6 referrers to a letter of evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell.

Access as national grid have shut down the heating system because the CO2 Alarm Kept Sounding.

Gas defect to domestic gas central Heating appliance.

**Fault Log:** 28/11/2014

**Est. Complete Date:** 28/11/2014

* **EXHIBIT D7**

This **Exhibit** D7 referrers to a letter of evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell.

Supply and fit Graphite Seal

Gas defect to domestic gas central Heating appliance.

**Fault Log:** 01/12/2014

**Est. Complete Date:** 03/12/2014

1. We also herein induce **Exhibit G42** as documented below
2. **EXHIBIT G42** Is photographic evidence Dated the **06/10/2022** of the Now Claimant rented Flat 109 Burncroft Avenue of the Enfield Council. The picture displays the flats front room main display wall and a leak running down the wall making the flat undecorate able while an undesiring place to be. The external side of the wall is open to air and has a drain guttering that runs on top and down its side that is leaking wastewater down the side of the wall. The Now Claimant request that of the Enfield Councils teams to repair the damage to the wall while fixing the Cause of Problem to make the flat a sustainable living place in the years of **2014.** Once the Enfield Councils Staff turned up, they overview the disrepair issue but never looked outside and

the Enfield Council treated and re skimmed the walls inside of the flat of 109 Burncroft Avenue due to the works that took a place in the years of **2006** till **2009.**

The walls inside of the flat of 109 Burncroft Avenue

The now claimant never realised at this stage the wall in the flat overside was an external wall open to air. The now claimant can remember talking to the different surveyors and workers trying to work out where the water was coming from. They all talked about the four flats above and the possibility of them having a water leak under their floorboards like had prior happened to the now Claimant. The repair teams said that they would order an inspection into the possibility of a leak coming from above. Within the month a plaster arrived at the Now Claimants Flat
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* **2015**

1. The year of **2015** suddenly appeared, and the Now Claimant was still suffering from their being no heating system in the flat, causing the Summers to stay cold of the nights and the winters become freezing.
2. Disrepair jobs needed completing, and the Council had now created two frauded Court Order applications with the seconds one being to get away from the first and all while the first frauded court application the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police Force used to cause the Claimants Neighbours to act in a hatred frenzy way against him as documented as

* which was no one would deal with and in the end the Now Claimants mother and I was so sick of what was going on my mother started sending emails of complaints.
* The 1st email sent was **02/03/2015** it was a Complaint, my mother did get a call back but it was not for everything nor the heating system, on the **04/03/2015** emails and complaints were also now being sent to the housing officer Dawn Allan regarding issues with neighbours and also repairs to the flat but no reply was forthcoming at all from Dawn Allan when at least 2 or more emails were being sent a month, it took until **21 Sep 2015** for Dawn Allan to finally reply. Due to emails being sent a few jobs to the flat was starting to get done but not the heating system.
* Around the end of **April 2015** my mother got a call from Enfield Council regarding the heating system she was horrified and angry at the lies being told to her by the Enfield Council worker, the Enfield Council worker told my mother the reason the heating system had not been replaced was due to Mr. S Cordell taking all the pipework from the flat and causing the damage that the cost to replace it would be nearly £4000.00 stating my son would need to pay, at that my mother went mad on the phone told the person she wanted a manger and surveyors to come to her son’s flat within 2 days, and if she needed to she would rip every place of flooring up in the flat to prove all the pipework and everything was still under the flooring that her son had not done what she was saying and she wanted this addressed she was not having lies stated about her son. The women on the phone said there be no need for all that they would replace the heating system. My mother was still horrified and angry at what the Enfield Councils staff had said and then stated she would still like an official person to come to the flat to see the truth for themselves, but the women on the phone stated that would not be needed the heating system will be replaced. My mother said she still wanted someone to come and check this has never happened and would not be the end of what was said.

So, we waited for them to come and do the heating this did not happened until **around July 2015,** the reason for it taking so long was due to what Enfield Council had told the company that would be doing the work. When a worker did turn up, he stated to Mr S Cordell no one wanted to do the job because of what Enfield Council had told them what you had done taking up all the pipes and doing a great deal of damage to the flat, the workman said he was so happy that he had agreed to do the job and could not wait to go back to the office and tell them everything he was shocked because he could see all the pipes were there they had not been removed like Enfield Council had told them, that his officer and the workers was going to be really shocked. Mr S Cordell then told him the whole history of what really happened and how he had to live and what Enfield Council had done the worker was more than shocked and said how did Enfield Council make you live like this. No one has ever come from Enfield Council to check the pipework was still there and is still there, which I would still like my name has been blackened by Enfield Council and I want a great deal corrected. Which Enfield Council has beached the duty of candour multiple times for things.
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**2016**

Then water pressure issue I was getting letters after letters blaming me for causing it, I let five council workers in to check my flat all stated the issue was not coming from my flat and I also had low water pressure but because I am based on the ground floor, I would not have noticed it so much. I myself called once after I could take no more of the letters blaming me and was very rude, I allowed Thames Water also in my flat four times to check my flat each time being told the issue is not coming from my flat. The complaints about the water pressure were being made by 117, it did not matter how many times I allowed Enfield Council workmen in to check or Thames Water, or the landlord of 117 plumbers in all saying the issues was not coming from my flat, Enfield council only believed what 117 tenants were telling them I was causing the issues with the water pressure. Enfield Council did not believe all their own workers or Thames Water or the property owner at 117 own plumbers, I just was blamed the letters kept coming this was ongoing for over a year. Then came the disrepair guy Neville Gray from Enfield Council who was rude and that is an understanding, and he lied on more than one occasion.
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**2017**

I was in my flat in **Feb 2017** after having really bad family news the day before so was really upset and did not feel well, Neville Gray just banged on my door and demanded I let him in, I called my mother who came to my flat.

Neville Gray lied to her along with her brother that day and it was not just going to stop there, it seemed he had been in contract with 117 and they knew he was coming he also stated that 113 knew he was coming as he had contracted them, the only person who had not been contracted was 109 Mr S Cordell.

In the end there was words said and also 113 was not there, Government staff named as Neville Gray who was employed by the Enfield Council lied in mutable instances to aid in a cover up of the truth.
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**2018**

* A
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**2019**

* A

Walls Damp Mould **2006** Till End Of **2008** then **2014** till **20022**

Flooring Sinking: **2008** till **0000** and then till **2022**

Banging On the Walls and Using Drills **2014** till **2022**

Window Seals **2015** till **2021**

Kitchen Cupboards 0000till **2021**

Sound Proofing **2006** till **2022**

The Now Claimant

The Now Claimant His Belongings

**2020**
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**2021**
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**2022**
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* **What Kind of Mould Grows on Walls?**

1. Common indoor moulds include: - “**Alternaria**” This occurs in damp places indoors, such as showers or under leaky sinks.
2. “**Aspergillus**” This often grows indoors on dust, powdery food items, and building materials, such as drywall. **20 Aug 2019.**
3. Moulds, in the right conditions, produce: - “**Mycotoxins**," poisonous substances that easily make people sick.
4. **“Aflatoxins”** are: **“Amongst the Most Poisonous Mycotoxins”** and they produce certain moulds such as: - “**Aspergillus Flavus**” and: - **“Aspergillus Parasiticus…”**

* **Exhibits D1.**

1. **Exhibit D1** is a letter that the Now Claimant received From the London Borough of Enfield Council on the date of **26th of July 2006.**
2. This letter shows that the Enfield Council were fully aware that the premises that they had rented out to the Now Claimant suffered with asbestos within the building materials and that it was their job to maintain the asbestos within the premises, to a fair standard of living.
3. The Enfield Council Letter addressed to the now claimant, also displays a doctor name printed inside of it and the Now Claimant believes that this is due to the danger asbestos can cause to human life the doctors name is a Donald Graham.
4. The Now Claimant suffered through High risks associated to contaminating mould growth due to the Enfield Councils incompetence.
5. The Enfield Council understood they were leaving people lives at a servery high risk by leaving them in horrendous inhabitable conditions due to mould being present in a large percentage of their rented home contained in their portfolio of property rented out to become homes and that it was going to be Very Likely that they have a claim put against them for damages caused due to these facts.
6. The Now Claimant: - “landlords” must protect him by not charging for any unfair rent.

* **Exhibit D2**

1. Is a letter sent to the Now Claimant from the Enfield Council.
2. This exhibited letter has a date of the **22/11/2011.**
3. The Letter subject is: - **“Electrical Air Vent System Due to Be Installed In 2010, Was to Prevent Damp and Mould Issues” – “Windows Have Been Temp Repaired to Cover Holes.” “No Skirting Boards in Bathroom and Bedroom.”**
4. The Letter shows that the Enfield Council Failed the Now Claimant in their obligation to supply a home fit for purpose.
5. The Date of the letter s is the **22/11/2011** and the Enfield Council are openly admitting having failed the Now Claimant prior to **2010.**
6. The Enfield Council raised the Issue of disrepair for another surveyor to overview the mutable different problems that left the flat in an unsustainable living condition and never substitute property in the meantime.
7. The next surveyor was to arrive on the **1st of December 2011.**

* **Exhibit D3**

1. This Exhibit D3 referrers to a letter of evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell.
2. Document Date **01/12/2011**
3. Damp Skirting Boards: - “I called to see you today at 14:33.”

* **Exhibit D4**

1. This Exhibit D4 referrers to a letter of evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell.
2. Document Date **15/02/2012**
3. Heating: - “I called to see you today at 10am.”

* **Exhibit D5**

1. This **Exhibit** D5 referrers to a letter of evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell.
2. Total Loss of Gas heating and Hot water in summer **1st May to 31st October.**
3. Gas defect to domestic gas central Heating appliance.
4. Fault Log: **14/05/2009**
5. Est. Complete Date: **19/05/2009**

* **Exhibit D6**

1. This **Exhibit** D6 referrers to a letter of evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell.
2. Access as national grid have shut down the heating system because the CO2 Alarm Kept Sounding.
3. Gas defect to domestic gas central Heating appliance.
4. Fault Log: **28/11/2014**
5. Est. Complete Date: **28/11/2014**

* **Exhibit D7**

1. This **Exhibit** D6 referrers to a letter of evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell.
2. Supply and fit Graphite Seal
3. Gas defect to domestic gas central Heating appliance.
4. Fault Log: **01/12/2014**
5. Est. Complete Date: **03/12/2014**

* **Exhibits E.**

1. **Exhibits E**. comes with twenty-three pictures that were took in the year of **2007.**
2. **EXHIBIT E2**. Bathroom.
3. **EXHIBIT E3.** Bathroom ceiling.
4. **EXHIBIT E4.** Bathroom ceiling.
5. **EXHIBIT E5**. Kitchen vermin issues on top of tumble dryer.
6. **EXHIBIT E6.** Kitchen vermin. Issues on top of microwave.
7. **EXHIBIT E7.** Kitchen vermin Issues on top of sides.
8. **EXHIBIT E8.** Kitchen vermin Issues on top of sides.
9. **EXHIBIT E9.** Kitchen vermin Issues on top of sides.
10. **EXHIBIT E10.** Front room entrance side damp damage to internal and Fixtures.
11. **Exhibit. E11.** Far side front room External window wall ledge damp issues.
12. **Exhibit. E12.** Far side front room External door frame inner wall damp issues based around the windows and back garden door.
13. **Exhibit. E13.** Far side front room wall damp issues.
14. **Exhibit. E14.** Far side front room wall damp issues.
15. **EXHIBIT E15.** Front room entrance side behind the door Vermin issues.
16. **EXHIBIT E16**. Bedroom Mould. Serious High Risk. Unliveable quarters “unable to be lived or unfit to live in” Damage to his property.
17. **EXHIBIT E17.** Bedroom walls mould. Serious High Risk. Unliveable quarters.
18. **EXHIBIT E18.** Bedroom walls mould. Serious High Risk. Unliveable quarters. Damaged bed mattress, tv.
19. **EXHIBIT E19.** Bedroom ceiling mould. Serious High Risk. Unliveable quarters.
20. **EXHIBIT E20.** Bedroom ceiling and wall mould. Serious High Risk. Unliveable quarters. With an ineffective air system.
21. **EXHIBIT E21.** Bedroom. Damage to Personal Property. Serious High Risk. Unliveable quarters.
22. **EXHIBIT E22.** Bedroom. Damage to Personal Property. Serious High Risk. Unliveable quarters.
23. **EXHIBIT E23.** Bedroom. Damage to Personal Property. Serious High Risk. Unliveable quarters.

* **Exhibits F.**

1. **Exhibits F.** comes with fourteen pictures that were took in the year of **2022.**
2. The pieces of evidence show how Enfield Council have managed the Damp issues in Burncroft Avenue and the Standards that they are happy to sublet properties out in.
3. 117 Burncroft Avenue **EXHIBIT F27** referrers to photographic evidence made by the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell, A letter of policy for subletting a premisses between the Enfield Council and Ashdale Services Limited. The Policy States: - “
4. 117 Burncroft Avenue **EXHIBIT F28** referrers to photographic evidence made by the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell, A letter of policy
5. 117 Burncroft Avenue **EXHIBIT F29** referrers to photographic evidence made by the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell, Business Card
6. 117 Burncroft Avenue **EXHIBIT F30** referrers to photographic evidence made by the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell, A letter of policy
7. 117 Burncroft Avenue **EXHIBIT F31** referrers to photographic evidence made by the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell, Video Link
8. 117 Burncroft Avenue **EXHIBIT F32** referrers to photographic evidence made by the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell, Video Link
9. 117 Burncroft Avenue **EXHIBIT F33** referrers to photographic evidence made by the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell, Video Link Freeze Frame Picture. A Dirty Bed Mattress 1 OF 5
10. 117 Burncroft Avenue **EXHIBIT F34** referrers to photographic evidence made by the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell, Video Link Freeze Frame Picture. A Dirty Mouldy Bed Mattress 1 OF 5
11. 117 Burncroft Avenue **EXHIBIT F35** referrers to photographic evidence made by the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell, Video Link Freeze Frame Picture. A Dirty Mouldy Bed Mattress 1 OF 5
12. 117 Burncroft Avenue **EXHIBIT F36** referrers to photographic evidence made by the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell, Video Link Freeze Frame Picture. A Dirty Mouldy Bed Mattress 1 OF 5
13. 117 Burncroft Avenue **EXHIBIT F37** referrers to photographic evidence made by the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell, Video Link Freeze Frame Picture. A Dirty Mouldy Bed Mattress 1 OF 5
14. 117 Burncroft Avenue **EXHIBIT F38** referrers to photographic evidence made by the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell, Video Link Freeze Frame Picture. A Dirty Mouldy Bed Mattress 1 OF 5
15. 117 Burncroft Avenue **EXHIBIT F39** referrers to photographic evidence made by the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell, Video Link Freeze Frame Picture. A Dirty Mouldy Bed Mattress 1 OF 5
16. 117 Burncroft Avenue **EXHIBIT F40** referrers to photographic evidence made by the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell, Broken Front Door. Smashed by 117 Slamming it closed as they left.

* **Exhibits G.**

1. **Exhibits G.**
2. **EXHIBIT G42** Is photographic evidence Dated the **06/10/2022** of the Now Claimant rented Flat 109 Burncroft Avenue of the Enfield Council. The picture displays the flats front room main display wall and a leak running down the wall making the flat undecorate able while an undesiring place to be. The external side of the wall is open to air and has a drain guttering that runs on top and down its side that is leaking wastewater down the side of the wall. The Now Claimant request that of the Enfield Councils teams to repair the damage to the wall while fixing the Cause of Problem to make the flat a sustainable living place in the years of **2014.** Once the Enfield Councils Staff turned up, they overview the disrepair issue but never looked outside and

The walls inside of the flat of 109 Burncroft Avenue were treated and re skimmed with plaster due to the works that took a place in the years of **2006** till **2009.**

The now claimant never realised at this stage the wall in the flat overside was an external wall open to air. The now claimant can remember talking to the different surveyors and workers trying to work out where the water was coming from. They all talked about the four flats above and the possibility of them having a water leak under their floorboards like had prior happened to the now Claimant. The repair teams said that they would order an inspection into the possibility of a leak coming from above. Within the month a plaster arrived at the Now Claimants Flat

As is **EXHIBIT** as **G62**

1. **EXHIBIT G43** Front Room Main Wall. There is water Running down the wall.
2. **EXHIBIT G44** Front Room Main Wall. There is water Running down the wall.
3. **EXHIBIT G45** Front Room Picture. And this shows that no matter how hard it has been for the Now Claimant he still keeps the flat in an orderly manner and should not have to suffer without being able to decorate of have a home up to a fair living standard.
4. **EXHIBIT G46** Front Room **2021** main windows hinges replaced due to rusting away. Front Room bottom double glassed window replaced due to blowing a hole inside of it through the seal and also needed new outer seals as the window was causing damp. Front Room Garden door had to be resealed due to bad drafts but was not fixed properly.
5. **EXHIBIT G47** Front Room Air vent
6. **EXHIBIT G48** Kitchen
7. **EXHIBIT G49** Kitchen
8. **EXHIBIT G50** Kitchen **2021** New Bottom Kitchen Cupboards installed because the plumbing system would not drain as it was blocked causing the main sink not to flow water down it and when the Enfield Council sent a worker around to fix it he realised the damp in the flat had damaged the wood on the Kitchen cupboards and to complete the drainage job they replaced the cupboards and also replaced the customised kitchen window and air vent as they became damaged from ware and tear causing the air flow system to fail.
9. **EXHIBIT G51** Kitchen
10. **EXHIBIT G52** Hallway
11. **EXHIBIT G53** Bathroom
12. **EXHIBIT G54** Bathroom
13. **EXHIBIT G55** Bathroom
14. **EXHIBIT G56** Bedroom
15. **EXHIBIT G57** The Bedroom Ceiling is suffering with a lack of due care from the Enfield Council due to Asbestos materials fulling into a bad state of disrepair. The Council has left the issue unattended to for the following years **2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022**. It was a builder who actually noticed the Asbestos and informed the Now Claimant to report it to the Enfield Council, so, the Now Claimant told the Enfield Council and they refused to listen.
16. **EXHIBIT G58** Back Garden Picture
17. **EXHIBIT G59** Back Garden Picture of the Garden fence just replaced by \*\*\*\*\* due to orders of the Enfield Council because
18. **EXHIBIT G60** Back Garden Picture
19. **EXHIBIT G61** Back Garden Picture displays a nice garden that the Now Claimant has not been able to use due to the Enfield Council allowing
20. **EXHIBIT G62** Drainpipe Causing flat wall to suffer with damp.
21. **EXHIBIT G63** is Audio recording of the Enfield Council at the Now Claimants Home in the Year of **2017** and is **Exhibited as** \*\*\*\*\*. Whin this recording there is more than one relevant issue of concern.

* **Air Quality**

1. The Now Claimant suffered with low quality air that was Poor fore human consumption withinside his Rented home of the Enfield Council due to fault of theirs.

* **The Now Claimants Health**

1. As the allergens dried out, they become airborne and caused the Now Claimant to suffer with dry eye and irritable breathing irritation as well as irritated skin, Throat irritation, Sinus swelling and irritation.
2. The Now Claimants Hair also, becomes dry and split due to the damp conditions in his home.
3. Dust mites thrived and multiplied, affecting the Now Claimant asthma and effected his skin due to allergies.
4. The evidence he and his support network have supplied clearly show bacteria’s growing inside of his home, that the Enfield Council forced him to live in leading to the Now Claimants illness to date such as the already mentioned and the addition of bad depression, alongside Excessive sweating.

* **The Now Claimants Rented Home also, Suffered with**

1. Wooden furniture and flooring dry out.
2. Warp Fixtures and crack walls as the air in the flat became excessively dry.
3. Even Houseplants were dying due to low humidity.
4. Condensation continually formed due to bad air flow, and this happened even with the windows open and as a result the Now Claimant could not stop the growth of mould alone.
5. The higher limit of risks associated to damp the Now Claimant suffered with and at no fault of his own
6. The Enfield Council should not have charged the Now Claimants Rent Rates through these periods for a flat not fit for renting purposes, the Now Claimants Tenancy Rent Rates the Council over charged and this fact we prove by the exhibited.
7. The Exhibits show an unacceptable standard of life that the Enfield Council charged the Now Claimant to live through.
8. The Damp came with a damp smell that covered the complete area of the home and was of a high-risk category, but the Enfield Council did not treat the damp or wellbeing relevantly so.
9. The flat of 109 Burncroft Avenue suffered with peeling wallpaper and damaged paint at the Now Claimants cost of repair.
10. Mould formed on the Now Claimants clothes and that of his most prided other possessions.
11. The Wooden flooring in the Now Claimant rented home that he installed the mouldy damp also damaged and this came at his loss of cost due to overtime lined disrepair issues.
12. Fungal decay stated grow poisonous Mushrooms from spores that are so tiny at first no person could see them with their naked eye and these spores are dangerous as the Enfield Council is well aware of.
13. Vomiting and diarrhoea became a regular problem for the Now Clamant as the flat stayed to unhygienic to cook food while residing inside of.
14. Insect and vermin infestation took over the premises of 109 Burncroft Ave as the conditions the Enfield Council left the Now Claimant to live in was more than just an inviting invitation form them as well.
15. The Now Claimant request for the Enfield Council, to pay the sum as totalled below in respect of the Disrepair Damages caused to him.

**Civil wrongs**

1. The Enfield Councils Insurance Covers them as outlined in *Material Damages* in part A page 14 & page 15 of *Section 2* which is – *The Cover* of your insurance policy document.
2. **Web Link to Metropolitans Police Insurance Policy Document**

* <https://serverone.hopto.org/Police%20policy%202012/>

**Recovery of damages and General Losses**

1. **2006** The Now Claimant requests a 50% split of: - **“Net Rent”** paid on his behalf for the following years, day, and Months: -

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | | |
| **2005** | | |
| **Numb** | **Rates** | **Totals** |
|  | * **Proprietors:** - London and Quadrant * **Date:** 19/05/2005 * **Gross Rent**: £76.19 * **Net Rent:** £67.60 * **Services:** £8.59 * **Water Rates:** N/a * **Address:** 04 Crompton Place Enfield Island Village | **N/a** |
| **2006** | | |
| **Numb** | **Rates** | **Totals** |
|  | * **Proprietors:** - London and Quadrant / The London Borough of Enfield. * **Date:** 24/01/2006 * **Gross Rent**: £76.19 * **Net Rent:** £67.60 * **Services:** £8.59 * **Water Rates:** N/a * **Address:** 04 Crompton Place Enfield Island Village * **Proprietors:** - The London Borough of Enfield. * **Date:** 11/08/2006 * **Gross Rent**: £69.13 * **Net Rent:** £62.04 * **Water Rates:** £3.96 * **Heating Charge:** N/a * **Caretaking:** £2.47 * **Ground Maintenance:** £2.47 * **Address:** 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield | * **Net Rent a Week:** £62.04 x**4** = £248.16p * **Rent Charged Per Day £62.04 divided by 7 =** £8.86p .28571 pence of a penny.   **August 31 days – 11 =** 2 weeks + 6 days totalling to 20 days =  2 weeks total to £124.08p  6 days total to £53.17p .7142 pence of a penny.  **September** **30 days =** **2 days extra. x 4** = £248.16p  **October 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £248.16p  **November 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £248.16p  **December 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £248.16p  = 992.64  + 1 month 248.16p  = 1,240.8  + 2 days  **1 week 3 days extra**  1 week = £62.04P  3 days = £26.58p. 8571 pence of a penny.  **Two Days**  x 2 day = 17.72p. 5711 pence of a penny.  **Without Penny’s Points** = 1, 258 .51p  **Penny’s** = 1p .5713 of a penny.  **Total Days** = 19 week 3 days = 136 days  **TOTAL VALUE**  **£**1,258.52.5713.  **Example:** 62.04 divided by 7 = 8.8628571 then 8.8628571 x by 7 = 62.39999. is not 62.04.   1. £. 1,258.52.5713 - £. 1,258.52.5713 = 2. **2006** “11/08/2006 till 04/04/2007 and as per my records the amount for the reimbursement comes to **£. 1,258.52.5713** pence of a penny. |
| **2007** | | |
| **Numb** | **Rates** | **Totals** |
|  | * **Proprietors:** - The London Borough of Enfield. * **Date:** 05/02/2007 * **Gross Rent**: £72.42 * **Net Rent:** £62.04 * **Water Rates:** £3.96 * **Heating Charge:** N/a * **Caretaking:** £2.47 * **Ground Maintenance:** £2.47 * **Address:** 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield | * **2007 Net Rent:** **£71.50?**   **January 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £00.00p  **February 28 days = x 4** = £00.00p  **March 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £00.00p  **April 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £00.00p  **May 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £00.00p  **June 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £00.00p  **July 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £00.00p  **August 31 days** **= 3 days extra. x 4** = £00.00p  **September** **30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £00.00p  **October 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £00.00p  **November 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £00.00p  **December 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £00.00p   1. **2007** 04/04/2007 till 04/04/2008 and as per my records the amount for the reimbursement comes to **£. (amount).** |
| **2008** | | |
| **Numb** | **Rates** | **Totals** |
|  | * **Proprietors:** - The London Borough of Enfield. * **Date:** 04/04/2008 * **Gross Rent**: £75.94 * **Net Rent:** £71.50 * **Water Rates:** £3.96 * **Heating Charge:** N/a * **Caretaking:** £2.47 * **Ground Maintenance:** £2.47 * **Address:** 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield | * **2008 Net Rent:** £71.50   29 days = 4 weeks 1 day  12 months x4 = 48 +  4 weeks 1 day  **Total**  49 weeks + 1 days  **--**  **£71.50 X 49** = £2,033.5p  **£71.50 Divided By 7** = £10.21p. 4285 pence of a penny.  --  £2,033.5p  £10.21p. 4285 pence of a penny.  **Total**  £2,43.26p  **+ 1 day leap year =** £10.21p .4285 pence of a penny.  **Total**  £2,53.47p .0.857 pence of a penny.  **January 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £286  **Leap Year February 29 days = x 4** = £286  **March 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £286  **April 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £286  **May 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £286  **June 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £286  **July 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £286  **August 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £286  **September 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £286  **October 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £286  **November 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £286  **December 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = ££286   1. £2,53.47p .0.857 - £2,53.47p .0.857 = 2. **2008** 04/04/2008 till 04/04/2009 and as per my records the amount for the reimbursement comes to **£2,53.47p .0.857** pence of a penny. |
| **2009** | | |
| **Numb** | **Rates** | **Totals** |
|  | * **Proprietors:** - The London Borough of Enfield. * **Date:** 04/04/2009 * **Gross Rent**: £78.37 * **Net Rent:** £78.37 * **Water Rates:** £4.75 * **Heating Charge:** N/a * **Caretaking:** £2.67 * **Ground Maintenance:** £1.05 * **Address:** 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield | * **2009 Net Rent:** £78.37   29 days = 4 weeks 1 day  12 months x4 = 48 +  4 weeks 1 day  **Total**  49 weeks + 1 days  **--**  **£78.37 X 49** = £3,840.13p  **£78.37 Divided By 7** = £11.19p .5714 pence of a penny.  **Total**  £3,851.32p .5714 pence of a penny.  **January 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £313.48p  **February 28 days = x 4** = £313.48p  **March 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £313.48p  **April 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £313.48p  **May 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £313.48p  **June 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £313.48p  **July 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £313.48p  **August 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £313.48p  **September 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £313.48p  **October 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £313.48p  **November 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £313.48p  **December 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £313.48p   1. £. 3,851.32p .5714 - £. 3,851.32p .5714 = 2. 04/04/2009 till 04/04/2010 and as per my records the amount for the reimbursement comes to **£. 3,851.32p .5714** pence of a penny. |
| **2010** | | |
| **Numb** | **Rates** | **Totals** |
|  | * **Proprietors:** - The London Borough of Enfield. * **Date:** 115/11/2010 * **Gross Rent**: £79.01 * **Net Rent:** £72.68 * **Water Rates:** £3.96 * **Heating Charge:** N/a * **Caretaking:** £2.47 * **Ground Maintenance:** £2.47 * **Address:** 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield | * **2010 Net Rent:** £72.68   29 days = 4 weeks 1 day  12 months x4 = 48 +  4 weeks 1 day  **Total**  49 weeks + 1 days  **--**  **£72.68 X 49** = £3,561.32p  **£72.68 Divided By 7** = £10.38p .2857 pence of a penny.  **Total**  £. 3,571.7p .2857 pence of a penny.  **January 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £290.72p  **February 28 days = x 4** = £290.72p  **March 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £290.72p  **April 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £290.72p  **May 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £290.72p  **June 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £290.72p  **July 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £290.72p  **August 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £290.72p  **September 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £290.72p  **October 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £290.72p  **November 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £290.72p  **December 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £290.72p   1. £. 3,571.7p .2857 - £. 3,571.7p .2857 = 2. 04/04/2010 till 04/04/2011 and as per my records the amount for the reimbursement comes to **£. 3,571.7p .2857** pence of a penny. |
| **2011** | | |
| **Numb** | **Rates** | **Totals** |
|  | * **Proprietors:** - The London Borough of Enfield. * **Date:** 04/05/2011 * **Gross Rent**: £83.46 * **Net Rent:** £74.61 * **Water Rates:** £5.02 * **Heating Charge:** N/a * **Caretaking:** £2.73 * **Ground Maintenance:** £1.10 * **Address:** 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield * **Council Tax:** £ 1,094.38 | * **2011 Net Rent:** £74.61   29 days = 4 weeks 1 day  12 months x4 = 48 +  4 weeks 1 day  **Total**  49 weeks + 1 days  **--**  **£74.61 X 49** = £3,655.89p  **£74.61 Divided By 7** = £10.65p .8571 pence of a penny.  **Total**  **£.** 3,666.54p .8571 pence of a penny.  **January 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £298.44p  **February 28 days = x 4** = £298.44p  **March 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £298.44p  **April 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £298.44p  **May 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £298.44p  **June 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £298.44p  **July 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £298.44p  **August 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £298.44p  **September 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £298.44p  **October 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £298.44p  **November 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £298.44p  **December 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £298.44p   1. £. 3,666.54p .8571 - £. 3,666.54p .8571 = 2. 04/04/2011 till 04/04/2012 and as per my records the amount for the reimbursement comes to **£. 3,666.54p .8571** pence of a penny. |
| **2012** | | |
| **Numb** | **Rates** | **Totals** |
|  | * **Proprietors:** - The London Borough of Enfield. * **Date:** 04/04/2006 * **Gross Rent**: £89.13 * **Net Rent:** £79.70 * **Water Rates:** £5.40 * **Heating Charge:** N/a * **Caretaking:** £2.87 * **Ground Maintenance:** £1.16 * **Address:** 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield | * **2012 Net Rent:** £89.13   29 days = 4 weeks 1 day  12 months x4 = 48 +  4 weeks 1 day  **Total**  49 weeks + 1 days  **--**  **£89.13 X 49** = £4,367.37p  **£89.13 Divided By 7** = £12.73p .2857 of a penny.  **Total**  £4,380.01p .2857 of pence of a penny.  **+ 1 day leap year =** £12.73p .2857 pence of a penny.  **Total**  £4,392.74p .5714 pence of a penny.  **January 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £356.52p  **Leap Year February 29 days = x 4** = £356.52p  **March 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £356.52p  **April 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £356.52p  **May 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £356.52p  **June 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £356.52p  **July 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £356.52p  **August 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £356.52p  **September 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £356.52p  **October 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £356.52p  **November 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £356.52p  **December 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £356.52p   1. £4,392.74p .5714 - £4,392.74p .5714 = 2. 04/04/2012 till 04/04/2013 and as per my records the amount for the reimbursement comes to **£4,392.74p .5714** pence of a penny. |
| **2013** | | |
| **Numb** | **Rates** | **Totals** |
|  | * **Proprietors:** - The London Borough of Enfield. * **Date:** 14/03/2013 * **Gross Rent**: £69.13 * **Net Rent:** £92.49. reduced by £5.65, to £86.84 each week * **Water Rates:** £5.65 * **Heating Charge:** N/a * **Caretaking:** £2.47 * **Ground Maintenance:** £2.47 * **Address:** 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield * Email in diary 14/03/2013 | * **2013 Net Rent:** £86.84p   29 days = 4 weeks 1 day  12 months x4 = 48 +  4 weeks 1 day  **Total**  49 weeks + 1 days  **--**  **£86.84 X 49** = £4,255.16p  **£86.84 Divided By 7** = £12.40p .5714 pence of a penny.  **Total**  **£.** 4,237.56p .5714 pence of a penny.  **January 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £86.84p  **February 28 days = x 4** = £86.84p  **March 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £86.84p  **April 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £86.84p  **May 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £86.84p  **June 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £86.84p  **July 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £86.84p  **August 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £86.84p  **September 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £86.84p  **October 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £86.84p  **November 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £86.84p  **December 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £86.84p   1. £. 4,237.56p .5714 - £. 4,237.56p .5714 = 2. 04/04/2013 till 04/04/2014 and as per my records the amount for the reimbursement comes to **£.** 4,237.56p .5714 pence of a penny. |
| **2014** | | |
| **Numb** | **Rates** | **Totals** |
|  | * **Proprietors:** - The London Borough of Enfield. * **Date:** 04/04/2014 * **Gross Rent**: £96.66 * **Net Rent:** £86.36 * **Water Rates:** £3.96 * **Heating Charge:** N/a * **Caretaking:** £3.04 * **Ground Maintenance:** £1.25 * **Address:** 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield | * **2014 Net Rent:** £86.36   29 days = 4 weeks 1 day  12 months x4 = 48 +  4 weeks 1 day  **Total**  49 weeks + 1 days  **--**  **£86.36 X 49** = £4,231.64p  **£86.36 Divided By 7** = £11.33p .7142 pence of a penny.  **Total**  **£.** 4,242.97p .7142 pence of a penny.  **January 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £345.44  **February 28 days = x 4** = £345.44  **March 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £345.44  **April 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £345.44  **May 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £345.44  **June 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £345.44  **July 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £345.44  **August 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £345.44  **September 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £345.44  **October 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £345.44  **November 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £345.44  **December 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £345.44   1. £. 4,242.97p .7142 - £. 4,242.97p .7142 = 2. 04/04/2014 till 04/04/2015 and as per my records the amount for the reimbursement comes to **£. 4,242.97p .7142** pence of a penny. |
| **2015** | | |
| **Numb** | **Rates** | **Totals** |
|  | * **Proprietors:** - The London Borough of Enfield. * **Date:** 11/08/2006 * **Gross Rent**: £69.13 * **Net Rent:** £96.66 reduced by £6.01, to £90.65 **each week** * **Water Rates:** £6.01 * **Heating Charge:** N/a * **Caretaking:** £2.47 * **Ground Maintenance:** £2.47 * **Address:** 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield * **Council Tax:** £ 1,088.38 | * **2015 Net Rent:** £90.65   29 days = 4 weeks 1 day  12 months x4 = 48 +  4 weeks 1 day  **Total**  49 weeks + 1 days  **--**  **£90.65 X 49** = £4,441.85p  **£90.65 Divided By 7** = £12.95p  **Total**  **£.** 4,454.08p  **January 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £90.65  **February 28 days = x 4** = £90.65  **March 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £90.65  **April 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £90.65  **May 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £90.65  **June 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £90.65  **July 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £90.65  **August 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £90.65  **September 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £90.65  **October 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £90.65  **November 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £90.65  **December 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £90.65   1. £. 4,454.08p - £. 4,454.08p = 2. 04/04/2015 till 04/04/2016 and as per my records the amount for the reimbursement comes to **£.** 4,454.08p |
| **2016** | | |
| **Numb** | **Rates** | **Totals** |
|  | * **Proprietors:** - The London Borough of Enfield. * **Date:** 04/04/2016 * **Gross Rent**: £99.49 * **Net Rent:** £87.38 * **Water Rates:** £6.30 * **Landlord Communal Service Charge**: £0.40 * **Heating Charge:** N/a * **Caretaking:** £3.38 * **Ground Maintenance:** £1.44 * **Entrance Cleaning Charge In:** £0.59 * **Address:** 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield * 27/02/2016 | * **2016 Net Rent:** £87.38   29 days = 4 weeks 1 day  12 months x4 = 48 +  4 weeks 1 day  **Total**  49 weeks + 1 days  **--**  **£87.38 X 49** = £4,281.62p  **£87.38 Divided By 7** = £12.48p .2857 pence of a penny.  **Total**  £4,294.01p .2857 of a penny.  **+ 1 day leap year =** £12.48p .2857 pence of a penny.  **Total**  £4,306.49p .5714 of a penny  **January 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £349.52  **Leap Year February 29 days = x 4** = £349.52  **March 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £349.52  **April 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £349.52  **May 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £349.52  **June 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £349.52  **July 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £349.52  **August 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £349.52  **September 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £349.52  **October 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £349.52  **November 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £349.52  **December 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £349.52   1. £4,306.49p .5714 - £4,306.49p .5714 = 2. 04/04/2016 till 04/04/2017 and as per my records the amount for the reimbursement comes to **£4,306.49p .5714** pence of a penny. |
| **2017** | | |
| **Numb** | **Rates** | **Totals** |
|  | * **Proprietors:** - The London Borough of Enfield. * **Date:** 04/04/2006 * **Gross Rent**: £99.28 * **Net Rent:** £86.51 * **Water Rates:** £3.96 * **Enhanced Cleaning Charge**: £0.59 * **Landlord Communal Service Charge**: £0.45 * **Heating Charge:** N/a * **Caretaking:** £3.54 * **Ground Maintenance:** £1.89 * **Address:** 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield | * **2017 Net Rent:** £86.51   29 days = 4 weeks 1 day  12 months x4 = 48 +  4 weeks 1 day  **Total**  49 weeks + 1 days  **--**  **£86.51 X 49** = £4,238.99p  **£86.51 Divided By 7** = £12.35p .8571 pence of a penny.  **Total**  **£.** 4,251.34p. .8571 pence of a penny.  **January 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £346.04  **February 28 days = x 4** = £346.04  **March 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £346.04  **April 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £346.04  **May 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £346.04  **June 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £346.04  **July 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £346.04  **August 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £346.04  **September 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £346.04  **October 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £346.04  **November 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £346.04  **December 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £346.04   1. £. 4,251.34p. .8571 - £. 4,251.34p. .8571 = 2. 04/04/2017 till 04/04/2018 and as per my records the amount for the reimbursement comes to **£. 4,251.34p. .8571** pence of a penny. |
| **2018** | | |
| **Numb** | **Rates** | **Totals** |
|  | * **Proprietors:** - The London Borough of Enfield. * **Date:** 03/04/2018 * **Gross Rent**: £98.24 * **Net Rent:** £62.04 * **Water Rates:** £3.96 * **Heating Charge:** N/a * **Caretaking:** £2.47 * **Ground Maintenance:** £2.47 * **Address:** 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield * **Council Tax:** £ 1,152.08 * 25.00% Discount - £288.02 * **Total:** £753.02 | * **2018 Net Rent:** £86.36   **January 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £00.00p  **February 28 days = x 4** = £00.00p  **March 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £00.00p  **April 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £00.00p  **May 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £00.00p  **June 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £00.00p  **July 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £00.00p  **August 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £00.00p  **September 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £00.00p  **October 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £00.00p  **November 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £00.00p  **December 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £00.00p   1. 04/04/2018 till 04/04/2019 and as per my records the amount for the reimbursement comes to **£. (amount).** |
| **2019** | | |
| **Numb** | **Rates** | **Totals** |
|  | * **Proprietors:** - The London Borough of Enfield. * **Date:** 01/04/2019 * **Gross Rent**: £98.52 * **Net Rent:** £84.78 * **Water Rates:** £7.43 * **Heating Charge:** N/a * **Caretaking:** £3.94 * **Ground Maintenance:** £1.90 * **Address:** 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield | * **2019 Net Rent:** £84.78   29 days = 4 weeks 1 day  12 months x4 = 48 +  4 weeks 1 day  **Total**  49 weeks + 1 days  **--**  **£84.78 X 49** = £4,154.22p  **£84.78 Divided By 7** = £12.11p .1428 pence of a penny.  **Total**  **£.** 4,166.33p .1428 pence of a penny.  **January 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £339.12p  **February 28 days = x 4** = £339.12p  **March 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £339.12p  **April 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £339.12p  **May 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £339.12p  **June 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £339.12p  **July 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £339.12p  **August 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £339.12p  **September 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £339.12p  **October 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £339.12p  **November 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £339.12p  **December 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £339.12p   1. £. 4,166.33p .1428 - £. 4,166.33p .1428 = 2. 04/04/2019 till 04/04/2020 and as per my records the amount for the reimbursement comes to **£. 4,166.33p .1428** pence of a penny. |
| **2020** | | |
| **Numb** | **Rates** | **Totals** |
|  | * **Proprietors:** - The London Borough of Enfield. * **Date:** 06/04/2020 * **Gross Rent**: £93.59 * **Net Rent:** £87.07 * **Water Rates:** N/a water rate will no longer be a part of rent charge. * **Landlord Communal Service Charge**: £0.48 * **Heating Charge:** N/a * **Caretaking:** £4.10 * **Ground Maintenance:** £1.94 * **Address:** 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield * **Council Tax**: £ 989,24 | * **2020 Net Rent:** £87.07   29 days = 4 weeks 1 day  12 months x4 = 48 +  4 weeks 1 day  **Total**  49 weeks + 1 days  **--**  **£87.07 X 49** = £4,266.43p  **£87.07 Divided By 7** = £12.43p .8571 pence of a penny.  **Total**  **£.** 4,278.86p .8571 pence of a penny.  **+ 1 day leap year =** £12.43p .8571 pence of a penny.  **Total**  £4,291.30p .7142 of a penny  **January 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £348.28p  **Leap Year February 29 days = x 4** = £348.28p  **March 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £348.28p  **April 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £348.28p  **May 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £348.28p  **June 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £348.28p  **July 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £348.28p  **August 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £348.28p  **September 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £348.28p  **October 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £348.28p  **November 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £348.28p  **December 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £348.28p   1. £. 4,291.30p .7142 - £. 4,291.30p .7142 = 2. 04/04/2020 till 04/04/2021 and as per my records the amount for the reimbursement comes to **£.** 4,291.30p .7142 of a penny |
| **2021** | | |
| **Numb** | **Rates** | **Totals** |
|  | * **Proprietors:** - The London Borough of Enfield. * **Date:** 05/04/2021 * **Gross Rent**: £94.95 * **Net Rent:** £88.38 * **Water Rates:** N/a * **Landlord Communal Service Charge**: £0.49 * **Heating Charge:** N/a * **Caretaking:** £4.12 * **Ground Maintenance:** £1.96 * **Address:** 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield * **Council Tax**: £ 1,047.36 | * **2021 Net Rent:** £88.38   29 days = 4 weeks 1 day  12 months x4 = 48 +  4 weeks 1 day  **Total**  49 weeks + 1 days  **--**  **£88.38 X 49** = £4,330.62p  **£88.38 Divided By 7** = £12.62p .5714 pence of a penny.  **Total**  **£.** 4,343.24p .5714 pence of a penny.  **January 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £353.52  **February 28 days = x 4** = £353.52  **March 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £353.52  **April 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £353.52  **May 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £353.52  **June 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £353.52  **July 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £353.52  **August 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £353.52  **September 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £353.52  **October 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £353.52  **November 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £353.52  **December 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £353.52   1. £. 4,343.24p .5714 - £. 4,343.24p .5714 = 2. 04/04/2021 till 04/04/2022 and as per my records the amount for the reimbursement comes to **£.** 4,343.24p .5714 pence of a penny. |
| **2022** | | |
| **Numb** | **Rates** | **Totals** |
|  | * **Proprietors:** - The London Borough of Enfield. * **Date:** 04/04/2022 * **Gross Rent**: £99.09 * **Net Rent:** £92.00 * **Water Rates:** N/a * **Landlord Communal Service Charge**: £0.50 * **Heating Charge:** N/a * **Caretaking:** £4.31 * **Ground Maintenance:** £2.28 * **Address:** 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield * **Increase By**: 4.1% from April 2022 | * **2022 Net Rent:** £92.00   29 days = 4 weeks 1 day  12 months x4 = 48 +  4 weeks 1 day  **Total**  49 weeks + 1 days  **--**  **£92.00 X 49** = £4,508.00p  **£92.00 Divided By 7** = £13.14p .2857 pence of a penny.  **Total**  **£.** 4,511.14p .5714 .2857 pence of a penny.  **January 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £368.00p  **February 28 days = x 4** = £368.00p  **March 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £368.00p  **April 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £368.00p  **May 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £368.00p  **June 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £368.00p  **July 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £368.00p  **August 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £368.00p  **September 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £368.00p  **October 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £368.00p  **November 30 days = 2 days extra. x 4** = £368.00p  **December 31 days = 3 days extra. x 4** = £368.00p   1. £. 4,511.14 .5714 .2857 - £. 4,511.14 .5714 .2857 = 2. 04/04/2022 till **25/11/2022** and as per my records the amount for the reimbursement comes to **£.** 4,511.14p .5714 .2857 pence of a penny. |
| **2023** | | |
| **Numb** | **Rates** | **Totals** |
|  | * **Proprietors:** - The London Borough of Enfield. * **Date:** 04/04/2022 * **Gross Rent**: £99.09 * **Net Rent:** £92.00 * **Water Rates:** N/a * **Landlord Communal Service Charge**: £0.50 * **Heating Charge:** N/a * **Caretaking:** £4.31 * **Ground Maintenance:** £2.28 * **Address:** 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield |  |

* **Damage to Personal Property**

1. The Now Claimant request a complete recovery of product losses due to the damp being left to escalate in such a bad condition for far too long of a lengthy time and his request is for a Like for Like Product Exchange or the Replacement of the Cash Value of the losses of products and the Now Claimant requests for the Enfield Council to also, take into account for the consideration of the Brand & Date of the purchases of products.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ID** | **Date** | **Who is Liable**  **Reason one!** | **Description of Item** | | **Details of Damage / Loss** | **Cost of**  **Product**  **£** | **Amount of**  **Claimed**  **£** | **Total**  **£** |
|  | 02/06/2012 | 1. Enfield Council. / 2. Proprietors. | Bedroom Net curtains | | 1. Damp and Mould over excessive time period. | **£** | **£** | **£** |
|  | 02/06/2012 | 1. Enfield Council. / 2. Proprietors. | Bedroom Main Curtains | | 1. Damp and Mould over excessive time period. | **£** | **£** | **£** |
|  | 02/06/2012 | 1. Enfield Council. / 2. Proprietors. | Bedroom Curtin Rail “Oak Wood” | | 1. Damp and Mould over excessive time period. | **£** | **£** | **£** |
|  | 02/06/2012 | 1. Enfield Council. / 2. Proprietors. | Bedroom wall Pictures | | 1. Damp and Mould over excessive time period. | **£** | **£** | **£** |
|  | 02/06/2012 | 1. Enfield Council. / 2. Proprietors. | Bedroom Side Chester draws set “Solid Oak Wood” | | 1. Damp and Mould over excessive time period. | **£** | **£** | **£** |
|  | 02/06/2012 | 1. Enfield Council. / 2. Proprietors. | Bedroom Main Chester draws Unit set “Solid Oak Wood” | | 1. Damp and Mould over excessive time period. | **£** | **£** | **£** |
|  | 02/06/2012 | 1. Enfield Council. / 2. Proprietors. | Bedroom Bottom of bed Chester Unit “Solid Oak Wood” | | 1. Damp and Mould over excessive time period. | **£** | **£** | **£** |
|  | 02/06/2012 | 1. Enfield Council. / 2. Proprietors. | 52” Sonny Plasma Tv  In Exhibit E18 | | 1. Damp and Mould over excessive time period. | **£** | **£** | **£** |
|  | 02/06/2012 | 1. Enfield Council. / 2. Proprietors. | Expensive Metal Gold Nob  Bed Frame | | 1. Damp and Mould over excessive time period. | **£** | **£** | **£** |
|  | 02/06/2012 | 1. Enfield Council. / 2. Proprietors. | Computer Console X Box New Out  Xbox 360/Release date  22 November 2005  And  20x Games | | 1. Damp and Mould over excessive time period. | **£** | **£** | **£** |
|  | 02/06/2012 | 1. Enfield Council. / 2. Proprietors. | Bed Shits | | 1. Damp and Mould over excessive time period. | **£** | **£** | **£** |
|  | 02/06/2012 | 1. Enfield Council. / 2. Proprietors. | Bed Covers | | 1. Damp and Mould over excessive time period. | **£** | **£** | **£** |
|  | 02/06/2012 | 1. Enfield Council. / 2. Proprietors. | Cloths | | 1. Damp and Mould over excessive time period. | **£** | **£** | **£** |
|  | 02/06/2012 | 1. Enfield Council. / 2. Proprietors. | Ironing Board | | 1. Damp and Mould over excessive time period. | **£** | **£** | **£** |
|  | 02/06/2012 | 1. Enfield Council. / 2. Proprietors. | Sound system | | 1. Damp and Mould over excessive time period. | **£** | **£** | **£** |
|  | 02/06/2012 | 1. Enfield Council. / 2. Proprietors. | Font room Living room, tv, pc Table set from Argos | | 1. Damp and Mould over excessive time period. | **£** | **£** | **£** |
|  | 02/06/2012 | 1. Enfield Council. / 2. Proprietors. | Damage to Italian Three-Piece Leather Sofa  2 x Single  1x 3-Seater | | 1. Damp and Mould over excessive time period. | **£** | **£** | **£** |
|  | 02/06/2012 | 1. Enfield Council. / 2. Proprietors. |  | | 1. Damp and Mould over excessive time period. | **£** | **£** | **£** |
|  | 02/06/2012 | 1. Enfield Council. / 2. Proprietors. |  | | 1. Damp and Mould over excessive time period. | **£** | **£** | **£** |
|  | 02/06/2012 | 1. Enfield Council. / 2. Proprietors. |  | | 1. Damp and Mould over excessive time period. | **£** | **£** | **£** |
|  | 02/06/2012 | 1. Enfield Council. / 2. Proprietors. |  | | 1. Damp and Mould over excessive time period. | **£** | **£** | **£** |
| **GRAND TOTAL CLAIMED FOR** | | | | **£** | | | | |
| 1. As per my records the amount for the reimbursement comes to **£. (amount).** | | | | | | | | |
| **END** | | | | | | | | |

* **Personal Damages Health**

1. As per my records the amount for the reimbursement comes to **£. (amount).**

* **Recovery of Expenses and/or Legal Fees**

1. As per my records the amount for the reimbursement comes to **£. (amount).**
2. The Below listed is the additional miscellaneous expenditure occurred by the Now Claimant caused as loss due to the ongoings within this claim and these specifics include receipts and bank transactions of purchase that are herewith attached and requested as recovered.

* **Receipt of Purchase: -**
* **Bank Transactions: -**

1. As per my records the amount for the reimbursement comes to **£. (amount).**
2. The Now Claimant Sums of losses Create due to the Enfield Council create a total of the following: -
3. Total Amount we requested as paid is. **£**
4. We request the Enfield Council to release the sums of loss as they are legally liable to pay for in respect of the damages caused to the Now Claimant.
5. We are looking forward to a prompt response from the Enfield Council so to be able to put right to right and an end to these proceedings.
6. Thanking you for your time.
7. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us directly on the details below and we are looking forward to your response.

Yours sincerely,

* **An additional Legal Consent Form.**

1. We have added a legal consent form below for the Now Claimants Mother a Ms Lorraine Cordell to have the legal consent to address these ongoing issues at any time of day.

* **Signature: -**
* **Signature: -**
* **Formal Name + Title: -**

1. Mr. Simon Paul Cordell

* **Address: -**

109 Burncroft Avenue

Enfield

London

EN3 7JQ

* **Email: -**

1. [Re\_Wired@ymail.com](mailto:Re_Wired@ymail.com)

* **Tel Number: -**

1. This Information is up to date on the Enfield Councils Databases.
2. **Criminal Record ACRO Reports**
3. Members Metropolitan Police targeted the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell from an early adolescent age and a copy of his criminal record that he has combined proves harassment.
4. The number of arrests leading to a nonconvention due to the Metropolitan police and Prosecution services not supplying enough evidence beyond reasonable doubt is disgusting for the Now Claimant to have to of suffered throughout pursuant.
5. The criminal record also, shows dates of arrest and these dates prove Mr. Cordell’s good Character leading up to the placement of a Forged Asbo Court Order that the Enfield Council & Metropolitan Police Force applied for at a Court of law and for an example we have bulletined examples below.

* The previous offence date before the Asbo is **00/00/**
* The rehabilitation Act

1. “In the Table at The Bottom of This Document Below is **Exhibit** \*\*\*\*\*.”
2. **The Asbo**

* **THE 1st ASBO ORDER**

1. **Said to have got Served Date:** 12/09/2014
2. **End Date:** 04/08/2020
3. The **Asbo Order** brought against the Now Claimant is heavily forged and due to the Now Claimant and others raising their factual evidence about the easily found inaccuracies and this fraud they found they then reported their findings to the correct departments and never received any fair follow up.
4. The Enfield Council & Co made the Now Claimant and his support network receive mutable different forms of forged Court Order applications through the Asbo proceedings to aid in members of their team’s evading justice.
5. The Enfield Council created a number to high be able to list in wrongdoings towards the Now Claimants person in an attempt to make him unwell.
6. “At the tip of the iceberg” the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police Forces used their Media Centres and lose tonged mouths in a bad way against the Now Claimant to avoid justice and them illegal activities spiralled out of control to a cartographic event and this foul play caused: -
7. Breaches of His Personal Data
8. Slander of the Definition of the Defamation of His Character
9. Breaches of his Right to a Fair & Speedy Trial.
10. Infringement of his Human Rights and just to name one; Article 2 the Right to Life.
11. The Enfield council & Metropolitan police inspired racial hatred in a magnific showcase fashion against the Now Claimant and as a result he suffered from negative publications as the Enfield council & Metropolitan police deliberately allowed their malicious Prejudicious acts to widely spread about him and allowed hatred acts by whoever would take apart in inflicting pain and sufferings upon him to happen.
12. The Asbo Court Order alongside other Court Orders that the Enfield Council and Metropolitan police all applied for show that the case developers and case handlers deliberately hurt Mr. S. P. Cordell the Now Claimant with bad intentions in mind.
13. The Court should have not allowed the Asbo application “to be submitted solely with hearsay and no factual evidence.” Because the High Court has emphasised that the use of the words "if any" shows that, “hearsay evidence may be given no weight at all.”
14. The applicant can rely on hearsay evidence; however, the Court of Appeal has said that it does not expect a Court to find that the criminal standard is at all reached by relying solely on hearsay evidence.
15. The prosecuting team must serve a Hearsay notice on top of evidence and an application for hearsay must then afterwards ordered and was not.
16. The Judge is to place little or no weight upon material that has not Prosecution evaluated by way of cross examination.
17. In Cleary, the Court of Appeal again restated that Courts should consider attaching no weight at all to such material, by the words of the statute:

* *Cleary v* Highbury Corner Magistrates *&amp; (1)* Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis and others**(2007) *1 WLR 1272;* [2006] *EWHC 1869.***

1. With the evidence that the Now Claimant has provided a jury should agree that a conspiracy involving maliciously spread rumours to undermine the Now Claimant personal reputation has happened because of the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and this is what made members of the public fuelled with anger and hatred about him.
2. During the present date of the **18/10/2022** the Now Claimant won 99% of the cases put against him as the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police could not prove guilt at Court but minus one case namely: - “The Asbo Proceedings” to which a Judge should have never found the Now Claimant guilty of.

**Getting Down to The Points About the Asbo**

1. The stipulation based in and around the fundamental building block of creating such a Court Order as any Asbo have sticked prerequisite for official persons to follow and these regulated requirements Staff did not fulfil as Mandatory required.
2. Any of the following voluntary solutions and alternative remedies staff should have considered prior to apply for an application for an ASBO but the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police did not do so, such examples are: -
3. Mediation.
4. Verbal and written warnings from the relevant authorities including Police Support Packages.
5. Diversionary schemes and activities.
6. Rehabilitation.
7. Criminal investigation.
8. We have not exhausted the above list to its limits.
9. The Now Claimant a Mr S. P. Cordell expressed his concerns at the earliest opportunity to the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police inclusively of their CPS Prosecution Team member, but they all together never give him any chance to any other remedies before they all started official Court proceeding for amerce.
10. The Asbo Applications Material facts were based solely on Hearsay evidence that the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police created in a Malicious falsehood against the Now Claimant.
11. The decision of staff acting only in a mischievous manner is not acceptable for what can be proved official members of staff intentionally Sabotaging a person’s life while abusing governed intrusted powers that their job entitlements carry just cannot be tolerated, from Computer Abuse first planned in Fraud that then lead to Corruption must be Detected at the earliest opportunity to be prevented and the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police force filed the client in this mandatory Obligation.
12. Negligence thrived as the Enfield Council allowed Torts against the Now Claimant escalated.
13. The Asbo Court order application to which they conspicuously developed is set out to deprive the Now Claimant of his wellbeing or life, reputation, and/or belongings.
14. The “Master of the Rolls” failed in more than one legal obligation
15. The rest of the applications made after the Asbo were all because the Enfield Council, Metropolitan Police and NHS members never acted following what the Now Claimant and his support Network were rightfully explaining to themselves about what people were illegally doing to him I.E.
16. Neighbours banging on the floors at him in a violent assault 24 hours around the clock and over mutable years.
17. Neighbours banging on the walls at him.
18. Neighbours slamming the doors in an evil manner and just to victimise the clamant.
19. A
20. A
21. The rest of the Court Order Applications after the Asbo the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police Force Members Developed Against the Now Claimant i.e.
22. The first and second Housing possession Orders
23. The First and Second Injunction Orders
24. They also, had no victims’ names to call in front of the Court and the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police Force heavily forged those applications as well and this is why we could not call any names to Court to challenge the accused offences and all this on top of the us complaining about the Asbo application they created in fraud.
25. The reason that the government Authorities took apart in forging more Court Order application and allowed Neighbours to do evil wrong doings that have now happen to the Now Claimant was to cover up the truth of what he and others were reporting.
26. the MPS stayed involved all involved sent emails to each other throughout the official different Court applications and at no early stage of time did, the MP’S do anything right to stop crime flourishing when reported to themselves by the Now Claimant and his mother and these failures of the MPS endangered the Now Claimants life and public sectors.
27. Shortly after the Now Claimant got to see not all of the pages from the Asbo application that his mother had photocopied after finding scattered pages all over the floor in a public place. He started to contact the police as he could see fraud in those pages in his name and this alerted the developers of the frauded Asbo application that their swindle had not fooled him.
28. “In the Table at The Bottom of This Document Below is **Exhibit** \*\*\*\*\*.”

**And Here is Relevant Laws**

1. Breaches of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act **2000**.

--

1. Breaches Admitting Evidence Under Sections 9 and 10 Criminal Justice Act **1967** - Updated **02nd of August 2018** as amended **2003.**

* **Article 190.1:** Definition of Offense

A person commits the criminal offense of fabrication of evidence when he or she, with intent to mislead, fabricates anything intending it to inserted as evidence in existing or proposed judicial proceedings.

* **Article 191.1:** Definition of Offense

A person commits the criminal offense of presentation of false or forged evidence when he or she presents evidence in judicial proceedings knowing it to be false or forged.

* **Article 198.1:** Definition of Offense

A person commits the criminal offense of “providing assistance to a perpetrator” after the commission of a criminal offense when he or she: **Section (b)** helps the perpetrator of a criminal offense elude discovery by concealing instruments or evidence or aids the perpetrator in any other way.

1. **Disclosure Procedure and Investigations Act 1996 (CPIA) Nondisclosure**
2. A
3. **Breaches of the Oaths Act 1868**
4. A
5. **Breaches of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 / 1st Asbo**
6. A
7. **The Neighbours**

* **The Neighbours**

1. Start Date 12/09/2014
2. End Date 14/11/2022
3. The Enfield Councils teams took for granted that it is a Penalties for concealing offences or giving false information under the Criminal Law Act **1967** – “Concealing an arrestable offence.” Mr. S. P. Cordell and other persons repeatedly reported the Tort of nuisance Act **1893** Christie v Davey and other civil and criminal wrongdoing what members of his Neighbours vigorously was doing to him with contemporary relevance to no evade of justice.
4. The tremendous while yet mortifying attack that Mr. S. P. Cordell reclaims his next-door Neighbours taking apart in panned out to be more than just a punishment and without any fair law or reason. More than thirty different members of Neighbours through different duration of years and times set out on him in an evil frenzy fuelled attack that would be illegal to take place throughout majority of the lands in the world that are in a governed state of control.
5. Mr. S. P. Cordell stays scared till date of reprisals as the Neighbours and local authorities left him quaking when applying for justice. Floorboards & windows used as Weapons and not to forget doors the Neighbours used it all to hurt Mr. Cordell and more to any extent, objects banged aloud to disgrace and petrify him and even when they involved knew that he had done nothing wrong. An innocent person tortured such as Mr. S P. Cordell took place and is not acceptable to accept in today’s modern society. The neighbour’s intended to cause considerable damage to Mr. S P. Cordell or any other fair-minded person who choose to act in redemption to save Mr Cordell from stopping the cruel Neighbours’ illegal wrong doings.
6. The different illegal scenarios that Mr. S. P. Cordell suffered forcefully put him in fear of losing his life or well-being and has had negative life changing effects on him.
7. The Now Claimant’s mother wrote at my request to the authorities for protection, “Enfield Neighbourhood Team & Enfield Council” while I made phone calls to the police.
8. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police Force blanked the Now Claimant and his mother for months with no replies to and from emails that we sent and while we waited in reply from them they both allowed the Now Claimant Neighbours to continue to attacked him in the hope of evading justice, and once the Now Claimant and his mother burst their bubble for not replying to official Correspondences they involved continued their spree of hate against the Now Claimant by trying to create him a Mental Health History rather than deal with factual claims addressed to themselves. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police Force refused the Now Claimant the right to justice by avoiding any fair investigation.
9. “In the Table at The Bottom of This Document Below is **Exhibit** \*\*\*\*\*.”

**And Here is Relevant Laws**

1. The Criminal Justice Act **2003**
2. Criminal Law Act **1967**
3. Tort of nuisance Act **1893** Christie v Davey
4. Offences against the Person Act **1861 s.18**
5. Housing Act **1988**
6. **The 1st Possession Order**

* **THE 1st POSSESSION ORDER**

1. Never got to a trial only the Asbo did
2. **Start Date** 09/08/2017
3. **End Date** 09/08/2017
4. The 1st Possession Order alongside with **E**, **F**, **G**, below were interlocutory orders and Mr. S. P. Cordell suffered through the years of **2016**, **2017**, **2018,** **2019** because of these proceedings and at no fault of his own.
5. Mr. S. P. Cordell contended the allegations from the very start of the justice system process taken against him and beard the loss of costs and damages.
6. The original Court orders were all produced in a none chaological order and were redacted copies and without any persons named to be able to evaluate the turning stones of the law and without the statement makers name being present to assess the weight of the bearing of the statements, Mr. S. P. Cordell or his litigation friend could not rightly challenge the requested in Court.
7. The proceedings never made it to trial as Mr. S. P. Cordell and others challenged the case handlers about the legal practicalities of what they were doing.
8. “In a nutshell” when the provided paperwork from the Enfield Council was overviewed by the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell it became plainer that the law-abiding documentation was yet again frauded due to obvious inaccuracies.
9. The relevant government bodies took no precautions or necessary steps to prevail the right of justice as in fact once when warned they refused to listen an act in accordance with stationery policies to protect that of the company they govern or while protecting that of Mr. S. P. Cordell and other associated people by having or showing no concern about whether behaviour they took was morally right from wrong when dealing with issues pertaining to this claim.
10. The Enfield council staff unlawfully tried to deprive Mr. S. P. Cordell of his rented residential premises of his occupation of the premises, when making false statement to Obtain Interim Possession Orders and what is a crime governed by the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act **1994**.
11. The Enfield council staff understood that by defrauding company records and using them forged documents in calculated planning.to apply for law abiding Court orders to put restraints on his freedom and deprive Mr. Cordell of his home that by doing so they involved would be intending to cause really severe injury physically and mentally to Mr. S. P. Cordell.
12. The Severity of the attack used calculated forgeries of testimonial evidence to interfere with the peace.
13. And the length of the or duration of illegal activities that took place by the Enfield Councils staff exoculated far beyond reason.
14. “In the Table at The Bottom of This Document Below is **Exhibit** \*\*\*\*\*.”

**And Here is Relevant Laws**

1. Making False Statement to Obtain Interim Possession Order Criminal Justice and Public Order Act **1994**
2. Civil Evidence Act **1968**
3. Protection from Eviction Act **1977 s.1**
4. Assisting or Encouraging Crime
5. **The 1st Injunction Order**

* **THE 1st INJUNCTION ORDER**

1. Never got to a trial only the Asbo did
2. **Start Date** 09/08/2017
3. **End Date** 09/08/2017
4. For the avoidance of doubt, the Now Claimant tried standard disclosure and failed in its obligation to sever the order in accordance to service and post, Civil Procedure **Rules part 6**.
5. A copy of the application that failed service on Mr. Cordell was also, emailed to his mother and for her reference only. The Email received held a list of documents about the 1st Injunction Order application. The list was in standard form.
6. The then found list of frauded allegation accused against her son a Mr. S. P. Cordell he denied he had committed, and she the Now Claimants mother agree with her son for her own list of different varied reasons.
7. The 1st Injunction Order was different from the 1st Possession Order because it held a Subpoena.
8. The Enfield Councils staff had avoided acting on the first and correct attributing claims sent to them by his mother about any of the then participating turned from perpetrators to victims and was swindled out of any fair outcomes by the Enfield council staffs from any fair outcome of her complaint by corruption as when request the Enfield Council objected to an inspection and continued proceedings,
9. Nevertheless, Mr. S. P. Cordell contended the allegations and beard loss of costs.
10. Words and expressions by the Judge brought a sharp close to proceedings as the Enfield Councils legal team did not return their questionnaire within the correct timeline requested by his honour.
11. The Now Claimant gave further tries for his honours decision to get Overturned, but the Judge was stern in his direction and stuck the case out of Court for good.
12. The 1st Injunction Order application clearly made and still makes a mockery of the Civil Evidence Act **1968** codes of practice and equality that with more other absolute Rights of Mr. Cordell & his family members.
13. “In the Table at The Bottom of This Document Below is **Exhibit** \*\*\*\*\*.”

**And Here is Relevant Laws**

1. A
2. A
3. **The 2nd Injunction Order**

* **THE 2nd INJUNCTION ORDER**

1. Never got to a trial only the Asbo did
2. **Start Date** 10/01/2018
3. **End Date** 09/08/2018
4. There are different numbers of observations I will make about this Court order.
5. **Firstly,** the 2nd Injunction Orders proceedings was going to be contentious, due to what Mr S. P. Cordell and others continued hushed quite about when complaining to the Enfield Council complaints departments, who then acted rigorously, by acting in a harsh and demanding way that was not compliant to United Kingdom’s Laws.
6. **Secondly,** The Edmonton Lower County Judge prohibited the reinstatement of the previously lost claims, when looked for by the Enfield Council but yet Enfield Council reinstated the documentation and
7. **Thirdly,** The Suit brought by the Enfield Council
8. **Fourthly,** The Enfield Council refused to subduct the forged claim.
9. **Fifthly,** His honour the Judge released proceedings with a final Court order saying that the Enfield Council must
10. **Lastly,** to play devil's advocate the Burgess of the Enfield Council throwed down the gauntlet and while aiding and abetting in affray and by doing so he gave Mr S. P. Cordell the right of cause of action.
11. “In the Table at The Bottom of This Document Below is **Exhibit** \*\*\*\*\*.”

**And Here is Relevant Laws**

1. A
2. A
3. **A Breach of a Court Order to Make an Emergency Housing Transfer on his behalf.**

* **The Housing Transfer by Order of the Judge!**

1. **Start Date** 09/08/2018
2. **End Date** 09/08/2018
3. In every second that tick by left means that the Now Claimant
4. A
5. A
6. “In the Table at The Bottom of This Document Below is **Exhibit** \*\*\*\*\*.”

**And Here is Relevant Laws**

1. A
2. A
3. **The 2nd Possession Order**

* **THE 2nd POSSESSION ORDER**

Never got to a trial only the Asbo did

1. **Start Date:** 09/08/2017
2. **End Date:** 09/08/2017
3. One way to explain the Enfield Council’s version of the 2nd Possession Order was like misaimed knife throwing blows with no accuracy or skills in disciplines of staff , Staff’s attitudes towards the Now Claimant was as if he to them was the human target to which they had misaimed at just to victimise on purpose when compiling the application through proceedings and this fact come as no surprise or avail to the Now Claimant due to past experience applied by themselves for Court order applications.
4. A
5. A
6. Again, the Enfield Councils staff did not act relinquish in proceedings with a resolution that leads to no fair outcome that they brought against Mr. S. P. Cordell at the final outcome of proceedings and as for a fact they altogether should face formal accusation for the fraud they committed to conduct proceedings brought against the Now Claimant for what he suffered.

**And Here is Relevant Laws**

1. A
2. A
3. **Summary of What We Reported**
4. As an example of the failures the Enfield Council made me suffer throughout and without any fair interception, I will be using one of the last telephone calls that myself and a Ms Kate Osbourne had who stands for the Enfield Councils Insurance department.
5. This telephone call was quite conclusive in respect of the issues that we complained about and without any fair follow-ups.
6. The date and time of the conversation are as follows **15/12/2020** at time **00:00**

* **File Temp Link Location**
* <https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Housing%20Transfer%20Files%2015-08-2022/Use%20to%20Make%20Needed%20Statements%20From%20DAC%20Beachcroft%20File/>

1. Neighbours
2. Dawn Allen
3. A
4. **Statutory Responsibilities Code of Conduct and Code of Accountability**

* **Act of laws covering topic:**

1. The local government Act **2000.**
2. The Local Government and Housing Act **1989**.
3. The local government Act **2000.**

* **Accountability:**

1. Everything done by those who work in the Enfield Council must be able to stand the tests of parliamentary scrutiny, public judgments on propriety and professional codes of conduct.
2. The current burden of breached responsibilities that lay within the context of this claim are because of:
3. Failures from the: - “**Monitoring Office.**”
4. Failures from the: - “**Enfield Director of Governance.**”
5. Failures from: - “**Director of Operations** **at Enfield Council.**”
6. Failures from: - “**Counter Fraud Department at Enfield Council.**”
7. Failures from: - “**Director of Finance at Enfield Council.**”
8. Failures from: - “**The Shareholder Managers at Enfield Council.**”
9. Failures from: - “**Director of Human Resources at Enfield Council.**”
10. And Any Other: - “**Enfield Council Members and Officers**,” that should or may have been involved.
11. The listed above did not undertake to discharge his and/or her statutory responsibilities to prevent the existence of the broken laws and regulated standards as marked in the; “Table at The Bottom of This Document Below **Exhibit as** \*\*\*\*\*.”
12. The Enfield Councils Staff did not stop criminal and civil wrongdoings with or without intent by its hired employees.
13. Thought the case handling of a Mr S. P. Cordell’s the Enfield council’s staff were not in compliance of their own protocols and the standards dropped well below the boundaries of an accepted services and their unacceptable standard became that also when accounting for products supplied.
14. While Enfield Councils staff managed its company affairs on behalf of its clients and namely a Mr S. P. Cordell’s the Enfield Councils staff deliberately fabricated evidence against him and refused to act when presented with real artefacts pertain to the allegations frauded against him, while knowing that what they were taking a part in was morally a wrongdoing and would deprive Mr. S. P. Cordell of his wellbeing, freedom, life, reputation, property and/or goods.
15. Mr. S. P. Cordell and his family members were all undermined at every point of interception they made through the correct channels of relevance to their caseloads, when raising their prioritised high-risk concerns and this undesired behaviour of official staff members was achieved to weaken his position, goals, and/or success of any truth being found in any complaint sent or raised when interacting with staff.

* **Unsatisfactory Performance**

1. The Enfield Councils staff showed no actions that would lead to a fair and positive conclusion to events that would have a final outcome of minimal impact on all involved.
2. The public safety and property within the Borough’s got put completely through unnecessary high risks due to the reckless actions of staff from the Enfield Council and without any fair reason.
3. The objects that the Enfield Council represent through its associated sublunary company’s got mistreatment by its staff to aid as tools of crime. I.e., eight properties that the Enfield Council rent due to owning and managing whin its own housing stock that they abused and used as a captive house and side-torture-houses knowingly once reported.
4. The Enfield Council Failed to supply advice and help to Mr. S. P. Cordell in respect of the Council’s housing policies that was fair or reasonable.
5. The Enfield Council Failed to create an attractive and safe environment for Burncroft Avenue and its attached safer neighbourhoods’ tenants.
6. The Enfield Council Failed to prevent crime and/or reducing the fear of crime.
7. By creating a charade of Court process based on frauded documentation that the Enfield Councils staff created, the Enfield Councils staff broke the united kingdom’s laws even once obviously caught by other persons and then after exposed in the act of fraud and as a cover-up the Enfield Council continued with a further Abuse of a Maliciously Process.
8. The achieved mark of ambitious standards of corporate and personal conduct in public services failed, when considering the severity of the ongoings within this claim and continued to full while the Enfield council was under new management and staff. The Enfield Councils regime mocked policies and staffs working standards clearly show underperformance of Enfield councils services and management structure. There is a need for the staff’s actions to be overviewed again in focus of public safety and concern for the issues raised.
9. The Enfield Council was not committed to maintaining an honest and open atmosphere which supports the elimination of the potential for fraud when alerted about the ongoing within their internal workplace by the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell and due to this wrong the system of internal control has now failed for the company namely an Enfield council and that of its clients, the reason for this failure is as no overall risk assessment was honestly audited or disclosed and because of no fair investigation taking a place one incidents were continually reported.
10. **Levels of seriousness**

* **Attempted Murder. Criminal Attempts Act 1981**

1. Members of the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police exhibited below with the following keyboard symbol [✞⚰️] Attempted to Murder the Now Claimant.
2. Members of neighbours who lived or live at Burncroft Avenue exhibited below with the following keyboard symbol [✞⚰️] Attempted to Murder the Now Claimant.

* **Torture “Criminal Justice Act s.134”**

1. The Enfield Councils official persons committed the offence of torture when they intentionally inflicted severe pain and suffering on Mr. S. P. Cordell when acting in an official ability, in the performance of their official duties. In the years of **2014**, **2015**, **2016**, **2017**, **2018**, **2019**, **2020**, **2021**, **2022** the Enfield Councils staff deliberately allowed and took apart in

* **Kidnapping and/or False Imprisonment / Unlawful Detention**

1. A
2. Kidnapping is taking someone away by force or fraud without their consent on any lawful excuse.
3. False Imprisonment is detaining someone against their free will
4. Both offences are categorised as profoundly serious offences, with each carrying the potential for life imprisonment on conviction.

Intentional Reckless Behaviour

The Restraint of a Victim's Freedom of Movement from A Particular Place

Misleading The Competence of The Court.

False Information in A Formal Written Statement

Fabricating Or Tampering with Evidence

Falsely Implicating an Innocent Person

Preventing The Giving of Evidence

Perjury And Allied Offences.

Contradictory Statements by Persons Giving Evidence on Oath.

Mental Element

Perverting The Course of Justice

1. In resolving Mr. S. P. Cordell’s problems and agreeing a way forward, staff frauded records including notes of telephone discussions, to aid in a guilty conviction against him.
2. The Enfield Council must show a fair progress and outcome in all affairs but was not able to supply monitoring returns showing the truth of progress through proceedings and any fair investigation into our complaints and this is because their staff manipulated the case proceedings and breached regulations along pursuit to evade punishment for the crimes they have got committed.
3. An inadequate governance becomes clear as a range of non and/or under-performed challenges became plainer and these under governed requirements that failed were because of Enfield Council not meeting the terms and conditions of Contracts.
4. The Enfield Councils staff did not implement a justifiable procedure that was condonable within any of the agreed timescales thought case proceedings they brought against me, and complaints or requests made by ourselves to them.
5. The Enfield Council Failure to arrange a face-to-face visit to consider concerns with a view to resolution and avoiding escalation once caught out in fraud and dishonesty was not adequate, even though Enfield Council’s staff did try to arrange a face-to-face meeting at their offices with the intention of depriving me of my home by illegally set me up and after already forging an Asbo order against me that was and is still getting complained about.
6. Failure to supply details of the monitoring office when requested.
7. The Chief Executives failed when deciding if it was necessary to suspend, adjust or end part or all of the contracts of staff he stands for when considering the weight of the evidence put before themselves.
8. The evidence provided when dealing with Mr. S. P. Cordell’s problems, showed high reason for concern, and proved high class criminal activities that took a place. No correct action even up until the current date has ever taken motion and the time scale exceeded any fair limits due to the Enfield Councils Chief Executive team’s bad judgment for complacency from right or wrong.
9. It is well known that the Enfield Homes & the Safer neighbourhood watch teams deliver housing management services on behalf of Enfield Council to its tenants and leaseholders & because of this fact they are all in partnership and hold equal responsibility to their clients and this becomes 100% clear, when working on projects or caseloads united.
10. The Enfield Council alongside with the Enfield Homes & the Safer neighbourhood watch teams failed their obligations to me a Mr. S. P. Cordell when managing a fair service because at no point in time did staff act in a responsive manner, nor did they listen to anything that people said to them and act following policies. The organisation did not take my views and evidence seriously and deliberately damaged my trust and confidence in themselves.
11. In proceedings it become so transparent at times that I and any other would agree that the organisation did not have my best interest at heart, and this is inclusive of surrounding Neighbours and property this incompetent behaviour from staff continued with a knock-on effect to other local areas and their inhabitants.
12. At no point until now has the Enfield Council really taken manging the right to life seriously and in return a value for money for services has decreased. The Enfield Councils staff, never commitment themselves to supplying a zero-tolerance approach towards domestic violence and encouraged it to thrive throughout mutable years and allowed this to happen to cover up foul play within their own departments and their illegal activities must be accountable for.
13. **The Now Claimant Underwent Once Reported:**

* **Hate Crime**

1. Act **1998** = Crime and Disorder Act **1998**

* **Physical Violence,**

1. putting people in fear of violence / Protection from Harassment Act **1997 s. 4(1)** / Violent Disorder Public Order Act **1986 s.2** **+  22**: - “Broadcasting or Including Programme in Cable Programme Service.”

* **Serious Crime,**

1. Assisting or Encouraging Crime - Part 2 of the Serious Crime Act **2007** creates, at **Sections 44 to 46.**
2. **Equality Act 2010**
3. Discrimination
4. Race relations Act **1976** (Repealed) Race relations Act **2000**
5. The Harassment and Stalking Acts **1997**
6. And the Enfield Council mandatory must prevent these instances from occurring at the earliest points of awareness as possible.
7. The Councils must be committed to collaborating with residents to resolve reports of anti-social behaviour and not manipulating official records to favour any parties involved as has happened.
8. No investigate took a place even when there is unmistakable evidence, and this meant that no necessary actions got took by the Enfield Council to follow the correct direction. Respect & confidentiality together went to an all-time low, as an accessible and supportive service to investigate high- risk enquires continually showed signs of getting abused.
9. The seriousness of the complaints made on behalf of a Mr. S. P. Cordell to the Enfield Council staff did not addressed and for wrongful reasons.
10. Breaches of the DPA – “**Data Protection Act 1998**” / **GDPR 2016** occurred on more than one occasion and when General Data Protection must be well regulated.
11. The Enfield Council continue to use anonymous & bogus complaints held on their computer system as easily proved when comparing data within their Court orders and that of data received by submission from the Enfield Council due to a requested **Freedom of Information Act 2000.**
12. Parts of the Enfield Council organisational structure acted in Malfeasance in Public Office as they continued their illegal pursuit of Targeted Malice against Mr. S. P. Cordell knowingly.
13. **Whistle Blowing officer**
14. The nominated Whistle Blowing officer of the Enfield Council should review the legitimacy of the registered suspicion and then liaise as necessary with the Directing chain of command and at

* **When A Whistle Blowing Officer Receives a Suspicion There Are 3 Step to Follow:**

1. No action necessary, update database, close case and there will be no referral.
2. Referral to the Assistant Director of CFPS who will appoint an investigator.
3. Further internal investigation needed – this may lead to no action or an investigation.

False pretence

1. “In the Table at The Bottom of This Document Below is **Exhibit** \*\*\*\*\*.”

* **Physical Evidence**

1. If there is any physical evidence the employee or Manager should seize this, if possible.
2. It is essential that this is secure, and a record kept of the time and place the information was document.
3. This is all showed in my diary.

* **Collection of Evidence**

1. If evidence consists of more than one item, for example more than one document, each one should easily be identifiable with a reference number corresponding to the written record.
2. This is all showed in my diary.

* **Witnesses**

1. Case handlers of complaints should talk through the disclosed information with the witness if right and complete a record kept of any discussions.
2. **The Now Claimant Future Employment**
3. The Enfield Councils staff understood what my intentions in life were. My destiny involved building a festival. I had continually promoted this information to the public, my loved ones, and my local council – The Enfield Council.
4. I worked closely alongside the Enfield Council at music events in my local parks as well as attending the civic centre about ways forward to achieve my positive gaols in life.
5. Following my dreams also meant that I worked in my local community hall and became a trusted key holder within a brief period of time. In my brief time at the community hall, I had to have board room meeting and these meetings involved Members of the Enfield Council as they were the; “Building Managers” who let the building out to be a community hall.
6. The Enfield Councils staff understood that my companies could float shares and have a Board of Directors of the Organisation and the stipulations that can be involved in such companies running aims and in short this means that my reputation has to me intact.
7. By the Enfield Council Staff forging paperwork to gain a Asbo in my name and then forging more paperwork’s as more official Court orders and then afterwards and once in trouble using the Mental Health teams to aid as a sharp knife out of a draw to stab me rather than addressing the true facts in mine and others official complaints, they contributed towards high levels of concern that raised breaches of the: - “**Ill-Treatment Of Patients And Mental Health Act** **1983 S.127**.” the second of time that they working for the Enfield Councils aided in created a forged Mental Health history about my person and now that forged documentation has negative effects on the rest of my life and this is due to the magnitude of failed attempts to undermine the defamation of Character by Slandering my reputation and then on creating large size documentation that was needed to attempt such illegal activities to a person to aid in the interference with the course of justice and prevent my claims getting taken seriously.
8. For an instance the size of the documentation is so overwhelming that if I did get arrested by police officer(s) no police custody officer(s) has the time to read over the documentation on Rio when booking me into the station to find out if what I am saying is true and that is that I have never been assessed to me Mental unwell in all of the assessments I have now got forced to undergo and due to this they will find me not fit for interview and refer me to the Doctors for a Mental Health assessment as I seem so well knowing by them. I get classed as not fit for interviews and taken to a hospital and assessed for up to 28 days with a possibility of then afterwards getting keep on a separate wing for treatment as a mental health patient with an extension in time for a further six months while forced medication in the second stage.
9. **Memorandum and Articles of Association of Enfield Homes Limited Weblink**

* <https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Housing%20Transfer%20Files%2015-08-2022/Enfield%20Council%2028-09-2022%20Recived%20Email/Parts/Bits%202/Appendix%20C.3%20-%20M%20Articles%20of%20Assoc.pdf>

1. At Index “Disqualification and Removal of Board Members” and in **Section 18.4, 18.4.1, 18.4.2,** the document for the Memorandum and Articles of Association of Enfield Homes states that
2. Lease holds Reforms Act **1967** “**Right to Buy**”
3. Trustee Act **1925** as Amended Act **2000**
4. Fraudulent Breach of Trust **1980**
5. Fiduciary Duty Companies Act **2016** (“Companies Act”) (formally **Section 132** of the Companies Act **1965**)
6. **Losses and Special Payments:**
7. The company mandatory Instructions for dealing with losses within compliance of the Compensation Act **2006** and special payments including delegation limits and when to inform Department, External Auditor and Police failed a Mr. S. P. Cordell when dealing with his matters of concern.
8. **Statutory Conspiracy:**
9. **Section 1(1)** of the: - “**Criminal Law Act 1977,”** states: “If a person agrees with any other person or persons that a course of conduct shall be pursued which, if the agreement is carried out in accordance with their intentions, either will necessarily amount to or involve the commission of any offence or offences by one or more of the parties to the agreement, or would do so but for the existence of facts which render the commission of the offence or any of the offences impossible, he is guilty of conspiracy to commit the offence or offences in question.”
10. **Criminal Liability:**
11. An Act to amend the law of England and Wales by abolishing the division of crimes into felonies and misdemeanours and to amend and simplify the law in respect of matters arising from or related to that division or the abolition of it; to do away (within or without England and Wales) with certain obsolete crimes together with the torts of maintenance and champerty; and for purposes connected therewith.
12. **Making A Complaint:**
13. The procedure for making a complaint about the conduct of an official person or other is simple and informal. A complaint is at its best made in writing but may be orally.
14. **Arranging A Meeting!**
15. General meeting

Engrossment

General damages

Prominence

**Draft Parts**

* **Companies Act 2006 “Directors' Duties”**
* **The Company Acts 1985**
* [https://www.jmw.co.uk/services-for-business/corporate/legal-advice-company-directors/criminal-Prosecution-involving-company-directors](https://www.jmw.co.uk/services-for-business/corporate/legal-advice-company-directors/criminal-prosecution-involving-company-directors)
* <https://asic.gov.au/about-asic/contact-us/how-to-complain/disputes-between-officeholders-and-or-members-of-small-proprietary-companies-video-transcript/>
* <https://www.lexisnexis.com/uk/lexispsl/corporatecrime/document/391421/55KB-9471-F188-N2X0-00000-00/Companies_Act_offences_overview>

1. A Making a material omission from a statement relating to a company’s affairs
2. Destroying, mutilating, or falsifying company records
3. A
4. Housing Act **1988**
5. Company Limited by Guarantee Act **1989**
6. Not having a Share Capital Act **2006**
7. Agreeing to Indemnify Sureties
8. Offences against the Person Act **1861 s.18**
9. The Prosecution of Offences Act **1985**
10. Criminal Law Act **1967**
11. Criminal Evidence Act **1984 / 1898**
12. Police and Criminal Evidence Act **1984** (PACE) codes of practice

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The Enfield Councils & Neighbourhood Watch Teams Names Table**  **Exhibit A**   * **File Temp Link Location** * <https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Groups-of-Involved-People-List/> | | | | |
| **Numb** | **Details** | **History** | **Laws & Regs / Info** | **Exhibit Numb** |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Ian.Davis@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Ian.Davis@enfield.gov.uk). * **Bosses** * [Chief.Executive@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Chief.Executive@enfield.gov.uk)   **Bosses** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Bosses** 3. On the **00/00/0000** 4. Ian Davis Attempted to Murder the Now Claimant [✞⚰️] by | **[Exhibit A1]**  Ian Davis |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Rob.Leak@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Rob.Leak@enfield.gov.uk) * [Chief.Executive@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Chief.Executive@enfield.gov.uk) * **Bosses** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Bosses** 3. On the **00/00/0000** 4. Rob Leak Attempted to Murder the Now Claimant [✞⚰️] by | **[Exhibit A2]**  Rob Leak |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Sarah.Cary@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Sarah.Cary@enfield.gov.uk) * **Bosses** * [Chief.Executive@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Chief.Executive@enfield.gov.uk) * **Bosses** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Bosses** 3. On the **00/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A3]**  Sarah Cary |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Tony.Theodoulou@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Tony.Theodoulou@enfield.gov.uk) * **Bosses** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Executive Director of Children & Adult Services** 3. Started in my case **05/12/2018** 4. “This is the Same Surname as PC Sophie Theodoulou who is the Police Officer who Lied and said that she Served me the First Asbo Folder! **12/09/2014**” | **[Exhibit A4]**  Tony Theodoulou |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Heather.Littler@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Heather.Littler@enfield.gov.uk) * [Chief.Executive@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Chief.Executive@enfield.gov.uk)   <https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/bullying_in_enfield_council?unfold=1> | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Bosses** 3. Senior Admin Officer Chief Executive's Unit London Borough of Enfield Civic Centre, Silver Street, Enfield, EN1 3XY 4. On the **24/11/2016** 5. On the **28/12/2017** 6. On the **29/12/2017** 7. On the **01/01/2018** 8. On the **02/01/2018** 9. On the **08/01/2018** 10. On the **15/01/****2018** 11. On the **25/01/2018** 12. On the **03/10/2018** 13. On the **05/12/2018** 14. On the **06/12/2018** 15. On the **03/03/2019** 16. On the **04/03/2019** 17. On the **28/12/2019** 18. **++++** | **[Exhibit A5]**  Heather Littler |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Sally.McTernan@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Sally.McTernan@enfield.gov.uk) * **Bosses** * [Chief.Executive@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Chief.Executive@enfield.gov.uk) * **Bosses** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Bosses** 3. On the **00/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A6]**  Sally McTernan |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name \*\*\*** * **Bosses**   [Chief.Executive@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Chief.Executive@enfield.gov.uk)   * **Bosses** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Bosses** 3. On the **00/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A7]** |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name \*\*\*** * **Bosses**   [Chief.Executive@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Chief.Executive@enfield.gov.uk)   * **Bosses** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Bosses** 3. On the **00/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A8]** |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name \*\*\*** * **Bosses**   [Chief.Executive@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Chief.Executive@enfield.gov.uk)   * **Bosses** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Bosses** 3. On the **00/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A9]** |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Jeremy.Chambers@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Jeremy.Chambers@enfield.gov.uk) * **Boss Solicitors** | 1. **Boss Solicitors** 2. On the **00/00/0000** 3. On the **00/00/0000** 4. On the **00/00/0000** 5. On the **00/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A10]**  Jeremy Chambers |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Ludmilla.Iyavoo@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Ludmilla.Iyavoo@enfield.gov.uk) * **Solicitor** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Solicitor** 3. On the **00/00/0000** 4. On the **00/00/0000** 5. On the **00/00/0000** 6. On the **00/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A11]**  Ludmilla Lyavoo |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Paul.Buckridge@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Paul.Buckridge@enfield.gov.uk) * **Solicitor** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Solicitor** 3. Started on my case before the **04/04/2018** | **[Exhibit A12]**  Paul Buckridge |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Zena.Ndereyimana@Enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Zena.Ndereyimana@Enfield.gov.uk) * **Solicitor** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Solicitor** Paralegal Legal Services 3. On the **00/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A13]**  Zena Ndereyimana |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Balbinder.KaurGeddes@enf1eld.goy.uk](mailto:Balbinder.KaurGeddes@enf1eld.goy.uk) * **Solicitor** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Solicitor** Admitted on **15/01/2002.** 3. Annual practising certificate from **01/11/2021.** 4. On the **01/05/2018** 5. On the **10/05/2018** | **[Exhibit A14]**  Balbinder KaurGeddes |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Kulwinder.Johal@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Kulwinder.Johal@enfield.gov.uk) * **Solicitor** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Solicitor** Ms. Kulwinder Johal 3. Litigation Lawyer |Corporate Team | Legal Services On behalf of the Director of Law and Governance 4. On the **20/06/2018** 5. On the **05/11/2019** 6. On the **12/12/2019** 7. **+++** | **[Exhibit A15]**  Kulwinder Johal |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Jill.Bayley@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Jill.Bayley@enfield.gov.uk) * **Solicitor** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Solicitor** Principal Lawyer, Safeguarding and Corporate Teams Legal Services. 3. On the **12/12/2019** 4. On the **13/12/2019** 5. **++++,** | **[Exhibit A16]**  Jill Bayley |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Antonia.Makanjuola@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Antonia.Makanjuola@enfield.gov.uk) * **Solicitor** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Solicitor**: The Assistant Principal Lawyer in the. Council's Legal Department Admitted on **01/10/2004.** 3. Annual practising certificate from **01/11/2021.** 4. On the **12/12/2019** 5. On the **13/12/2019** 6. **++++,** | **[Exhibit A17]**  Antonia Makanjuola |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Kay.Osborne@Enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Kay.Osborne@Enfield.gov.uk) * **Insurance** * [k\_osamor@hotmail.com](mailto:k_osamor@hotmail.com) * **Insurance** * [Insurance@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Insurance@enfield.gov.uk) * **Insurance** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Insurance** 3. On the **00/00/0000** 4. On the **00/00/0000** 5. On the **00/00/0000** 6. On the **00/00/0000** 7. On the **00/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A18]**  Kay Osborne |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Simon.James@enfieldhomes.org](mailto:Simon.James@enfieldhomes.org) * **Enfield Homes** | 1. **Enfield Homes** 2. On the **00/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A19]**  Simon James |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Monica.Kaur@enfieldhomes.org](mailto:Monica.Kaur@enfieldhomes.org) * **Enfield Homes** | 1. **Enfield Homes** 2. On the **00/00/0000** 3. On the **00/00/0000** 4. On the **00/00/0000** 5. On the **00/00/0000** 6. On the **00/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A20]**  Monica Kaur |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * Jo.O'Brien@enfieldhomes.org * **Enfield Homes** | 1. **Enfield Homes** 2. **Officers Name** Jo.O'Brien@enfieldhomes.org 3. On the **14/09/2016** 4. On the **+++++++** 5. On the **04/03/2015** 6. Search “**Brien**” = **Professional Standards Unit** Detective Sergeant Directorate of Professional Standards SMIU /Brixton Driving Case is the **“**Same Name in **28**) John.O'Brien@met.pnn.police.uk | **[Exhibit A21]**  Jo O'Brien |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Allan.Katongole@enfieldhomes.org](mailto:Allan.Katongole@enfieldhomes.org) * **Enfield Homes** | 1. **Enfield Homes** 2. On the 00**/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A22]**  Allan Katongole |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Brien@enfieldhomes.org](mailto:Brien@enfieldhomes.org) * **Enfield Homes** | 1. **Enfield Homes** 2. On the 00**/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A23]**  Brien |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Louise.Brown2@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Louise.Brown2@enfield.gov.uk) * **Enfield Homes** | 1. **Enfield Homes** 2. **Anti-Social Behaviour Teams** Anti-Social Behaviour Officer Community Safety Unit Regeneration & Environment Department London Borough of Enfield 3. On the 00**/00/0000** 4. On the 00**/00/0000** 5. On the 00**/00/0000** 6. On the 00**/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A24]**  Louise Brown |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Dawn.Allen@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Dawn.Allen@enfield.gov.uk) * **Enfield Homes** | 1. **Enfield Homes** 2. **Tenancy Management Officer Council Housing** the Edmonton Centre 3644 South Mall Edmonton N9 0TN 3. On the 00**/00/0000** 4. On the 00**/00/0000** 5. On the 00**/00/0000** 6. On the 00**/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A25]**  Dawn Allen |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Jackie.Gubby@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Jackie.Gubby@enfield.gov.uk) * **Enfield Homes** | 1. **Enfield Homes** 2. **Housing Manager Tenancy Management** the Edmonton Centre 36-44 South Mall Edmonton Green N9 0TN 3. On the 00**/00/0000** 4. On the 00**/00/0000** 5. On the 00**/00/0000** 6. On the 00**/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A26]**  Jackie Gubby |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Nicholas Foster@Enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Nicholas%20Foster@Enfield.gov.uk) * **Communications & Data Access** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Communications & Data Access Complaints and Access to Information Manager Gateway** 3. On the 27**/01/2016**   till   1. On the 09**/03/2016** | **[Exhibit A27]**  Nicholas Foster |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Ned.Johnson@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Ned.Johnson@enfield.gov.uk) * **ASBO** **Communications & Data Access.** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **ASBO Communications & Data Access.** 3. **Principal Officer Health Safety & Pollution.** Pollution Control, Planning & Licensing Enforcement Planning, Highways & Transportation Regeneration & Environment Department 4. On the 06**/03/2015**   till   1. On the 28**/01/2016** | **[Exhibit A28]**  Ned Johnson |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Seun.Ogunsan@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Seun.Ogunsan@enfield.gov.uk) * **Communications & Data Access** **Coordinator** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Communications & Data Access.** 3. Complaints & Access to Information **Coordinator** 4. On the 07**/12/2018** | **[Exhibit A29]**  Seun Ogunsan |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Eboni.Ward@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Eboni.Ward@enfield.gov.uk) * **Communications & Data Access.** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Communications & Data Access.** 3. Access to Records Officer - Gateway Services. 4. On the 16**/02/2019**   till   1. On the 03**/03/2019** | **[Exhibit A30]**  Eboni Ward |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Daniel.Ellis@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Daniel.Ellis@enfield.gov.uk) * **Communications & Data Access** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Communications & Data Access.** 3. Access to Records Officer - Gateway Services. 4. On the 00**/00/0000** 5. On the 00**/00/0000** 6. On the 00**/00/0000** 7. On the 00**/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A31]**  Daniel Ellis |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Concetta.Nobile@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Concetta.Nobile@enfield.gov.uk) * **Communications & Data Access** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Communications & Data Access.** 3. Access to Records Officer - Gateway Services. 4. Started on my case **21/12/2016** 5. On the 00**/00/0000** 6. On the 00**/00/0000** 7. On the 00**/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A32]**  Concetta Nobile |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Kailey.Plahar@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Kailey.Plahar@enfield.gov.uk) * **Communications & Data Access** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Communications & Data Access.** 3. Access to Records Officer - Gateway Services. 4. Started on my case **04/11/2018** CRM SAR 1085 5. On the 00**/00/0000** 6. On the 00**/00/0000** 7. On the 00**/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A33]**  Kailey Plahar |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Steve.Durbin@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Steve.Durbin@enfield.gov.uk) * **Communications & Data Access** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Communications & Data Access.** 3. Data Protection Officer, Customer Experience and Change London Borough of Enfield 4. On the 25**/11/2018** | **[Exhibit A34]**  Steve Durbin |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Theresa.Dodd@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Theresa.Dodd@enfield.gov.uk) * **Communications & Data Access** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Communications & Data Access.** 3. **ASBO** Correspondence & Complaints Manager Environment & Street Scene Department 4. On the 05**/03/2015** 5. On the 06**/03/2015** 6. On the 10**/03/2015** 7. On the 20**/03/2015** 8. On the 22**/03/2015** | **[Exhibit A35]**  Theresa Dodd |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Linda.Wentum@Enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Linda.Wentum@Enfield.gov.uk) * **Communications & Data Access** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Communications & Data Access.** 3. Customer Services Officer Customer Gateway Finance, Resources & Customer Services 4. On the 28**/09/2017** | **[Exhibit A36]**  Linda Wentum |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Dionne.Grant@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Dionne.Grant@enfield.gov.uk) * **Communications & Data Access** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Communications & Data Access.** 3. Statutory Complaints Manager ‐ Gateway Services Finance, Resources and Customer Services 4. With **Ian Davis** Director of Enfield Council, 5. And with **Jeremy Chambers** Director of Law & Governance. 6. On the 13**/01/2017** 7. On the 27**/06/2019** 8. On the 00**/00/0000** 9. On the 00**/00/0000** 10. On the 00**/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A37]**  Dionne Grant |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Andrea.Clemons@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Andrea.Clemons@enfield.gov.uk) * **Head of Community Safety Unit** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Head of Community Safety Unit** 3. Customer Services Officer Customer Gateway Finance, Resources & Customer Services 4. Started on my case **07/11/2018** 5. **+++++** | **[Exhibit A38]**  Andrea Clemons |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Geoffrey.Mann@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Geoffrey.Mann@enfield.gov.uk) * **Boss Neighbourhood Watch Teams** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Boss Neighbourhood Watch Teams** 3. Started on my case **00/00/2015** 4. On the 00**/00/0000** 5. On the 00**/00/0000** 6. On the 00**/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A39]**  Geoffrey Mann |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Sarah.Fletcher@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Sarah.Fletcher@enfield.gov.uk) * **Neighbourhood Watch Teams** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Neighbourhood Watch Teams** 3. Started on my case **17/10/2016** 4. On the 00**/00/0000** 5. On the 00**/00/0000** 6. On the 00**/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A40]**  Sarah Fletcher |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Obie.Ebanks@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Obie.Ebanks@enfield.gov.uk) * **Neighbourhood Watch Team** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Neighbourhood Watch Teams** 3. Access to Records Officer - Gateway Services. 4. On the 11**/08/2017**   till   1. On the 28**/09/2017** | **[Exhibit A41]**  Obie Ebanks |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Nasir.Uddin@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Nasir.Uddin@enfield.gov.uk) * **Neighbourhood Officer Housing Services** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Neighbourhood Watch Teams** 3. Neighbourhood Officer Housing Services Housing & Regeneration Place Department Enfield Council the Edmonton Centre 36-44 South Mall Edmonton Green N9 0TN 4. **The Right Home for Everyone”** 5. On the 09**/08/2019** 6. **+++++** | **[Exhibit A42]**  Nasir Uddin |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Lemmy.Nwabuisi@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Lemmy.Nwabuisi@enfield.gov.uk) * **Anti-Social Behaviour Teams** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Anti-Social Behaviour Teams** 3. Started on my case **01/10/2016** 4. On the 00**/00/0000** 5. On the 00**/00/0000** 6. On the 00**/00/0000** 7. On the 00**/00/0000** 8. On the 00**/00/0000** 9. On the 00**/00/0000** 10. On the 00**/00/0000** 11. On the 00**/00/0000** 12. On the 00**/00/0000** 13. On the 00**/00/0000** 14. On the 00**/00/0000** 15. On the 00**/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A43]**  Lemmy Nwabuisi |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Kaunchita.Maudhub@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Kaunchita.Maudhub@enfield.gov.uk) * **Anti-Social Behaviour Teams** / | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Anti-Social Behaviour Teams** 3. Anti-Social Behaviour Team Leader in the Community Safety Unit / One of Lemmy Nwabusi Line Managers / employment since **March 2016** 4. Started on my case **01/10/2016** 5. On the 00**/00/0000** 6. On the 03**/11/2016** “We are aware of Simon Cordell as Steve/Pat obtained an ASBO against him for illegal raves extra.” 7. On the 09**/01/2018** 8. On the 31**/05/2018** 9. On the 21**/12/2018** 10. On the 28**/12/2018** working with MPS Andrea Clemons 11. On the 12**/02/2019** working with MPS Andrea Clemons 12. On the 00**/00/0000** 13. On the 00**/00/0000** 14. On the 00**/00/0000** 15. On the 00**/00/0000** 16. On the 00**/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A44]**  Kaunchita Maudhub |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Jean.Barton@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Jean.Barton@enfield.gov.uk) * **Anti-Social Behaviour Teams** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Anti-Social Behaviour Teams** 3. ASB Victim & Witness Support Officer at Victim Support 4. Stain Curtis / this is the date the staff started to set the Now Claimant up by using the forged Cristine and Caron Case. 5. The police never arrested the Now Claimant for Stain Curtis, but the police did arrest him for the forged Cristine and Caron case and the council switched the cases around to cover up the set up. 6. On the 01**/11/2016** 7. On the 03**/11/2016** 8. On the 04**/11/2016** 9. On the 07**/11/2016** 10. On the 08**/11/2016** 11. On the 14**/11/2016** 12. On the **15/11/2016** 13. **+++++** | **[Exhibit A45]**  Jean Barton |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Neville.Gray@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Neville.Gray@enfield.gov.uk) * **Legal Disrepair Surveyor till** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Legal Disrepair Surveyor** 3. On the 14**/08/2017**   till   1. On the 16**/08/2017** | **[Exhibit A46]**  Neville Gray |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [TheMashTeam@Enfield.gov.uk](mailto:TheMashTeam@Enfield.gov.uk) * [Kevin.Kamese@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Kevin.Kamese@enfield.gov.uk) * **Enfield Council the Mash Team** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **The Mash Team** 3. MASH OSD for Health, Housing B Adult Social Care Operational Support HUB / Merlin Met 4. On the 12**/12/2017** 5. On the 13**/04/2018** 6. On the 04**/11/2016** 7. On the 01**/06/2018** 8. On the 21**/08/2018** | **[Exhibit A47]**  Kevin Kamese |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Clare.Duiqnan@enfield.Gov.uk](mailto:Clare.Duiqnan@enfield.Gov.uk) * **(HOS Integrated Care Mental Health for Adults with Profound Mental illness)** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. (HOS Integrated Care Mental Health for Adults with Profound Mental illness) 3. On the 05**/06/2018** with Kaunchita Maudhub, Ludmilla Lyavoo; Lemmy Nwabuisi + NHS Debbie Morgan | **[Exhibit A48]**  Clare Duiqnan |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Steve.Stirk@Enfieid.Gov.Uk](mailto:Steve.Stirk@Enfieid.Gov.Uk) * **Survivor** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Survivor** 3. On the 00**/00/0000** 4. On the 00**/00/0000** 5. On the 00**/00/0000** 6. On the 00**/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A49]**  Steve Stirk |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [Gyamfi@Enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Gyamfi@Enfield.gov.uk) | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **A** 3. On the 00**/00/0000** 4. On the 00**/00/0000** 5. On the 00**/00/0000** 6. On the 00**/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A50]**  Gyamfi |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [revs@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:revs@enfield.gov.uk) * **Tax Man** * [www.enfield.gov.uk/counciltaxonline](http://www.enfield.gov.uk/counciltaxonline) * **Tax Man** * [Colin.Bullworthy@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Colin.Bullworthy@enfield.gov.uk) * **Tax Man** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Tax Man or Woman** 3. **A** 4. On the 00**/00/0000** 5. On the 00**/00/0000** 6. On the 00**/00/0000** 7. On the 00**/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A51]**  Colin Bullworthy |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [revs@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:revs@enfield.gov.uk) * **Tax Man** * [www.enfield.gov.uk/counciltaxonline](http://www.enfield.gov.uk/counciltaxonline) * **Tax Man** * [James.Rolfe@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:James.Rolfe@enfield.gov.uk) * **Tax Man** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Tax Man or Woman** 3. Director of Finance, Resources and Customer Services 4. On the 02**/02/2017** 5. On the 00**/00/0000** 6. On the 00**/00/0000** 7. On the 00**/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A52]**  James Rolfe |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [revs@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:revs@enfield.gov.uk) * **Tax Man** * [www.enfield.gov.uk/counciltaxonline](http://www.enfield.gov.uk/counciltaxonline) * **Tax Man** * Patricia Simpson * **Income Team** Council Housing | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Tax Man or Woman** 3. Income Team Council Housing 4. On the 09**/05/2016** 5. On the 00**/00/0000** 6. On the 00**/00/0000** 7. On the 00**/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A53]**  Patricia Simpson |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [niadams@dacbeachcroft.com](mailto:niadams@dacbeachcroft.com) * **DAC Beachcroft** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Solicitor** 3. The Last Set of Solicitors Hired by Enfield Council to Stop Me Proving the Truth or Claiming an Insurance Claim Against Themselves. 4. On the 00**/00/0000** 5. On the 00**/00/0000** 6. On the 00**/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A54]**  Niadams |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** * [daknapp@dacbeachcroft.com](mailto:daknapp@dacbeachcroft.com) * **DAC Beachcroft** | 1. **Enfield Council** 2. **Solicitor** 3. The Last Set of Solicitors Hired by Enfield Council to Stop Me Proving the Truth or Claiming an Insurance Claim Against Themselves. 4. On the 00**/00/0000** 5. On the 00**/00/0000** 6. On the 00**/00/0000** | **[Exhibit A55]**  DAC Knapp |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **Officers Name** |  | **[Exhibit A56]** |
| **End** | | | |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The Neighbours Names Table**  **[Exhibit B]**   * **File Temp Link Location** * <https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Temp/Neighbours%20Only/Neighbours%20Only/> | | | | |
| **Numb** | **Details** | **History** | **Laws & Regs / Info** | **Exhibit Numb** |
|  | Number 97 Burncroft Avenue | * **Neighbours Name**  1. Known as **Ozzie** 2. Real Name **Hassan Ozman** | * Ozzie normally rents his Council Flat out to loggers. * Ozzie loggers are and stays a big problem. * Hassan Ozman has committed crimes against the Now Claimant and these crimes the Now Claimant has documented in his diary, and also, recorded by Audio, Recorded by Video and other persons witnessed Ozzie in the middle of his illegal frenzied escapade. * The Crimes that Hassan Ozman has committed the police and the Enfield Council refused to fairly investigate. * His address is 97 Burncroft Avenue, and this is in the next Block of Flats. * Hassan Ozman front room and bedroom walls are side to side with the Now Claimants. * Ozzie is a: - “Secure Council Tenants” * To the Now Claimants understanding Ozzie has lived in the block of flats Burncroft Ave since the year of **2004** and this is up until Date of the **05/10/2022.** * Ozzie = one person + another. * Ozzie = one person + 2 more sub-renters. * A | **[Exhibit B1]**  Hassan Ozman or Ozzie |
|  | Number 95 Burncroft Avenue | * **Neighbours Name**  1. Known as **Christine Smith** | * “Secure Council Tenants” * Still the Current Occupier dated **07/11/2022.** * The Now Claimants has a large magnitude of evidence that has amounted over the years against Christine Smith. * Christine Smith made sure she rooted herself as the main cause to a wide-ranging of the illegal activities that took a place against the Now Claimant because none of the court order applications or documents on the government computer systems would not exist without her and her companion co-defendants. * X 1 person + others * A | **[Exhibit B2]**  Christine Smith |
|  | Number 99 Burncroft Avenue | * **Neighbours Name**  1. Known as **Karen Dunno** 2. Real Name **Karen Becky** | * “Unsecure Tenants” * “Left Premisses” * Number 99 Burncroft Avenue. * This is in the next Block of Flats to Mr S. P. Cordell’s * Number 99 Burncroft Avenue does not run alongside 109 Burncroft Avenue internal rooms. * The flat is above number 95 and on the second floor. * Karen Dunno joined in with Christine Smith and Stain Curtis alongside with other Neighbours in the year of * X 1 person * A | **[Exhibit B3]**  Karen Dunno or Karen Becky |
|  | Number 111 Burncroft Avenue | * **Neighbours Name**  1. Was Known as **Stain Curtis** 2. Real Name Was **Stain Fisher** | * “Was a Secure Council Tenants” * 111 Burncroft Avenue is in the same block of flats as my rented home and is on the ground floor, 111 is the only flat that faces 109 as the front doors face each other in a small separate communal landing to the main building and the kitchens in both flats run aside to each other. Both these flats have back gardens that also, run a join. * X 1 person * Stain is sadly deceased as of the date **17/04/2020.** * A | **[Exhibit B4]**  Stain Curtis or Stain Fisher |
|  | Number 111 Burncroft Avenue | * **Neighbours Name**  1. Known as **Janice Barton** | * “Secure Council Tenants” * Give up her tenancy * The flat of 111 Burncroft Avenue is empty at the current date of **05/10/2021** and has stayed that way for months prior. | **[Exhibit B5]**  Janice Barton |
|  | Number 111 Burncroft Avenue | * **Neighbours Name**   Known as | * Re Occupied 30/09/2022 * A | **[Exhibit B6]** |
|  | Number 113 Burncroft Avenue | * **Neighbours Name**  1. Known as **Debra Andrews** | * “Secure Council Tenants” * X 1 person * A | **[Exhibit B7]**  Debra Andrews |
|  | Number 113 Burncroft Avenue | * **Neighbours Name**  1. Known as **Ambrose Tariq** 2. Real Name **Ambrose Atoro** | * “Secure Council Tenants” * X 1 person * A | **[Exhibit B8]**  Ambrose Tariq or  Ambrose Atoro |
|  | Number 113 Burncroft Avenue | * **Neighbours Name**  1. Known as **George Quinton** | * “Secure Council Tenants” * X 4 people * A | **[Exhibit B9]**  George Quinton |
|  | Number 113 Burncroft Avenue | * **Neighbours Name**  1. Known as **Richard Edward Skinner** | * “Secure Council Tenants” * X 1 person * A | **[Exhibit B10]**  Richard Edward Skinner |
|  | Number 115 Burncroft Avenue | * Young White Couple Real name: Young White Couple * “Unsecure Tenants” * X 2 people | N/a. | **[Exhibit B11]**  N/a. |
|  | Number 115 Burncroft Avenue | * **Neighbours Name**  1. Known as **Turkish Looking Woman** | * X 1 person. * “Unsecure Tenants” * A | **[Exhibit B12]**  Turkish Looking Woman |
|  | Number 115Burncroft Avenue | * **Neighbours Name**  1. Known as **Turkish Looking Woman** | * Light skin Girl Rebecca O * Still the Current Occupier * X 2 people * “Unsecure Tenants” * A | **[Exhibit B13]**  Rebecca O |
|  | Number 117 Burncroft Avenue | * **Neighbours Name**  1. Known as **Mathiyalagan Family** 2. Real Name **Markandu Mathiyalagan** 3. Real Name **Ravathy Mathiyalagan** 4. Real Name **Ravathy Thambirasa** 5. Real Name **Kajenthiran Thevarasa** | * 1ST The Mathiyalagan Family & Kanathran the Logger * “Unsecure Tenants” * X 3 people * A | **[Exhibit B14]**  Markandu Mathiyalagan,  Ravathy Mathiyalagan.  Ravathy Thambirasa.  Kajenthiran Thevarasa. |
|  | Number 117 Burncroft Avenue | * **Neighbours Name**  1. Known as the 2nd Turkish lot 2x Adults 1 male and 1 female + 3x young children and 1x one new-born. | * “Secure Council Tenants” * X 3 people * A | **[Exhibit B15]**  Known as the 2nd Turkish lot 2x Adults 1 male and 1 female + 3x young children and 1x one new-born. |
|  | Number 117 Burncroft Avenue | * **Neighbours Name**  1. Known as **Rasheedah Lynch** 2. And **Mica Cowan** | * The 3rd Set of occupiers * Black Woman & Man and young child Black family * Rasheedah Lynch & Mica Cowan * “Unsecure Tenants” * X 2 people * A | **[Exhibit B16]**  Rasheedah Lynch  And  Mica Cowan |
|  | Number 117 Burncroft Avenue | * **Neighbours Name**  1. Known as **Ryhnna Daniels** | * The fourth occupier * X 1 person * N/a | **[Exhibit B17]**  N/a |
|  | Number 117 Burncroft Avenue | * **Neighbours Name**  1. Known as **Louisse Miller** | * The 5th Set of occupiers * A | **[Exhibit B18]**  Louisse Miller |
|  | Number 117 Burncroft Avenue | * **Neighbours Name**  1. Known as **Dakoto Dunn** | * The 6th Set of occupiers * “Secure Council Tenants” * X 1 person * A | **[Exhibit B19]**  Dakoto Dunn |
|  | Number 117 Burncroft Avenue | * **Neighbours Name**  1. Known as **John Irving** | * **The Homeowner** | **[Exhibit B20]**  N/a |
|  | Number 119 Burncroft Avenue | * **Neighbours Name**  1. Known as **N/a** | * Re Occupied Around the 07/11/2022 * Still the Current Occupier | **[Exhibit B21]**  N/a |
| **End** | | | |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **LIMITATION PERIODS**  **[Exhibit C]** | | |
|  | **Class of claim** | **Limitation period** |
|  | **Fraudulent breach of trust** | None (LA 1980, s. 21(1)) |
|  | **Recovery of land** | 12 years (LA 1980, s. 15(1)) |
|  | **Recovery of money secured by mortgage** | 12 years (LA 1980, s. 20(1)) |
|  | **Speciality** | 12 years (LA 1980, s. 8(1)) |
|  | **Recovery of money due under statute** | 6 years (LA 1980, s. 9(1)) |
|  | **Enforcement of a judgment** | 6 years (LA 1980, s. 24(1)) |
|  | **Contract** | 6 years (LA 1980, s. 5) |
|  | **Recovery of trust property and breach of trust** | 6 years (LA 1980, s. 21(3)) |
|  | **Recovery of arrears of rent** | 6 years (LA 1980, s. 19) |
|  | **Tort (except those listed below) Note:** This includes claims under s. 2(1) of the Misrepresentation Act 1967 | 6years (LA 1980, s. 2) |
|  | **Defective Premises Ad 1972 (DPA 1972) claims** | 6 years (DPA 1972, s. 1(B)) |
|  | **Personal injury claims** | 3 years (LA 1980, s. 11(4)) |
|  | **Fatal Accident Act 1976 claims** | 3 years (LA 1980, s. 12(2)} |
|  | **Claims under the Consumer Protection Act 1987** | 3 years (LA 1980, s. 11 A) |
|  | **Carriage by Air Act 1961 (CAA 1961) claims** | 2 years (CAA 1961, Sched. 1) |
|  | **Claims for personal injury or damage to vessel, cargo, or** | 2 years (Merchant Shipping Act 1995, s. 190(3) and |
|  | **property at sea** | Sched. 6) |
|  | **Disqualification of company directors** | 2 years (Company Directors Disqualification Act 1986, s. 7(2)} |
|  | **Contribution under the Civil Liability (Contribution) Act 1978** | 2 years (LA 1980, s. 10(1)} |
|  | **Contributions under the Maritime Conventions Act 1911** | 1 year (Merchant Shipping Act 1995, s. 190(4)) |
|  | **Carriage of Goods by Road Act 1965 (CGRA 1965)** | claims 1 year (CGRA 1965, Art. 32(1)) |
|  | **Defamation and malicious falsehood** | 1 year (LA 1980, s.4A) |
|  | **Applications for judicial review** | 3 months (CPR54.5) |
|  | **Unfair dismissal under the Employment Rights Act 1996 (ERA 1996)** | 3 months (ERA 1996, s. 111(2)) |
|  | **Applications for new business tenancies under the** | Not less than 2 months nor more than 4 months (LTA |
|  | **Landlord and Tenant Act 1954 (LTA 1954)** | 1954, s. 29(3}) |
|  | **Actions for an account** | Period applicable to claim on which account is based (LA 1980, s. 23) |
| **WHICH LIMITATION PERIOD APPLIES TO AN ACTION?**   1. It is sometimes difficult to decide which category a particular case may fall. It is possible that the nature of the claim itself may affect the application of a limitation period. If the action arises from fraudulent behaviour, the Court will consider whether it was the fraudulent behaviour of a party or of another. Where the fraud is that of a person who is not a party, then the defendant will normally be able to rely on a limitation period applying. But if the fraudulent behaviour is that of a party, then it is more likely that the Court will decide that no limitation period applies. Claims that are a mixture of tort and contract can also cause difficulties. 2. A full examination of the more complex issues arising from limitation is outside the scope of this manual, but any legal representative acting in an action in which 'limitation' issues raise will need to examine the law applying in detail (see *Blackstone's Civil Practice* in this regard). 3. The Court has a discretion to dis-apply the limitation period in personal injury actions under s. 33 of the LA **1980.** In these circumstances, the Court will decide whether it would be equitable and whether it would be prejudicial to the defendant, considering all of the circumstances of the case. There may be good reasons not to rely on a limitation defence, where a fair trial can still take place despite the delay. Two recent cases have considered the application of s. 33 LA—in *Kara Rayner v Wolfe stans* (A firm), ***Medway NHS Foundation Trust [2015] EWHC 2957 (QB),*** the Judge allowed the Now Claimant to proceed with her personal injury claim seven years after the statutory period of limitation had expired where the Judge found that the Now Claimant had been prejudiced by delays not of her making. This case is a clear example of the Court helping a 'deserving' Now Claimant. In Collins v Secretary of State for Business Innovation & Skills **[2013]** the Court would not exercise its discretion, as it decided that the evidence was dodgy and unreliable, and there would be real prejudice to the defendant if the limitation period did not apply.   **Exceptions in the Limitation Act**   1. The Limitation Act **1980** does hold exceptions to the rules discussed above. There are two exceptions that may be relevant to claims against the police. Firstly, time does not begin to run against a minor until he or she reaches the age of eighteen. Thus, if the alleged police misconduct occurred during the Now Claimant's childhood the applicable limitation period would not start to run until he or she reached adulthood. **Yes** 2. Secondly, the running of the proper limitation period faces delays where any fact relevant to the Now Claimant's right of action is “concealed deliberately from him or her by the defendant.” In these circumstances the period runs from the time when the Now Claimant discovers the concealment or from the point when he or she could have discovered it by using reasonable diligence. A deliberate breach of duty in circumstances where it is unlikely discovered for time amounts to deliberate concealment for these purposes. Deliberate concealment therefore covers intentional wrongdoing that, by its nature, is unlikely to be discovered for a considerable period of time, if the wrongdoer does nothing to draw it to the Now Claimant's attention.71 Accordingly, this concept could cover police misconduct that was not readily apparent to the Now Claimant at the time but emerges subsequently, for example if; officers pressurised or induced a third party falsely to incriminate the Now Claimant. In this instance the Now Claimant would know from the outset that the testimony incriminating him or her was false, but he or she would not necessarily appreciate that this stemmed from improper police behaviour. The deliberate concealment must relate to a fact that forms part of the 'right of action,’ as opposed to those which simply strengthen an existing case. So, it would be difficult for the Now Claimant to obtain an advantage from this statutory provision in a false imprisonment claim, as the cause of action is complete when the detention occurs and any subsequently discovered facts would bolster an existing claim, rather than create a fresh cause of action. In contrast, in a malicious Prosecution claim, a lack of reasonable and probable cause for the Prosecution and malice on the part of the wrongdoer are intrinsic elements of the cause of action; thus, subsequent discovered police misconduct relating to those issues may well to facts relevant to the right of action, so that the running limitation period is postponed until they came to light.   **Human Rights Act claims**   1. The limitation period for bringing proceedings against a public authority under the Human Rights Act **1998** is short. Proceedings brought must be before the end of one year beginning with the date on which the act complained of took place. However, there is provision for a longer period if the ‘Court or tribunal considers it equitable having regard to all the circumstances. The one-year period is subject to any rule imposing a stricter time limit in relation to the procedure in question. Thus, for example, a judicial review application which relied upon breaches of the Human Rights Act **1998** would be subject to the usual three-month time period applicable to such claims.8" However, where a person does not bring proceedings against a public authority but merely seeks to rely on his or her rights under the European Convention of Human Rights in relation to legal proceedings brought by others, no limitation period is imposed by the Human Rights Act **1998.S1**   **Discrimination claims**   1. The time limit for bringing proceedings under the Race Relations Act **1976** is within six months less one day from the date of the act complained of “It is possible to obtain a two-month extension when a claim to the Commission exists for Racial Equality for help within the six-month period. The Commission can grant a further month’s extension if it is considering the application. The six-month period for bringing a claim does not begin to run until the conclusion of ‘an act extending over a period'. The Court has a discretion to extend the time limit for bringing discrimination claims where it considers it ‘just and equitable to do so. Similar limitation provisions apply in relation to discrimination on the grounds of sex and disability. 2. There may be instances where the same facts give rise to different limitation periods. For example, if a person is stopped and searched in a manner which gives rise to a potential claim under the Race Relations Act **1976** and is then prosecuted, but the proceedings are not concluded until more than six months after the initial incident, consideration should be given to issuing proceedings in the county Court under the Act and then staying these proceedings pending the outcome of the criminal case. The priority for the potential Now Claimant may well be to secure an acquittal on the criminal case and he or she may not wish to aggravate the police or CPS by alerting them to a potential race case. In these circumstances it is open to the adviser to issue proceedings within the initial six-month period, but to delay serving them until the conclusion of the criminal matter.   **Persons under disabilities**   1. Where the Now Claimant is a person under a disability, being either a child or a protected party ' (see paragraphs 7.3.1 and 7.3.2), the limitation period does not start to run until:   --   1. if a child, from the date of the child's 18th birthday. 2. if a protected party, if they were of unsound mind at the time of the cause of action “or the unsound mind was caused by the cause of action,” from the date on which they are no longer of unsound mind (whenever that may be medically certified). If the person was of sound mind at the time of the cause of action, the limitation period will continue to run.   **Fraud, concealment, and mistake**   1. In claims based on fraud, the limitation period does not begin to run until the Now Claimant discovers (or could, with reasonable diligence, have discovered) the fraud. The limitation period will also not run whilst the defendant deliberately conceals a relevant fact. Where the claim is for relief from the consequences of a mistake, time does not run until the claimant discovered the mistake or could have discovered it with reasonable diligence.   **Latent damage**   1. The Latent Damage Act **1986** created greater fairness in situations in which the limitation period may expire before a party is even aware that a claim exists. In claims in tort (other than for personal injuries), the Latent Damage Act **1986** provides new sections (inserted into the LA **1980, ss. 14A and 14B)**. The provisions added to the LA **1980** by the **1986** Act provide two periods of limitation: one that is six years from accrual (the usual period for claims in tort), and another that is three years from the 'starting date'—that is, the earliest date at which the Now Claimant knew that the relevant damage was sufficiently serious to justify proceedings, enabling a claim to subsist, and when it could be attributed to the act of negligence and the identity of the defendant. 2. To prevent defendants being potentially 'at risk' of a claim indefinitely, s. 14B of the LA **1980** provides a long-stop period for bringing proceedings of 15 years from the act or omission alleged to constitute the negligence causing the Now Claimant's damage.   **The discretionary extension of limitation periods**   * Discretionary provisions to extend the statutory limitation period apply in: * judicial review proceedings “the three-month time limit can be extended if good reasons are shown.” | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Disrepair Issues and Bad Management by My Housing Team Asbestos!**  **[Exhibit D]**   * **File Temp Link Location** * <https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Temp/Disrepair%20109%20Burncroft%20Avenue/> | | | |
| **Numb** | **Details of Responsible Authority / Landlords** | **Exhibits** | **Photographic Evidence** |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT D1** * This **Exhibit** D1 referrers to a letter of evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell. * Document Date **26/07/2006** * This Date **06/10/2022**   **Exhibit D1** is a letter that the Now Claimant received From the London Borough of Enfield Council on the date of 26th of July 2006.  This letter shows that the Enfield Council were fully aware that the premises that they had rented out to the Now Claimant suffered with asbestos within its building materials and that it was their job as the proprietors and local Council to maintain the asbestos within the premises, to a fair standard of living.  The Enfield Council Letter addressed to the now claimant, also displays a doctor name printed inside of it and we believe that this is due to the dangers that asbestos can cause to human life. The doctor’s name is a Donald Graham. | Text, letter  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT D2** * This **Exhibit** D2 referrers to a letter of evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell. * Document Date **22/11/2011** * This Date **06/10/2022** |  |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT D3** * This **Exhibit** D3 referrers to a letter of evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell. * Document Date **01/12/2011** * This Date **06/10/2022** | Text, letter  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT D4** * This **Exhibit** D4 referrers to a letter of evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell. * Document Date **15/02/2012** * This Date **06/10/2022** * Heating | Text, letter  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT D5** * This **Exhibit** D5 referrers to a letter of evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell. * Total Loss of Gas heating and Hot water in summer 1st May to 31st October. * Gas defect to domestic gas central Heating appliance. * **Fault Log:** 14/05/2009 * **Est. Complete Date:** 19/05/2009 |  |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT D6** * This **Exhibit** D6 referrers to a letter of evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell. * Access as national grid have shut down the heating system because the CO2 Alarm Kept Sounding. * Gas defect to domestic gas central Heating appliance. * **Fault Log:** 28/11/2014 * **Est. Complete Date:** 28/11/2014 | Text, letter  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT D7** * This **Exhibit** D7 referrers to a letter of evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell. * Supply and fit Graphite Seal * Gas defect to domestic gas central Heating appliance. * **Fault Log:** 01/12/2014 * **Est. Complete Date:** 03/12/2014 | A picture containing text, receipt  Description automatically generated |
| **END** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Disrepair Issues and Bad Management by My Housing Team Pictures the First Set 109!**  **[EXHIBIT E]**   * **File Temp Link Location** * <https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Temp/Disrepair%20109%20Burncroft%20Avenue/> | | | | |
| **Numb** | **Details of Responsible Authority / Landlords** | **Exhibits** |  | **Photographic Evidence** |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT E2** * This **EXHIBIT E**2 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A light from a ceiling  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT E3** * This **EXHIBIT E**3 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A picture containing wall, indoor, bathroom, green  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT E4** * This **EXHIBIT E**4 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A picture containing wall, indoor, ceiling, tiled  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT E5** * This **EXHIBIT E**5 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A picture containing indoor, appliance, microwave, white goods  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT E6** * This **EXHIBIT E**6 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A picture containing indoor, oven, stove  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT E7** * This **EXHIBIT E**6 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A picture containing indoor, bottle, wall, drink  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT E8** * This **EXHIBIT E**8 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A picture containing floor, indoor, building, wooden  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT E9** * This **EXHIBIT E**9 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A picture containing indoor, floor, wooden, wood  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT E10** * This **EXHIBIT E**10 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A picture containing floor, indoor  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT E11** * This **EXHIBIT E**11 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  |  |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT E12** * This **EXHIBIT E**12 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A picture containing indoor  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT E13** * This **EXHIBIT E**13 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A picture containing wall, indoor, person  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT E14** * This **EXHIBIT E**14 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A picture containing indoor, white  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT E15** * This **EXHIBIT E**15 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A group of bugs on a wood floor  Description automatically generated with low confidence |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT E16** * This **EXHIBIT E**16 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A picture containing indoor, messy, clothes, cluttered  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT E17** * This **EXHIBIT E**17 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A picture containing indoor  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT E18** * This **EXHIBIT E**18 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A picture containing wall, indoor, floor, building  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT E19** * This **EXHIBIT E**19 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A picture containing wall, indoor, dirty  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT E20** * This **EXHIBIT E**20 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A picture containing wall, indoor  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT E21** * This **EXHIBIT E**21 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A picture containing indoor, tiled  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT E22** * This **EXHIBIT E**22 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A picture containing wall, indoor  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT E23** * This **EXHIBIT E**23 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A picture containing text  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT E24** * This **EXHIBIT E**24 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  |  |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT E25** * This **EXHIBIT E**25 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  |  |
| **End** | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Disrepair Issues and Bad Management by My Housing Team 117 Burncroft Avenue Flat and Block Pictures!**  **[EXHIBIT F]**   * **File Temp Link Location** * <https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Temp/Disrepair%20109%20Burncroft%20Avenue/> | | | | |
| **Numb** | **Details of Responsible Authority / Landlords** | **Exhibits** |  | **Photographic Evidence** |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT F27** * This **EXHIBIT F**27 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** | This just come out of 117 Burncroft Avenue.  ‎**25 ‎May ‎2022?**  set of tennants in 2 years or more | Text, letter, whiteboard  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT F28** * This **EXHIBIT F**28 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | Text  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT F29** * This **EXHIBIT F**29 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | Text, letter  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT F30** * This **EXHIBIT F**30 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | Text, letter  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT F31** * This **EXHIBIT F**31 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | **Video Link**  <https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Temp/Disrepair%20109%20Burncroft%20Avenue/1%20This%20just%20come%20out%20of%20117%203rd%20set%20of%20tennants%20in%202%20years%20or%20more/20220525_175017.mp4> |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT F32** * This **EXHIBIT F**32 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | **Video Link**  <https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Temp/Disrepair%20109%20Burncroft%20Avenue/1%20This%20just%20come%20out%20of%20117%203rd%20set%20of%20tennants%20in%202%20years%20or%20more/20220525_175620.mp4> |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT F33** * This **EXHIBIT F**33 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** | **Video Link Pictures** | A picture containing floor, tiled, dirty  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT F34** * This **EXHIBIT F**34 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A close up of a person's skin  Description automatically generated with low confidence |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT F35** * This **EXHIBIT F**35 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A picture containing indoor, seat  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT F36** * This **EXHIBIT F**36 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A picture containing grass  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT F37** * This **EXHIBIT F**37 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A close-up of a wall  Description automatically generated with low confidence |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT F38** * This **EXHIBIT F**38 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A close-up of a wall  Description automatically generated with low confidence |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT F39** * This **EXHIBIT F**39 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A picture containing cement  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT F40** * This **EXHIBIT F**40 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  | A picture containing indoor, floor, tiled  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT F41** * This **EXHIBIT F**41 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** |  |  |
| END | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Disrepair Issues and Bad Management by My Housing Team Pictures the Second Set 109!**  **EXHIBIT G**   * **File Temp Link Location** * <https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Temp/Disrepair%20109%20Burncroft%20Avenue/> | | | | |
| **Numb** | **Details of Responsible Authority / Landlords** | **Exhibits** |  | **Photographic Evidence** |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT G42** * This **EXHIBIT G**42 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** | Upto date of the **06/10/2022** | A living room with a fireplace  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT G43** * This **EXHIBIT G**43 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** | Upto date of the **06/10/2022** | A picture containing text, wall, indoor, painting  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT G44** * This **EXHIBIT G**44 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** | Upto date of the **06/10/2022** | A picture containing wall, indoor, toilet, dirty  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT G45** * This **EXHIBIT G**45 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** | Upto date of the **06/10/2022** | A picture containing text, indoor, wall, floor  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT G46** * This **EXHIBIT G**46 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** | Upto date of the **06/10/2022** | A living room with a fireplace  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT G47** * This **EXHIBIT G**47 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** | Upto date of the **06/10/2022** | A picture containing indoor, wall, window, furniture  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT G48** * This **EXHIBIT G**48 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** | Upto date of the **06/10/2022** | A picture containing indoor, wall, kitchen, appliance  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT G49** * This **EXHIBIT G**49 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** | Upto date of the **06/10/2022** | A picture containing indoor, appliance, kitchen appliance, stove  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT G50** * This **EXHIBIT G**50 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** | Upto date of the **06/10/2022** | A picture containing indoor, kitchen, appliance, kitchen appliance  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT G51** * This **EXHIBIT G**51 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** | Upto date of the **06/10/2022** | A picture containing window, indoor, sink, counter  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT G52** * This **EXHIBIT G**52 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** | Upto date of the **06/10/2022** | A picture containing indoor, wall, room  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT G53** * This **EXHIBIT G**53 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** | Upto date of the **06/10/2022** | A bathroom with a tub toilet and sink  Description automatically generated with low confidence |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT G54** * This **EXHIBIT G**54 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** | Upto date of the **06/10/2022** | A bathroom with a tub toilet and sink  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT G55** * This **EXHIBIT G**55 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** | Upto date of the **06/10/2022** | A picture containing wall, indoor, bathroom, toilet  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT G56** * This **EXHIBIT G**56 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** | Upto date of the **06/10/2022** | A picture containing indoor, wall, bed, window  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT G57** * This **EXHIBIT G**57 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** | Upto date of the **06/10/2022** | A picture containing wall, indoor  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT G58** * This **EXHIBIT G**58 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** | Upto date of the **06/10/2022** | A picture containing outdoor  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT G59** * This **EXHIBIT G**59 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** | Upto date of the **06/10/2022** | A picture containing outdoor, yellow, tool  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT G60** * This **EXHIBIT G**60 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** | Upto date of the **06/10/2022** |  |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT G61** * This **EXHIBIT G**61 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** | Upto date of the **06/10/2022** | A picture containing building, outdoor, grass, brick  Description automatically generated |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT G62** * This **EXHIBIT G**62 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** | Upto date of the **06/10/2022** | A brick building with windows  Description automatically generated with medium confidence |
|  | Enfield Civic Centre. Enfield Civic Centre. Silver Street, Enfield, London, EN1 3XA | * **EXHIBIT G63** * This **EXHIBIT G**63 referrers to photographic evidence made on behalf of the Now Claimant a Mr. S. P. Cordell * This Date **06/10/2022** | Upto date of the **06/10/2022** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **About the ASBO & Criminal Record ACRO Report**  **Must Read!**  **All about the ACRO Reports!**  **Read all about it!**  **EXHIBIT H** | |
| **Quick Note** | **Rough Notes for Now in this Section**  **General Information**   * This part of this Email / Document / Witness Statement / Insurance Claim holds the Now Claimants: - “Police Criminal Records / Acro Report for the years of: - “**2017**, **2020,** **2021**, from the police national dispatch system.   **2013**  **The Reason the Now Claimant Requested the ACRO Report is Because:**   1. The Now Claimant and his mother in the year of **2013** took their first glance of the Now Claimants Criminal Record because of the: - “Gazebo Case.” and this is when they both noticed errors in the Criminal Record. 2. What occurred is that on the **25/06/2013** the police detained the Now Claimant at the: “Police Station” after arresting him for an accused incident involving a: —**Gazebo”** 3. The police officers thought the Now Claimants stole the Gazebo, but he did not and the date the police said the alleged offence happened is the **04/05/2013**. 4. The Now Claimant has supplied below a complete list of Court and Police Station dates minus any emailed-correspondence about the Gazebo Case and they are as follows: -  * **Gazebo Case Remand Dates: --**  1. **25/06/2013:** “Police Station” 2. **26/06/2013:** “Court & the World of Scrubs” 3. **27/06/2013:** “World of Scrubs” 4. **28/06/2013:** “Judge & Chambers “Granted Bail” 5. **10/07/2013:** “Bail Conditions” 6. **16/07/2013:** “Bail Conditions” 7. **16/08/2013:** “Bail Conditions” 8. **09/09/2013:** “Bail Conditions” 9. **19/11/2013:** “Bail Conditions” 10. **20/11/2013:** “Bail Conditions” 11. **23/12/2013:** “Bail Conditions” 12. **08/04/20**14**:** “Bail Conditions” 13. **01/07/20**14**:** “I won the Case, No more Bail Conditions.” 14. When in the police station the police custody officer would not grant the Now Claimant bail due to: - “Failing to Surrender,” being present on his Criminal Record. 15. The Now Claimant disputed the Failing to surrender to be an error when talking to the custody officer at the time, but the custody officer said this the Court will sort it out later. 16. The police held the Now Claimant in the police station overnight and brought him to the Court House on the **26/06/2013.** 17. The Now Claimant and his Legal Team and Support Network all knew that the reasons for the Now Claimants detentions were inaccurate and contended them in Court, but the Judge presiding over the Court proceedings stayed adamant in the made decision of refusing bail and then on after remanded the Now Claimant to HMP: “The World of Scrubs.” Due to the same error that the police refused bail for and that being of: —Failing to Surrender,” being present on the Now Claimants Criminal Record, on the day in court the judge refused to accept any verbal evidence from the Now Claimants and his Litigation Team and/or Support Network as being true. 18. By the Date of the **28/06/2013** the Now Claimant legal team and his support network had prepared a well-documented application for bail and brought it before the: “Judge & Chambers,” as the Now Claimants legal team had a copy of the Criminal Record and could prove it to be inaccurate and the Judges granted the application for bail granted for the Now Claimant but still only under stringent bail conditions. 19. Throughout and because of the Gazebo Case proceedings the Now Claimant and his mother and law firm had all committed themselves to try to get the errors taken off the Criminal Record so, the same mistake could not happen again. 20. Between the Now Claimants and his Litigation Team and/or Support Network they all together, questioned more details withinside of the police Criminal Record printout to being errors.  * **Sending Emails Across to Check and Rectify Any Inaccuracies in the year of 2014**  1. By the Date of the **12/02/2014** the Now Claimant and his mother were sending emails across to check and rectify any inaccuracies they found in the Criminal Record, and this included contacting the relevant Courthouses about the arrest summons numbers contained in the police printout of the Criminal Record. 2. The Now Claimant and his mother questioned guilty verdicts in the Criminal Record and/or the arrests happening at all. 3. Their queries were in respect of two Courthouses records, due to the police always charging the Now Claimant inadvertently without any fair prospect of a guilty conviction against him. 4. The two Courthouses records that both the Now Claimant and his mother questioned with the high relevance amongst the multitude were and are: - 5. Tottenham Magistrates Court Lordship Lane London N17 6RT because as an adolescent youth the Metropolitan Police Force brought the Now Claimant to the doors of (a) as this was the local magistrates court that HM then deployed to the establishment. 6. Highbury Corner Magistrates Court 51 Holloway Road London N7 8JA because after the closure of (a) the Metropolitan Police Force transferred all cases to this court but not all files. 7. The Now Claimant mother and himself keep sorting the errors out by way of emails and attending the courts as the below exhibit proves.   **A picture containing table  Description automatically generated**   1. The correspondent above displays the date of the **07/03/2014** and is an email from her Majesty’s Magistrates Court at Tottenham, Lordship Lane. 2. The Court told the Now Claimant Mother that she could collect a copy of the staff’s notes of the checked registries from within the Court and other associated materials and that is what happened.  * **The Bits of The Evidence Found Supporting the Criminal Record to Be in Error as Follows: -**  1. The Now Claimants mother sent and received mutable emails backwards and forwards from the courts based on the police Criminal Record printout from the Gazebo Case till finally, the Courts worked out the following to be in error. 2. **21/05/98** Not in the Courts Record. 3. **05/01/01** Not in the Courts Record. 4. **17/08/02** Not in the Courts Record. 5. **24/04/03** Not in the Courts Record. 6. **25/01/08** Failing to surrender to Police custody. “The Judge Dismissed this charge and the Now Claimant also, notes that this is the day before his birthday.” 7. The Gazebo Case continued until **01/07/2014** when the Now Claimants won the Case, and the Judge removed the Bail Conditions in complete. 8. Gazebo Case Start **25/06/2013** 9. Gazebo Case “Won.” **01/07/2014** 10. The police would not listen to the Now Claimant and his mother when they tried to get the errors removed from the Now Claimant Criminal Record.  * **Scattered Pages of An Asbo Folder Still Showed the Now Claimants Criminal Record to Be in Error, 2014.**  1. Throughout the meantime the Metropolitan Police Force and Enfield Council filed a frauded Asbo Court Order application into the court against the Now Claimant. 2. The Metropolitan Police tried to serve the frauded Asbo Court Order Application on the Now Claimant but failed. 3. The Now Claimant contacted his mother as he would not go into the block of flats Corridor were the police had left the folder and instead asked her to attend and she agreed to do so, but not until the following day as she was too busy. 4. Due to the police leaving the Asbo Bundles of the floor, The next day when the Now Claimants mother arrived, she found a copy of her son’s Criminal Record again and by this time, the Now Claimant and his mother had seen more than enough to do something about it all. 5. The Found Scattered Pages of An Asbo Folder Still Showed highly classified documentation that the police had left on the floor in an unconcealed location such as the corridor of 109 Burncroft Avenue. 6. The Now Claimants and his mother could work out that the Now Claimants Criminal Record was in Error and the rest of the Found Scattered Pages of An Asbo application, showed fraud. 7. The way in which Enfield Council and the Metropolitan Police Force dropped these documents and left them lying on the floor made it obvious that they were not going to acting in a professional manner towards the Now Claimant and his family. 8. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police: - “Failed Service of Asbo Court Order On the; - **12/09/2014**. 9. The Asbo Application Scattered Pages showed that the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police wrongly accused the Now Claimant of alleged incidents that Run Consecutively to the Gazebo Case while he was on police bail conditions to say inside of his home and the incidents are Inconsistent to the truth. 10. The Now Claimant and his mother decided to address these issues to the Judge at the Highbury Corner Magistrates Court 51 Holloway Road London N7 8JA. 11. Because the Asbo Application contained a copy of the Now Claimant’s Criminal Record and with the Errors still withinside of it that they had already proved to be in error and all while the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and the Crown Prosecution Team had not even submitted: - “a bad character application,” to the judge at the Highbury and Islington Court for the Criminal Record to be present in the Asbo applications folders, the Now Claimant and his mother started to take what was being ignored and forced on the Now Claimant by the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police force much more seriously. 12. The Judges at the Highbury and Islington Court would not listen to the Now Claimant and his mother and made a mockery of the Criminal Record being present in the Asbo Application by allowing the prosecutor to submit a late: - “bad character application,” that the Judge turned down anyway but somehow the Judge still allowed the same filed Asbo application that was never served to continue in court. 13. The officials wrongly used a copied printout of the Now Claimants: - “Police Criminal Record,” to darken his character in court against him and the Criminal Record held the following: - 14. Wrongful Conviction of Failing to Surrender. 15. Wrongful Conviction Entries. 16. No Furthered Action Cases. 17. Disposed of Cases. 18. Times and date. 19. Police filed the copy of the Now Claimants Criminal Record in the Asbo Application in such a way to deceive any reader of the following: 20. To discredit the Now Claimants character and in turn not showing the true facts of police harassment. 21. To find a guilty conviction to gain one up in the paperwork and against the Now Claimant. 22. Because the Now Claimant 23. **Ozzie** 24. **117 Mathiyalagans** 25. **Stain** 26. **Dawn Alan Debra Andrews**  * **2012, 2013, 2014, till 2015**  1. Through the Gazebo Case and the Asbo Proceedings the Metropolitan Police Force Members keep maliciously targeting the Now Claimant in: - “Any Way They Felt They Could Get Away With” and this caused the Now Claimant to suffer wrongly from the following: - 2. Trailer Case 3. Gazebo Case 4. The Metropolitan Police and Crown Prosecution lost the nine Driving Bans at Appels that the Now Claimant had to fight to get overturned. 5. Forged Asbo 6. **Neighbors and Council and police setting him up**: - The Enfield Council & The Metropolitan Police Force staff planned and then forged incidents to set up the Now Claimant as displayed in this document but when all went wrong because the Now Claimant discovered their evil intentions, they used even more illegal activities to cover up the truth. 7. The Enfield Council & The Metropolitan Police Force cover up involved: 8. A ploy to kill 9. Spreading malicious fake rumors 10. Using Media Centers 11. Breaches of personal data 12. Abuse of process 13. Violating Human Rights 14. Allowing other persons to join them in an Unfair Purge to Capture the Now Claimant at any means necessary for them to avoid justice and for their own wrongful self-gained reason and if the named staff / people had followed protocol of the law then they would not have broken the law unnecessarily. 15. Arrest Date: - “\*” Case Name: - “\*” Case Details: - “\*” 16. Arrest Date: - “\*” Case Name: - “\*” Case Details: - “\*” 17. Arrest Date: - “\*” Case Name: - “\*” Case Details: - “\*” 18. The Enfield Council & The Metropolitan Police Force called the **Doctors** daily after the Now Claimant Caught their staff committing fraud and other evil criminal activities against him. 19. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police wound up the Now Claimants Neighbours by negative publications about the Now Claimant that then lead to press printing articles in the Newspapers about him. 20. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police then allowed members of the Now Claimant Neighbours to assault him to and extreme level of violence and tried to cover up any fair investigation that would show the truth and with their intended achievement being of an unmoral practice. 21. The Metropolitan Police Constabulary constantly set up or allowed for the Now Claimant to be set up so, they the police could then arrest him too dispose of his claims against them and other government staff, so, that the Now Claimants statements of truth would not stand any test of weight, what so, ever in a court of the law against them involved, the Metropolitan Police Maliciously used their powers of law and allowed an abuse of process to aid in them making the Now Claimant suffer and this suffering included wrongful detentions at police stations and bail conditions for him to then be reared of through an: abusive: – “Abuse of Police Procedures,” to the NHS Mental Health System to undermine his Mental Capacity and Mental Health in knowing he was Stable and Fit in Mind, in what he stated against them. 22. Once the Enfield Council & the Metropolitan Police managed to wrongly get the Asbo granted against the Now Claimant on the; - **00/00/2015** the Newspapers hammered on with the information they found on the police website saying that they had found the Now Claimant guilty for the: - “The Organisation of Illegal Raves…” 23. The Now Claimant then afterwards applied for an Appeal and the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police force worked together to stop him saying what he and others could prove against them by build the following: - 24. The Enfield Council & The Metropolitan Police used and built the Frauded 1st Possession Order 25. The Enfield Council & The Metropolitan Police used and built the Frauded 1st Injunction Order 26. The Enfield Council & The Metropolitan Police used and built the Frauded 2nd Injunction Order 27. The Enfield Council & The Metropolitan Police used and built the Frauded 2nd Possession Order 28. The Enfield Council & The Metropolitan Police Re opened the Frauded 2nd Possession Order 29. The Enfield Council Refused to  * **The Next Police Arrest after the Gazebo Case is in the year of 2016**   **Neighbors The Christine & Carron Case** who were helping Stain 111 Burncroft Avenue hurt me **14/08/16**  The Christine & Carron Case “Won.” NFA (No further action) **28/10/16**  And   * **The Now Claimant and his mother Contacted Police And requested the Now Claimant Acro Report 2017**  1. Because of the mentioned facts above the Now Claimant needed a complete copy of his Acro Report for the year: - “**2017,**” Backdated to the first record and asked his mother to request the files on his behalf and the Courts fees she helped to pay, while the Courts invoiced away! 2. When the Now Claimants mother received the first copy of the: - “Acro Report,” she straight away noticed the same inconsistencies, from the police printout and even more so, such as. 3. The police induced the Asbo in the 2017 Copy of the Now Claimants Criminal Record, and this made her contact the police and ask questions. 4. The police explained that they will remove thew Asbo from the Criminal Record when it is time served. 5. and this made her go on a mission to solve the errors with what she knew to be wrong and was already dealing with and more. 6. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and the Crown Prosecution Team locked the Now Claimant up in doors with a Frauded Asbo Application and its related Malicious Court Process and these factors caused the Now Claimant life to be in ruins and with a long-term negative impact. 7. When the Now Claimant received his copy of the: - “Criminal Record” 8. The Acro Report looked quite bad in the Now Claimant name due to the size of the files and its contents of nature this raised her suspicion even further than the Wrongful submission of Failing to Surrender being inside **of the scattered pages of the Asbo** Bundle left by police, + “Conviction entries,” + “Times and date,” 9. This made the Now Claimant and his mother feel that the Acro Reports context was out of proposition and with the reason being they keep their own records intact and this led to further investigations of the document. 10. The offence in the Asbo states: **- “Illegal Raves”** and the Now Claimant went to Court with his legal team to defend against this illegal aspect. 11. The Now Claimant legal team and himself were at court prepared to defend against: - “The Organisation of Illegal Raves” and not: - “The Organisation of Raves.” 12. The Crown Prosecution Team could not prove an illegal aspect had taken place and the judge should have thrown the case out of the Court but refused to do so. 13. The police never arrested the Now Claimant for this allegation and never had an interview with him causing: - “No fair investigation,” to take place. 14. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and Crown Prosecution were fully aware that: - “The Organisation of Illegal Raves” is an arrestable offence and that if the Now Claimant was arrested and interviewed in accordance with the Pace Codes of practice and the relevant stationary laws then the Cps would have found no case to answer to for the Now Claimant as the evidence was circumstantial at it best. 15. The “maximum sentence” under the Raves Bill Act **1994** is two and a half months if arrested.   **Acro Report for the years of: - “2020.”**  **What Happened Once They Received the Second Copy of the Years**  2021?  **Asbo**  **Another Reasons the Now Claimant has Submitted a Copy of his ACRO Report are**   * The Now Claimant and his mother requested the information for varied reasons but with a couple of the main reasons being: -  1. “The police never arrested the Now Claimant for the Asbo this meant that he never got a fair investigation, in fact, every time he went to court, the Judge also, never allowed him to speak and this also meant that the Asbo was not listed in a copy of his Criminal Record as a: - “Criminal Offence,” but the police still documented the conditions inside of the: - “Criminal Record,” until the Asbo was time served so, if any person was to call 999 because they see the Now Claimant out at a suspected: - “Illegal rave,” then the police could arrest the Now Claimant for a breach of the Asbo Order. 2. When the Now Claimants mother asked those involved if it would stay present in the: - “Criminal Record,” after the Asbo time lapsed those involved told the Now Claimants mother no they will remove the Asbo Conditions afterwards, and therefore they requested a copy of the **2021** Acro Report. 3. The Now Claimant and his mother requested a copy of the Now Claimant ACRO Reports and done so, partly to check this information. 4. Another reason the Acro Report got requested is because when the Asbo is said to have gotten served there was a failing to surrender to custody that got the Now Claimant remanded into prison until he went to Judge and Chambers to get bail varied and when the failing to surrender got disputed he and his mother found other offences that were showing in the Acro Report that the Now Claimant had never been found guilty of. 5. The Now Claimant mother went to the courthouses, and they checked the registries to conclude that they were right. 6. Also, the Asbo had the police offices names changed in it and the ACRO Reports prove this fact as well what is: - “Harassment / Malicious Process & Abuse.” 7. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police filled The Asbo Court Order Application wrong due to a criminal offence being present that any person in the United Kingdom is arrestable for and chargeable for police to bring in front of the court of law. 8. “THE ORGANISATION OF ILLEGAL RAVES” is a criminal offence and the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police wrongly adducted inside as civil case law.  * **The standards must** * It is an arrestable offence under the Raves Bill **1994**, Criminal Justice & Public Order Act,**1994** and penalises with a “maximum sentence” of Three months do one and a half months in prison and/or a £2,500 fine. * The Now Claimant received Two years while the trial was getting prepared and Five years once he had gotten set up. * The Judge refused when the e prosecutor asked for a lifetime ban, but then agreed that the Five-year sentence she is giving would not run concurrently, with the time spent pending trial at the Magistrates’ Courts as she thought the lifetime ban would be too long. * and this also meant that the Asbo was not in his criminal record as a criminal offence, but the police still documented the conditions until the Asbo was time served then the police would remove the information about the Asbo as amended out. * The Now Claimant and his mother requested a copy of the Now Claimant ACRO Reports and done so, partly to check this information. * Another reason the Acro Report got requested is because when the Asbo got served there was a failing to surrender to custody that got the Now Claimant remanded into prison until he went to Judge and Chambers to get bail varied and when the failing to surrender got disputed, he and his mother found other offences that were showing in the Acro Report that the Now Claimant had never been found guilty of. * The Now Claimant mother went to the courthouses, and they checked the registries to conclude that they were right. * Also, the Asbo had the police offices names changed in it and the ACRO Reports prove this fact as well what is: - “Harassment / Malicious Process & Abuse.”   **Acro Report for the years of: - “2021.”**  **What Happened Once They Received the Third Copy of the Years**   * The Now Claimants mother spoke to the Now Claimant her son and together they decided to see if the police had removed the Asbo Conditions from his Criminal Record as they should not be present any longer as somehow and someway, the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police never arrested him. * It was agreed and a new request was made to the Metropolitan Police Force for an up-to-date copy of the Now Claimants: - “Acro Report,” for the year: - “**2021**,” that would be Backdated to the first record of arrest be again requested from the police and so, the fee paid had to be paid for again. * The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police had Fraudulently locked up the Now Claimant in his rented flat of the Enfield Council scarred of reprisal’s, the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police basically kept him in a spree of: - “Malicious Process,” of a: - “Targeted Malice,” by using the: - “Courthouses,” Police Station,” “Mental Hospitals,” and there: - “Company-Personnel-Impowered -Powers,” of: - “Work,” over many years to demoralize him. * The Now Claimants mother first opened the Acro Report files at her home to see if the Asbo Conditions were still present and, on her inspection, she noticed they were gone. The Now Claimants mother then contact him by way of her mobile phone and she explained her finding.   We requested the **2021** Acro report to see if the police had removed the Asbo out of it as they must.  In our finding we can say yes, it has because in **2017**’s copy of the Acro report the Abo is present, as the below snip-out proves and in **2021** it is absinth.  A Snippet -out of the **2017** and **2020** Acro Report that the police no longer contained in the **2021** Acro Report: -   * **Report one** * **Class:** Criminal Behaviour Order * **Issued At:** Wood Green Crown Court * **For:** Criminal Behaviour Order * **Power:** Cond arrest (Condition Al Arrest) * **Fs Ref.:** 01 (Metropolitan Police) * **Case Papers:** 01ye * **End Date: 03/08/20** * **Condition 1:** must not be concerned in the organisation of a rave as defined by **S.63(1)** or **S63(1a)** of the criminal justice and public order act **1994** * **Condition 2:** knowingly use or supply property, personal or otherwise, for use in a rave as defined by **S.63 (1)** of the Criminal Justice and public order act **1994** * **Condition 3:** enter or remain in any disused or abandoned building unless invited to do so in writing by a registered charitable organisation or local authority or owner of the premises * **Condition 4:** supply any service in respect of any licensable activity on unlicensed premises * **Condition 5:** enter any non-residential private property (by which words buildings and an open enclosed are “intended to be individual”) or an industrial estate between the hours of 22:00 and 07:00 * **Condition 6:** without written permission from the owner and leaseholder of such property. If you can Demonstrate that the purpose of your entry of Such property is to buy goods or services * The Now Claimants then asked his mother to send a copy of the files to him by way of email so that he could have a look, and this is what she did. * When the Now Claimant opened the files at his home alone, he started to Combine the Acro Reports in a chronological order and it then became easy to notice in short, the following: -  1. A  * To Stop the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police, NHS & Private Doctors, and Nurses + Administration and the Crown Prosecution with the Judges using this fabricated information that they all wrongly induced in the Now Claimants Government Records the Now Claimants has clearly shown: -  1. A  * The Now Claimants decide to compile all the years together and strip the file down while implementing a structure to be able to understand things a little better.   **The ACRO shows that I have been**   1. A   **When looking at the original files.**   1. **A**  |  |  | | --- | --- | |  | **This Is Roughly, What the Now Claimant Criminal Record May Have Inside of It!** | |  | 1. Arrests in Total up to the Date of the: 28th of June 2021  * In **2014** they went for me even more than normal for them! * **The Last time in trouble with the police**   Small Quantity Class B – cannabis 15/05/13 on the Spot Penalty Notice.  **Shoplifting x1**   1. 14/10/09 “Trainers”   **18 Mis Miners**  **11 Offences Below**  **Mis Miners**   1. Small Quantity Class B - cannabis/ **x3** 2. 15/05/**13** Penalty Notice. “After we all went out we wanted to go to the Sunday Market and needed to cut across a closed down train line that we all knew to be: - “Abandoned -Derelict – Decommissioned” as we got back out on the same side as the market through an extra-large hole in a fence already made, a cooper sees us and then does a search.” 3. 19/02/09 At Enfield magistrates fine. 4. 02/11/02 At Enfield magistrates fine. “On the way back home to the Enfield Island Village a police car was wating on the slip road of the first Round about you come to and he pulled me over in my car. 5. **Small Quantity Possession of Ketamine Class C x1** 6. 11/06/**09**   Ketamine: - I went to a festival when I was much younger, and I had a Nitrous Oxide Bottle or more with me. I was giving away balloons when a young gentleman came up to me and he asked me if I would give him as “Many Balloons” as possible for Ketamine and he had no money on him. I explained to him that I do not take the stuff or neither do I sell stuff like that. He decided to stay with me for a while and get to know me a bit better, “Lol.” After a little while I gave him what he wanted and put the wrap in my money bag, “Not lol.” The day went on and it came to a stage where I needed to get something, so I left the bottle with my friend. While I was walking a police officer, officer taped me on the shoulder and asked me if I had anything that I should not on me I told him no, but he still wanted to search me. We went to a site tent and the police office asked me to search for my money bag. I gave it to him happily thinking all was “OK,” when he emptied the bag the wrap the gentlemen earlier had given me dropped into the tray. The police arrested me and released me afterwards and I then went to Court. End of story.   1. **Being-Drunk and Disorderly” X1** 2. 05/06/04 3. **Driving A Motor Vehicle with Excess Alcohol X1** 4. 15/11/08      1. **Driving While Ban X7** 2. 22/10/99 3. 12/11/98 4. 19/10/98 5. 04/04/98 6. 23/02/98 7. 03/11/97 8. 17/09/97 9. **Use Disorderly Behaviour or Threatening/ Abusive/Insulting Words Likely to Cause Harassment Alarm or Distress X2** 10. 23/01/06 11. 02/04/03 12. **Use Disorderly Behaviour or Threatening/Abusive/Insulting Words Likely to Cause Harassment Alarm or Distress X1** 13. 02/02/00 14. **Using Threatening, Abusive, Insulting Words or Behaviour (With Intent) To Cause Fear or Provocation of Violence X1** 15. 20/08/97 16. **Using Threatening, Abusive, Or Insulting Words or Behaviour Likely to Cause Distress X1** 17. 21/09/97   **Offences Below**   1. **Shoplifting x1** 2. 14/10/**09** “Trainers” 3. I went to a festival far away from my home with a friend and we had planned to try and get tickets at the festival. We could not get any and after trying for time we thought we would see if we could find a way in. I had brand fresh trainers on in fact like new. While trying to find our way in we went through wet fields and the fields turned into sinking mud and by the time we got into the festival I was without a trainer and covered in mud. I broke back out of the festival as I looked a mess and went to buy new trainers from the closest town centre and with good intentions but still terribly upset because I had lost my new creep. I picked up a set of trainers I liked and went to pay for them, but it was like no one was present to take the money of me and I made a bad mistake as I do not shoplift. In the end the trainers set the alarms of as the company hid a security tag inside of one of the trainers and next the security guard appeared. 4. **Theft x1** 5. 25/07/08 6. **Taking A Motor Vehicle Without Consent X2** 7. 24/01/97 8. 24/01/97 9. **Possessing Offensive Weapons X1** 10. 12/07/07 “Bike Lock Chain taken out of my car boot by a friend outside Stevenage nightclub” 11. **Criminal Damage X1** 12. 12/07/07 Damage to a police property window in the custody room, after arrest for a “Bike Lock Chain.” 13. **Destroy Or (Value of Damage £5000 Or Less -Offence Against Criminal Damage Act 1971 Only) X1** 14. 10/11/01 Damage property of a Clock on the wall, when I chased a man into his house”   “I needed to catch a bloke, he never wanted me to have caught him so, we ended up running down a road with me trying to grab him and he ran into a house. I thought this house was his home, but it was not. When I chased him through the front door there was a clock on the wall, and it fell to the floor by mistake and damaged. Police charged me with damaging the clock by the owner of the house with the help of the police.”   1. **Burglary (With Intent) To Steal – Dwelling X1** 2. 10/05/98 I got myself into trouble with friends 3. **Burglary And Theft Non-Dwelling X1** 4. 28/01/98 5. **Burglary And Theft Non-Dwelling X1** 6. 03/01/98 “When I was a child, I was sleeping rough at this stage in my life I met an adult who was in a comparable situation, and we started to wonder London’s Streets at night together. When walking we saw a school window that someone had left open and to get into the window someone had to climb up a drainpipe and stupidly, I took the job of climbing up and in doing so I left my fingerprints. The police later arrested me for my bad judgment, and I was remorseful for my wrongdoings.” 7. **Burglary (With Intent) To Steal – Dwelling X1** 8. 22/05/97 “I was living in a children’s home and there was an argument with staff that I had over money that should have got issued to me but because I would not come home over the nights because I liked living with my girlfriend then at the time and with her mother they refused to pay me when I got home and because of this I got into the office without breaking anything or getting detected and picked up the money box and left the building. The police later arrested me.” | |  | * Under the [Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1974/53) criminal convictions can become spent or ignored after a rehabilitation period.    |  |  | | --- | --- | | **A Custodial Sentence Of 6 Months or Less** | “The end of the period of 24 months beginning with the day on which the sentence (including any licence period) is completed.” | | **A Fine** | “The end of the period of 12 months beginning with the date of the conviction in respect of which the sentence is imposed.” | | **A Compensation Order** | “The date on which the payment is made in full.” | | **A Community or Youth Rehabilitation Order** | “The end of the period of 12 months beginning with the day provided for by or under the order as the last day on which the order is to have effect.” | | **Driving Endorsements** | “5 years from the date of conviction.” | | **Driving Disqualification** | “When the period of the disqualification has passed.” | | **Absolute Discharge** | “Spent immediately.” | |   Because the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police never arrested the Now Claimant for the organisation of illegal raves and just landed a scattered Asbo Application outside of his front door  and other issues such as Errors in my PNC files that I and my mother complained about I have included the relevant emails below in this table in date order,   * The Judge and Prosecution changed the Asbo condition when I was not at the at the Court nor was my Solicitor or any other representation for myself.   They made this change of conditions at the appeal trial and due to the Judge changing his honored word.  A couple of days before the 1st trial date of the appeal at Wood Green Crown Court my Solicitor tried to dismiss me as her client, she asked the Judge when I was there, he asked me how I felt about this, and I gave more than good enough reason for her not to be able to leave, the Judge agreed with me, and I keep the same firm. He put conditions down that the firm cannot leave me unless Michael Carroll, the director, comes to Court himself and explains with good reason he would want to do so, a new trial date got set for months later again.  The day before the next trial we all had to attend Court for a preliminary hearing to make sure all was set for the next day, I and my mother were both at the Court at suitable times as the doors opened to the public. We waited outside the Court room for quite a long time until the Judge called us into the Courtroom by asking the Court Ashur.  The Judge told me that I would not have a Solicitor for my trial the next day as he had allowed her to leave as she no longer wanted to stand in for me. I asked the Judge about his order from the prior time when this happened before and if Michael Carroll attended and he told me no. The Judge explained that if I cannot get a Solicitor by the next day, I must act for myself, or he will find my guilt in my absinth.  My mother and I found another Solicitor firm and addressed the appeal the next day. My new Solicitor asked for an extension of time as he does not know anything about the case and it had been going on for some time making the files very large in size the Judge bullied the new Solicitor and told him no the new Solicitor explained that he would not be able to have my best interests in heart without the extension of time but the Judge was adamant in his order, my Solicitor asked the Judge for 5 minutes so, he could telephone his company partners for a decision and after a while the Court started again, and he could no longer act on my behalf.  My mother would not let me attend Court for the trial the next day but what she did do was request a copy of the Court transcribe as she did also, in the magistrates’ Courts. When the transcribes arrived the Courts had missed the first day out of when my new Solicitor attended but added the days I could not go. This is when the Judge changed my bail conditions, but no person afterwards would ever explain what had changed.  It is also, when sally Gilchrist the legal director for Scotland yard who stands for the whole of the United Kingdom and whales as the legal governor, who was my case handler through the whole-time scale of the Asbo personally.  She attended all Court cases with the prosecutor and other staff and on the appeal trial date when I was not present in the transcribes admits that there are no victims or any person who would sign a statement or attend Court and continued to explain how she based all the evidence in the whole Asbo case on the forged police cads what is against the law.  When the Judge changed the conditions, he said, as I can read, that the past conditions were a breach of my human rights as I and my mother had been complaining about from the start of proceedings and not that the below made them much better.  One more thing to say, the transcribes for the appeal stage do not make sense, when trying to read. I have updated them on in the server at  Please read after going through this document first. They are under Asbo or at the bottom of all the tables.  [https://horrific-corruption-files.serveblog.net/flipbook-indexs/flipbook-allwithlinks-indexs/](https://horrific-corruption-files.serveblog.net/Flipbook-Indexs/Flipbook-AllWithLinks-Indexs/)  Also, read “private homes and gardens”  [https://horrific-corruption-files.serveblog.net/a%20snippet-from-the-licencing-act-2003/](https://horrific-corruption-files.serveblog.net/A%20Snippet-from-the-Licencing-Act-2003/)  Condition 7: from any shop or garage or fuel supplier which is open to the public at such times.  Then in such an event, you may enter but you must not remain on such property for longer than 30 minutes and you  Condition 8: may do so on only one occasion during each separate nine-hour period between 22:00 and 07:00 daily  **End of Snippet**  **Also see Snippet Raves Act 1994 Section 63**  [https://www.cps.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/legal\_guidance/ THE-CRIMINAL-JUSTICE-AND-PUBLIC-ORDER-ACT-1994.pdf](https://www.cps.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/legal_guidance/%0bTHE-CRIMINAL-JUSTICE-AND-PUBLIC-ORDER-ACT-1994.pdf)  Open and look at **page 3**  **Sentence guidelines** and **section 63 =** All the events I got set up for were in buildings and police statements say with Section 144, LASPO’s present.   1. The Now Claimant Has **Exhibited** his evidence of findings as number **“8”** in the Table that is below this table, and he named the file as: “**The Combined Criminal Recorded File**” with a searchable arrest summons of: “**13/0000/00/625125u**”   **How to use this joint file**  Open the file with word and in the bottom right corner you will see three icons next to the word focus, click on the last one web layout then use the mouse and right click in Microsoft Word, press control f to open navigation bar on the right and make sure you selected it in headers.  Then click on  “Work Out Code” text at the top of the document right click and go to “expand /collapse” and go to collapse all headings. Use the arrows at the beginning of text to dropdown the files and reclose them afterwards.  The work out file is my algorithm that I have created to understand things a little better. We will come back to that in a moment.  The rest of the links below are the filing index for the police national computer system when regulating civilian’s personal data.  The links marked in red are self-explanatory.  The green text that starts at number “1” is the times that police have arrested the Now Claimant and has the information about these times including the outcome.  I have added all three Acro reports for the years **2017, 2020, 2021** and they are in each arrested e.g., “1” in header navigation bar & main document.  Once you have had a look around right click on the heading again and collapse it all, then open the work out code.  This will show a table  The dates start at the top with the most current event that has taken place then go down the document backwards in time.  Without going into everything that the table shows I will get straight to the point.  68 Arrests show under “**Nub**” Under the title marked as “**NFA Date**” you will notice all the cases that I have one and the dates associated with them arrests.  This information includes on the spot penalties and shows how long ago the police have not found the Now Claimant guilty of any offence.  The times that the police have arrested the Now Claimant he is not proud of, but he can explain what happed extremely easy on these occurrences and they do not amount to any reason for the police or Enfield Council to punish or set him up the way that they have. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criminal Record Acro Report the Combined File**  **EXHIBIT I** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Original files:** | | * [**Abracadabra:** - New 30-5-22 Combined 2017,2020,2021 WORK OUT CODE PNC.docx](https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Temp/1%20PNC%20Errors%20Updated%2030-05-2022%20-%201/PNC%20Errors%20Updated%2012-01-2022%20-%201/New%2030-5-22%20Combined%202017,2020,2021%20WORK%20OUT%20CODE%20PNC.docx) * [**Shazam:** - Original Court Application Case File 1](https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Temp/1%20PNC%20Errors%20Updated%2030-05-2022%20-%201/PNC%20Errors%20Updated%2012-01-2022%20-%201/Original%20Court%20Application%20Case%20File%201/) * [**Alakazam-Zoom:** - Police PNC Record Emails.docx](https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Temp/1%20PNC%20Errors%20Updated%2030-05-2022%20-%201/PNC%20Errors%20Updated%2012-01-2022%20-%201/Police%20PNC%20Record%20Emails.docx) * [**Open Sesame:** Simulation Criminal Record 1](https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Temp/1%20PNC%20Errors%20Updated%2030-05-2022%20-%201/PNC%20Errors%20Updated%2012-01-2022%20-%201/Simulation%201/) | | | | | | | |
| **2019** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Numb** | **Arrest/**  **Summons**  **Ref** | **Date**  **Arrested** | **Last Updated** | **Case**  **Name** | **Arresting**  **Officer** | **Police Force** | **Remand** | **NFA**  **Date**  **:** | **Offence Dates** |
|  | 19/0000/00/592734e | 26/05/19 | 28/05/19 | Burglary in other than dwelling was person subjected to violence or threat of violence | Law  PC  233651 | Met | Yes, one Bail Condition | **“Won.”**  16/07/20 | 26/05/19 |
| **[EXHIBIT I1]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. 13, & a Half Months 2. Condition 1: Not to Contact Directly or Indirectly  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. Arrested **26/05/19** 2. Remanded on police bail on **27/05/2019** At: at 01yd 3. To appear at: next appearing on **24/06/2019** At: at 01yd  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. There are also more bail dates up to**16/07/2020** / **21/10/2022** 2. This happened because Enfield Council, Metropolitan Police and NHS Doctors allowed Members of my Neighbors to 3. **Getting Arrested Partly for Trusting Alley!** While indoors I started to tidy up, straight after awaking at 07:00am. I soon afterwards found myself sitting back at my commuter table working hard and of no bother to any other person by the time of 7:30Am.  * [New parts 14-10-21 need to put in diary.docx](https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Temp/Neighbours%20Only/Neighbours%20Only/New%20parts%2014-10-21%20need%20to%20put%20in%20diary.docx) | | | | | | | |
| **2018** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Numb** | **Arrest/**  **Summons**  **Ref** | **Date**  **Arrested** | **Last Updated** | **Case**  **Name** | **Arresting**  **Officer** | **Police Force** | **Remand** | **NFA**  **Date**  **:** | **Offence Dates** |
|  | 18/01yd/01/8306e | 25/10/18 | 25/10/18 | Assault occasioning actual bodily harm offence date(s): 25/10/18 | Sabri  PC  243525 | Met | Yes, one Bail Condition | **“Won.”**  06/02/20 | 25/10/18 |
| **[EXHIBIT I2]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. 01 Year 03 Months 2. **Condition 1:** Not to Contact Directly or Indirectly … 3. **Condition 2:** Not to Enter the Block of Flats Numbered 105 Burncroft Avenue En3  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. \*\*\*  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. This happened because Enfield Council, Metropolitan Police and NHS Doctors allowed Members of my Neighbours to 2. A  * [0 2018 p2 of 2 = 1.docx](https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Temp/New%20Diary%20New%2028_05_22%20-%2021.6%20Gb/Diary%20New%2028_05_22/0%202018%20p2%20of%202%20=%201.docx) | | | | | | | |
|  | 18/01yd/01/4274x | 31/05/18 | 05/02/20 | Harassment - breach of civil injunction offence date(s): 30/05/18 | Stylianou  PC  242454  YE | Met | Yes, one Bail Condition | **“Won.”**  05/02/20 | 30/05/18  31/05/18 |
| **[EXHIBIT I3]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. 01 Year 08 Months 05 Days 2. **Condition 1:** Not to Contact Directly or Indirectly … 3. **Condition 2:** Not to Enter the Block of Flats Numbered 105 Burncroft Avenue En3  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. Remanded on police bail on **31/05/18** at 01yd 2. To appear at: next appearing on **22/06/18**   “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”   1. This happened because Enfield Council, Metropolitan Police and NHS Doctors allowed Members of my Neighbours to 2. A  * [0 2018 1st half = 1.docx](https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Temp/New%20Diary%20New%2028_05_22%20-%2021.6%20Gb/Diary%20New%2028_05_22/0%202018%201st%20half%20=%201.docx) | | | | | | | |
|  | 18/01yd/01/1984h | 15/03/18 | 18/12/18 | Affray | Sefil  PC  235331 | Met | Yes, one Bail Condition | **“Won.”**  18/12/18 | 15/03/18 |
| **[EXHIBIT I4]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. 08 Months 03 Days 2. **Condition 1:** Not to Attend 117 Burncroft Ave En3 3. **Condition 2:** Not to Contact Any Of …  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. Remanded On Police Bail On **15/03/18** At 01yd 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **05/04/18** At: At 01yd  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. This happened because Enfield Council, Metropolitan Police and NHS Doctors allowed Members of my Neighbours to 2. On the day of the **15/03/2018** I did not want to leave my flat due to the forged Court Order Application’s that Enfield Council Forged against me and because they abused my name and without my legal consent putting me in danger. 3. But I still had to go to the shop no matter what to get living essentials. 4. I looked in my hallway to make sure that no neighbors who had been attacking me or set up the forged applications with the council and Police Officers help were present. 5. I got to the shop safely and on my way back I must cut across my estate’s car park, when doing so, I looked and could see Markandu Mathiyalagan and his wife waiting in the car park with their children present next to their car. 6. I decided to walk past them and just get back into my house so I could win the case they had brought against me, as I walked past Markandu Mathiyalagan got his mobile phone out and decided to start to record me. I thought of it as a cheap trick that will not full me and I just walked straight past him and his family. 7. I Got to the entrance of my building by doing as I intended. And appeared around me to see the Mathiyalagan family in their car driving past with Ms. Mathiyalagan in the passenger seat with a mobile phone up to her side window and still as if it were on video recording and recording myself. I turned around and started to look with my right hand in my pockets for my keys with my shopping from the shops to which I had just been still in my left hand. 8. I heard a loud voice shout at me from the other side of the road to where I was standing before I could open my community front door. I quickly re-analyzed my surroundings and noticed Mr. Mathiyalagan’s car parked on the side road leading out of the estate and him across the road trying to wind me up with his phone still in his hand. I looked around and see his wife and child still in the car, I then next put my shopping on the floor outside of my door and walked toward this strange man. 9. I knew what he had done to me and the history behind us since the date he became an unsecure tenant who occupies a flat in the same block of flats where I live inside of as a secure tenant. 10. As I got to the carb of the same side of road that my flats are located on, I noticed Mr. Mathiyalagan while on the other side of the road run towards his car and open the boot of his car, he then proceeded to take a meatal object out of the boot in an aggressive manner which I now know to be a meatal pole. I choose not to show that his actions would leave me scared in my own home of him and to stand out what he was doing as he then on run at me with his metal pole in his hand to assault me even further. 11. This led to me having to protect myself. 12. **How things got worse.** 13. Across the road from the block of flats where I and the Mathiyalagan family lived is a delightful home which is a house, and this home always has one of the nicest cars on the estate parked outside of it that the owner takes out to car shows. 14. **Back to the scene** 15. Mr. Mathiyalagan came at me with his choose to weapon a metal pole, so, I first moved out of the way, but he was determined to get one over on me I could tell by his besotted eyes that raged with anger and hatred at me as he stared to lash his metal pole around in his hand trying to make physical contact with me. 16. I made a mistake while avoiding the estranged man with his metal pole, 17. before I realized I had gone too close to the nice car. I heard a noise and by that time it was too late as Mr. Mathiyalagan hit the car with his long metal pole and damaged it 18. I shouted at him about what he had done but this was not enough to stop him. 19. I creeped around the now damaged car and got to the owner’s front door and knocked on it and as soon as I had done this I had to quickly move away as the Mathiyalagan was coming with his pole again. I can remember myself shouting aloud look what you have done to the car as I moved away from him. 20. A new person came to the front door and the Mathiyalagan got closer and closer with his swinging of the metal pole to my body. 21. I decided enough is enough and I need to disarm this man before he done real damage.  * [0 2018 1st half = 1.docx](https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Temp/New%20Diary%20New%2028_05_22%20-%2021.6%20Gb/Diary%20New%2028_05_22/0%202018%201st%20half%20=%201.docx) | | | | | | | |
|  | 18/01yd/01/259h | 09/01/18 | 08/04/20 | Threats to kill | Razzaq  DC  228598 | Met | Yes, one Bail Condition | **“Won.”**  08/04/20 | 09/01/18 |
| **[EXHIBIT I5]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. 02 Years 03 Months 2. **Condition 1:** Not to Contact Directly or Indirectly Any … 3. **Condition 2:** Not to Engage in Threatening Conduct That Is Likely to Cause Physical or Verbal Abuse to The Employee S Of the London Borough of Enfield  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. Remanded On Police Bail On **10/01/18** At 01yd 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **05/02/18** At 01yd  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. This happened because Enfield Council, Metropolitan Police and NHS Doctors allowed Members of my Neighbours to 2. This is about Lemmy Nwabusi, who works for Enfield Council, who keeps setting me up for things and on this day because I am telephoning him. 3. Lemmy Nwabuisi made lies up and got me arrested to create the 2nd Injunction Order because he lost the other case and never wanted me to be able to reveal what had happened prior.  * [0 2018 1st half = 1.docx](https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Temp/New%20Diary%20New%2028_05_22%20-%2021.6%20Gb/Diary%20New%2028_05_22/0%202018%201st%20half%20=%201.docx)  1. I had been getting my Human Rights violated by cruel malicious treatment that the government allowed to continue and took part in and while I and they knew that I was an innocent person in all claims set out against myself. 2. The government officials created mutable forged Court application to infringe my legal rights and deprive me of my way of life. 3. The Mathiyalagan family who lived above me, who had been assaulting me mentally causing physical and mental harm, need to cover up with the council allowed them to do illegally to me. 4. I and my mother had reported The Mathiyalagan family to the police and Enfield Council for their illegal activities, but the council pretended that I was the one that was crazy to cover up doing a fair investigation into mine and others claims for what we could prove to be true because they were as guilty as the Mathiyalagan family. 5. The reason the police and Enfield Council wanted to cover up everything was because they frauded an Asbo application that I was hot on their cases for so, they abused their positions to prevent me from revealing to the public the truth to help get them arrested.   **B. 1ST Possession Order –** this possession order had a knock-on effect, which the government officials caused who forged the Abo had achieved by darkening my name.  The corrupt official’s outcome had turned my neighbors against myself & due to my mother and I complaining about what the Police, Enfield Council and the Neighbors were all allowed to do to me against my free will the council and police override the correct decisions to protect me and collaborated with who I and my mother had been complaining about, Members of my neighbors alongside themselves.  They created forged accusations and filed them in Government Computer systems as files against myself while applying for illegal Court applications that I and my mother could prove beyond reasonable doubt were not true.  The Enfield Council officials who took apart met and conspired with members of my neighbors at meetings in their offices and at neighbors’ houses in a criminal plot against I to cover up their past illegal activities with members of the Metropolitan police in creating the Asbo and for allowing my neighbors then afterwards to attack me due to rumors that was getting spread about my name.  The Criminal Plot –  Because I was trying to revel  and by doing so, they all involved would go to prison for more than a lengthy period.  The Enfield Council was supposed to serve the first possession Order in various stages by law.  The first is the Council  The Enfield Council never took the first possession Order back to Court as I disputed the allegations held inside of the context of the application.  The Enfield Council never served me, and this happened because I telephoned the case developer who was also the case handler who worked for the Enfield Council, our conversation made him and his team colleges aware of vital errors that they had created when forging the application.  While on the phone to Lemmy “Telephone conversations recorded”  In the end of the 1st Possession Order  C. **Injunction Order.**  Enfield Council Forged the 1st Possession Order then Forged the 1st Injunction Order and all while they avoided mine and my mother’s complaints, we sent to them. Enfield Council did not treat us per the laws or regulations to which it is mandatory for them to govern and because of this I continued to get assaulted.  **Discrimination = Race relations Act 1976 (Repealed) Race relations Act 2000 / to the Equality Act 2010**  ==  **Search;** Discriminatory advertisements  **-**  These Laws Regs would Subside Alongside with any other United Kingdom Laws & Compulsory Regulations or Statutory Duties that the Now Claimant has had violated.  -- | | | | | | | |
| **2016** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Numb** | **Arrest/**  **Summons**  **Ref** | **Date**  **Arrested** | **Last Updated** | **Case**  **Name** | **Arresting**  **Officer** | **Police Force** | **Remand** | **NFA**  **Date**  **:** | **Offence Dates** |
|  | 16/01ye/01/3890g | 04/10/16 | 21/11/16 | Non-conviction  Not guilty  01 (metropolitan police)  Using threatening, abusive, insulting words or behavior (with intent) to cause fear or provoke action of violence  **Photograph three** | Campbell  PC  205732 | Met | Yes two  Bail Conditions | **“Won.”**  16/11/16  At north London  Magistrates Court ref: 16/2572-  /124001k1 discount-  Insurance | 14/08/16 |
| **[EXHIBIT I6]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. At North London Magistrates Court Ref: 16/2572- /124001k1 Discontinuance 2. 01 Month 12 Days 3. **Condition 1:** Not to Contact Directly or Indirectly, … Or … 4. **Condition 2:** Exclusion: Not to Enter Burncroft Avenue En3 5. **Condition 3:** Residence: Live and Sleep Each Night at his Mother’s Address  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. **1:** Remanded in Custody On **05/10/16** At 01ye 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **05/10/16** At North London Magistrates 3. **2:** Remanded on Bail On **05/10/16** At North London Magistrates 4. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **17/11/16** At North London Magistrates   “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”   1. This happened because Enfield Council, Metropolitan Police and NHS Doctors allowed Members of my Neighbours to 2. George’s bike Case cps lost case on the **17/11/2016.** 3. Lemmy met George after police and CPS lost case on the **11/01/2017** and used the NFA File in Court against me to make Forged Court Order Applications.  * [0 2016 Last three months New = 1.docx](https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Temp/New%20Diary%20New%2028_05_22%20-%2021.6%20Gb/Diary%20New%2028_05_22/0%202016%20%20Last%20three%20months%20New%20=%201.docx) | | | | | | | |
|  | 16/01yd/01/6024b | 14/08/16 | 28/10/16 | Threats to kill | Campbell  PC  205732 | Met | Yes, one Bail Condition | **“Won.”**  NFA (No further action)  28/10/16  At 01  (Metropolitan  Police)  Fs/ref: 01 (Metropolitan  Police) | 14/08/16 |
| **[EXHIBIT I7]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. NFA (No Further Action) 28/10/16 At 01 (Metropolitan Police) Fs/Ref: 01 (Metropolitan Police) 2. 02 Months 14 Days 3. Set up to go to the Mental Health Hospital then Conditions to stay at my mother’s home.  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. Remanded On Police Bail On **15/08/16** At 01yd 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **04/10/16** At: At 01ye  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. This happened because Enfield Council, Metropolitan Police and NHS Doctors allowed Members of my Neighbours to 2. The Christine & Carron Case who were helping Stain 111 Burncroft Avenue hurt me and getting involved themselves. 3. Arrested for completely made up lies by them **14/08/2016** after me and mother put in complaint about my neighbors with no fair follow up. 4. Detained in St Ann’s Hospital: **15/08/2016** by police at Edmonton station for their lies and to help the police and council get away with the forged Asbo Application the Neighbors slandered the claimants name also, as the police and Enfield Council let them violate his Human Rights. 5. Christine and Carron used an incident that sort of occurred days prior to this date to make up their lies on the **14/08/2016** 6. The date the police Enfield Council and Christine and Carron alongside Stain and Co set me up with their fake story as they made it up was the **11/08/2016** 7. This was not the first time they tried to set me up, in fact they even got phone calls made to my mother and father prior to this date accusing me of lies, so they both rushed to my front door to find that Christine and Carron and Stain had manipulated them. 8. Date **00/00/2016** 9. **06/07/2016** is the first date in Stains History 10. Released from St Ann’s Hospital: **28/08/2016** 11. Formal Complaint dated by mother and me **24/08/2016** 12. Waiting to return on police bail for Christine and Carron setting me up and getting me put in a mental hospital: **04/10/2016** 13. George’s bike he starts on me while I am in my Barth: **04/10/2016** 14. Christine & Carron Case dropped Info: **16/11/2016 / 17/11/2016** with George’s bike. 15. Lemmy met Christine and Carron after police cps lost case to use the dead cases to make the possession order and other Court applications. 16. Formal Complaint by mother and I again dated **29/11/2016.** 17. A  * [0 2016 Newish p1 of 2 = 1.docx](https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Temp/New%20Diary%20New%2028_05_22%20-%2021.6%20Gb/Diary%20New%2028_05_22/0%202016%20Newish%20p1%20of%202%20=%201.docx) | | | | | | | |
| **2013** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Numb** | **Arrest/**  **Summons**  **Ref** | **Date**  **Arrested** | **Last Updated** | **Case**  **Name** | **Arresting**  **Officer** | **Police Force** | **Remand** | **NFA**  **Date**  **:** | **Offence Dates** |
|  | 13/0000/00/625125u | 25/06/13 | 02/07/14 | Southwark  Burglary and  Theft –  Non-dwelling  **Photograph three** | Mayhew  DC  204182  MD | Met |  | **“Won.”**  01/07/14  At Woolwich Crown Court ref: 13/2576/95-  178e 1 no evidence offered - dismissed - t20130649 | 01/05/13 To 08/05/13 |
| **[EXHIBIT I8]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. At Woolwich Crown Court Ref: 13/2576/95- 178e 1 No Evidence Offered - Dismissed - T20130649 2. 12 Months 06 Days 3. **Condition 1:** \*\* Bail Conditions Apply Until Next Court Appearance at Above Court. \*\* 4. **Condition 2:** To Live and Sleep Each Night at Above Address 5. **Condition 3:** To Observe a Curfew Between the Hours Of 20:00 And 06:00 \*\* With Doorstep Conditions \*\* 6. **Condition 4:** To Report to Edmonton Police Station Each Sunday Between 12:00 And 14:00 7. **Condition 5:** Must Not Enter the London Borough of Southwark 8. **Condition 6:** \*\* **24th And 25th Dec 2013** to Reside at Address. 23 Byron Terr Ace, Hertford Road, Edmonton, London, N9 With Curfew as Before. On 31/12/13 To Reside At 90 Leven Road, Scotland, 9. **Condition 7:** PA15. Curfew Extended 01:00 - 06:00 No Doorstep. With Conditions as Before From 01/01/14 \*\*  * **Court & Police Station Dates**   **1**   1. Remanded In Custody On **26/06/13** At South London Magistrates 2. Next Appearing On **10/07/13** At Woolwich Crown   **2**   1. Remanded On Bail On **10/07/13** At Woolwich Crown 2. Next Appearing On **16/07/13** At Woolwich Crown   **3**   1. Remanded On Bail On **16/07/13** At Woolwich Crown 2. At Woolwich Crown Next Appearing On **16/08/13**   **4**   1. Remanded On Bail On **16/08/13** At Woolwich Crown 2. Next Appearing On **09/09/13** At Woolwich Crown   **5**   1. Remanded On Bail On **09/09/13** At Woolwich Crown 2. Next Appearing On **19/11/13** At Woolwich Crown   **6**   1. Remanded On Bail On **20/11/13** At East London Magistrates 2. Next Appearing On **23/12/13** At Woolwich Crown   **7**   1. Remanded On Bail On **23/12/13** At Woolwich Crown 2. Next Appearing On **08/04/14** At Woolwich Crown   **8**   1. Remanded On Bail On **08/04/14** At Woolwich Crown 2. Next Appearing On **01/07/14** At Woolwich Crown  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. The Gazebo Case 2. A  * [0 2013 from the 05th = 1....docx](https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Temp/New%20Diary%20New%2028_05_22%20-%2021.6%20Gb/Diary%20New%2028_05_22/0%202013%20from%20the%2005th%20=%201....docx) | | | | | | | |
|  | 13/0000/00/484853z | 15/05/13 | 16/05/13 | Possession of a  Controlled  Drug  - Class B - cannabis/  Cannabis Resin | O’Mahoney  PC  226527 | Met |  | **“Lost”**  Penalty  Notice  Issued on 15/05/13  At 01  (Metropolitan  Police)  Fs/ref: 01 (Metropolitan  Police) | 15/05/13 |
| **[EXHIBIT I9]** | | * **“Lost”**  1. Penalty Notice Issued On **15/05/13** At 01 (Metropolitan Police) Fs/Ref: 01 (Metropolitan Police) 2. 1 Day  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. N/a in Acro Report!  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A  * [0 2013 from the 05th = 1....docx](https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Temp/New%20Diary%20New%2028_05_22%20-%2021.6%20Gb/Diary%20New%2028_05_22/0%202013%20from%20the%2005th%20=%201....docx) | | | | | | | |
|  | 13/01ht/01/1537c | 07/04/13 | 25/07/13 | Using vehicle  While  Uninsured  **Photograph five** | Aston  PC  232845 | Met |  | **“Won.”**  23/07/13  At east  London  Magistrates  Court ref: 13/2574-  /60295a1  Withdrawn  Final | 07/04/13 |
| **[EXHIBIT I10]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. At East London Magistrates Court Ref: 13/2574-/60295a1 Withdrawn Final 2. 14 Months 16 Days  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. Remanded On Bail On **07/04/13** At 01ht 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **23/07/13** At East London Magistrates  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A  * [0 2013 1st 5 months = 1.docx](https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Temp/New%20Diary%20New%2028_05_22%20-%2021.6%20Gb/Diary%20New%2028_05_22/0%202013%201st%205%20months%20=%201.docx) | | | | | | | |
|  | 13/01kw/01/669j | 24/01/13 | 25/01/13 | Burglary and  Theft  Non-dwelling | Cliffen  SC  521217 | Met |  | **“Won.”**  NFA (No further action)  25/01/13  At 01  (Metropolitan  Police) | 24/01/13 |
| **[EXHIBIT I11]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. NFA (No Further Action) **25/01/13** At 01 (Metropolitan Police) 2. 01 Day  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. N/a in Acro Report!  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A  * [0 2013 1st 5 months = 1.docx](https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Temp/New%20Diary%20New%2028_05_22%20-%2021.6%20Gb/Diary%20New%2028_05_22/0%202013%201st%205%20months%20=%201.docx) | | | | | | | |
| **2012** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Numb** | **Arrest/**  **Summons**  **Ref** | **Date**  **Arrested** | **Last Updated** | **Case**  **Name** | **Arresting**  **Officer** | **Police Force** | **Remand** | **NFA**  **Date**  **:** | **Offence Dates** |
|  | 12/01ye/01/5001u | 15/10/12 | 03/01/13 | Hampshire magistrates  &  Winchester Crown  “theft” | Sims  PC  223781 | Met | Yes four  Bail Conditions | **“Won.”**  25/10/13  At  Winchester Crown  Court ref: 13/0465-  /193681f1  Not guilty | 13/08/12 |
| **[EXHIBIT I12]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. At Winchester Crown Court Ref: 13/0465-/193681f1 Not Guilty 2. 01 Year 10 Days  * **Court & Police Station Dates**   **1**   1. Remanded On Bail On **15/10/12** At 01ye 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **13/11/12** At Northwest Hampshire Magistrates   **2**   1. Remanded On Bail On **13/11/12** At North Hampshire Magistrates 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **11/12/12** At North Hampshire Magistrates   **3**   1. Remanded On Bail On **11/12/12** At North Hampshire Magistrates 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **02/01/13** At Winchester Crown   **4**   1. Remanded On Bail On **02/01/13** At Winchester Crown 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing Date Unknown at Winchester Crown  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 12/20dc/02/3727d | 14/08/12 | 25/08/12 | (West midlands  Police)  “Theft of vehicle”  **Photograph six** | Carey  PS  2831 | WMP | Yes, one Bail Condition | **“Won.”**  NFA (No further action)  25/08/12  At 20  (West Midlands police)  Fs/ref: twenty  (West  Midlands police) | 01/04/12 16:00  To  01/04/12 20:05 |
| **[EXHIBIT I13]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. NFA (No Further Action) **25/08/12** At 20 (West Midlands Police) Fs/Ref: 20 (West Midlands Police) 2. 11 Days  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. Remanded On Police Bail On **15/08/12** At 20 DC 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **12/09/12**  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
| **2005** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Numb** | **Arrest/**  **Summons**  **Ref** | **Date**  **Arrested** | **Last Updated** | **Case**  **Name** | **Arresting**  **Officer** | **Police Force** | **Remand** | **NFA**  **Date**  **:** | **Offence Dates** |
|  | 12/41hq/01/20685j | 13/08/12 | 13/09/13 | (Hertfordshire constabulary)  “robbery” | Coyle  PC  8 | HC | Yes, one Bail Condition | **“Won.”**  NFA (No further action)  18/09/12  At 41  (Hertfordshire Constabulary) | 16/04/05 13:40 |
| **[EXHIBIT I14]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. NFA (No Further Action) 18/09/12 At 41 (Hertfordshire Constabulary) 2. 01 Month 06 Days 3. **Condition 1:** Not to Contact Directly or Indirectly Any Witness Connected to This Investigation 4. **Condition 2:** Not to Enter Hertfordshire Except to Answer Police Bail 5. **Condition 3:** Res Mothers Address  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. Remanded On Police Bail On **14/08/12** At 41k1 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **18/09/12** At 41k1  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
| **2009** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Numb** | **Arrest/**  **Summons**  **Ref** | **Date**  **Arrested** | **Last Updated** | **Case**  **Name** | **Arresting**  **Officer** | **Police Force** | **Remand** | **NFA**  **Date**  **:** | **Offence Dates** |
|  | 11/01ye/01/5200l | 04/09/11 | 20/01/12 | 1. Possessing controlled Drug (with intent) to supply – Class B – amphetamine 2. Possessing offensive weapons in public. | Geraghty  PC  232507 | Met | Yes six  Bail Conditions | **“Won.”**  NFA (No further Action) 19/10/11 At 01 (metropolitan police) Fs/ref: 01 (metropolitan police)  **“Won.”**  NFA (No further action) 19/10/11 At 01 (metropolitan police) | 1. Offence   Date(S):  04/09/11   1. 04/09/11 |
| **[EXHIBIT I15]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. 45 Days 2. **1.** NFA (No Further Action) 19/10/11 At 01 (Metropolitan Police) Fs/Ref: 01 (Metropolitan Police)  * **“Won.”**  1. **2.** NFA (No Further Action) 19/10/11 At 01 (Metropolitan Police)  * **Court & Police Station Dates**   **1**   1. Remanded On Police Bail On **05/09/11** At 01ye 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **19/10/11** At 01ye   **2**   1. Remanded On Bail On **19/10/11** At 01ye 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **04/11/11** At Enfield Magistrates   **3**   1. Remanded On Bail On **04/11/11** At Enfield Magistrates 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On 16/12/11 At Enfield Magistrates   **4**   1. Remanded On Bail On **16/12/11** At North London Magistrates 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **23/12/11** At North London Magistrates   **5**   1. Remanded On Bail On **23/12/11** At North London Magistrates 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **20/01/12** At Wood Green Crown   **6**   1. Remanded On Bail On **20/01/12** At Wood Green Crown 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing Date Unknown at Wood Green Crown  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
| **2010** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Numb** | **Arrest/**  **Summons**  **Ref** | **Date**  **Arrested** | **Last Updated** | **Case**  **Name** | **Arresting**  **Officer** | **Police Force** | **Remand** | **NFA**  **Date**  **:** | **Offence Dates** |
|  | 10/01ye/01/7294n | 04/12/10 | 26/01/11 | Destroy or  Damage property  (Value of  Damage £5000  Or less -offence against criminal  Damage  Act 1971 only) | Yianni  PC  222116 | Met | Yes two  Bail Conditions | **“Won.”**  NFA (No further action)  26/01/11  At 01  (Metropolitan  Police) | 05/12/10 |
| **[EXHIBIT I16]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. NFA (No Further Action) 26/01/11 At 01 (Metropolitan Police) 2. 01 Month 25 Days 3. **Condition 1:** To Live and Sleep at Your Home Address Of 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, En3 7jq 4. **Condition 2:** To Adhere to A Nighttime Curfew at Your Home Address Between the Hours Of 2200 - 0600hrs 5. **Condition 3:** Not to Associate With  * **Court & Police Station Dates**   **1**   1. Remanded On Police Bail On **05/12/10** At 01ye 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **26/01/11** At 01ye   **2**   1. Remanded On Police Bail On **05/12/10** At 01ye 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **29/03/11** At 01ye  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 10/01gn/01/2357x | 02/05/10 | 02/05/10 | Possessing  Controlled  Drug  Class A  Other | Slater  DC  229876 | Met | No | **“Won.”**  NFA (No further action)  02/05/10  At 01  (Metropolitan  Police) | 02/05/10 |
| **[EXHIBIT I17]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. 01 Day 2. NFA (No Further Action) 02/05/10 At 01 (Metropolitan Police)  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. N/a in Acro Report!  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
| **2009** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Numb** | **Arrest/**  **Summons**  **Ref** | **Date**  **Arrested** | **Last Updated** | **Case**  **Name** | **Arresting**  **Officer** | **Police Force** | **Remand** | **NFA**  **Date**  **:** | **Offence Dates** |
|  | 09/0000/00/929328d | 14/10/09 | 03/11/09 | 1. (Hampshire constabulary)   Theft –  Shoplifting   1. Not surrendering to custody at appointed time 2. Not surrendering to custody   As soon as  Practicable  After appointed time | Jennings  PC  20638 |  | Yes, one Bail Condition | **“Lost”**   1. 03/11/09   At south-east  Hampshire  Magistrates Court ref: 09/1782/-155908t1 conditional  Discharge six  Months (months) two costs £85.00  **“Won.”**   1. 03/11/09 at southeast Hampshire magistrates   Court  Ref: 09/1782/155908t1 withdrawn final  **“Won.”**   1. 03/11/09 at southeast Hampshire Magistrates Court ref: 09/1782/155   908t1 withdrawn final | Offence date(S):   1. 14/10/09 14:30 To 14/10/09 15:10 2. 23/10/09 3. 23/10/09 |
| **[EXHIBIT I18]** | | * **“LOST”**  1. **1.** **03/11/09** At South-East Hampshire Magistrates Court Ref: 09/1782/-155908t1 Conditional Discharge 6 Months (Months) 2 Costs £85.00 2. 20 Days  * **“Won.”**  1. **2. 03/11/09** At Southeast Hampshire Magistrates Court 2. Ref: 09/1782/155908t1 Withdrawn Final  * **“Won.”**  1. **3. 03/11/09** At Southeast Hampshire Magistrates Court Ref: 09/1782/155908t1 Withdrawn Final  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. Adjourned On **23/10/09** At Southeast Hampshire Magistrates 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing Date Unknown At **\*\* “Failed to Appear” \*\***  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 09/22ea/01/155u | 07/08/09 | 08/08/09 | (West Mercia Constabulary)  Possess a  Controlled drug  Class A  Crack cocaine | Barnes  DC  473 |  | No | **“Won.”**  NFA (No further action) 08/08/09 at 22 (West Mercia Constabulary) | 07/08/09 |
| **[EXHIBIT I19]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. 01 Day 2. NFA (No Further Action) **08/08/09** At 22 (West Mercia Constabulary)  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. N/a in Acro Report!  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 09/23n3/01/1708m | 25/07/09 | 04/09/09 | (Warwickshire Constabulary)  Possessing  Controlled  Drug  (With intent)  To supply –  Class a - md ma | Williamson  DC  568 |  | Yes, one Bail Condition | **“Won.”**  NFA (No further action)  03/09/09 at 23 (Warwickshire constabulary) | 25/07/09 |
| **[EXHIBIT I20]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. NFA (No Further Action) 03/09/09 At 23 (Warwickshire Constabulary) 2. 01 Month 09 Days  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. Remanded On Police Bail On **26/07/09** At 23n3 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **04/09/09** At 23s1  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 09/0000/00/530252a | 12/06/09 | 16/11/09 | (Hampshire Constabulary)  Possessing controlled drug  (With intent) to supply - class a – other | Thelwell  PC  21510  TR |  | Yes two  Bail Conditions | **“Won.”**  NFA (No further action) 10/11/09 at 44 (Hampshire constabulary | 12/06/09 22:00 to 12/06/09 23:30 |
| **[EXHIBIT I21]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. NFA (No Further Action) **10/11/09** At 44 (Hampshire Constabulary 2. 05 Months  * **Court & Police Station Dates**   **1**   1. Remanded On Police Bail On **13/06/09** At 44ln 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **15/09/09** At 44ln   **2**   1. Remanded On Police Bail On **13/06/09** At 44ln 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **15/09/09** At 44ln  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 09/0000/00/528079n | 11/06/09 | 03/11/09 | (Hampshire Constabulary)  Possession of  Ketamine  Class c  Controlled  Drug | Harrison smith  DC  23628 |  | Yes four  Bail Conditions | **“Lost”**  19/11/09 at isle of wight magistrate’s Court  Ref: 09/1945/156706y  One fine £50.00  Two cost £50.00  Three forfeitures under s27 misuse drugs act '71 | 11/06/09 21:30 to 11/06/09 21:44 |
| **[EXHIBIT I22]** | | * **“Lost”**  1. 19/11/09 At Isle of Wight Magistrates Court 2. Ref: 09/1945/156706y 3. 1 Fine £50.00 4. 2 Costs £50.00 5. 3 Forfeitures Under S27 Misuse Drugs Act '71 6. 04 Months 11 Days  * **Court & Police Station Dates**   **1**   1. Remanded On Police Bail On **12/06/09** At 44ln 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **05/08/09** At 44ln   **2**   1. Remanded On Bail On **19/10/09** At Isle of Wight Magistrates 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **27/10/09** At Isle of Wight Magistrates   **3**   1. Adjourned On **27/10/09** At Isle of Wight Magistrates 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing Date Unknown At **\*\* “Failed to Appear” \*\*\***   **4**   1. Adjourned On **30/10/09** At Isle of Wight Magistrates 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **19/11/09** At Isle of Wight Magistrates  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. **Ketamine: -** I went to a festival when I was much younger, and I had a Nitrous Oxide Bottle or more with me. I was giving away balloons when a young gentleman came up to me and he asked me if I would give him as “Many Balloons” as possible for Ketamine and he had no money on him. I explained to him that I do not take the stuff or neither do I sell stuff like that. He decided to stay with me for a while and get to know me a bit better, “Lol.” After a little while I gave him what he wanted and put the wrap in my money bag, “Not lol.” The day went on and it came to a stage where I needed to get something, so I left the bottle with my friend. While I was walking a police officer, officer taped me on the shoulder and asked me if I had anything that I should not on me I told him no, but he still wanted to search me. We went to a site tent and the police office asked me to search for my money bag. I gave it to him happily thinking all was “OK,” when he emptied the bag the wrap the gentlemen earlier had given me dropped into the tray. The police arrested me and released me afterwards and I then went to Court. End of story. 2. **\*\* “Failed to Appear” \*\*** | | | | | | | |
| Table  Description automatically generated | | | | | | | | | |
|  | 09/0000/00/174108m | 19/02/09 | 20/02/09 | Possess a  Controlled  Drug  Class b –  Cannabis resin | Macpherson  PC  223826  YE | Met | No | **“Lost”**  06/03/09  At Enfield magistrates  Court ref: 09/2757/41947f  One fine £65.00 - cn0900610376  Two forfeiture and destruction of cannabis resin  Three cost £40.00 | 19/02/09 |
| **[EXHIBIT I23]** | | * **“Lost”**  1. 06/03/09 At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 09/2757/41947f 2. 1 Fine £65.00 - Cn0900610376 3. 2 Forfeiture and Destruction of Cannabis Resin 4. 3 Costs £40.00 5. 15 Days  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. Offence Date(s): 19/02/09 2. Court Date: 06/03/09  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 09/01yf/01/152b | 05/02/09 | 15/06/09 | 1. Resist or Obstruct a Constable 2. Handling: - stolen goods (receiving) 3. Assault a constable | Seabright  PC  194907 | Met | Yes five  Bail Conditions | **“Won.”**   1. 19/10/09   At Enfield magistrates Court ref: 09/2757/56738h  1  No evidence offered - dismissed - case no 0901036681  Two: Bound over 6 months (months) 50.00  **“Won.”**   1. NFA (No further action)   24/03/09  At 01  (Metropolitan police)  **“Won.”**   1. NFA (No further action)   24/03/09  At 01  (Metropolitan police) | Offence date(s):   1. 05/02/09 2. 05/02/09 3. 05/02/09 |
| **[EXHIBIT I24]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. **1. 19/10/09** at Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 09/2757/56738h1 2. No Evidence Offered - Dismissed - Case No 0901036681 3. 2 Bound Over 6 Months (Months) 50.00 4. 08 Months 14 Days  * **“Won.”**  1. **2.** NFA (No Further Action) **24/03/09** 2. At 01 (Metropolitan Police) 3. 1 Month 20 Days  * **“Won.”**  1. **3.** NFA (No Further Action) 2. **24/03/09** 3. At 01 (Metropolitan Police Curfew) 4. 1 Month 20 Days  * **Court & Police Station Dates**   **1**   1. Remanded On Police Bail On **05/02/09** At: At 01yf 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **24/03/09** At 01ye   **2**   1. Remanded On Bail On **24/03/09** At: At 01ye 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **03/04/09** At: At Enfield Magistrates   **3**   1. Adjourned On **06/04/09** At: At Enfield Magistrates 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **01/06/09** At Enfield Magistrates   **4**   1. Adjourned On **01/06/09** At: At Enfield Magistrates 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **15/06/09** At Enfield Magistrates   **5**   1. Adjourned On **15/06/09** At: At Enfield Magistrates 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **19/10/09** At Enfield Magistrates  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 09/01ld/01/27q | 01/01/09 | 02/01/09 | Possessing controlled drug - class a - md ma | Leonard  PC  217596 | Met | Yes, one Bail Condition | **“Won.”**  NFA (No further action)  18/03/09 at 01 (Metropolitan Police) | 02/01/09 |
| **[EXHIBIT I25]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. NFA (No Further Action) **18/03/09** At 01 (Metropolitan Police) 2. 02 Months 17 Days  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. Remanded On Police Bail On **02/01/09** At 01ld 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **18/03/09** At 01ld  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
| **2008** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Numb** | **Arrest/**  **Summons**  **Ref** | **Date**  **Arrested** | **Last Updated** | **Case**  **Name** | **Arresting**  **Officer** | **Police Force** | **Remand** | **NFA**  **Date**  **:** | **Offence Dates** |
|  | 08/01yt/01/4253k | 15/11/08 | 24/02/09 | 1. Driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol   I came up at 39 milligrams.  --   * Although the legal limit is thirty-five micrograms of alcohol in one hundred milliliters of breath, suspects with breath test readings between thirty-six & below 40 Police should release without a caution and without charge.  1. Using vehicle while uninsured | Kneebone  PC  220999 | Met | Yes four  Bail Conditions | **“Lost”**   1. 27/03/09   At Haringey magistrates Court ref: 09/2742/48610a  One fine £100.00  Two disqualifications from driving reduced if course completed from twelve  Months  To 9 months  Three cost £50.00  Four driving licenses endorsed   1. 23/02/09   At Haringey magistrates Court ref: 09/2742/23443v  One withdrawn final | 1. 15/11/08 2. 15/11/08 |
| **[EXHIBIT I26]** | | * **“Lost”**  1. **1.** 27/03/09 At Haringey Magistrates Court Ref: 09/2742/48610a 2. 1 Fine £100.00 3. 2 Disqualifications from Driving Reduced If Course Completed From 12 4. Months 5. To 9 Months 6. 3 Costs £50.00 7. 4 Driving License Endorsed 8. 04 Month 14 Days Till **27/03/2010**  * **“Won.”**  1. **2. 23/02/09** At Haringey Magistrates Court Ref: 09/2742/23443v 1 Withdrawn Final 2. 03 Months 03 Days  * **Court & Police Station Dates**   **1**   1. Remanded On Police Bail On **15/11/08** At 01yt 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **23/12/08** At 01yt   **2**   1. Remanded On Bail On **09/01/09** At 01yt 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **23/01/09** At Haringey Magistrates   **3**   1. Adjourned On **09/02/09** At Haringey Magistrates 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **23/02/09** At Haringey Magistrates   **4**   1. Remanded On Bail On **23/02/09** At Haringey Magistrates 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **27/03/09** At Haringey Magistrates  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 08/01ye/01/4408d | 25/07/08 | 16/10/08 | Theft | Read  PC  224398  YE | Met | Yes four  Bail Conditions | **“Lost”**  16/10/08  At Wood Green Crown Court  Ref:  08/2757/114676r   1. Community order 12 months (months) t20080721-1   Supervision requirement  Program requirement | 25/07/08  22:40 |
| **[EXHIBIT I27]** | | * **“Lost”**  1. **16/10/08** At Wood Green Crown Court 2. **Ref:** 08/2757/114676r 3. Community Order 12 Months (Months) T20080721-1 Supervision Requirement Program Requirement 4. **Condition 1:** Bail Conditions Apply Until Next Appearance at The Above Crown Court. 5. **Condition 2:** Live and Sleep Each Night at The Above Bail Address 6. **Condition 3:** Curfew Hours Between 1200hrs and 0500hrs + Tagging 7. **Condition 4:** To Report to Edmonton Police Station Between 1100hrs and 1400hrs Each Mon, Wed and Saturday 8. **Condition 5:** Defendant Is to Cooperate with Probation for The Purposes of Compiling a Presentence Report 9. 02 months 22 days  * **Court & Police Station Dates**   **1**   1. Remanded In Custody On **26/07/08** At 01ye 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **28/07/08** At Enfield Magistrates   **2**   1. Remanded On Bail On **28/07/08** At Enfield Magistrates 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **07/09/08** At Enfield Magistrates   **3**   1. Remanded On Bail On **08/09/08** At Enfield Juvenile 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **05/10/08** At Enfield Juvenile   **4**   1. Remanded On Bail On **06/10/08** At Wood Green Crown 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **16/10/08** At Wood Green Crown  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 08/01ye/01/1626e | 18/03/08 | 05/08/08 | 1. Possessing controlled drug (with intent)   To supply –  Class a - cocaine   1. Handling: - stolen goods (receiving) 2. Not stopping after accident | Conner  DC  202533 | Met | Yes five  Bail Conditions | **“Won.”**   1. NFA (No further action) 02/09/08 at 01 (metropolitan police)   **“Won.”**   1. NFA (No further action) 02/09/08 at 01 (metropolitan police)   **“Won.”**   1. NFA (No further action) 18/03/08 at 01 (metropolitan police) | 1. 16/03/08 2. 16/03/08 3. 16/03/08 |
| **[EXHIBIT I28]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. **1.** NFA (No Further Action) **02/09/08** At 01 (Metropolitan Police) 2. 15 Days 05 Months  * **“Won.”**  1. **2.** NFA (No Further Action) **02/09/08** At 01 (Metropolitan Police) 2. 15 Days 5 Months  * **“Won.”**  1. **3.** NFA (No Further Action) **18/03/08** At 01 (Metropolitan Police) 2. Same Day  * **Court & Police Station Dates**   **1**   1. Remanded On Police Bail On **18/03/08** At 01ye 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **27/05/08** At 01ye   **2**   1. Remanded On Police Bail On **18/03/08** At 01ye 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **08/07/08** At 01ye   **3**   1. Remanded On Police Bail On **18/03/08** At 01ye 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **17/07/08** At 01ye   **4**   1. Remanded On Police Bail On **18/03/08** At 01ye 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **05/08/08** At 01ye   **5**   1. Remanded On Police Bail On **18/03/08** At 01ye 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **02/09/08** At 01ye  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
| **2007** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Numb** | **Arrest/**  **Summons**  **Ref** | **Date**  **Arrested** | **Last Updated** | **Case**  **Name** | **Arresting**  **Officer** | **Police Force** | **Remand** | **NFA**  **Date**  **:** | **Offence Dates** |
|  | 07/01ye/01/24943a | 22/12/07 | 27/06/08 | 1. Destroy or damage property (value of damage £5000 or less -offence against criminal damage act 1971 only) 2. Not giving AME and address after accident | Nelson  PC  201962 | Met | Yes five  Bail Conditions | **“Won.”**   1. NFA (No further action)   27/05/08 at 01 (metropolitan  Police)  **“Won.”**   1. 18/08/08 at Enfield magistrates Court ref: 08/2757/85807m1 no evidence offered - dismissed | 1. 22/12/07 2. 22/12/07 |
| **[EXHIBIT I29]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. NFA (NO FURTHER ACTION) 27/05/08 AT 01 (METROPOLITAN POLICE) 2. 04 months 08 days  * **“Won.”**  1. **18/08/08** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 08/2757/85807m1 No Evidence Offered Dismissed 2. 07 Months 27 Days 3. **Bail Address:**109, Burncroft Avenue Enfield Middlesex En3 7jq 4. **Condition 1:** To Live and Sleep Each Night at Bail Address  * **Court & Police Station Dates**   **1**   1. Remanded On Police Bail On **22/12/07** At 01ye 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **20/02/08** At 01ye   **2**   1. Remanded On Police Bail On **22/12/07** At 01ye 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **22/02/08** At 01ye   **3**   1. Remanded On Police Bail On **25/04/08** At 01ye 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **27/05/08** At 01ye   **4**   1. Remanded On Bail On **27/05/08** At 01ye 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **17/06/08** At Enfield Magistrates   **5**   1. Remanded On Bail On **26/06/08** At Enfield Magistrates 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **18/08/08** At Enfield Magistrates  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 07/48c6/01/4660j | 02/12/07 |  | (City of London police)  Possess cannabis  A class c  Controlled  Drug | Drake  PC  357 |  | Yes two  Bail Conditions | **“Won.”**  03/03/08  At city of  London  Magistrates,  Magistrates  Court ref: 08/2631/50386p1  No evidence  Offered –  Dismissed | 02/12/07 |
| **[EXHIBIT I30]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. 03/03/08 At City of London Magistrates, Magistrates Court Ref: 08/2631/50386p1 2. **No Evidence Offered Dismissed** 3. 03 Months 02 Days  * **Court & Police Station Dates**   **1**   1. Remanded On Police Bail On **02/12/07** At 48c6 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **25/01/08** At 48c6   **2**   1. Remanded On Bail On **26/01/08** At 48c6 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **26/01/08** 3. **At Failed to Appear**  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. **“Failed to Appear”** 2. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 07/01yt/01/34813d | 23/11/07 | 24/11/07 | Possessing controlled  Drug  (With intent)  To supply –  Class a –  Md ma  **DNA Report 3** | Sharp  DC  215026 | Met | Yes, one Bail Condition | **“Won.”**  NFA  (No further  Action)  14/12/07  At 01  (Metropolitan  police) | 23/11/07 16:15 |
| **[EXHIBIT I31]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. NFA (No Further Action) **14/12/07** At 01 (Metropolitan Police) 2. 28 Days  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. Remanded On Police Bail On **24/11/07** At 01ye 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **14/12/07** At 01ye  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 07/01ye/01/22350g | 03/09/07 | 03/09/07 | Burglary and  Theft –  Non-dwelling | Stanford  PC  216231 | Met | Yes, one Bail Condition | **“Won.”**  NFA (no  Further  Action)  06/09/07  At 01  (Metropolitan  Police) | 04/06/07 |
| **[EXHIBIT I32]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. NFA (No Further Action) **06/09/07** At 01 (Metropolitan Police) 2. Same Day  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. Remanded On Police Bail On **03/09/07** At 01ye 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **06/09/07** At 01ye  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 07/41hq/01/22486x | 12/07/07 | 16/07/07 | 1. (Hertfordshire   Constabulary)  Possessing offensive weapons  In public place   1. Destroy   Or damage property (value of damage £5000 or less -offence against criminal damage act 1971 only)   1. Breach of   Conditional discharge   1. Possession   Cannabis a  Class c  Controlled  Drug   1. Failing to   Surrender to custody at appointed time   1. Failing to   Surrender to custody at appointed time   1. Failing to   Surrender to custody as soon as practical after appointed time   1. Affray | Hill  DC  2097 |  | Yes, one Bail Condition | **“Lost”**   1. 05/06/08   At east Hertfordshire magistrates Court ref: 08/1888/91015f 1 imprisonment 12 wks. (weeks)   1. 05/06/08   At east Hertfordshire magistrates Court ref: 08/1888/91015f1 no separate penalty  **“Lost”**   1. 05/06/08   At east Hertfordshire magistrates Court ref: 08/1888/91015f1 no separate penalty  **“Lost”**   1. 05/06/08   At east Hertfordshire magistrates Court ref: 08/1888/91015f1 not gone ahead with not put at Court adjudication:  Not guilty  Plea description:  Not guilty  **“Won.”**   1. 16/05/08   At east Hertfordshire magistrates Court ref: 08/2631/43735k1 dismissed.  **“Won.”**   1. 16/05/08   At east Hertfordshire magistrates Court ref: 08/2631/43735k1 dismissed.  **“Won.”**   1. 16/05/08   At east Hertfordshire magistrates Court ref: 08/2631/43735k 1 dismissed.  **“Won.”**   1. 24/02/08   At 41 (Hertfordshire constabulary)  Adjudication:  NFA (No further action)  NFA (No further action) | 1. 12/07/07   02:20   1. 12/07/07   03:00   1. 12/07/07 2. 02/12/07 3. 12/07/07   02:20   1. 12/07/07   02:20   1. 12/07/07   02:20   1. 12/07/07   02:20 |
| **[EXHIBIT I33]** | | * **“Lost”**  1. **05/06/08** At East Hertfordshire Magistrates Court Ref: 08/1888/91015f 1 Imprisonment 12 Wks. (Weeks) 2. **05/06/08** At East Hertfordshire Magistrates Court Ref: 08/1888/91015f1 No Separate Penalty 3. Days Missing  * **“Lost”**  1. **05/06/08** At East Hertfordshire Magistrates Court Ref: 08/1888/91015f1 No Separate Penalty  * **“Lost”**  1. **05/06/08** At East Hertfordshire Magistrates Court Ref: 08/1888/91015f1 Not Proceeded with Not Put at Court Adjudication: Not Guilty Plea Description: Not Guilty  * **“Won.”**  1. **16/05/08** At East Hertfordshire Magistrates Court Ref: 08/2631/43735k1 Dismissed.  * **“Won.”**  1. **16/05/08** At East Hertfordshire Magistrates Court Ref: 08/2631/43735k1 Dismissed.  * **“Won.”**  1. **16/05/08** At East Hertfordshire Magistrates Court Ref: 08/2631/43735k 1 Dismissed.  * **“Won.”**  1. **24/02/08** At 41 (Hertfordshire Constabulary) Adjudication: NFA (No Further Action) NFA (No Further Action)  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. A  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 07/41hq/01/8820t | 17/03/07 | 18/03/07 | (Hertfordshire constabulary)  Threatening to damage or destroy property | Sprent  PC  1796 |  | Yes, one Bail Condition | **“Won.”**  01/10/07  At east Hertfordshire magistrates Court ref: 07/1888/53248m1 discontinuance | 18/06/06 16:30 |
| **[EXHIBIT I34]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. **01/10/07** At East Hertfordshire Magistrates Court Ref: 07/1888/53248m1 Discontinuance 2. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. Remanded On Bail On **17/03/07** At 41a1 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **21/03/07** At East Hertfordshire Magistrates  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
| **2006** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Numb** | **Arrest/**  **Summons**  **Ref** | **Date**  **Arrested** | **Last Updated** | **Case**  **Name** | **Arresting**  **Officer** | **Police Force** | **Remand** | **NFA**  **Date**  **:** | **Offence Dates** |
|  | 06/0000/00/1629163x | 21/12/06 | 22/12/06 | Affray  **DNA Report 4** | Cage  PC  223931  YR | Met | Yes, one Bail Condition | **“Won.”**  NFA (No further action) 12/01/07 at 01 (metropolitan police) | 21/12/06 |
| **[EXHIBIT I35]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. NFA (No Further Action) **12/01/07** At 01 (Metropolitan Police) 2. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. Remanded On Police Bail On **21/12/06** At 01yr 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **12/01/07** At 01yr  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 06/0000/00/1252088h | 29/09/06 | 29/09/06  **“check”**  01/12/20  **“check”**  Weed  Date:  12/01/21 | Possessing  Prohibited  Weapon  Weapon for  Discharge of  Noxious liquid  Gas | Llewellyn  PC  203929  YE | Met | Yes, one Bail Condition | **“Won.”**  NFA (no  Further  Action)  02/11/06  At 01  (Metropolitan  Police) | 29/09/06 |
| **[EXHIBIT I36]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. NFA (No Further Action) **02/11/06** At 01 (Metropolitan Police) 2. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. Remanded On Police Bail On 29/09/06 At 01ye 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On 14/11/06 At 01ye  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 06/0000/00/912763b | 15/07/06 | 17/07/06 | 1. Obstructing powers of search for drugs   **“Overturned.”**   1. Obstructing powers of search for drugs | Conn-  Olly  PC  218455  YE | Met | No | **“Lost”**   1. 05/02/07   At Enfield magistrates Court ref: 06/2757/94252g1 conditional discharge 24 months (months) two costs £50.00  **“Won.”**  **“Overturned.”**   1. 29/08/06   At Enfield magistrates Court ref: 07/2757/39716w1  Discharged –  Final | 1. 15/07/06 13:00 2. 15/07/06 13:00 |
| **[EXHIBIT I37]** | | * **“Lost”**  1. **05/02/07** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 06/2757/94252g 2. 1 Conditional Discharge 24 Months (Months) 2 Costs £50.00 3. Days Missing  * **“Won.”**  1. “Overturned.” **29/08/06** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 07/2757/39716w1 Discharged Final  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. N/a in Acro Report!  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 06/41hq/01/15207l | Reported  On 31/05/06  Remanded  On police bail on 05/05/06 | 06/05/06 | (Hertfordshire constabulary)  Burglary  And theft - dwelling | Johnson  DS  2253 |  | Yes, one Bail Condition | **“Won.”**  NFA (No further action) 31/05/06 at 41 (Hertfordshire constabulary) | 16/04/06 07:30 to 21/04/06 13:15 |
| **[EXHIBIT I38]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. NFA (No Further Action) **31/05/06** At 41 (Hertfordshire Constabulary) 2. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. Remanded On Police Bail On **05/05/06** At 41a1 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **31/05/06** At 41a1  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 06/0000/00/397207p | 25/03/06 | 21/08/06 | (Essex Police)  Aggravated  Burglary  (Comprising commission  Of  Offence –  In dwelling)  **DNA report one** | Tindall  DC  192  GD |  | Yes two  Bail Conditions | **“Won.”**  NFA  (No further  Action)  06/09/06  At 42  (Essex Police) | 20/03/06 12:20 |
| **[EXHIBIT I39]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. NFA (NO FURTHER ACTION) 06/09/06 AT 42 (ESSEX POLICE) 2. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**   **1**   1. Remanded On Police Bail On **25/03/06** At 42dy 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **07/06/06** At 42dy   **2**   1. Remanded On Police Bail On **07/06/06** At 42dz 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **02/08/06** At 42dz   **3**   1. Remanded On Police Bail On **02/08/06** At 42dy 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **06/09/06** At 42dy  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 06/0000/00/113215c | Reported on 23/01/06 | 31/01/06 | (Essex Police)  Use disorderly  Behaviour or threatening/  Abusive/insulting words likely to cause harassment alarm or distress | Butler  PC  4087  GD |  | No | **“Lost”**  Penalty  Notice  Issued on  23/01/06  At 42  (Essex Police) fs/ref: forty-two  (Essex Police) | 23/01/06 00:15 |
| **[EXHIBIT I40]** | | * **“Lost”**  1. Penalty Notice Issued On **23/01/06**at 42 (Essex Police) Fs/Ref: 42 (Essex Police) 2. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. N/a in Acro Report!  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
| **2005** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Numb** | **Arrest/**  **Summons**  **Ref** | **Date**  **Arrested** | **Last Updated** | **Case**  **Name** | **Arresting**  **Officer** | **Police Force** | **Remand** | **NFA**  **Date**  **:** | **Offence Dates** |
|  | 05/41hq/01/24737w | Summoned on 12/08/05 | 21/03/07 | 1. (Hertfordshire constabulary)   Forging vehicle registration plates   1. “Motor vehicles failed to comply with red/green arrow/lane closure.” flashing light signals - automatic equipment 2. Fraudulently altering vehicle trade plates | Kaur  PC  77 |  | No | **“Won.”**   1. 16/03/07   At central  Herts  Magistrates  Court ref: 05/1892/119344x  One withdrawn  Final  **“Won.”**   1. 16/03/07   At central  Herts  Magistrates  Court ref: 05/1892/119344x1 withdrawn.  Final  **“Won.”**   1. 16/03/07   At central  Herts  Magistrates  Court ref: 05/1892/119344x1 withdrawn.  Final  Registration  Mark | 1. 16/02/05 16:55 to 16/02/05 17:00 2. 16/02/05 16:55 to 16/02/05 17:00 3. 16/02/05 16:55 to 16/02/05 17:00 |
| **[EXHIBIT I41]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. **1. 16/03/07** At Central Herts Magistrates Court Ref: 05/1892/119344x1 Withdrawn Final 2. Days Missing  * **“Won.”**  1. **2. 16/03/07** At Central Herts Magistrates Court Ref: 05/1892/119344x1 Withdrawn. Final  * **“Won.”**  1. **3. 16/03/07** At Central Herts Magistrates Court Ref: 05/1892/119344x1 Withdrawn. Final Registration Mark  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. N/a in Acro Report!  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 05/41hq/01/5704h | 16/02/05 | 18/02/05 | (Hertfordshire constabulary)  Making off  Without  Paying | Kaur  PC  77 |  | No | **“Won.”**  NFA  (No further action)  16/02/05 at 41 (Hertfordshire constabulary | 16/02/05 16:48 |
| **[EXHIBIT I42]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. NFA (No Further Action) **16/02/05** At 41 (Hertfordshire Constabulary 2. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. N/a in Acro Report!  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
| **2004** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Numb** | **Arrest/**  **Summons**  **Ref** | **Date**  **Arrested** | **Last Updated** | **Case**  **Name** | **Arresting**  **Officer** | **Police Force** | **Remand** | **NFA**  **Date**  **:** | **Offence Dates** |
|  | 04/0000/00/1281346m | 19/12/04 | 21/12/04 | Driving whilst disqualified | Hinchliffe  PC  YE | Met | No | **“Won.”**  NFA  (No further action)  23/03/05 at 01  (Metropolitan  Police) | 19/12/04 14:40 |
| **[EXHIBIT I43]** | | * **“Won.”**  1. NFA (No Further Action) **23/03/05** At 01 (Metropolitan Police) 2. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. N/a in Acro Report!  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 04/0000/00/480133d | 05/06/04 | 28/06/04 | “Being-Drunk  And  Disorderly” | Coghlin  PC | Met | No | **“Lost”**  Penalty notice issued on 05/06/04 at 01 (metropolitan police) fs/ref: 01 (metropolitan police) | 05/06/04 |
| **[EXHIBIT I44]** | | * **“Lost”**  1. Penalty Notice Issued On **05/06/04** At 01 (Metropolitan Police) Fs/Ref: 01 (Metropolitan Police) 2. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. N/a in Acro Report!  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
| **2003** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Numb** | **Arrest/**  **Summons**  **Ref** | **Date**  **Arrested** | **Last Updated** | **Case**  **Name** | **Arresting**  **Officer** | **Police Force** | **Remand** | **NFA**  **Date**  **:** | **Offence Dates** |
|  | 04/0000/00/1054471j | Charged on  02/04/03 | 25/10/04 | Use disorderly behavior or threatening/  Abusive/  Insulting  Words likely  To cause harassment  Alarm or  Distress | Stevenson  PS  27  YE | Met | No | **“Lost”**  21/08/03  At Enfield magistrates Court ref: 04/2757/136593v1 conditional discharge 24 months (months) eq - 03005905m | 02/04/03 |
| **[EXHIBIT I45]** | | * **“Lost”**  1. **21/08/03** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 04/2757/136593v1 Conditional Discharge 24 Months (Months) Eq - 03005905m 2. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. N/a in Acro Report!  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
| **2002** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Numb** | **Arrest/**  **Summons**  **Ref** | **Date**  **Arrested** | **Last Updated** | **Case**  **Name** | **Arresting**  **Officer** | **Police Force** | **Remand** | **NFA**  **Date**  **:** | **Offence Dates** |
|  | 02/0000/00/999308b | Charged on  02/11/02  16/05/03 | 16/11/02 | Possession of Drug  Class B  Cannabis  Resin | Redmond  TSG  PC  186124 | Met | No | **“Lost”**  24/04/03  At Enfield magistrates Court ref: 02/2757/825176v   1. No separate penalty 2. Forfeiture/confiscation of cannabis | 02/11/02 20:45 |
| **[EXHIBIT I46]** | | * **“Lost”**  1. **24/04/03** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 02/2757/825176v No Separate Penalty forfeiture / Confiscation of Cannabis 2. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. N/a in Acro Report!  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 02/0000/00/556175k | Charged on 17/06/02  17/08/02 | 19/06/02 | 1. Taking motor vehicle   Without  Consent   1. Using vehicle while uninsured 2. Driving without reasonable consideration | Charleston  PC  198786  YE | Met | No | **“Lost”**   1. 24/04/03   At Enfield magistrate’s Court  Ref: 02/2757/454304y1 imprisonment  6 months (months)  **“Lost”**   1. 24/04/03   At Enfield magistrates Court ref: 02/2757/454304y   1. No separate penalty 2. From driving 12 months (months) 3. Varied on appeal 25/07/03 disqualified (disqualification) reduced from 12 months to 3 months 4. Driving license endorsed   **“Lost”**   1. 24/04/03 at Enfield magistrates Court ref: 02/2757/454304y 2. No separate penalty 3. Disqualifications from driving 12 months (months) 4. Varied on appeal 25/07/03 reduced from 12 months to   3 months  Four driving licenses endorsed | 1. 17/06/02 12:05 2. 17/06/02 12:00 to 17/06/02 12:05 3. 17/06/02 12:00 |
| **[EXHIBIT I47]** | | * **“Lost”**  1. **1. 24/04/03** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 02/2757/454304y1 Imprisonment 6 Months (Months)  * **“Lost”**  1. **2. 24/04/03** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 02/2757/454304y No Separate Penalty from Driving 12 Months (Months) Varied on Appeal **25/07/03** Disqualify (Disqualification) Reduced From 12 Months To 3 Months Driving License Endorsed  * **“Lost”**  1. **3. 24/04/03** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 02/2757/454304y No Separate Penalty Disqualifications from Driving 12 Months (Months) Varied on Appeal **25/07/03** Reduced From 12 Months To 3 Months 4 Driving License Endorsed 2. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. N/a in Acro Report!  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. **Not in the Courts Record** 2. Disposal: 24/04/03 AT ENFIELD MAGISTRATES COURT REF: 02/2757/454304Y 3. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 02/0000/00/331835m | Charged on 05/04/02 | 05/04/02 | Destroy or damage property (value of damage £5000 or less -offence against criminal damage act 1971 only) | Raphael  PC  199673  YE | Met | Yes two  Bail Conditions | **“Lost”**  12/08/02  At Enfield magistrates  Court ref: 02/2757/273350j  Fine £200.00  Costs £200.00  Compensation  £80.00 | 10/11/01 00:15 |
| **[EXHIBIT I48]** | | * **“Lost”**  1. **12/08/02** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 02/2757/273350j 2. Fine £200.00 3. Costs £200.00 4. Compensation £80.00 5. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. Remanded On Bail On **05/04/02** At 01ye 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **12/04/02** At Enfield Magistrates  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. I needed to catch a bloke, he never wanted me to have caught him so, we ended up running down a road with me trying to grab him and he ran into a house. I thought this house was his home, but it was not. When I chased him through the front door there was a clock on the wall, and it fell to the floor by mistake and damaged. Police charged me with damaging the clock by the owner of the house with the help of the police. 2. A | | | | | | | |
| **2000** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Numb** | **Arrest/**  **Summons**  **Ref** | **Date**  **Arrested** | **Last Updated** | **Case**  **Name** | **Arresting**  **Officer** | **Police Force** | **Remand** | **NFA**  **Date**  **:** | **Offence Dates** |
|  | 00/0000/00/1139706k | Charged on 07/12/00 | 11/12/00 | Possession of Drug  Class B  Cannabis  Resin | Hankin  PC  198806  YE | Met | No | 05/01/01  At Enfield magistrates  Court ref: 00/2757/731154m   1. Conditional   Discharge 12 months (months)   1. Forfeiture/   Confiscation order for drugs | 07/12/00 06:55 |
| **[EXHIBIT I49]** | | 1. **05/01/01** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 00/2757/731154m Conditional Discharge 12 Months (Months) Forfeiture / Confiscation Order for Drugs 2. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. N/a in Acro Report!  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. **Not in the Courts Record** 2. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 00/0000/00/740128l | Charged on 08/08/00 | 27/10/01 | 1. Assault a   Constable   1. Using   Threatening, abusive,  Insulting  Words or behavior  (With intent)  To cause fear or provocation of violence | Scanlon  PC  466  YE | Met | No | **“Lost”**   1. 22/05/01   At Enfield magistrates  Court ref: 01/2757/542551b  Curfew order four  Months (months)  Costs £55.00  Compensations  £100.00   1. 22/05/01   At Enfield magistrates  Court ref: 01/2757/542551b1 curfew order 4 months (months) | 1. 21/07/00 2. 21/07/00   14:55 |
| **[EXHIBIT I50]** | | 1. **1. 22/05/01** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 01/2757/542551b 2. Curfew Order 4 Months (Months) 3. Costs £55.00 4. Compensation £100.00 5. **2. 22/05/01** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 01/2757/542551b1 6. Curfew Order 4 Months (Months) 7. Days Missing   **Court & Police Station Dates**   1. N/a in Acro Report!   “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”   1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 00/0000/00/136789h | Charged on 03/02/00 | 04/02/00 | Use disorderly behavior or threatening/abusive/insulting words likely to cause harassment alarm or distress | Dibbs  PC  194801  YF | Met | No | **“Lost”**  05/06/00  At Enfield magistrates Court ref: 00/2757/93719y   1. Conditional discharge   12 months (months)   1. Costs £40.00 | 02/02/00 19:30 |
| **[EXHIBIT I51]** | | 1. **05/06/00** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 00/2757/93719y Conditional Discharge 2. 12 Months (Months) Costs £40.00 3. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. N/a in Acro Report!  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
| **1999** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Numb** | **Arrest/**  **Summons**  **Ref** | **Date**  **Arrested** | **Last Updated** | **Case**  **Name** | **Arresting**  **Officer** | **Police Force** | **Remand** | **NFA**  **Date**  **:** | **Offence Dates** |
|  | 99/0000/00/960881c | Charged on 26/10/99 | 27/10/99 | Driving whilst disqualified | Palmer  PC  121  YE | Met | No | **“Lost”**  07/07/00  At Enfield magistrates Court ref: 99/2757/657417k   1. Driving license endorsed 2. Curfew order 3 months (months) at Mother Home 3. 7dg.8am-8pm, Mon-Sun (INC) | 22/10/99 13:25 |
| **[EXHIBIT I52]** | | 1. **07/07/00** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 99/2757/657417k Driving License Endorsed 2. Curfew Order 3 Months (Months) 3. At Mothers Home 8am-8pm, Mon – Sun (Inc) 4. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. N/a in Acro Report!  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 99/0000/00/336639d | Charged on 26/10/99 | 14/05/99 | Handling | Palmer  PC  121  YE | Met | Yes two  Bail Conditions | 17/06/99  At Enfield magistrates Court ref: 99/2757/211730t  Probation  Order 24 months (months)  Curfew order  3 months (months) 7pm-7 am  Saturday  And  Sunday  Costs £40.00 | 14/04/99 08:30 TO 14/04/99 15:30 |
| **[EXHIBIT I53]** | | 1. **17/06/99** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 99/2757/211730t 2. Probation Order 24 Months (Months) 3. Curfew Order 3 Months (Months) 7pm-7 Am Saturday and Sunday 4. Costs £40.00 5. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**   **1**   1. Remanded On Bail On **15/04/99** At 01yf 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **13/05/99** At Enfield Magistrates   **2**   1. Remanded On Bail On **14/05/99** At Enfield Magistrates 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **27/05/99** At Enfield Magistrates  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. **Not in the Courts Record** 2. A | | | | | | | |
| **1998** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Numb** | **Arrest/**  **Summons**  **Ref** | **Date**  **Arrested** | **Last Updated** | **Case**  **Name** | **Arresting**  **Officer** | **Police Force** | **Remand** | **NFA**  **Date**  **:** | **Offence Dates** |
|  | 98/0000/00/989685m | Charged on 12/11/98 | 16/11/98 | 1. Driving whilst Disqualified 2. Dangerous Driving 3. No insurance | Almond  PC  189791  YE | Met | Yes, one Bail Condition | **“Lost”**   1. 18/11/98   At Enfield  Juvenile  Court ref: 98/2757/508187l 1 imprisonment 5 months (months)   1. 18/11/98   At Enfield  Juvenile  Court ref: 98/2757/508187l 1 imprisonment 5 months (months)   1. 18/11/98   At Enfield  Juvenile  Court ref: 98/2757/508187l1  No separate penalty | 1. 12/11/98   12:55   1. 12/11/98   12:55   1. 12/11/98   12:55 |
| **[EXHIBIT I54]** | | 1. **18/11/98** At Enfield Juvenile Court Ref: 98/2757/508187l 2. 1 Imprisonment 5 Months (Months) 3. **18/11/98** At Enfield Juvenile Court Ref: 98/2757/508187l 4. 1 Imprisonment 5 Months (Months) 5. **18/11/98** At Enfield Juvenile Court Ref: 98/2757/508187l1 6. No Separate Penalty 7. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. Remanded On Bail On **13/11/98** At Enfield Magistrates 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **18/11/98** At Enfield Magistrates  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 99/0000/00/326472c | Charged on 23/10/98 | 26/04/01 | 1. Driving whilst disqualified 2. No insurance | Macdonald  PS  32  YF | Met | No | **“Lost”**   1. 04/11/98   At Enfield magistrates Court ref: 99/2757/202095v   1. Attendance   Centre   1. 24 hrs. (hours)   Driving  License  Endorsed   1. 04/11/98 2. At Enfield magistrates Court ref: 99/2757/202095v 3. No separate   Penalty  Driving license  Endorsed  Penalty points | 1. 19/10/98 2. 19/10/98 |
| **[EXHIBIT I55]** | | 1. **04/11/98** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 99/2757/202095v Attendance Centre 24 Hrs. (Hours) Driving License Endorsed 2. **04/11/98** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 99/2757/202095v No Separate Penalty Driving License Endorsed Penalty Points 3. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. N/a in Acro Report!  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 98/0000/00/462560a | Charged on 10/05/98 | 03/06/98 | Burglary  (With intent)  To steal - dwelling | Can…t  PC  766 | Met | No | **“Lost”**  13/08/98  At wood  Green  Crown Court  Ref: 98/2742  /238752z   1. Supervision   Order 12 months (months)  (t980434-2 | 10/05/98 |
| **[EXHIBIT I56]** | | 1. **13/08/98** At Wood Green Crown Court Ref: 98/2742/238752z Supervision Order 12 Months (Months) (T980434-2 2. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. Remanded On Bail On **09/04/98** At 01yr 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **07/05/98** At Haringey Juvenile  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 98/0000/00/388582p | Charged on 09/04/98 | 11/05/98 | Burglary and theft  non-dwelling | Scott  PC  196160  YR | Met | Yes, one Bail Condition | **“Lost”**  18/06/98  At Haringey juvenile  Court ref: 98/6742/200774f  One young offenders’ institution  2 months  (months) | 28/01/98 |
| **[EXHIBIT I57]** | | 1. **18/06/98** At Haringey Juvenile Court Ref: 98/6742/200774f 1 Young Offenders Institution 2 Months (Months) 2. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. N/a in Acro Report!  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 98/0000/00/295516f | Charged on 04/04/98 | 08/04/98 | 1. Driving whilst Disqualified 2. No insurance | White  PC  198  YE | Met | No | **“Lost”**   1. 20/05/98   At Enfield magistrates Court ref: 98/2757/154995g1 disqualification from driving  Yrs. (years)   1. 20/05/98   At Enfield magistrates Court ref: 98/2757/154995g | 1. 04/04/98   13:00 TO 04/04/98 13:35   1. 04/04/98   13:00 TO 04/04/98 13:35 |
| **[EXHIBIT I58]** | | 1. **1. 20/05/98** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 98/2757/154995g1 Disqualification from Driving Yrs. (Years) 2. **2. 20/05/98** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 98/2757/154995g 3. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. N/a in Acro Report!  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 98/0000/00/227669j | Charged on 09/03/98 | 17/03/98 | Common assault | Waga  PC  194298  YE | Met | No | 10/06/98  At Enfield juvenile Court ref: 98/6757/118791r 1 fine £50.00   1. Compensation   £50.00 | 10/01/98 17:45 TO 10/01/98 17:50 |
| **[EXHIBIT I59]** | | * **Adjudication Date:**  21/05/98  1. **10/06/98** At Enfield Juvenile Court Ref: 98/6757/118791r 2. 1 Fine £50.00 3. Compensation £50.00 4. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. N/a in Acro Report!  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. **Not in the Courts Record** 2. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 98/0000/00/1006737x | Charged on 23/02/98 | 16/02/00 | 1. Driving whilst disqualified 2. Using vehicle While uninsured 3. Handling-stolen Goods (receiving) 4. Driving Whilst Disqualified 5. Using vehicle While uninsured | Perry  PC  177246  YE | Met | No | **“Lost”**   1. 26/08/98   At Enfield magistrates Court ref: 98/2757/517363k  Supervision order  Disqualifications from driving 18 months (months)  Driving license endorsed   1. 26/08/98   At Enfield magistrates Court ref: 98/2757/517363k   1. No separate penalty 2. Driving license endorsed 3. 26/08/98   At Enfield magistrates Court ref: 98/2757/517363k 1 supervision order   1. 26/08/98 at   Enfield magistrates Court  Ref: 98/2757/517363k   1. Supervision order 2. Driving license endorsed 3. 26/08/98   At Enfield magistrates Court ref: 98/2757/517363k   1. No separate penalty 2. Driving license endorsed | 1. 23/02/98   12:05 TO 23/02/98 15:33   1. 23/02/98   12:05 TO 23/02/98 15:33   1. 23/02/98   12:05 TO 23/02/98 15:33   1. 23/02/98   12:05 TO 23/02/98 15:33   1. 23/02/98   12:05 TO 23/02/98 15:33 |
| **[EXHIBIT I60]** | | 1. **26/08/98** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 98/2757/517363k Supervision Order Disqualifications from Driving 18 Months (Months) Driving License Endorsed 2. **26/08/98** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 98/2757/517363k No Separate Penalty driving License Endorsed 3. **26/08/98** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 98/2757/517363k 1 Supervision Order 4. **26/08/98** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 98/2757/517363k Supervision Order Driving License Endorsed 5. **26/08/98** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 98/2757/517363k no Separate Penalty driving License Endorsed 6. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. N/a in Acro Report!  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 98/0000/00/5553d | Charged on 04/01/98 | 05/01/98 | Burglary  And  Theft  Non-dwelling | Tolhurst  PC  300  YE | Met | No | **“Lost”**  20/05/98 at Enfield magistrates Court ref: 98/2757/2361a  Young offenders’ institution 6 months (months) at Felltham | 03/01/98 20:00 |
| **[EXHIBIT I61]** | | 1. **20/05/98** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 98/2757/2361ayoung Offenders’ Institution Months (Months) At Felltham 2. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. N/a in Acro Report!  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. When I was a child, I was sleeping rough at this stage in my life I met an adult who was in a comparable situation, and we started to wonder London’s Streets at night together. When walking we saw a school window that someone had left open and to get into the window someone had to climb up a drainpipe and stupidly, I took the job of climbing up and in doing so I left my fingerprints. The police later arrested me for my bad judgment, and I was remorseful for my wrongdoings. | | | | | | | |
| **1997** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Numb** | **Arrest/**  **Summons**  **Ref** | **Date**  **Arrested** | **Last Updated** | **Case**  **Name** | **Arresting**  **Officer** | **Police Force** | **Remand** | **NFA**  **Date**  **:** | **Offence Dates** |
|  | 97/0000/00/964137u | Charged on 03/11/97 | 11/12/97 | Driving whilst disqualified | Dean  PC  189188  YE | Met | Yes, one Bail Condition | **“Lost”**  20/05/98  At Enfield juvenile Court ref: 97/6757/566952f1 disqualification from driving  3 yrs. (years) | 03/11/97 15:00 |
| **[EXHIBIT I62]** | | 1. **20/05/98** At Enfield Juvenile Court Ref: 97/6757/566952f1 Disqualification from Driving 3 Yrs. (Years) 2. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. Remanded On Bail On **10/12/97** At Enfield Juvenile 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **16/01/98** At Enfield Juvenile  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 97/0000/00/952126n | Charged on 29/10/97 | 07/11/97 | 1. Driving whilst Disqualified 2. No insurance | Greenhill  PC  195958  JL | Met | No | **“Lost”**   1. 20/05/98   At Enfield magistrates Court ref: 97/6813/560435m   1. Disqualification from driving 3 yrs. (years) 2. Driving license endorsed 3. 20/05/98   At Enfield magistrates  Court ref: 97/6813/560435m   1. No separate penalty 2. Driving license endorsed | 1. 17/09/97 13:15 2. 17/09/97 13:15 |
| **[EXHIBIT I63]** | | 1. **20/05/98** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 97/6813/560435m Disqualification from Driving 3 Yrs. (Years) Driving License Endorsed 2. **20/05/98** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 97/6813/560435m No Separate Penalty Driving License Endorsed 3. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. N/a in Acro Report!  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 97/0000/00/823525e | Reported on 21/09/97 | 22/09/97 | Using threatening, abusive, or insulting words or behavior  Likely  To cause distress | Childs  PC  74  YF | Met | No | **“Lost”**  20/05/98  At Enfield juvenile Court ref: 00/6757/535429e 1 fine £25.00 | 21/09/97 16:15 |
| **[EXHIBIT I64]** | | 1. **20/05/98** At Enfield Juvenile Court Ref: 00/6757/535429e 2. 1 Fine £25.00 3. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. N/a in Acro Report!  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 97/0000/00/768545u | Charged on 01/09/97 | 09/10/97 | 1. Burglary (With intent) to steal - dwelling      1. Burglary and theft - non-dwelling | Urand  PC  194672 | Met | Yes, one Bail Condition | **“Lost”**   1. 13/11/97   At Enfield juvenile Court ref: 98/6757/112150y 1 community ser vice order 180 hrs. (hours)   1. Compensation £400.0- 2. 13/11/97 at   Enfield juvenile Court ref: 98/6757/112150y 1 community ser vice order 180 hrs. (hours) | 1. 22/05/97   08:45 TO 22/05/97 16:20   1. 11/02/97   22:00 TO 12/02/97 06:00 |
| **[EXHIBIT I65]** | | 1. **13/11/97** At Enfield Juvenile Court Ref: 98/6757/112150y 2. 1 Community Service Order 180 Hrs. (Hours) 3. Compensation £400.0- 4. **13/11/97** At Enfield Juvenile Court Ref: 98/6757/112150y 5. 1 Community Service Order 180 Hrs. (Hours) 6. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. Remanded On Bail On **08/10/97** At Enfield Magistrates 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **22/10/97** At Enfield Magistrates  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. I was living in a children’s home and there was an argument with staff that I had over money that should have got issued to me but because I would not come home over the nights because I liked living with my girlfriend then at the time and with her mother they refused to pay me when I got home and because of this I got into the office without breaking anything or getting detected and picked up the money box and left the building. The police later arrested me. 2. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 97/0000/00/736197h | Reported on 20/08/97 | 10/09/97 | Using threatening, abusive, insulting words or behavior (with intent) to cause fear or provocation of violence | Etherington  PC  189901  YE | Met | No | **“Lost”**  Cautioned on 21/08/97 at 01 (metropolitan police) fs/ref: 01 (metropolitan police) | 20/08/97 22:00 TO 20/08/97 22:10 |
| **[EXHIBIT I66]** | | 1. Cautioned On **21/08/97** At 01 (Metropolitan Police) Fs/Re f: 01 (Metropolitan Police) 2. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. N/a in Acro Report!  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 97/0000/00/236370t | Charged on 08/03/97 | 17/03/97 | 1. Taking a motor vehicle without consent 2. Using vehicle while uninsured 3. “Driving otherwise, then in accordance with a license.” | Shepherd  PC  196821  YE | Met | No | **“Lost”**   1. 06/08/97   At Enfield magistrates  Court ref: 97/2757/168374g   1. No separate penalty 2. Costs £25.00 3. Supervision order 24 months (months) 4. 06/08/97   At Enfield magistrates  Court ref: 97/2757/168374g  One disqualification from driving 12 months (months)   1. 06/08/97   At Enfield magistrates  Court ref: 97/2757/168374g   1. Driving license endorsed 2. No separate penalty | 1. 24/01/97 19:30 2. 24/01/97 19:30 3. 24/01/97 19:30 |
| **[EXHIBIT I67]** | | 1. **1. 06/08/97** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 97/2757/168374g No Separate Penalty 2. Costs £25.00 3. Supervision Order 24 Months (Months) 4. **2. 06/08/97** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 97/2757/168374g 1 Disqualification from Driving 12 Months (Months) 5. **3. 06/08/97** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 97/2757/168374g Driving License Endorsed No Separate Penalty 6. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**  1. N/a in Acro Report!  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | 97/0000/00/193878f | Charged on 28/02/97 | 02/10/97 | 1. Taking a motor vehicle without consent 2. Using a vehicle while uninsured 3. “Driving otherwise than in accordance with a license.”     **DNA Report 2** | Kneafsey  PC  188082  YF | Met | Yes three  Bail Conditions | **“Lost”**   1. 06/08/97   At Enfield magistrates Court ref: 97/2757/168374g   1. No separate   Penalty   1. Costs £25.00 2. Supervision   Order 24 months (months)   1. 06/08/97   At Enfield magistrates Court ref: 97/2757/168374g  One disqualification from driving 12 months (months)   1. 06/08/97   At Enfield magistrates Court ref: 97/2757/168374g   1. Driving license endorsed 2. No separate penalty | 1. 24/01/97 19:30 2. 24/01/97 19:30 3. 24/01/97 19:30 |
| **[EXHIBIT I68]** | | 1. **1. 06/08/97** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 97/2757/168374g No Separate Penalty 2. Costs £25.00 3. Supervision Order 24 Months (Months) 4. **2. 06/08/97** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 97/2757/168374g 5. 1 Disqualification 6. From Driving 12 Months (Months) 7. **3. 06/08/97** At Enfield Magistrates Court Ref: 97/2757/168374g 8. Driving License Endorsed no Separate Penalty 9. Days Missing  * **Court & Police Station Dates**   **1**   1. Remanded On Bail On **28/02/97** At 01yf 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **16/04/97** At Enfield Juvenile   **2**   1. Remanded On Bail On **22/04/97** At Enfield Magistrates 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **30/04/97** At Enfield Magistrates   **3**   1. Remanded On Bail On **01/10/97** At Enfield Magistrates 2. To Appear At: Next Appearing On **19/11/97** At Enfield Magistrates  * “**The Notes are In the Diary in Rough!**”  1. A | | | | | | | |
|  | **End** | **End** | **End** | **End** | **End** | **End** | **End** | **End** | **End** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Asbo Main: - “What Happened”**  **[EXHIBIT J]** | | | |
|  | | | **Definitions and Interpretations; [EXHIBIT J1]** |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Numb** | **Definitions and Interpretations** | **Means** | |  | Exhibit | Means Material That the Now Claimant Produces as Official Evidence | |  | The Asbo | Means a Forged Anti-Social Behaviour Court Order Applied for! | |  | The 1st Possession Order | Means the 1st Forged Housing Possession Court Order Applied for! | |  | The 1st Injunction Order | Means the 1st Forged Injunction Order Applied for! | |  | The 2nd Injunction Order | Means the 2nd Forged Injunction Order Applied for! | |  | The 2nd Possession Order | Means a 2nd Forged Housing Possession Court Order Applied for! | |  | The Now Claimant | Means The Claimant of These Claims Documented Within This Document. | |  | The Now Claimant Mother | Means The Claimant Mother of These Claims Documented Within This Document. | |  | The Now Claimant Barrister | Means a professional lawyer hired by an acting solicitor firm to represent the defender in a legal battle as his or her defending barrister for a court case. | |  | The Now Claimant Solicitor | Means | |  | The Government | Means | |  | Officials | Means | |  | The Enfield Council | Means | |  | The Police | Means | |  | The Neighbourhood Team Watch | Means | |  | The Neighbours | Means | |  | The Lordship Lane Old Magistrates Court | Means | |  | The Highbury & Islington Court | Means | |  | The Wood Green Crown & Islington Court | Court | |  | The Edmonton Lower Court | Means | |  | Judge | Means A | |  | The Doctors or the NHS | Means | |  | The St Ann’s Mental Hospital | Means | |  | The Chase Farm Mental Hospital | Means | |  | \*\*\*\*\* | Means | |  | \*\*\*\*\* | Means | |  | \*\*\*\*\* | Means | |  | Interrelating Side Issues with Members of his Neighbours due to Government Figures Trying to Avoid Justice. | Means People That Tried To | |  | Human Rights | Means | |  | \*\*\*\*\* | Means | |  | \*\*\*\*\* | Means | |  | \*\*\*\*\* | Means | | | | |
|  | | | **About Anti-Social Behaviour Orders; [EXHIBIT J2]** |
| * **History of ASBOs P1 OF 10 The United Kingdom’s History Behind the Creation of Community Safety Orders / Anti-Social Behaviour Orders**  1. **Acts Progress** 2. England, Scotland, and Wales first introduced: - “**ASBOs**” in by the: - “**Crime and Disorder Act 1998.”** 3. **Responsible Department:** Home Office.  * **Origin:**  1. The Lords, Under the Labour's Manifesto: - 2. James Gordon Brown served as the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and Leader of the Labour Party from **2007** to **2010.** 3. Tony Blair otherwise known as Sir Anthony Charles Lynton Blair KG served as the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom from **1997** to **2007** and was the Leader of the Labour Party from **1994** to **2007.** 4. **Lords First Reading:** 5. 03rd December **1997.** 6. **Lords Second Reading:** 7. 16th December **1997.** 8. **A Couple of the Lords Were in Trouble For: - “Parenting”** 9. January **1998.** 10. **Committee Stage:** 11. 03rd, 10th, 12th, February **1998.** 12. **Report Stage:** 13. 17th, 19th March **1998.** 14. **Lords Third Reading:** 15. 31st March **1998.** 16. **The United Kingdom House of Commons Introduced Asbo’s:** 17. 01st April **1998.** 18. **Second Reading:** 19. 08th April **1998.** 20. **Committee Stage:** 21. 28th, 30th April **1998.** 22. 05th, 07th, 12th, 14th, 19th, 21st May **1998.** 23. 02nd, 04th, 09th, 11th June **1998.** 24. **Report And Third Reading:** 25. 16th, 17th June **1998.** 26. **Considerations Of Commons Amendments:** 27. 22nd July **1998.** 28. **Consideration Of Lords Amendments:** 29. 28th July **1998.** 30. **Royal Assent** 31. 31st July **1998.**  * **History of ASBOs P2 OF 10 About Anti-Social Behaviour Orders**  1. The: - “**Labour Party**” under: - “Tony Blair” in the year of **1998** introduced: - “**ASBOs**” 2. Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs) are civil orders made against someone who has engaged in anti-social behaviour in the UK or Ireland. 3. During the **1997** election campaign Tony Blair made a firm commitment to the United Kingdom that Labour will introduce a: - “Crime and Disorder Bill” that will: - “Target Crime” and/or: - “Anti-Social Behaviour” within his: - “First Year in the Government Office.” 4. Throughout the **1997** & **1998** election campaign: - “Crime Was a Key Election Issue,” and: - “Both Major Parties” competed against one and other in a bid to prove to the world that they were tougher on crime than the other. 5. Labour's manifesto promised to the public: - “fast-track punishment” for: - “Persistent Young Offenders” by issuing out: - “Community Safety Orders” and these Orders people later called: - “Anti-Social Behaviour Orders” set out in the order of law to deal with: - “Threatening” and: - “Disruptive Criminal Neighbours." 6. With Tony Blair in the driving seat for the **Labour Party** they together: - “Echoed through the Worlds Capitals & Streets” to the people in the: - “Suburb’s” & “Urban’s” aloud, their now famous pledge, by stating: "*We should be tough on crime and tough on the underlying causes of crime. We should be prepared and eager to give people opportunity.*" 7. Tony Blair told voters that Labour would take a: - “Zero Tolerance Approach” to: - “Crime,” promising more: - “Convictions” and a drop in: - “Violent Crime.” 8. When Labour introduced the new Crime and Disorder Act **1998** by announcing their new Bill off Legal Rights, the home secretary at the time was a Jack Straw and he made it clear of their latest changes in support of new laws to help build safer communities. The Governments Candidates aims were to target persistent troublemakers and to allow their new Crime and Disorder Acts of Law to abide in the freedom for neighbours to be free from fear and harassment. 9. The Labours Campaign was based on the wholesale of the reform of the youth justice system. 10. When Labour introduced the Anti-Social Behaviour Orders its key plank into the Bill of Right of the Crime and Disorder Act **1998,** they designed the policy to walk the accused of from being able to commit any more Civil wrongs that still to date stay debatable and to prevent repeat Criminal offender from reoffending. 11. In the year of **1998,** The Crime and Disorder Act was based on: - 12. Penalties Aimed at Young Offenders 13. Parental Responsibility 14. Criminal Neighbours Who Were Threatening and Disruptive. 15. Because the government introduced their new range of penalties aimed at young offenders and associated orders aimed at their parents it came to no surprise when the government felt their own whip just pass themselves on its way to penalise whoever it could be aimed at next as their embarrassing moment came for the Labour party was when Jack Straw's 17-year-old son got cautioned by police for supplying cannabis in January **1998.** 16. The home secretary Mr. Straw made light of the affair, when he admitted that due to the incident cabinet colleagues of his had made jokes to him along the line of, he had become a prime candidate for an "Anti-Social Behaviour, Parenting Order.” 17. As time continued to pass the Anti-Social Behaviour formed the basis for a new strength in the youth justice system framework by becoming a document that legally enshrined preventing Children and young people from offending. 18. Labours intent was to give the United Kingdom a way to prevent and control Summary Offence Level Crime and High-Level Crime by introducing a tool kit for Councils and police that created a Three-strike Warning system. 19. Labour implemented the Three-strike Warning system into the Crime and Disorder Act **1998** and designed to incapacitate re offenders when they selectively trigger a third of a kind offence   by mandating lengthy prison sentences for those convicted of particular types of crime more than once (most commonly serious violent and sexual crimes).   1. that when a person triggers a third of a kind offence, they are seriously reprimanded   So-called ‘three strikes’ laws are a type of law designed to   1. Misplace Behaviour that police had the power to arrest but found to be time consuming and/or shows lack of 2. Convicted offenders would not normally call for a criminal Prosecution but brings fear and misery to those living amongst it. 3. ASBOs past through parliament as law to limit and correct the recipient's behaviour. 4. For example, by forbidding a return to a certain area or shop, or by restricting public behaviour such as swearing or drinking. 5. As the ASBO is a civil order, the defendant has no right to evidence that might disprove the assertions of the plaintiff, though violating an ASBO can incur up to five years imprisonment. 6. This means getting an ASBO does not give you a criminal record but breaking the ASBO could.   **1999 & 2000**   * **History of ASBOs P3 OF 10 By the year of 2001 & 2002**  1. In the year of **2001**: - “Tony Blair” was still driving the Labour Party forward in victory as Labour won the general election with another landslide, with **167** seats won, as Labour retained most all of their seats won in the **1997** landslide victory, the media dubbed the **2001** election: - “The Quiet Landslide.” 2. By the year of **2002** Tony Blair went on to become the first Labour Prime Minister to serve two consecutive full terms in office. 3. Labour continued with their: - “Zero Tolerance Approach” to: - “Crime,” and introduced the Police Reform Act **2002** as it received its Royal Assent on **24 July 2002.** 4. As we have explained above Labour introduced ASBOs into section 1 of the Crime and Disorder Act **1998** in England and Wales. 5. But they also introduced similar power into the Police Reform Act **2002** so that officials can make similar Asbo orders on conviction in criminal proceedings the government themselves called these Court Orders CRASBOs and they became available in **December 2002.** 6. Both types of ASBO have a minimum duration of two years but a judge can order an Asbo Application until further order, meaning that they can be in force for an indeterminate period of time until discharged or withdrawn by a court.  * **History of ASBOs P4 OF 10 By the year of 2003**  1. Later legislation strengthened its application: in England and Wales this has been via the Anti-social Behaviour Act **2003,** in Northern Ireland through an Order-in-Council and in Scotland with the Antisocial Behaviour. 2. **Background and summary** 3. In March 2003, the Government published a white paper outlining its proposals for tackling anti-social behaviour. *Respect and Responsibility – taking a stand against anti-social behaviour*focussed on providing local authorities and the police with a wider, more flexible range of powers to meet their existing responsibilities and respond to the needs of their local communities. 4. The Government designed the Act to ensure that the police have the appropriate powers to deal with serious anti-social behaviour. It introduces new powers for tackling the problem of premises used for drug dealing and for dispersing intimidating groups. It enables the police to tackle the nuisance that young people cause with air weapons and supports action against gun crime by banning the possession of imitation guns and air guns in public without good reason. It also tackles the danger of air weapons that people can easily convert to for the use of conventional ammunition. It also amends existing police powers to place conditions on public assemblies, deal with illegal raves and to deal with unauthorised encampments. 5. The Act also provides powers for local authorities and those collaborating with them to tackle anti-social behaviour in local communities. It extends property owners’ powers to deal with anti-social behaviour in social housing, including developing the use of injunctions and demoted tenancies. It also includes provisions aimed at dealing with noise nuisance. It develops the sanctions that are available for use against those who engage in anti-social behaviour and extends the range of agencies that can use them. It provides a means for schools, local authorities, and youth offending teams to collaborate with the parents of children who are behaving anti-socially and creates the mechanisms for enforcing this work. The Act extends local authorities’ powers in relation to cleaning land. It extends the measures that officers can take to remove graffiti and restricts the sale of aerosol paint to children. The Act also gives local authorities powers to intervene in disputes over high hedges. 6. The Act is in ten Parts. 7. **Part 1** Creates New Powers to Close Premises That Are Being Used for Drug Dealing or Use. 8. **Part 2** Extends Powers for Tackling Anti-Social Behaviour in Social Housing. 9. **Part 3** Develops Mechanisms for Enforcing Parental Responsibility for Children Who Behave in An Anti-Social Way in School or In the Community. 10. **Part 4** Creates A New Power for The Police to Designate Areas Where They Can Disperse Groups Causing Intimidation. 11. **Part 5** Deals with The Misuse of Air Weapons. 12. **Part 6** Extends Powers for Local Authorities to Clean the Environment. 13. **Part 7** Amends Police Powers for Dealing with: - “Public Assemblies” and: - “Trespassers.” 14. **Part 8** Provides New Powers for Local Authorities to Intervene in Disputes Regarding High Hedges. 15. **Part 9** Develops the Existing Sanctions of Anti-Social Behaviour Orders, Fixed Penalty Notices and Supervision Orders. 16. **Part 10** Contains General Provisions.  * **History of ASBOs P5 OF 10 By the year of 2004, 2005, 2006**  1. (Scotland) Act **2004**. 2. Scotland, however, has an existing tribunal charged with dealing with children and young persons who offend, the Children's Hearings System. 3. In a press release of **28th October 2004,** Tony Blair and David Blunkett announced further measures to extend the use and definition of ASBOs. 4. The Press Release Concluded by Remarking: 5. "In the past year around the Government has dealt with: - “**100,000 Cases”** of anti-social behaviour and issued out: - “**2,633 ASBOs**” and: - “**418 Dispersal Orders**” in the same period." 6. On **25 October 2005,** Transport for London announced its intent to apply for a new law giving them the authority to issue orders against repeat fare dodgers, and increased fines. 7. Kat Richards was the first offender ever given a Asbo and for repeated drunk and disorderly behaviour. As of **31st March 2004: -** “**2455, ASBOs**” had been issued in England and Wales. 8. On **30th March 2006,** the Home Office announced that: - “**7,356 Anti-Social Behaviour Orders”** have got issued out since **1999** in England and Wales. 9. **The remit would include:** 10. Extension of the Witness Protection Programme in anti-social behaviour cases. 11. More Courts dealing with cases. 12. More offences including: - “Dog-Fouling,” “Litter,” “Graffiti,” and: - “Night-Time Noise” liable for Fixed Penalty Notices. 13. Giving Parish councils the power to issue fixed penalty notices for infringements.  * **History of ASBOs P6 OF 10 By the year of 2007,**  1. On the **27th of June 2007** Tony Blair and the Labour Party  * **History of ASBOs P7 OF 10 By the year of 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012.**  1. The statistics documented in the table below show   Chart, bar chart  Description automatically generated   * **History of ASBOs P8 OF 10 By the year of 2013**   **Anti-Social Behaviour Includes a Range of Problems Including:**   1. Noise Pollution - Playing Music Persistently Too Loud or Persistently Making Other Loud or Intrusive Noise. 2. Drunkenness. 3. Abandoned Cars, Burned-Out Cars, Joyriding. 4. Stealing/Mugging/Shoplifting. 5. Begging. 6. Vandalism, Graffiti, Criminal Damage to Property. 7. Loitering. 8. Dropping Litter/Fly Tipping/Dog Fouling. 9. Drug Dealing or Drug Taking. 10. Intimidation And Bullying. 11. Spitting.  * **History of ASBOs P9 OF 10 By the year of 2014**   The Government replaced Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs) with Civil Injunctions and Criminal Behaviour Orders (CBOs) in 2014. Police, councils, and other organisations can apply to court to give a Civil Injunction to anyone over 10 years old for anti-social behaviour such as: Graffiti.  The Anti-social Behaviour, **Crime and Policing Act 2014** replaced nineteen existing mechanisms to tackle anti-social behaviour with six reformed remedies.  **These are: -**  **One:** Civil Injunctions  **Two:** Criminal Behaviour Orders  **Three:** Community Protection Notices  **Four:** Public Spaces Protection Orders  **Five:** New Closure Powers and Dispersal Powers  **Six:** New Dispersal Powers  The Crime and Policing Act **2014** States that the responsibility for dealing with anti-social behaviour is between all agencies and in particular the police, councils, and social property owners.   * **History of ASBOs P10 OF 10 Asbo’s Are Not Without Controversy!**  1. Critics suggest that Asbo’s may be "desirable" to certain people as a "badge", amongst peers to respect. 2. In the United Kingdom, an ASBO may be issued in response to "conduct which caused or was likely to cause harm, harassment, alarm or distress, to one or more persons not of the same household as him or herself and where an ASBO is seen as necessary to protect relevant persons from further anti-social acts by the Defendant." 3. In England and Wales, Magistrates’ Courts issue them, and in Scotland by the Sheriff Courts. 4. The British government introduced ASBOs by the Crime and Disorder Act **1998.** 5. In the UK, a CRASBO is a "criminally related" ASBO. 6. One local authority has published photos of those given ASBOs on an Internet site, but this is not standard practice.   **Please See [EXHIBIT J8]**   * **Why ASBOs are Issued**  1. Applications for ASBOs get trialled by magistrates sitting in their civil ability. Although the proceedings are civil, the Court must apply a heightened civil standard of proof. 2. This standard is virtually indistinguishable from the criminal standard. 3. The applicant must satisfy the Court "so that it is sure" that the defendant has acted in an anti-social manner. 4. The test for the Court to be "satisfied so that it is sure" is the same direction that a Judge gives to a jury in a criminal case heard in the Crown Court. 5. This is also known as satisfying the Court "beyond reasonable doubt": R vs Kritz [**1950**] 1 KB 82, approved by the Privy Council in Walters v R [**1969**] 2 AC 26 at 30. 6. As a matter of law, the burden of proof stays on the applicant and the standard is, effectively, the criminal standard. A Court may not order an anti-social behaviour order unless it is satisfied so that it is sure that the defendant has committed one or more of the anti-social acts alleged. 7. In pursuant with section 1(1) Civil Evidence Act **1995**, an applicant (and a defendant) has the right to rely on witness statements without calling the makers of those statements - known as hearsay. 8. If a party proposes to rely upon a hearsay statement, then the other party become entitled to ask the Court for permission to call that witness for cross examination: section 3 Civil Evidence Act **1995** and Rule 4 Magistrates' Courts (Hearsay Evidence in Civil Proceedings) Rules **1999.** 9. If the Court refuses to grant such an application, then the defendant will be unable to challenge the makers of the hearsay statements. Nevertheless, it is open for them to submit that the Court should place little or no weight upon material that has not yet to be cross examined. 10. Section 4(1) Civil Evidence Act **1995** states that: 11. ...in estimating the weight (if any) to hearsay evidence in civil proceedings the Court shall have regard to any circumstances from which any inference a Judge can draw as to the reliability or otherwise of the evidence. 12. The High Court has emphasised that the use of the words "if any" shows a Judge may give no weight at all to hearsay evidence. 13. To create an ASBO the applicant must prove beyond all reasonable doubt that the respondent has behaved in an anti-social manner. 14. The applicant can rely on hearsay evidence. 15. However,the Court of Appeal has said that it does not expect a Court to find that the Judge can reach the criminal standard by relying solely on hearsay evidence. 16. The Civil Evidence Act **1995** itself makes clear that Courts should consider what weight, if any at all, attaches to hearsay material. 17. In Cleary, the Court of Appeal again restated that Courts should consider attaching no weight at all to such material, following the words of the statute: **Cleary v** Highbury Corner Magistrates &amp; (1) Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis and others **(2007) 1 WLR 1272; [2006] EWHC 1869.** 18. [citation needed] 19. It is for the Court to decide what weight to give the hearsay evidence. 20. The Court of Appeal has said that the high standard of proof is difficult to meet if the entirety of the case, or the majority of it, is based upon hearsay evidence. 21. The proper approach will be for a Court to consider to what extent the hearsay evidence is, amongst other things, supported by other evidence, the cogency and similarity of supporting instances of hearsay evidence and the cogency and reliability of contradictory evidence supplied by a defendant. 22. Where, for example, ten anonymous witnesses who are unrelated to each other each provide a witness statement as to the defendant's anti-social behaviour where each statement refers independently to the same particular events and where this is supported by a witness statement from a non-anonymous witness, such as a housing officer, who confirms that residents have made complaints about a particular person over a period of time then the Court may be justified in according the statements a fair degree of weight.   **Please See [EXHIBIT J9]**   * **Hearsay**  1. **WLR 1272; [2006] EWHC 1869**  * <https://www.casemine.com/Judgement/uk/5a8ff75f60d03e7f57eabd50>   **Freedom Of Speech**   1. The Government introduced the words: - “In Open Air” into the bills of rights such as the raves bill **1994** and this still is present in the act of law to the date of the **17/11/2022.** 2. 15/ The words: - “In Open Air” was also, induced into theCrime and disorder act **1998** but this gave police less powers over domestic violence in private homes. 3. The Labour party omitted out / amended the words as removed: - “in open air” from the crime and disorder act **1998** so, the officials could tackle violent disorder within a private dwelling effectively as this is what the Act of law was set out to achieve. 4. The American saying as a couple of the United Kingdom Citizens wrongly Quote is. “We have the freedom of speech” the Americans are right as they have a different Legal system to the UK called the: - “First Amendment” and the First Amendment states the following: - “*Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.*” 5. In the United Kingdom Government law states that a Citizen can cause a public disturbance which some Citizens otherwise quote as: - “A Breach of The Peace” and a public disturbance can be easily caused by having an opinion and being seen or overheard by a member of the public in your local vicinity.   Councils must look into complaints about noise that could be a ‘statutory nuisance’ (covered by the Environmental Protection Act 1990).  **For the noise to count as a statutory nuisance it must do one of the following:**   1. unreasonably and substantially interfere with the use or enjoyment of a home or other premises 2. injure health or be likely to injure health   If they agree that a statutory nuisance is happening or will happen in the future, councils must serve an abatement notice.  This requires whoever is responsible to stop or restrict the noise.  The officers will usually serve the notice on the person responsible, but they can also serve the notice on the owner or occupier of the premises.  The abatement notice can sometime face delays for up to Seven days while the council tries to get the person responsible to stop or restrict the noise.  **Councils are responsible for looking into complaints about noise from:**   1. premises including land like gardens and certain vessels (for example, loud music or barking dogs) 2. vehicles, machinery, or equipment in the street (for example, music from car stereos)   **Statutory noise nuisance laws do not apply to noise from:**   1. traffic or planes (they do apply to model planes) 2. political demonstrations and demonstrations about a cause 3. premises occupied by the armed forces or visiting forces 4. Councils can decide what level of service they provide to deal with noise complaints, for example, whether to have officers on call at night.   **Noise at night: warning notices**  Councils can investigate complaints of statutory nuisance to tackle noise produced at any time of day or night.  They may also issue warning notices in response to complaints about noise above permitted levels from 11pm to 7am.  The Councils can use these warning notices for noise that is not a statutory nuisance.  **The warning notice must tell the recipient:**   1. That the noise is coming from the premises between 11pm and 7am 2. That the noise exceeds, or may exceed permitted levels as measured from within the complainant’s dwelling 3. That the accused person must reduce the noise to the below permitted level in the specified period and officials are to advise for this to happen within the first 10 minutes once the notice is served and must end by 7am) 4. What time the notice is issued   **Noise from dwellings**  If the noise comes from a dwelling the warning notice must say that the person responsible may be guilty of an offence if he or she exceeds the noise levels made in the period specified permitted.  **Noise from other premises**  If the noise comes from other premises (not a dwelling), the notice must say that the person responsible for the premises may be guilty of an offence if “noise exceeding permitted levels is made in the period specified.”  **If Occupiers do not reduce the noise**  If the council thinks the noise still exceeds the permitted level after the specified period and wants to prosecute, they must measure the noise level from within the dwelling of the person who complained.  **Permitted noise levels**  The permitted noise level using A-weighted decibels “The Unit Environmental Noise Is Usually Measured In” is:   1. Thirty-four dBA (decibels adjusted) if the underlying level of noise is no more than twenty-four dBA 2. dBA above the underlying level of noise if this is more than twenty-four dBA   Penalties for not complying with a warning notice  **If someone does not comply with a warning notice without a reasonable excuse, councils can:**   1. give a fixed penalty notice (FPN) giving them the chance to pay a fine (up to £110 for dwellings and £500 for licensed premises) within 14 days, instead of the officers prosecuting the accused person. 2. prosecute them if they do not issue an FPN or if the person responsible does not pay the fine on time (if convicted they can get a fine of up to £1,000 for dwellings and an unlimited amount for licensed premises) 3. remove noise-making equipment like loudspeakers  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Portrait** | | **Name (Birth–Death)** | **Term Of Office** | | **Elected** | **Political Party** | **Previous, Concurrent, And Subsequent Political Offices** | **Education** | |  | A person in a suit  Description automatically generated with low confidence | **MP**  Tony Blair  **Labour** | 2 May 1997 | 27 June 2007 | **0** | Labour | 1. With his parents basing their family in Durham, Blair attended the Chorister School from **1961** to **1966.** 2. Aged **thirteen**, he spent his boarding school term-time at Fettes College in Edinburgh from **1966** to **1971**. 3. It is known that Blair hated his time at Fettes. 4. His teachers were unimpressed with him; his biographer, John Rentoul, reported that "All the teachers I spoke to when researching the book said he was a complete pain in the backside, and they were very glad to see the back of him." 5. Blair, modelled himself on Mick Jagger, lead singer of The Rolling Stones. 6. During his time there he met Charlie Falconer (a pupil at the rival Edinburgh Academy), whom he later appointed lord chancellor. 7. Leaving Fettes College at the age of **eighteen**, Blair next spent a gap year in London attempting to find fame as a rock music promoter.   A dog playing a piano  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | * 0 | |  | A person in a suit and tie  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | **MP**  Jack Straw  **Labour** | **0** | **0** | **0** | Labour | 1. Secretary of State for Justice 2. Lord Chancellor | * 0 | | End | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | **Requested Order; [EXHIBIT J3]** |
| * **Highbury Magistrates Court**  1. On the **5th of November 2014,** at Highbury Magistrates Court a guilty verdict was wrongfully issued.  * **Wood Green Crown Court**  1. The Now Claimant requests for the decision/order made at Wood Green Crown Court on **19th January 2017** in relation to the Appeal against conviction, of the Antisocial Behaviour Order to be stuck out of Court in the Now Claimants Favour. 2. This application is to have the following decisions/orders reviewed and reversed in order to prevail in the right to and in justice. 3. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan police force staff all together decided to create an Interim Antisocial Behaviour Court Order against the Now Claimant in a conference at the Enfield civic centre on the **00/00/2014**. 4. The Now Claimant asks for the Courts to reopened and reviewed the case under the bases that the application was frauded when developed by the Enfield Councils Staff and that of Metropolitan Police Members inclusively, he asks for the overturning of the Asbo verdict. 5. The ongoing of the Asbo case are a clear injustice that the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police allowed to happen, even once reported. | | | |
|  | | | **Infringements; [EXHIBIT J4]** |
| * **Infringements**  1. A breached of The Now Claimant's Human Rights has wrongly occurred. 2. breaches of The Now Claimant's rights to data protection wrongly occurred in relation towards the ongoings of the Anti-Social Behaviour order. 3. A breached of The Now Claimant's right to Fair Process has also wrongly occurred. 4. Definitions and Interpretations 5. About Anti-Social Behaviour Orders 6. Requested Order. 7. Infringements 8. Preparation Of Service: - **11/08/2014** 9. Asbo Certificate / Notice: - **13/08/2014** 10. Failed Service of Court Order; **12/09/2014** 11. The 1st Court Appearance; **06/10/2014** 12. Asbo Certificates / Notices; **30/10/2014** 13. The 2nd Court Appearance; **22/10/2014** 14. The 3rd Court Appearance; **05/11/2014** 15. **30/11/2014** Taken from Diary Going to the shop and seeing Debra Andrews of 113 Burncroft Avenue **&**   **02/12/2014** (Hearing for interim Driving)   1. Due to No Disclosure; **20/01/2015** 2. Another Asbo Hearing; **10/03/2015** 3. The Now Claimant's Mother Received a Phone Call; **02/08/2014** 4. Had to Attend Court for the Asbo Trial; **03/08/2014 / 04/08/2014** 5. The Magistrates Court Imposed Conditions; **04/08/2014** 6. Contacting the Local MPs about the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police Force; **01/05/2015 & 16/07/2015** 7. After The Magistrates Trial Getting a New Solicitor for An Appeal / Legal Aid; **03/08/2015 & 04/08/2015 &**   Or Keeping the Old Solicitors **&**  In the Meantime.   1. The Metropolitan Police Service Posted on Their Website a Guilty Verdict: **13/08/2021** 2. The Appeal Hearing; **26/10/2015** 3. All Parties to Be Ready and At the Crown Court; **09/11/2015** 4. Failed Meetings by the Now Claimants Solicitor; **December 2015** &   Multiple Texts and Calls We Made **&**  Exhibiting Just One of the Occasion Texts and phone Calls that Stayed Ignored   1. The Solicitor Left the Bundles with The Now Claimants Mother; **23/12/2015** &   The Now Claimants Case Handlers; **23/12/2015.**   1. After the Christmas and the New Year's Holidays; **01/01/2016 till the 19/02/2016** 2. The Now Claimants then Solicitor Requested to Come of the Records; **19/02/2016 &**   Failure of Any Received Disclosure.   1. The Case Was too be Ready for Trial as It Was The; **22/02/2016 &**   Interrelating Side Issues / Mental Health Team Workers **&**  While still at Court Facing the Asbo **&**  After the Court Hearing   1. Upon Attending Court; **04/04/2016** 2. In Between The Two Past Dates of The Court Mention Hearings of the**: 19/02/2016 &**   The Last Mention Hearing of the: **04/04/2016** Taking A Place   1. Finding an Email: - **12/07/2016** 2. Blank “Doctors part” 3. From the Housing Transfer Files 15-08-2022 =39.9.1 **&**   **Asbo:** 14/08/2015 **Asbo:** 16/08/2015 Evidence: Exhibit 1 / 16/08/2015: The Newspaper articles: **-- &**  Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews: 18/08/2015 **&**  Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews: 20/08/2015 **&**  Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews: 28/08/2015 **&**  Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews: 29/08/2015 **&**  Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews: 30/08/2015.   1. Sally Gilchrist: - 02**/09/2016** 2. From the Housing Transfer Files 15-08-2022 =39.9.1 **&**   Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews: 18/09/2015 **&**  **At Court; 21/09/2016** + **22/09/2016.**   1. From the From the Housing Transfer Files **15-08-2022 =39.9.1 &**   Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews: **21/09/2015 &**  Collecting the Court Bundles from Michael Carroll's Office; **23/09/2016 &**  From the From the Housing Transfer Files 15-08-2022 **=39.9.1 &**  Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews: **23/09/2015.**   1. At the Court on; **26/09/2016** 2. No Solicitor at Court; **14/10/2016** 3. The Solicitor No Longer Worked for The Solicitor Firm; **19/10/2016** 4. Attended Court: - **25/10/2016** 5. The Now Claimant Mother Meet with Ms Ward; **27/10/2016** 6. An Email to The Judge: - **01/11/2016** 7. An Email from The Judge: - **02/11/2016** 8. More Email’s to The Judge: - **19/12/2016** 9. More Email from The Judge: - **21/11/2016** 10. No Solicitor's Firms: **09/2016** 11. The Mother and Uncle Attended the Court due to Government Figures Trying to Avoid Justice: **17/01/2017** 12. More Interrelating Side Issues with Members of his Neighbours due to Government Figures Trying to Avoid Justice: **18/01/2017** 13. Probation Conditions 14. JR Court 15. **With Ease Section 1** “Requested Order to be Made” The Claimant and his mother 16. **Posting about Section 3** “Failed Service of Court Order” It would be inaccurate to believe that 17. **The Obvious Section 4** “The 1st Court Appearance” By the forged Asbo application forcing the Now Claimant to attend Court he suffered from Malicious wrongdoing created by 18. **When Summing Section 5** “The 2nd Court Appearance” It would be fair to say that more could have organised to prevent the criminal and civil wrongdoing staff inflicted on the Now Claimant, but the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police force failed the claimant when he reported | | | |
|  | | | **Preparation Of Service**: - **11/08/2014; [EXHIBIT J5]** |
| * **Preparation Of Service**  1. **A**  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Statements**  **Witness**  **Victims**  **Police Officers**  **[EXHIBIT J5]** | | |  | * Steven Elsmore is the Asbo case developer as it is his name at the top of every page in the application that logged into the Enfield Councils and Metropolitan Police Forces Computer to develop the Asbo against the Now Claimant. | |  | * **The 1st Asbo Folder / pub Book Issue: one!**   WITNESS STATEMENT of hearsay evidence Steve ELSMORE / Police Officer 206372  --   1. I am a police officer attached to the Anti- Social Behaviour Team as part of the Community Safety Unit based at Enfield Civic Centre. */*   --  **Page Numbers:**  **Mag 2** – 11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,  **Appeal -** 19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31  **11/08/2014** | |  | * **The 2nd Asbo Folder / pub Book Issue: one!**   WITNESS STATEMENT of hearsay evidence Steve ELSMORE / Police Officer 206372  --   1. I am a police officer attached to the Anti- Social Behaviour Team as part of the Community Safety Unit based at Enfield Civic Centre.   --  **Page Numbers:** 19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31  **11/08/2014** | | **End:** | | | | | |
|  | | | **Asbo Certificate / Notice:** - **13/08/2014; [EXHIBIT J6]**  **Date;** **13/08/2014**  &  **Date;** **30/10/2014** |
| * **Asbo Certificate / Notice**  1. All Asbo’s Bundles that the Enfield Council, Metropolitan Police and Crown Prosecution served on the Now Claimant in the Lower Court and onto the Crown Court must have the same documentation held withinside, pertaining to the same files already submitted but the apps do not the exhibits below prove this as the Magistrates and Crown Court Asbo Bundles have Different Certificates inside of them. 2. The certificates shown below also prove “Joint Circular” as a consultation, as required by s.1E (3) of the Crime and Disorder Act **1998** took place between the following Enfield Council & Subsidiary Companies including the Metropolitan Police.  * **1st Asbo / Borough Commander Jane Johnson & Steve Hodgson**   A consultation, as required by s.1E (3) of the Crime and Disorder Act **1998,**  **Date;** **13/08/2014**  **Mag 2 – Page:** ten.  Text, letter  Description automatically generated     * **ENFIELD COUNCIL & THE MET POLICE “Working together for a safer London.”**  1. **POLICE ('the Police’**) as required **by S.1(2)** of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 that: 2. “On the:        The Local Authority and the Police held a Consultation meeting together with other relevant organisations to discuss issues concerned in the case of: (name)... Simon CORDELL of (address) 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield EN3 and to reach a decision on action to be taken in this matter.” 3. **“There Is no conflicting work** in progress with the above-named which **conflicts** with **the aim** of an **application** under the**Crime and Disorder Act 1998.”** 4. “Consultation having taken place; the applicant Is entitled to apply for the order sought The Metropolitan Police certify that they are in full support of the application.”   Dated this day of  Signed:  Signed:  For and behalf of the London Borough of Enfield       For and behalf of the Metropolitan Police   * **Penalty** * **Is a conflict-of-interest illegal**  1. IT IS HEREBY **CERTIFIED**by the **LONDON BOROUGH OF ENFIELD (‘the Local Authority’) and the METROPOLITAN** 2. Having a conflict of interest is not illegal. ... Simply put, a public official has a “conflict of interest” when his or her ability to be an objective decision-maker becomes impaired by his or her own interests, or the interests of family members or business associates.  * [**Companies Act 2006**](https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/46/section/175) * <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/46/section/175>  1. 175. Duty to avoid conflicts of interest 2. A director of a company must avoid a situation in which he has, or can have, a direct or indirect interest that conflicts, or may conflict, with the interests of the company. 3. This applies in particular to the exploitation of any property, information, or opportunity (and it is immaterial whether the company could take advantage of the property, information, or opportunity).  * **Conflicts of Interest and Confidential Information Act 1998** * <https://www.icaew.com/-/media/corporate/files/technical/ethics/professional_ethics/1-205-conflicts-of-interest-and-confidentiality.ashx>      |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Portrait** | | **Name** | **Went To the Bar** | **Court** | **History** | |  | [A person in a uniform  Description automatically generated with medium confidence](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Boris_Johnson_July_2015.jpg) | **Commissioner**  **Sir Bernard Hogan Howe**  **Met Police** | **4** | (Magistrates’ courts | 1. M | |  | [A picture containing person, indoor, office  Description automatically generated](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Boris_Johnson_July_2015.jpg) | **Borough Commander** Jane Johnson **Met Police** | **4** | (Magistrates’ courts | 1. M | |  | [A picture containing text, person  Description automatically generated](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Boris_Johnson_July_2015.jpg) | **Director**  Rob Leak  **Enfield Council** | **4** | (Magistrates’ courts | 1. M | | **End** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | **Failed Service of Court Order; 12/09/2014; [EXHIBIT J7] &; [EXHIBIT J8] &; [EXHIBIT J9]** |
| * **Failed Service of Court Order**  1. It is said that on the on the **12th of September 2014** the police attended The Now Claimant home address of 109 Burncroft, Avenue, Enfield, EN3 7JQ, they knocked on his front door, the Now Claimant was not expecting anyone, the Now Claimant approached his front door and looked through his spy hole he could see people who appeared to be Police Officers, and asked them through the door what they wanted, the police stated they needed to speak to him, the Now Claimant opened his front door very slightly using his foot to keep the door safely locked but slightly ajar, then at that moment in time a female police officer that was present started to try to force an object into the front door, the Now Claimant soon become aware that the Police Officers were trying to trick him as their true intensions were different than what they had first said. When playing closer attention to the Police Officers’ actions the Now Claimant realised the Police Officers were trying to serve documents on him and due to the size of those files, they needed him to open his front door and get the paperwork into his hands as they would never have been able to fit into any standard letterbox. 2. The Now Claimant's knew this to be unfair “Tricked by Police Officers with other intention than what they first explained for those officers to gain access to any premises is deceitful behaviour of them and would obviously not break law.” 3. Words came out of the Now Claimant mouth in the effect of I have learning difficulties, followed by: - “he will not accept any documents.” 4. Next the Now Claimant closed his front door and said: - “that he was not being rude to any Police Officers, but he does not accept service of any files” and in the Now Claimant doing so, police present at 109 Burncroft Avenue did not manage to serve him. 5. It is a well-known fact on the police's Computer system and now that of other government bodies databases that the Now Claimant does have learning difficulties and health problems. 6. The Now Claimant could hear the police talking outside his front door and the lady police officer then questioned her colleges and said, “what shall we do now,” a male police officer said put the application on the floor and in front of the door referring to the files in the lady officer’s hands. 7. The lady police officer then placed what is known to be an A4 size folder on the floor outside the Now Claimant's front door, just as the male Police officer had instructed her to do. 8. The Female police officer then put what she had left in her hands into the Now Claimant's letterbox, which was a total of four pages of paper. 9. The four pages of paper put into the Now Claimants Front door contain a part of an Asbo Court application but was not clear due to not being complete. 10. The Now Claimant then made a phone call to his mother, who could not attend his home address on this day but did manage to do so, on the following day after. 11. On her attendance, she found the folder the Police Officers had left on the floor somehow opened as her son had refused to go into his communal corridor until she arrived. 12. The Now Claimant’s mother was very shocked when she first took a glance at the mess on the floor of scattered files, once the Now Claimants mother had got over the disbelieve of what she was looking at the clean-up begun. 13. The mother of the Now Claimant collected what she could see and took a look inside of the battered files the police had left a mess. Dazed in amassment The Now Claimant’s mother saw the data that was within pages and that Police Officers had left in the publics reach. 14. The Now Claimant asked his mother what was in the folder while taking a look over her shoulder but she told him: - “to be quite as she is going home to photocopy what she has found,” for his mother to then say that: “she is going to bring it to the Edmonton police station due to the mess she found it in,” and before the Now Claimant knew it she had disappeared Quoting: “she will send him a copy latter of what she had found by email.” 15. The data that the police offices left in such a mess outside of the Now Claimants front door contained people’s personal information and was a breach of the data protection act **1998** by Police Officers leaving official data in a commune area of the block of flats. 16. On the Claimants mother’s arrival to the Edmon police station, she went into the front foyer of reception and spoke to an assistant in grave detail about what Police Officers had done wrong at her son’s home when managing classified data. 17. To the Now Claimants’ mothers understanding the four pages of paper that Police Officers posted in the letter box of her son address would have amounted to be a complete Asbo application with the other found and missing associated documents that got left outside his home when all together and if served right so, she also, handed the four pages into the front desk of the police station at the same time. 18. The Police assistant collected the file and brought it away to another room after inspection of the files he soon after came back and started to complete a lost property receipt and then handed it to the Claimants mother’s, at the same time, the Now Claimant mother explained to that assistant that we had drafted a letter of our own and handed it him, the assistant documented notes in the police computer about this and gave out another receipt to the Now Claimants mother and to say farewell at the end of all of what had occurred to happened they said goodbye to each other and departed acquaintances. 19. The Now Claimant and his mother put a letter of complaint into the police about the way police acted at 109 Burncroft Avenue on the **13th of September 2014,** when at the Police Station. 20. But by **2016** this made no difference as it became clear that police and the Enfield Council had frauded the whole Asbo application and would do nothing about it right, as more official staff forged more documents to cover up the events that really took place on this day of the **12/09/2014.** When the Now Claimant and his mother received a copy of the Asbo appeal Bundle they both noticed a that Police Officers who attended 109 Burncroft Avenue had induced their own frauded statements   **Please See [EXHIBIT J8]**   1. This Exhibit we contain herein is in the 2nd Asbo Folder PC Sophie Theodoulou Police Officer Who Lied and said that she Served the Now Claimant the First Asbo Folder, when she did not! 2. The Prosecution did not sneck the file below in the Appel Stage until the date of: - **00/00/2016** 3. **Date: 12/09/2014** 4. **Page Numbers:** 57,58   Text, letter  Description automatically generatedTable  Description automatically generated   1. Every complaint made by the Now Claimant and his mother to the Metropolitan Police and Enfield Council they treated unfairly in the standards. 2. The Enfield council and metropolitan police staff did not treat the claimants and his mothers’ complaints with the relevance they deserved and a failure of a professional response concluding any fair outcome appeared while staff displaying noncompliance for law when dealing with official complaints and company affairs. 3. Please see a letter of the compliant and photos and receipt that was handed to Edmonton police station on **13th September 2014.** 4. The CAD number for this the police have lost as when you call and give the information to the police station, they cannot find anything in regard to this, but I clearly have the CAD information and receipt for this when it was handed in. See below   **Please See [EXHIBIT J9]**   * **The 1st Asbo Folder / pub Book Issue:** One  1. Met Property Receipt / 2. Page Numbers:   A picture containing diagram  Description automatically generatedText, letter  Description automatically generatedText, letter  Description automatically generated | | | |
|  | | | **The 1st Court Appearance; 06/10/2014; [EXHIBIT J10]** |
| * **The 1st Court Appearance**  1. On **06th October 2014,** the Now Claimant was due to appear in Court and on this day the Now Claimant had arranged for Michael Carroll and Co Solicitors, to act on his behalf and this included for him to have his legal aid put into place. 2. Ready for Court was we not, as problem after problem that we raised to our litigation friend and others did not get adhered towards and for an instance the application for legal aid we applied for; - “legal aid had refused,” when the Judge sitting in the Courtroom heard Legal Aids decision, he himself Overturned their decision and granted legal aid in the Now Claimants favour and the case went ahead. The reason for the Judge overturning legal aid and granting it was due to the Now Claimant having known learning difficulties, health problems and due to the complexity of the case. 3. The Now Claimant asked for Disclosure so, that he could stand a fair and speedy trial, but the requested to the Asbo application developers never became complied with. 4. The case was relisted for the **22/10/2014,** for an interim Antisocial Behaviour Order hearing and the Judge ordered for all Police Officers that we requested to attend for the interim hearing.  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **1 Out of 20 of 20 Court dates the 1 of 7 appearance towards the 1st Asbo**  **At Highbury Court and the Judge was** | | | **Date:** | 6th October 2014 Asbo Hearing | | **Defendants Name:** | Mr Simon Cordell | | **Case Handler:** | Ms Sally Gilchrist Legal Executive Director Met Police and she was Present! | | **Court House:** | Highbury Corner Magistrates | | **Reason:** | Mention Hearing | | **Case Number:** | 1402490741 | | **Judge s Name:** | Defendant Judge Pigott  Defendant Judge Cordell?  Defendant Judge Williams | | **Contra’s Name:** | Robert Talalay | | **My Barrister Name:** | Mr. Andrew Locke | | **Note 1:** |  | | **Note 2:** |  |  * **THE NATURE OF THE ROLE OF THE DISTRICT JUDGE (MAGISTRATES’ COURT)** * <https://www.nijac.gov.uk/sites/nijac/files/media-files/District%20Judge%20%28Magistrates%27%20Court%29%202021_0.pdf> * **LIST OF JUDGES** * <https://www.judiciary.uk/about-the-judiciary/who-are-the-judiciary/list-of-members-of-the-judiciary/dj-mags-ct-list/> * <https://www.judiciary.uk/about-the-judiciary/who-are-the-judiciary/list-of-members-of-the-judiciary/circuit-judge-list/> * <https://www.judiciary.uk/about-the-judiciary/who-are-the-judiciary/list-of-members-of-the-judiciary/district-judge-list/> * <https://www.judiciary.uk/about-the-judiciary/who-are-the-judiciary/list-of-members-of-the-judiciary/hc-masters-list/> * <https://www.judiciary.uk/about-the-judiciary/who-are-the-judiciary/list-of-members-of-the-judiciary/bench-chairmen-list/>  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Portrait** | | **Judge Name** | **Went To the Bar** | **Court** | **History** | |  | [A picture containing person, indoor  Description automatically generated](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Boris_Johnson_July_2015.jpg) | **DDJ Defendant** Judge Pigott | **1978** | (Magistrates’ courts | 1. Since her call in **1978** Diana has practiced entirely at the Criminal Bar. She prosecutes and defends. She has considerable experience in dealing with cases involving violence, drugs, grave sexual offences, and those involving children. 2. Diana has been a Leading Junior in Law cases, particularly those involving sexual complaints. She is a Grade 3 prosecutor and is on the Rape List Panel. She has lectured defence solicitors on how to be successful in cases involving sexual offences. She also sits as a DDJ in the Magistrates Court. 3. Diana has developed a specialist expertise in dealing with young and vulnerable defendants. Solicitors praise her patience and her ability to explain the law and facts in a way that defendants can understand. Her main field of work involves serious sexual allegations (including rape and historical complaints). Diana is often the first choice for someone charged with an offence of a sexual nature. Solicitors like her first-hand approach, the fact that she works hard and to deadlines and is familiar with the complexities of the law. Defendants praise her ability to fairly put forward their case and explain issues. The Court often praised her for conducting cross examination of vulnerable witnesses in a sensitive manner. 4. She is frequently instructed to represent those charged with non-accidental injuries to children and has done ‘baby shaking ‘cases. She has extensive expertise in cross examining co-defendants in ‘cutthroat’ defences and in dealing with expert evidence from the medical profession. 5. She was also involved in the case of R v C (sexual activity with a person with a mental disorder impeding choice). This case involved the cross examination of psychiatrists. An appeal to the Court of Appeal was successful. The Crown then appealed to the House of Lords. It is still the leading authority. 6. Practice Area 7. Diana’s particular expertise is in dealing with cases involving sexual complaints. She prosecutes and defends. She has developed a particular expertise in dealing with young and vulnerable defendants. She has considerable patience and can explain law and facts in a way that a defendant can understand. She also represents defendants who are professionals in their field and who face grave consequences if convicted.  * <https://www.187fleetstreet.com/barristers/diana-pigot> | |  | A close-up of a stethoscope  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | **District Judge Susan** Williams | **1978** | (Magistrates’ courts | 1. District Judge (MC) Williams Southeast **03/01/22** 2. District Judge Susan Williams is a designated district judge in the Magistrates’ courts 3. Susan Frances Williams retires with effect from **01st January 2022.**   **Background information**   1. District Judge (Magistrates’ courts) Williams (66) went to the Bar (Middle Temple) in **1978**. 2. The bench appointed District Judge Williams as a Deputy District Judge in the (Magistrates Courts) in **1996** and also, as a District Judge in the (Magistrates’ courts) in **2002.** 3. As a Judge at Highbury Corner Magistrates' Court, she fined a care firm £300,000. 4. District Judge Susan Williams criticised the company for trying to "cover up" sexual assaults. | |  |  | **Cordell?** | **4** | (Magistrates’ courts | 1. **MAYBE**   <https://www.legal500.com/firms/1819-joelson/278-london-england/lawyers/600732-sheldon-cordell/>   1. Defendant Judge Cordell is a real Judge 2. Judicial pay ranges from around £90,000 to £270,000 per year, depending on their seniority. 3. Judicial roles can be part time and combined with earnings (and higher earnings) from private practice. | | **End** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | **Asbo Certificates / Notices; [EXHIBIT J11] & [EXHIBIT J12]**  **Date;** **13/08/2014**  &  **Date;** **30/10/2014** |
| * **Asbo Certificates / Notices**  1. **Appeal Stage 2nd Asbo Folder – Pages** 5, 6 = These are Two different documents to the first Asbo folder.  * **The 2nd Asbo**  1. **Borough Commander Johnson** A consultation, as required by s.1E (3) of the Crime and Disorder Act **1998, Date;** **30/10/2014** and on **Page;** five  * **The 2nd Asbo**  1. Steve Hodgson a consultation, as required by s.1E (3) of the Crime and Disorder Act **1998, Date;** **30/10/2014** and on **Page;** six   **Text, letter  Description automatically generatedText, letter  Description automatically generated**  **[EXHIBIT J11] [EXHIBIT J12]** | | | |
|  | | | **The 2nd Court Appearance; 22/10/2014; [EXHIBIT J13]** |
| * **The 2nd Court Appearance**  1. On the **22nd of October 2014**, the Now Claimant was due in Court for the Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order to be hearable and arrived in Court in advance of the required time. 2. But due to the Now Claimant Barristers’ home flooding with water due to having a burst pipe he could not attend Court. 3. The Now Claimant still wanted the Judge to hear the case, which the Judge would not allow. 4. The Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order hearing was then set for the **05/11/2014.** 5. All Police Officers did attend Court for the hearing as requested by the Now Claimant and his litigation friends, but the case did not go ahead.  * **Disclosure**  1. Disclosure was also, asked for on this date and that included.  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **2 Out of 20 of 20 Court dates the 2 of 7 appearance towards the 1st Asbo**  **At Highbury Court and the Judge was** | | | **Date:** | 22/10/2014 | | **Defendants Name:** | Mr Simon Cordell | | **Court House:** | Highbury Corner Magistrates | | **Reason:** | Mention Hearing | | **Case Number:** | 1402490741 | | **Judge s Name:** |  | | **Contra’s Name:** | Robert Talalay | | **My Barrister Name:** | Mr. Andrew Locke | | **Note 1:** | (Was Due to be interim) | | **Note 2:** | Ms Sally Gilchrist Legal Executive Director Met Police was Present! | | | | |
|  | | | **The 3rd Court Appearance; 05/11/2014; [EXHIBIT J14]** |
| * **The 3rd Court Appearance**  1. In the days prior to this hearing, an ambulance rushed the Now Claimant into hospital due to kidney problems and while he was still in hospital, his Solicitor informed him on the **04/11/2014** that if he did not attend Court on the **05/11/2014** the case would go ahead without his presence. 2. The Now Claimant then had to discharged himself from the hospital because he had no choice. (He was extremely unwell) 3. On **05th November 2014,** the Courts forced the Now Claimant to arrive at Court for the Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order hearing; He and his mother knew that all police had to attend Court yet again from the **22/10/2014** but they did not attend, and the Prosecutions reasons given to why they did not attend was the Prosecution did order them to attend. 4. The reason given was absolute nonsense as the case had only adjourned due to the Now Claimants Barristers Home flooding with water. 5. The Now Claimant and his litigation friend had prior requested the following witnesses to attend Court. 6. Inspector Douglas Skinner; - 7. Police constable Miles; - 8. Acting police sergeant Edgoose; - 9. Police constable Elsmore: - 10. Sergeant King: - 11. Police constable Ames; and: - 12. Inspector Hamill.  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Portrait** | | **Judge Name** | **Went To the Bar** | **Court** | **History** | |  | [A person wearing a vest  Description automatically generated with medium confidence](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Boris_Johnson_July_2015.jpg) | **Inspector**  Douglas Skinner  **Met Police** | **4** | (Magistrates’ courts | 1. M | |  | [A person wearing a helmet  Description automatically generated with medium confidence](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Boris_Johnson_July_2015.jpg) | **Constable** Charles Miles  **Met Police** | **4** | (Magistrates’ courts | 1. M | |  |  | **Sergeant** Edgoose  **Met Police** | **4** | (Magistrates’ courts | 1. M | |  |  | **Constable** Elsmore  **Met Police** | **4** | (Magistrates’ courts | 1. M | |  |  | **Sergeant** King  **Met Police** | **4** | (Magistrates’ courts | 1. M | |  |  | **Constable** Ames  **Met Police** | **4** | (Magistrates’ courts | 1. M | |  |  | **Inspector** Hamill  **Met Police** | **4** | (Magistrates’ courts | 1. M | | **End** | | | | | |  1. Another issue for the Now Claimant on this day was that his Barrister still could not attend Court with his given reason being: - “due to the flooding of his property that had taking place on the **22/10/2014**,” and on stead another Barrister turned up in his place. 2. The temporary Barrister did not have a copy of the Asbo application brought against the Now Claimant and knew truly little about the case. 3. The temp Barrister who attended the Court produced a skeleton argument to strike-out the Antisocial Behaviour Order application and submitted the document on behalf of the Now Claimant but arguments from the Prosecution were raised that “those which rely upon the civil procedure rules, are not applicable to these proceedings and advanced that the civil procedure rules only apply to proceedings in the County Court, the High Court, and the Civil Division of the Court of Appeal and as a result the Magistrate's Court had no jurisdiction to consider an application to strike-out the Asbo application that the Now Claimants Barrister had submitted and the Antisocial Behaviour Order hearing went ahead under the Judge s Orders. 4. As the hearing continued for the Interim Asbo application the outcome became more of a gross injustice to the Now Claimant and easily showed disorder in the Court. 5. The District Judge Newham granted the Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order and Upon delivering her judgment, the District Judge Newham ruled that it is just for her to impose an Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order, and that she had taken regard when considering the application due to the Now Claimants Article 6 and 8 Human Rights in respect of his business. 6. The District Judge ruled that there are no provisions contained within the (amended) and proposed the Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order would not prevent the Now Claimant from conducting legitimate business.  * **The Judge Ordered the Following Directions:**  1. The District Judge also, ruled that parties are to exchange any added evidence on which they seek to rely by **20th January 2015,** and this is to include any witness statements from any witness, including the defendant himself; and: - 2. The Jude then stated that she prohibits all parties involved in the Asbo application from relying on any evidence not already served or served following paragraph 1 of these directions, without the permission of the Court. 3. District Judge Newham explained in the Court hearing; although not a formal direction, should any witnesses who are to attend Court become no longer needed then that party involved is to speedily serve their request in writing.  * **Our Raised Concerns**  1. Continuously raised thought Court proceeding by the Now Claimant and his litigation team were concerns of the conditions set by the Judge as they breached the Now Claimants **Human Rights,** and this included: - 2. Article 6 right to a fair trial: - 3. The Now Claimant had to go ahead at the hearing without the Barrister having any other paperwork other than the application to strike out, which the Judge disallowed. 4. Also on this date, the Police Officers did not attend when they knew they should. 5. The Now Claimant was so unwell at this hearing, he was not coping he should never have had to discharge himself from hospital to try to defend himself. 6. The police have it on the police systems who done what they say the Now Claimant has done and have not showed that information when requested. 7. The Prosecution’s case also relied solely on hearsay, Magistrate's Courts (hearsay evidence in civil proceeding) rules **1999** and breached the Now Claimants right to challenge.  * **Disclosure**  1. We again brought up Disclosure and the District Judge played an excellent roll as an “Escape-Artist,” when avoiding the matter. 2. The interim order comital got set to continue on the **10th of March 2015** when the Judge would hear a full hearing over two days.  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **3 Out of 20 of 20 Court dates the 3 of 7 appearance towards the 1st Asbo**  **At Highbury Court and the Judge s was** | | | **Date:** | 05th November 2014 Asbo Hearing | | **Defendants Name:** | Mr Simon Cordell | | **Case Handler:** | Ms Sally Gilchrist Legal Executive Director Met Police and she was Present! | | **Court House:** | Highbury Corner Magistrates | | **Reason:** | Mention Hearing | | **Case Number:** | 1402490741 | | **Judge s Name:** | **District Judge Newham = Julia Newton?** | | **Contra’s Name:** | Robert Talalay | | **My Barrister Name:** | Mr. Andrew Locke | | **Note 1:** | (Hearing for interim) | | **Note 2:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Portrait** | | **Judge Name** | **Went To the Bar** | **Court** | **History** | |  | A close-up of a stethoscope  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | **District Judge**  Julia Newton | **4** | (Magistrates’ courts | 1. District Judge Julia Newton Highbury and Islington 2. Also known as Julia Carolyn Newton | | **End** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | **30/11/2014** Taken from Diary Going to the shop and seeing Debra Andrews of 113 Burncroft Avenue**; [EXHIBIT J15]**  **&**  **02/12/2014** (Hearing for interim Driving)**; [EXHIBIT J16]** |
| **Please See [EXHIBIT J15]**   * **Taken from Diary Going to the shop and seeing Debra Andrews of 113 Burncroft Avenue**  1. A   **Please See [Exhibit 16]**   * **(Hearing for Interim Driving)** Notes taken from Diary  1. **Note 1: Driving license.** I had to go to Highbury Court!  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **4 Out of 20 of 20 Court dates the 4 of 7 appearance towards the 1st Asbo**  **At Highbury Court and the Judge s was** | | | **Date:** | 02nd December 2014 Asbo Hearing | | **Defendants Name:** | Mr Simon Cordell | | **Court House:** | Highbury Corner Magistrates | | **Reason:** | Mention Hearing | | **Case Number:** | 1402490741 | | **Judge s Name:** |  | | **Contra’s Name:** | Robert Talalay | | **My Barrister Name:** | Mr. Andrew Locke | | **Note 1:** |  | | **Note 2:** | Ms Sally Gilchrist Legal Executive Director Met Police was Present! | | | | |
|  | | | **Due to No Disclosure; 20/01/2015; [EXHIBIT J17]** |
| * **Due to No Disclosure**  1. Before the first Court hearing took a place the Now Claimant and his mother was constantly requesting via phone and emails for the acting Solicitors Michael Carrol and Co to obtain the relevant disclosure need to prove his innocence and the Jude disappeared at every intervention we made about disclosure. 2. The Now Claimant asked his litigation friends to have his best interests at heart and find-out about disclosure for him to be able to have a fair trial and we asked this request in front of the Court Clerk on more than one occasion. 3. No receipt received of the disclosed documentation requested in return from the Prosecution seemed that justice could not easily be prevailed. 4. We understood that by the Judge not holding the Prosecution as accountable for not addressing the issues of disclosure to the correct standards and in a fair time the following occurred: - 5. A failure in the standardly important level of service that is set by Courts and that of the Enfield Council to stay remarkably high dropped below that set level and the upkeep of those services failed when waiting for disclosure. 6. The achieved marker set to be on and above the bar dropped below the average, due to the Prosecution team having a complete disregard for showing any or all relevant materials ordered or asked for. 7. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police Force created a Widley fabricated and inaccurate Asbo application that then got produced at a Court of Law and for them to prevent the detection of fraudulent activities within their office of workplace where they built their frauded Asbo app, they now involved denied the right of the Now Claimant to any right to Justice and in part by refusing him his legal right to disclose what they knew would prove his innocence. 8. What seemed like Magic-Tricks of non-disclosure allowed to happen in Court that the Prosecution entertained and while all for the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police Force the Judge sitting the case proceedings could not seem to notice and for the Prosecution this gave them the courage to show no concern. 9. “No matter how many times,” the Now Claimants himself or that of his Legal Teams and/or support network explained to the Judge ’s bench that the case was a shambles of fraud and that disclosure of the prosecuting team was anon, the Judge allowed proceedings to continue. 10. It is obvious that The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police Force alongside with their prosecuting team just simply would not allow the Now Claimant to give the requested documentation, because they understood these documents would prove the Now Claimants claims of innocence and more fraud they had committed. 11. By not providing nonredacted copies of Asbo application when requested and other associated materials the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police Force staff prevented Justice as did the Courts 12. As the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police Force relevant procedures to this case continued to fail, they blinded the Now Claimant’s litigation team as if they were not present, by a continuation of non-attached receipts of any returned response of the Now Claimants requests and for this reason the Now Claimant did not have the correct correspondents ready for trial but even aloe the case should have got stuck out under these grounds. 13. By the date of the **20/01/2015** the Now Claimant and his teams received No disclosure that they requested, and this continued to happen throughout the whole case proceedings. 14. The disclosure we ask for would prove within the Asbo application the Now Claimant did not do what the police accused him of.  * **Solicitor Stuff**  1. Since the start of the Asbo Court hearings the Now Claimant’s Solicitor constantly cancelled meetings. 2. At our times of interaction with the acting Solicitor firm, we asked them if they would go over the CADs, and Crimit’s Reports contained within as we understood there to be serious errors and fraud contained within its context, but our request never got adhered towards by the acting Solicitor firm. 3. We also, asked the representing litigation friends to create a list about the Asbo case of the relevant laws and then to question that made list and to highlight the facts about illegality’s we could prove. 4. The police have never arrested the Now Claimant for the Asbo application when the organisation of illegal raves is an arrestable offence. 5. Also noticed within the Now Claimant's bundles were other serious breaches of the data protection Act and breaches regulated by the codes of conduct within the Asbo application. 6. The Judge allowed Police Officers’ statements to remain within the Asbo applications bundles although we constantly showed proof of Corruption within them. 7. Also, the Asbo applications bundles contained witness statements that were solely wrote by just Police Officers and not the witnesses themselves. 8. The Judge stopped us from calling any witnesses or Police Officers whose information was within the Asbo applications by not enforcing our requests. 9. The Now Clamant Barrister could only question Police Officers that the Prosecution wanted to attend, and the Judge denied the Now Clamant Legal Rights of any other witnesses standing under oath and having the integrity of their statements questioned. | | | |
|  | | | **Another Asbo Hearing;** **10/03/2015; [EXHIBIT J18]** |
| * **Another Asbo Hearing**  1. At Each Court Appearance the Court Proceedings Become Weirder. 2. On the **10th of March 2015,** the District Judge Williams was to complete a hearing for the Antisocial Behaviour Order to be ready for the trial, but the Court had made a mistake and only listed it for a one-day hearing when we all required two days more. 3. The District Judge Williams, apologised for the error about the days needed to hear the case and gave two options. 4. She said that a part hearing could take place. 5. Or the Court can adjourn to a later date so that the full hearing could stand over two days. 6. The Now Claimant wanted the Asbo case to be over but knew the production would not drop the Case and asked the Judge for a third option that he subjects, the District Judge asked the Now Claimant to say his request. 7. What the Now Claimant asked the Judge for was: - the Asbo hearing to adjourn until the **03/08/2014** and the **04/08/2014** but only if she the District Judge Williams appeared in Court to hear the case herself. 8. The District Judge Williams agreed with the Now Claimant request and said she will be in attendance on the dates agreed, the district Judge Williams then asked her Court Clerk to clear her diary and book the dates and while promising to all present in the Court that she would be the Judge that would preside over the Asbo Case. 9. The Now Claimant requested disclosure again and all parties took notes involved. 10. Judge Williams also, said that this was the first time she had ever seen a case in which the commissioner of the metropolitan police had brought an Antisocial Behaviour Order in front of her in this way in a civil capacity.  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **6 Out of 20 of 20 Court dates the 6 of 7 appearance towards the 1st Asbo**  **At Highbury Court and the Judge s was** | | | **Date:** | 10/03/2015 | | **Defendants Name:** | Mr Simon Cordell | | **Court House:** | Highbury Corner Magistrates | | **Reason:** | Mention Hearing | | **Case Number:** | 1402490741 | | **Judge s Name:** | District Judge Williams | | **Contra’s Name:** | Robert Talalay | | **My Barrister Name:** | Mr. Andrew Locke | | **Note 1:** | (Mention Hearing) | | **Note 2:** | Was to be a full Hearing | | **Note 3:** | Ms Sally Gilchrist Legal Executive Director Met Police was Present! | | | | |
|  | | | **The Now Claimant's Mother Received a Phone Call; 02/08/2014; [EXHIBIT J19]** |
| * **The Now Claimant's Mother Received a Phone Call**  1. On the **02nd of August 2015** the Now Claimant's mother received a phone call from Miss Ward the Now Claimants’ acting Solicitors, regarding a statement she had just found in her emails relating to Antisocial Behaviour Order, The Now Claimant's mother asked if this could be sent over via email to her, in knowing it was too late to do anything about it because the full hearing started the next day. 2. Similar things were continuously happening throughout the case; the Solicitors only did anything on the case the day before the hearings, or a couple of days before it was due to take place. 3. We sent mutable emails, and this includes making mutable phone calls to get the right things done, those emails sent went not replied to for months, phone calls went unanswered, or if they were the claimant and his litigation team got the run around given to themselves and the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police members done this so, things never got fixed fairly. | | | |
|  | | | **Had to Attend Court for the Asbo Trial; 03/08/2014 / 04/08/2014; [EXHIBIT J20] & [EXHIBIT J21] & [EXHIBIT J22] & [EXHIBIT J23] & [EXHIBIT J24] & [EXHIBIT J25] & [EXHIBIT J26]** |
| * **Had to Attend Court for the Asbo Trial; [EXHIBIT J20]**  1. Surprised at Court. 2. Well in advance of the start of proceedings we had shown prior evidence to the contrary of the Now Claimants innocence. 3. There is also, the fact that no Judge had stopped the trial from going ahead under all the grounds presented to themselves. 4. The Now Claimant attended Court on the **03rd of August 2015** to aspect to see District Judge Williams sitting the case but this Judge: - “was not to be seen.” and while waiting for her the Claimant and his mother waited with others to start Court proceedings. 5. When sometime afterwards and all of a sudden, while to all of our surprise: - Out-Pops District Judge D Pigott, she appeared out of the side door that leads back into the Judge ’s chambers and within a flash took her place were District Judge Williams should have been. 6. The Now Claimant and all present in the Courtroom knew that the stipulations had changed, the very reason the Now Claimant had allowed this trial to continue had magically faded away. 7. The presiding Judge was not District Judge Williams, its fact it was District Judge D Pigott who would be hearing over the evidence on the dates of the **03/08/2014** & **04/08/2014.** 8. District Judge D Pigott acted from the start of proceeding bios against the Now Claimant, and it was clear that she had already found that she was going to prove the case in favour of the Prosecution from the very get go. 9. Before the hearing started the Now Claimants, mother informed the Judge the Now Claimant was extremely ill and she did not think he would cope due to health problems and even aloe, she alerted the Judge to these issues even if she could not see them herself, the District Judge D Pigot continued the case none the less and she did not ask the Now Claimant's mother to elaborate further or she would have explained in detail about the **“Interrelating Side Issues with Members of his Neighbours due to Government Figures Trying to Avoid Justice.”** But the Now Claimants mother knew the Judge would make the issues she raised to her disappear without any change anyway, so choose not to. 10. Later within the hearing the Now Claimants mother told the District Judge D Pigott that there should have been medical records adduced for the Now Claimants response within his bundle and this was missing. 11. We all talked about non-disclosure, but nothing came of this, and the Now Claimants’ legal rights continued to dissolve out of plain sight for ever. 12. The Now Claimant’s bundle was only around eighty-two pages when it should have been around three hundred pages, and no one could explain why it was still like this. 13. The trial went ahead nether the less and when the Now Claimant took the stand, the Judge asked where the Now Claimants bundle was, he stated he had never been given one, and did not know he needed one, the Judge did ask if there was a spare bundle that the Now Claimant could use which there was not so, she gave him her copy. This was the first time the Now Claimant received a copy of the Asbo application, and the Judge never gave him any time to prepare. 14. District Judge D Pigott made one more comment aloud and that was to the Prosecution she asked Robert Talalay & a Ms Sally Gilchrist if they had seen the Now Claimants witness statement and had time to go other it, the Prosecution replied: “yes,” and she then asked if they were sure that they want to continue proceeding to a reply of: - “yes again.” 15. The Judge continued proceedings and allowed the Prosecution to cross-examine the Now Claimant and clearly this was an error and for more reasons than one. 16. Continually through the Now Claimants Barrister cross-examination toward the Police Officers, the District Judge D Pigott kept interrupting and telling the Barrister he could not ask the questions he was asking even though what he was asking corresponded with what the police had put in their own statements. 17. The Now Claimant's Barrister even commented to the Judge Pigott “I am only asking questions pertaining to what the police have put in their statements” also he said to the Judge “I hope you are not going to have as much due- diligence with my client on cross-examination as you have with me” to which the Judge replied she would. This was certainly the case as in fact, the Judge allowed the prosecutor to cross-examine the Now Claimant and extremely harshly even when knowing they had infringed the Now Claimants Legal Rights within Court proceedings. 18. The Now Claimant feels that if he had had been solicited correctly and the Judge had mandated the right to a fair trial then for sure he would have been prepared for the trial even better and this would have left him with access to his own copy of the Asbo bundle and in this situation of a Fair Trial taking a place then the Now Claimant is sure the Asbo proceedings would have got “Struck-Out” of the UK Court, as a Termination of Proceedings and/or a Discontinuance was accepted but this was wrongly not allowed by the Judge under any circumstances that got presented. 19. We all now feel this was inappropriate for Mr Simon Cordell to have suffered the Judge was in the wrong by opposing the right to a fair trial and therefore the Now Claimant challenges the rightfulness of what the Judge allowed to happen. 20. To the best of the Now Claimants Barrister abilities, he questioned the legitimacy of our concerns as best he could. 21. When pinpointing out more than one of issues that took place throughout the Asbo Proceedings, please take note to the three following: 22. One of three of the concerns that we reported is the Cads that are in the Asbo application is a mockery to weighty evidence due to the obvious being that 23. Two of three is that Crown Road 24. Three of three shows   **Please See [EXHIBIT J21]**   * **Magistrates Court Transcripts**  1. It is clear by the Court **Transcripts** that the Now Claimants mother requested that the Now Claimants Barrister brought to the Judge s attention on the **03/08/2014** / **04/08/2014** days at trial the following: - 2. A clever line of investigation that showed 3. Supporting evidence insuring the Now Claimant’s innocence 4. The Now Claimants Barristers’ attributes of case law submitted to the Judge and Prosecution they diminished wrongfully, while rudely pushing aside causing an undermining of the right to justice. 5. And it is also, clear by the Court **Transcripts** that the Now Claimant’s Barrister was 6. Harshly, Treated 7. Inadvertently Disadvantaged 8. Abruptly Interrupted 9. Wrongfully Hindered from The Right of Contamination of Cross-Referenced Events. 10. Onthe **6th 7th** & **8th June 2014**, and at Progress Way an event is supposed to have taken a place and the Prosecution is accusing the Now Claimant of being the organiser, to which he disputes. 11. While Police Officers were in Court and under oath in the witness box, one after the other the Now Claimants Barrister questioned them while interrogating their falsehood and as he done this he reviled their inconsistent statements showing Police Officers devilish wizardry and this continued to the extent that Police Officers were coming out of the witness box and vanishing out of the Court room but you heard them saying to the Judge as they done this and to all who else was present in the same Courtroom: - “sorry, sorry, sorry,” So, we all present knew they had been caught for lying by the Now Claimant Barrister and all while under oath. One of these Police Officers was an Inspector Hamill. 12. In the Court Transcripts and as the Now Claimant’s Barrister lead into his lines of questioning he asked: - if there was an illegal rave that took place **6th 7th** & **8th June 2014**, at Crown Road in knowing that Crown Road is a road just ajar from Progress Way and we knew that there was an event that certainly did take place, be it private party or not. 13. “Inspector Hamill Stated, *there was a rave on an adjourning RD but not on that day*” 14. “Inspector Hamill Stated, *phone calls received were not relating to Crown Rd Rave on that day*” 15. The Now Claimant asked the Now Claimant’s Barrister to make this line of questioning with the reason being: - “they wanted no more tricks,” he and others understood after reading the local newspapers and making other inquires and also, because of being able to check the cads submitted in the Asbo application such as the ones with Crown roads name and/or grid reference number present and while not forgetting attached linked cad numbers. 16. Due to these facts and more we could be 100% sure that if the police officer said no then he would be lying. 17. The Judge even Asked the same question to Inspector Hamill “did any CADs in the Asbo application relate to other raves on the same date as progress way and the police officer replied to her honour: - “No.” 18. The Now Claimants litigation team and support network had shown yet again inconsistencies in the Police Officers’ statements. 19. Inspector Hamill and others lied to help themselves gain a guilty verdict against the Now Claimant, what the police officer said to the district Judge under cross-examination is a lie and not the truth. 20. The Now Claimant and his Network can prove that the police officer named as Inspector Hamill lied due to a copy of a freedom of information act that we requested in receipt from the Enfield Council as well. 21. Attached is a copy of the “Freedom of Information Act,” which we obtained.   **Please See [EXHIBIT J22]**   * **Solicitor Stuff**  1. It was latter revelled that the acting Solicitors had not gone over the CADs before the trial, although the Now Claimant and others had asked her too many times, and this should have been a standardly fair practice for them. 2. If asked to by any official person involved in the on goings of the Anti-Social Behaviour Order, the defendant can and is happy to supply a list of correspondents. 3. The Now Claimant and his mother asked for the prosecuting team and that of their own litigation friends to treat them fairly as they would them but the prosecuting team did not instead they “Spun-Around,” the Now Claimants request and faster than a small mist of smoke could disappear “Showed-the Request-In-Revers,” due to this he did not get any fair treatment of them when requesting disclosure by way of mobile texts and electronic emails and in those messages the Now Claimant and his teams had asked for the following. 4. The Prosecution’s teams to oblige us by 5. For the Now Claimants acting Solicitor firm at the time to make sure of all reductions that were proved to be wrongful submitted within the Asbo application being removed and as an example there are cads that had nothing to do with what the Now Claimant or what he has got accused for still present in the bundle and should not stand as any part of a case against his person. 6. Other inconsistencies that the Now Claimants Barrister drew attention to within the CADs are the “Time-Stamps,” as they do not consist within the formal time boundaries of a normal time format as the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and Crown Prosecution somehow made the time stamps go backwards in the Cads in all the Asbo Bundles they provided us with. 7. Another issue with the Asbo application is the Now Claimant receiving redacted cads because if they were unredacted they would prove the Now Claimant’s innocence as those redacted Cads are clearly frauded in other aspects and this will strengthen the frauded fact. 8. Another fact is that Police and the Council updated old intelligence reports and then induced them in the Asbo application, the tampering of evidence must not go on within applications brought before the Courts and Courts must simply not tolerate any such behaviour, but the Judge allowed this to continue once reported.   **Data Protection Within the Now Claimants PNC Record**   1. There are breaches of the data protection Act within the Asbo application such as a copy of the Now Claimant Criminal Record that is inaccurate with-it’s material facts and the Now Claimant disputes the Criminal Records inconsistencies. 2. The Now Claimant Memorised by the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and Crown Prosecution acts in and out of Court realised that there is also the fact that by a copy of the Now Claimant’s criminal record being present in the Asbo application from the start of proceedings when no Judge had received a bad reference of character application of the Prosecution team the Now Claimants human Rights become infringed. 3. To make things even worse late into Court proceedings the Now Claimants litigation friend brought this Cunning trick up to the Prosecution and the Judge and the Prosecution team then afterwards mesmerizingly drafted up an application and submitted it to his honour for the Judge to read, the Judge then made an order striking out the application, but the Criminal record was already seen by the Judge and not taken out of the Asbo Bundles. 4. The inconsistencies breaching the Now Claimant’s Legal Rights are uncanny towards the Data Protection Act **1998** as Amended **2018,** and the Courts allowed breaches of the Now Claimant to exceed above the limit.   **Police & Enfield Council Knew Crown Road Was Occupied by Other Persons on The Dates in Question.**   1. We know the police knew about the illegal rave at Crown Road because police deployed police there and this can clearly be check within the CADs which are within the application's bundle and even when there is so many redactions within the Asbo applications pages. 2. We also, know that there is more Hocus Pocus tricks that pertains to Crown Road, which proves the police and council intend to victimise the Now Claimant by maliciously targeting him, while they blindfolded him from checking and now, we or no other person can see this in the Asbo Bundles due to the reductions not being unredacted. 3. (1) I respectfully refer you to the case of Dunn v Durham CC which confirms that the CPR “trump” data protection legislation.  * ***Dunn v Durham County Council*[2012] EWCA Civ. 1654**  1. “***Disclosure of the documents was agreed and passed to this Claimant***” after he implied that by staff at a centre for young people run by Durham County Council (DCC) had assaulted him. 2. The “Disclosure Was Redacted,” due to people’s personal data / “***names of some children (other service users***” when received by this claimant and his solicitor, this was the prudence of the case 3. This **claimant** requested that “***the documents get unredacted because of section 35 DPA”*** this allows a party to be exempt from the provisions of DPA where litigation is: - intended or in proceedings. **The district Judge refused by ruling.** 4. This **Claimant** appealed to the circuit Judge arguing that under DPA, section 35 unredacted disclosure was necessary. 5. This **Defendant** argued against disclosure and that the request is: - governed by the disclosure rules of the Civil Procedure Rules (CPR), Part 31. 6. The circuit Judge (HHJ Armitage in Manchester County Court) **allowed the claimant’s appeal** on the basis that DPA, section 35 imposed a test of necessity. *“****It was for the applying party to show that the document was needed for a section 35 purpose.****” Court action has not started yet* 7. Judge Armitage accepted that such purpose: - “was clearly established,” by stating: - “the residents may be material witnesses and their names should be disclosed.” 8. This was a unanimous decision. 9. The leading Judgment is by Lord Justice Kay, and she held in essence that the circuit judge “***made the right decision but for the wrong reasons.***” 10. The correct test was a balancing exercise between CPR duties of disclosure and the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), as enacted in English law in the Human Rights Act. 11. The denial of disclosure or inspection: - “is limited,” to circumstances where such denial is strictly necessary. 12. The onus of establishing necessity is upon the party refusing to provide disclosure or inspection. 13. This includes a "train of enquiry" which is not merely a "fishing" expedition. 14. The circuit Judge conducted a balancing exercise and applied a test of necessity. “***However, he was wrong to place the burden on the claimant rather than the defendant and was "distracted by the DPA" arguments.***” 15. Dunn involved a social services case of physical assault but will have application to all requests for disclosure of records where litigation is: “intended” and is particularly relevant to issues that arise in claims involving social care, including fostering and adoption. 16. We suggest that in social care cases, involving physical and/or sexual exploitation at least, that a broad view will be took of this. 17. We consider that all of a service user’s records are potentially relevant to determine issues of negligence and to give context and understanding to arguments of causation. 18. Redaction may still be necessary. However, the burden of establishing “necessity,” after Dunn, is on the party with possession of the documents. 19. The test of ‘necessity’ under Dunn is a high one and LAs will not be able to blank out names simply because a person is a non-party. 20. There must be other cogent and compelling reason. 21. In a civil claim, or intended claim, for damages CPR and Human Rights Act considerations are the key and not the Data Protection Act.  * **Aspects of the *Dunn v Durham Case***  1. The Enfield Council & Metropolitan Police redacted the Asbo, and the Now Claimant and his legal and support network requested for them to underact the files, but they would not! 2. The Enfield Council redacted both of the Possession Orders and both of the Possession Orders as well and the Now Claimant and his legal and support network requested for them to underact the files, but they would not! 3. The Enfield Council redacted both of the injunction Orders and both of the Possession Orders as well and the Now Claimant and his legal and support network requested for them to underact the files, but they would not! 4. The reason the Enfield Council & Metropolitan Police would not underact the files is because they knew that this would prove by uncovering the fraud that the Now Claimant and his legal and support network caught them committing!  * **The Now Claimants Barrister Submission About Trespass**  1. Part of the Now Claimant Barrister submission on the day of trial were that the allegations the Prosecution wrongly accused the Now Claimant of involved the organising of illegal raves, but the Prosecution had not adduced evidence of trespass which is a requirement for proving that an indoor rave was illegal.  * **When Proving Illegality**  1. At A Blink of An Eye Lid the District Judge ruled that the Now Claimant did not need to prove illegality - all that she needed to prove was the Now Claimant had acted in an Antisocial Manner. 2. In the Now Claimants Barrister view this is a very questionable decision: firstly, the Now Claimant 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 raves were legal, and thus the Now Claimant being prohibited from engaging in an ostensibly lawful activity requires more careful consideration on issues of proportionality. 3. The Barrister continued to state that the Now Claimant 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 Now Claimants best interest as he believed there is little merit in doing so, the reason he gave was because the Now Claimant 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. 4. To summarise the Judge stated she did not need to prove illegality, but she proved the Now Claimant had acted in an Antisocial Manner, how the district Judge came to this conclusion we do not understand, none of the Police Officers stated the Now Claimant had acted in an Antisocial Manner towards them and it is also a fact that any application for an Antisocial Behaviour Order has to be bought within six months of the dates of the accused incidents taking place, but the alleged offences in the Asbo application go back prior to the six months and the police and the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police should have only used these documents for reference Purposes, when following the correct guidance under the “The Prosecution Team Manual of Guidance For the preparation, processing and submission of prosecution files **2011,**” but still the District Judge based her guilty verdict on these incidents wrong. 5. **Temp Weblink:** - <https://library.college.police.uk/docs/appref/MoG-Final-2011-July.pdf>  * **MG6C: - “Is the Schedule of Relevant Non-Sensitive Material!”**  1. The: - “Prosecutor,” are to: - “Disclose to The Defence the Schedule,” and contained in it, any material produced by the: - “CPS,” the produced material is to be: - “Described,” as: - “Disclosed to The Defence,” and by the instruction of the: - “CPS,” named as: - “the Prosecutor,” and/or the: - “Judges” directions. 2. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and Crown Prosecution must list all the Material based in its context in the beginning pages of the schedule covers and this must include all relevant: - “Unused,” “Non-Sensitive Material,” “Recorded,” and “Retained,” or “Generated During the Course of Any Investigation.” 3. The exception to this: - “Is,” any: - “Material Seized,” during the course of a: - “Investigation,” which any Investigating Team Members have not yet examine due to its lack of immediate and apparent relevance to the investigation and this falls outside the,” CPIA,” and is not ‘Unused Material’ but the investigating Team Members must record its existence on an: - “MG11 form,” with the appropriate caption, i.e.: - “The Following Material Has Not Been Examined by The Investigator or Disclosure Officer And Is Considered Not To Fall Within The CPIA Definition Of Prosecution Material.” 4. All items of: - “Unused Material,” that contain: - “Sensitive” and/or: - “non-Sensitive” information, the Investigating Team Members must list those pieces of information, into the: - “MG6C,” as being an: - “Edited Version,” or: - “Edited,” and are: - “Not Tenable,” in Court. 5. E.g. The Investigating Team Members must: - “Never mark,” any of: - “there,” noted: - “Original Documents,” all: - “Pocket Notebooks,” containing: - “Entries,” of any: - “Personal Details of a Witness,” or the: - “Circumstances of The Arrest,” any Investigating Team Members: - “Must Submit,” into: - “MG6C.” 6. The Investigating Team Members: - “Must Never,” mark the original documents. 7. Team Members can: - “Redact Out,” the mandatory sensitive parts of: - “Witness Details,” e.g.: - “Telephone Numbers,” “Date of Birth,” and “Addresses,” in the: - “Copied Formats, Based on The Original Documents,” with a: - “Dark Marker Pen,” and: - “Never Use,” any: - “White-Correcting-Fluid.” 8. The Investigating Team Members: - “Must Never,”” list the: - “Unedited Versions,” that the Investigating Team Members inputted into the: - “MG6D,” the relevant laws pertaining to this are covered in the: - “The Prosecution Team Manual of Guidance **2011**,” - Section 1 (iii) MG6D, which states the following: - “The Schedule Of Relevant Sensitive Material Will Not Be Disclosed To The Defence If It Is Not In The Public Interest Not To Do So” 9. Team Members must: - “Clearly State,” their reasons to why the item should: - “Not Be Disclosed,” to the: - “Defence,” and for an example: - “Details That Identify an Observation Post Must Not Be Disclosed,” to: - “The Defence.” 10. If there is: - “No Sensitive Material,” in a case: - “Endorsed,” by the: - “Standards to Be Meet Within the MG6D,” or to that effect then the Investigating Team Members are to: - “Submit,” that: - “Material,” with the: - “MG6C” and: - “MG6E.” 11. Where Team Members think they have material that is: - “Very Sensitive,” such as: - “Information from A Covert Human Intelligence Source (CHIS),” the Investigating Team Members are to: - “Make Contact,” with the: - “Prosecutor,” who will then refer the Team Members, as necessary, to the appropriate person for advice: - “(iv) MG6E – Disclosure of Officer’s Report.” 12. It is important to note that: - “The Councils and Polices,” are to: - “enter,” into the: - “MG6E,” that the following information: - “Must Be Brought to The Attention of the CPS,” such as: - 13. Material which contains a first description of an offender (Para 7.3 CPIA Code of Practice); or 14. Material which might undermine the prosecution case or assist the defence. 15. The: - “Team Members,” and the: - “Courts,” Disclosure Officers must record on the form the following: - 16. Whether the: - “Undermining or Descriptive Information Was Originally Listed on The MG6C or MG6D, Original Item Numbers," 17. Briefly, the Team Members: - “Must,” input into the: - “MG6E,” all: - “Intelligence,” that: - “Contains First-Hand Descriptions of Suspects,” and/or: - “May Cast the Doubt on Reliability of Witness’. 18. And for: - “The Prosecutor,” it is a: - “Must,” for: - “Him Or Her,” to: - “Always Inspect,” the: - “Documents,” or any other: - “Reasonable Material,” by: - “Viewing It,” or: - Listening,” to it, and with: - “Any Other Material Meaning” by nature: - “Any Material,” that: - “Could Reasonably,” be: - “Considered,” as: - “Capable Of Undermining The Prosecution Case Against The Accused Or Of Assisting The Case For The Accused.” 19. The: - “Disclosure Officers” may need to: - “Consult With,” and: - “Allow,” the: - “Prosecutor,” to: - “Inspect the Retained Material.”  * **Public Order Investigation Unit**  1. Since the Asbo application & its proceedings started, we knew the police and the public order investigation unit held information on the police systems that proved the Now Claimant was not the organiser of these illegal raves. 2. In fact, the police knowingly went around to the known organiser's homes and also spoke with them on the telephone. 3. This proves they have the information we were asking for in disclosure. 4. (We found this information out via social media and Google the Now Claimant mother done the research) the Now Claimant mother even called the public order investigation unit and spoke to DS Chapman, and Val Turner.  * **Upon Proving the Case**  1. The Prosecutor seemed as if he were pulling cards out of his sleeves and dropping them on the floor by mistake throughout the case at every line of questioning he aimed at the Now Claimant but the District Judge Pigot had allowed the Trickster of the prosecutor to Run Rings Around the Frauded Facts pertaining to the Asbo Case by becoming a Fortune Teller and ruling the case against the Now Claimant by finding him guilty and against all odds set to the facts. 2. Upon proving thecase the District Judge Pigott granted all the Prosecutions requested conditions against the Now Claimant that they conjured up but one. 3. The Prosecution had an Illusion that they wanted to make the Asbo application a lifetime sentence, but the district Judge Pigott seemed to us like she finally felt guilty and did not allow this to happen and on stead she granted it for five years within the whole of the UK and without the sentence running consecutively by not taking into consideration the time of the hearings that elapsed. 4. The magic here was that the Prosecutors Illusion became true anyways after what the Judge had Ordered. 5. District Judge Pigott also, added the stipulation that the conditions could be reapplied for when the five years concluded. 6. The District Judge reinstated that the five years from the **04/08/2015;** did not count the time the Now Claimant had been on the Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order as a fact.  * **The Now Claimant Walked Out of The Court Room**  1. The Now Claimant explained this was not fair to the Judge and reminded her that the Prosecuting team keeps deceiving her into believing everything when she should not, but he knew it was too late as she had made the Asbo Court Order already. 2. The Now Claimants face went red as he walked out of the Courtroom in disgust of District Judge Pigott decisions. 3. The Now Claimant 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. 4. District Judge then asked the Clerk to get the Now Claimant back into the Courtroom and she also informed that if Now Claimant re-entered the Courtroom and was disruptive, she would hold him in contempt of Court. 5. The Now Claimants mother knew this was: - “no barrel of laughs,” and would not let the Now Claimant re-entered the Courtroom, as she knew the Now Claimant was very annoyed and would not want to cope with such incomitance and this left his mother in fear of him getting into trouble for contempt of Court and because of this, the Now Claimant was not there to have the Antisocial Behaviour Order served on him, and the Antisocial Behaviour Order was served to the Now Claimant mother on his behalf.  * **The Conditions of The Antisocial Behaviour Order to Be Clearer Defined**  1. The Now Claimant mother and the Now Claimant Barrister then asked the Judge if the conditions of the Antisocial Behaviour Order could be defined as there were many points of concern that just disappeared into the atmosphere, the Judge was asked if the Now Claimant went to a Tesco or Tesco petrol station between the hours of 10 pm and 07 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”. 2. It is not such a guess to understands that the Judge meant the same about the Now Claimant attending a commercial location for food and any other similar necessities and this would include hospitals, police stations, restaurants, cinemas and alike. 3. The District Judge Pigott listened to the Now Claimant mother and Barrister questions and with one of those question being, “do you think this is in accordance with the law,” and the district Judge replied “the conditions are precise and plain.  * **District Judge Pigott Then Left the Courtroom**  1. The District Judge Pigott then left the Courtroom but before she left, she made an order for her Court of Clerk to get the memorandum of an entry ready as soon as possible. The reason for the District Judge ordering the Clerk to hurry was due to the lateness of the day and that the department who dealt with this kind of request would be closing soon. 2. When the District Judge Pigott returned she asked why the Now Claimants Barrister was not in Court, the Now Claimants mother said that he had left because he was not told that he needed to stay, she was handed a copy of the memorandum of an entry and a copy was agreed to get sent to the Now Claimants Barrister. 3. The Now Claimant’s mother on inspection of the memorandum of an entry noticed subliminal messages in text of a horrid kind that referred to her and her family but due to here being scared of reprisals and not wanting her family to be “Walked All Over” she done what she thought best. She showed the Now Claimants Barrister the memorandum of an entry and explained how she felt. 4. When the Barrister overviewed the Court order he also, agreed that there were multiple spelling mistakes and explained that the dates entered from **2013** should not be present and therefore removed. 5. Together the mother and Barrister of the Now Claimant asked the District Judge Pigott & that of her Court Clerk who prepared the document in the start under the Judge instructions and who had given the memorandum then afterwards to the Now Claimants mother signed with his signature at the bottom, just to simply amend the text spelling mistakes. He then took the document away and gave it back to her in the same condition. The District Judge Pigott said she will raise the issue so, that the Court staff will oversee it the mistakes and then amend the document to be right and that the Claimants mother will receive it in the post shortly after. 6. After Court, the Now Claimants mother could easily see that her son was upset and did not want to inform him about the Spelling Mistakes / Subliminal messages so, decided to wait till a later date. 7. The Now Claimants mother got feed up of not receiving any post containing the agreed Newley print out of memorandum of an entry that would be minus the subliminal messages or Spelling mistakes and contacted the Court via emails herself and due to her emails and telephone calls what was labelled as “the spelling mistakes” were finally corrected but not that of the inaccurate dates. 8. 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 and that map would have just shown the whole of the UK and Wales, 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 beyond reasonable doubt.   **Please See; [EXHIBIT J23]**   * **The Subliminal Messages or Spelling Mistakes / Court Order**   Text, letter  Description automatically generated   * **Highbury Corner Magistrates' Court**  |  | | --- | | **This is a Text Version of Above!** | | **Code 2572**  **North London Admin Centre POBOX52 N7 1AF**  **Telephone** 020 7506 310  **Fax** 0870 739 5768  Mr Simon CORDELL 109 Bancroft Avenue Enfield Middlesex EN37JQ  **Case number:** 011402490741  Bom:  **Anti-social behaviour order on application**  **Order**  **You must not**   1. Attended a rave as defined by **S.63(1)** of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act **1994.** 2. Be concerned in the organisation of a rave as defined by **S.63(1)** of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act **1994** 3. Knowingly using or supplying property, personal or otherwise, for the use in a rave as defined in **S.63(1)** of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act **1994.** 4. Enter or remain in any **dis/us/ed** or abandoned building unless invited to do so in writing by a registered charitable organisation or Local Authority 5. Enter or **re man** on non-residential private property on an industrial estate between the hours of 10pm and 7am Without written permission from the owner and/or leaseholder of the property; and 6. Engage in any licensable activity in an unlicensed premise 7. For the sake of clarity, nothing in this order prevents the Defendant from assisting, preparing for or engaging in licensed licensable activities 8. This order lasts for 5 years.   **Warning**   1. “If you do not obey any part of this order, you will commit an offence and may be fined or sent to prison for up to five years.” 2. **J. Vantyghem** 3. **Date: 4 August 2015** 4. Justices' Clerk 5. Mr Simon CORDELL 6. **04 August 2015**/ASBOJ6\_0/1584095/1 |  1. About **J. Vantyghem** the Court Clerk, this Court Clerkhad been dealing with the Now Claimant and his mother in other cases than just the Asbo at the same time through different Courts, and the Now Claimant has documented these past court cases, such as the: - “Brixton Case” and more than likely other driving cases as well. J. Vantyghem the Court Clerk was involved when the Court had to overturn a guilty verdict as he and other lost in the “Driving Ban Cases,” brought against the Now Claimant. 2. The Now Claimant and his mother went to other courts on appeals and got the cases overturned because the Now Claimant had insurance to drive on the wrongly accused incidents. 3. What makes this worse is when the Asbo Application was made by the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police by developing the App they used six cases but one of those case was a driving offence that was still pending in court that the Now Claimants won before getting a guilty verdict for the Asbo and the Judge and Prosecution refused to retrack the No Further Actioned Case out of the Asbo Proceedings.   **Please See Notes [EXHIBIT J24]**   * **My 1st Asbo Response Bundle/ pub Book Issue: one!**   Driving Ban / Transcript of Successful Appeal Against No Insurance Conviction**/**  **Page Numbers:** 214,215,216,217,218,219,220,221,223,  224,225,226,227,228,229,230,231,232,233,234,235,236,  237,238,239,240,241,242,243,244,245,246,247,248   1. This information is Dated the **26/01/2015** and on page number **214**, and state: - “**Further Information:** For more information about disqualification or endorsement see: [www.gov.uk/penalty-points-endorsements](http://www.gov.uk/penalty-points-endorsements) **J. Vantyghem,”** 2. There is also, another fact being that The Memorandum of an Entry above with the Subliminal Messages / Spelling Mistakes / Court Order the Enfield Council also, placed in: -- 3. **The 1st Injunction Order: - Page 256 or 254** 4. The: - “Enfield Council,” also, Frauded The 1st Injunction Court Order and lost against the Now Claimants in Court with: - “Lemmy Nwabusi, as their: - “Iconic-Case-Handler-Conducting-the-Proceedings. 5. Within the Pages of 256 or 254 is a file that The Enfield Councils: - “Iconic-Case-Handler-Conducting-the-Proceedings Lemmy Nwabusi,” filed and this file is a copy of those correspondence: 6. And this means that Lemmy and the Enfield Council had a copy of the Asbo files all the way through the Asbo proceedings given to them by Sally Gilcrest or her legal team. 7. After I telephoned Lemmy and he lied to me on the phone about not knowing about the Asbo when he had been talking to my mother in emails about it prior to our conversations he lied so he could get a possession order to take my house that he also forged. While the same company held me illegally with a forged Asbo Order. 8. I asked Lemmy in the recordings if he would go to the Asbo folder because he can as he works in the same department that Steven created it in and to notice the missing signatures and backwards timestamps on stead, he went to the folder took the worse page out of it with the threats and added it to the Injunction orders. 9. The solicitors’ refused to allow the Now Claimant to go to their offices for meeting to build the response bundle throughout meetings. 10. When the Now Claimant got setup by the Enfield Council getting him convicted for the Asbo they frauded his mother had to go to the offices to get the folders so that they were ready for the appeal stage and whatever solicitor firm would represent me at this time and date I was on bail conditions to stay at my mother’s house. 11. When the Now Claimant mother brought the Asbo folders back she did do so, to her house, and the Now Claimant got to see the Asbo documents a bit latter after she had photocopied the large files. 12. the Now Claimant had to quickly go over what his mother showed him and that gave them both little time to view the documentation. 13. Once the Now Claimant took his look, he noticed the solicitor firm had not submitted information that he and his mother wanted to put to the prosecution in his defence and this included all easily proved corruption as Josie the Now Claimant solicitor refused to go down that route. 14. The Now Claimant mother wanted to send the folder of ready for the Appeal stage as fast as she could, so, the Now Claimant hurried and created a couple of letters and submitted them in the back of the response bundle. 15. The Now Claimant also, noticed that in the front pages of the  * **Release Of the Trials Transcripts**  1. The Now Claimant mother requested the Court for the release of the trial’s transcripts, but the Magistrate's Court said they do not record hearings and that the only notes they keep is the Court Clerks Notes. We then requested a copy of the Clerks Notes and also paid the fee for the documents to obtain: -   **Please See Notes [EXHIBIT J25]**   1. Upon looking at the Clerk's notes there is a substantial amount of the trial that went ahead that is not within the documentation and this accounts for both different days that the trial was herd.  * **Judicial Review**  1. His honour the Judge heard a request of the Now Claimant for a judicial review to take place in regard to the Magistrates hearing and agreed to the request.  * **Solicitor Stuff**  1. The Now, Claimants, then Solicitor firm never wanted to act on his behalf and another Solicitor firm became hard to find that would stand for the Now Claimant. 2. There was also confusion over what the past Barrister had explained in his Court submissions that he had handed back to the acting Solicitor firm as he had said that the Now Claimant would be better to go for the Appeal at the Crown Court rather than a judicial review.   **Please See Notes [EXHIBIT J26]**   1. The Now Claimants mother contacted the high Court herself within weeks after the trial to make enquiries in regard to a judicial review and she explained to them the situation that had occurred throughout the Asbo Case Proceedings and in return they told the Now Claimants mother to apply for Judicial Review and that under exceptional circumstances the time limit could be Overturned when considering special reasons. 2. The Appeal Hearing at the Wood Green Crown Court did not conclude until **19 January 2017.**  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **7 Out of 20 of 20 Court dates the 7 of 7 appearance towards the 1st Asbo**  **At Highbury Court and the Judge s was** | | | **Date:** | 03/08/2015 & 04/08/2015 | | **Defendants Name:** | Mr Simon Cordell | | **Case Handler:** | Ms Sally Gilchrist Legal Executive Director Met Police and she was Present! | | **Court House:** | Highbury Corner Magistrates | | **Reason:** | Mention Hearing | | **Case Number:** | 1402490741 | | **Judge s Name:** | Defendant Judge Pigott | | **Contra’s Name:** | Robert Talalay | | **My Barrister Name:** | Mr. Andrew Locke | | **Note 1:** | (Full Hearing) **Trial** | | **Note 2:** |  | | | | |
|  | | | **The Magistrates Court Imposed Conditions; 04/08/2014; [EXHIBIT J27]** |
| * **The Magistrates Court Imposed Conditions**  1. And it was like the Judge Pulled the Asbo Applications Conditions out of a: - “Magic-Hat,” she placed them on the Now Claimant to be for the whole of the UK & Whales.  * **The Defendant Is Prohibited From:**  1. Attending a rave as defined by **S.63 (1)** of the criminal justice and public order Act **1994.** 2. Being concerned in the organisation of a rave as defined by **S.63(1)** of the criminal justice and public order act **1994.** 3. Knowingly using or supplying property, personal or otherwise, for use in a rave as defined by **S.63(1)** of the criminal justice and public order act **1994.** 4. Entering or staying in any disused or abandoned building unless invited to do so in writing by a registered charitable organisation. 5. Entering or staying on non-residential private property on an industrial estate between the hours of 10 pm and 7 am without written permission from the owner and/or leaseholder of the property; and: - 6. Engaging in any licensable activity in any unlicensed premises. 7. For the sake of clarity, nothing in this order prevents the defendant from assisting, preparing for, or engaging in licensed licensable activities.  * **Points To Address About the Conditions That the Judge Prohibited the Now Claimant from Doing:**  1. **When referring towards (a) Conditions A states: *“Attending a rave as defined by S.63 (1) of the criminal justice and public order Act 1994.”*** 2. A 3. A 4. **Concerning (b) Conditions B states: - *“Being concerned in the organisation of a rave as defined by S.63(1) of the criminal justice and public order act 1994.”*** 5. A 6. A 7. **Appertaining (c) Conditions C states: - *“knowingly using or supplying property personal or otherwise for the use of a rave as defined under section 63.1 of the criminal justice and public order act.”*** 8. The Now Claimants has spent the last 10 years building his business saving every penny with help from his family. 9. The company he has built is regulated within the entertainment industry and is represented by the licensing Act **2003,** he intends to hire equipment out, the Now Claimants business is seriously affected by the conditions, partly because if he hired his equipment to any person and it ended up in an indoor private party or an outdoor illegal rave then the Now Claimant would be in breach of the conditions he has been imposed to be incompliance with another issue of concern is all events sighted within the Now Claimants bundle are indoor events and are therefore not illegal. 10. When hiring out equipment the Now Claimant does ask what the purpose of hire is for and also makes sure that he and his clients have that of a professional contract in place, so for him to be sure he is hiring the equipment in good faith. 11. Sometimes when a person tells you their reason for hiring the equipment out you may find out and at a later date that what the hirer explained when hiring the equipment out is not always correct. 12. The Now Claimant should not be liable for other people's actions when following the correct protocols of business and should never be in breach of the Asbo conditions in them circumstances. 13. Also, if the Now Claimant loaned someone any personal belongings and that person ended up at an illegal rave then the Now Claimant would again be in breach of his conditions, even if the item were something that did not even constitute as being for an illegal rave. 14. **Affecting (d) Conditions D states: - *“Entering or staying in any disused or abandoned building unless invited to do so in writing by a registered charitable organisation.”*** 15. A 16. A 17. **Running alongside (e) Conditions D states: - *“Entering or staying on non-residential private property on an industrial estate between the hours of 10 pm and 7 am without written permission from the owner and/or leaseholder of the property”*** 18. With this condition in place, it makes it so that the Now Claimants life is in term while as it leaves him in a state of confusion as to what he can and cannot do, The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police have violated the Now Claimants Human Rights and these infringements causes a life not equal to others. 19. Any non-residential property the Now Claimant would like to attend such as where house night club or any friends or family’s private parties he is not able to attend: 20. This also includes Hospitals, Police Stations, 24-hour Supermarkets, Petrol Stations, Cinemas, Restaurants, Bars, Nightclubs, and any other public place open to the public between these times that is non-residential. 21. **Entailing (f) Conditions F states: - *“Engaging in any licensable activity in any unlicensed premises.”*** 22. A 23. A 24. **Dealing with Implicating (g) Conditions G states:** - **“*for the sake of clarity, nothing in this order prevents the defendant from assisting, preparing for, or engaging in licensed licensable activities.”*** 25. The above is untrue as the Now Claimant and his network have since contacted the Metropolitan Police and a list of Councils for them to say an event license would not be issued to hold any events as long as the Antisocial Behaviour Order was in place other than when applying with Enfield Council. 26. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police have tarnished the Now Claimant's entertainment business with a seriously long-term negative effect by forging the Antisocial Behaviour Order and causing other “Interrelating Side Issues with Members of his Neighbours due to Government Figures Trying to Avoid Justice.”   **All of the Asbo Conditions**   1. The conditions the Now Claimant is under are a breach of the Now Claimant's human rights, and disproportionate due to the fact it would breach: 2. **Article 3: -** Freedom from Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment: - 3. **Article 5: -** Right to Liberty and Security: - 4. **Article 8: -** Respect for Your Private and Family Life, Home, And Correspondence: - 5. **Article 23.1: -** Of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights States: (1) Everyone Has the Right to Work, To Free Choice of Employment, To Just and Favourable Conditions of Work and To Protection Against Unemployment. 6. The Judge ordered that the Now Claimant cannot go to a music event without written permission showing consent of the owner of any building and/or open-air land. This is degrading for the Now Claimant to have to ask or find the owners of a building or any event organisers of any event each time he wants to go out somewhere when music or licensable activities may be involved due to the fact that he might get the blame for organising the event. 7. How a Judge can apply this condition in law is shocking and when we questioned the Judge got about the integrity of the order she refused to listen to any sense or reason. 8. Her orders are a beach of the Now Claimant’s human rights and should not have been justifiable. 9. The Judge also, ordered that the Now Claimant would | | | |
|  | | | **Contacting the Local MPs about the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police Force; 01/05/2015 & 16/07/2015** |
| 1. The **16/07/2015** is the date of another piece of evidence that I have, it is an email that we sent to my Local MPs in respect of a date in **May 2015,** so, I have allocated the missing email to this date of the **01/05/2015,** due to not being sure of what date they sent it. 2. My mother who drafted the email of the **16/07/2015** to Andy Love of the Labour MPs members Cabinet raised concerns about myself and brother alongside herself due to unjustified treatment by government officials, in Layman terms Harassment 1998 and more. 3. Her complaint listed issues listing back towards mutable years to my early adolescent childhood of when I became social cares responsibilities, because I lived in children’s homes when the police Harassment had started to escalate even further than when I was in the own Duty of Care of my own mother.   **Please See; [EXHIBIT J23]**   * **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue:**   567. Lorraine Cordell \_Re\_ Update  **/ Page Numbers:** 2070  **From:** Lorraine Cordell [[lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk](http://lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk)]  **Sent:** 16 July **2015** 13:28  **To:** [k\_osamor@hotmail.com](http://k_osamor@hotmail.com)  **Subject: Re:** Update  Dear Kate Osamor,   1. “I am writing this email as Andy Love was dealing with a matter for my son's and the police.” 2. The last time I spoke to anyone they were still waiting to hear back from the police this was in **May 2015**. 3. I have not had any contact or update about this matter, 4. and I feel very let down by our MP. 5. I was on the understanding that due to Andy Love leaving you would have taken up the case. 6. Could you get back to me with an update, 7. if you need any more information, you can contact me via this email.   Regards  Lorraine Cordell  **Please See; [EXHIBIT J23]**  **From:** Lorraine Cordell [mailto:[lorraine32@bluevonder.co.uk](mailto:lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk) ]  **Sent:** 22 July 2015 11:22  **To:** ['kate.osamor.mp@parliament.uk](mailto:kate.osamor.mp@parliament.uk) '; 'Andrew Cordell'  **Subject:** RE: Re: Update  Dear Kate Osamor,   * After we made a call today about not hearing back from you about the problems with my family and the police. * “My brother who made the call was told I had sent the below email to the erroneous email which I used”  1. [k osamor@hotmail.com](mailto:k%20osamor@hotmail.com)  * and got this email from  1. <http://www.labour.org.uk/people/detail/kate-osamor>  * I now seem to have found the correct email which is  1. [kate.osamor.mp@parliament.uk](mailto:kate.osamor.mp@parliament.uk)  * so, I am now forwarding this email to this email address. * “We have also been told you seem to have the wrong address for me on file you seem to have 28 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London, N9 7DG, when in fact the address is 23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London, N9 7DG” * Could someone get back to me with what is going on with this case and if you have heard back from the police.   Best Regards  Lorraine Cordell  **Please See; [EXHIBIT J23]**  On **Wed, Jul 22, 2015, at 11:56 AM,** Lorraine Cordell <[lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk](mailto:lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk) > wrote:  Dear Kate Osamor,   * My brother has just asked me to send over some more details, * Mr Simon Cordell 109 Burncroft Ave Enfield Middlesex EN3 7JQ * “I do have an issue as everything about what the police have been doing to my family over the last 18+ years was only said on phone calls and limited information” * The family is at breaking point and my older son Simon Cordell is not coping at all due to what is going on. There is a setup case the police put on him last **Sep 2015** for an **ASBO** which the police know full well he has not done, this case is at court for full hearing on the 3rd and 4th August 2015. * We know full well the public order unit at Scotland yard holds information that proves my son has not done what the police are saying he has; we have asked for this information yet not given it. * Also, his PNC record is not correct, and the police will not do anything about it, with around eight errors that should not be on his record. and I have the proof of this. * there are 2 complaints in with the Serious Misconduct Investigation Unit (SMIU2A) Directorate of Professional Standards one for Tyrone Benjamin and one for Simon Cordell Simon Cordell one is due to a police officer lying at both the magistrates court where my son was found guilty for something, he had not done due to the police officer lying, and also on appeal at the crown court the crown court judge over tuned the guilty and my son won the appeal. * “There is so much more that has happened and all due to how much the police hate my family; we cannot take no more as a family and something has to be done to stop what the police are doing.” * No one could understand what the family has put up with over the last 18+ years, to write it all down would take forever but I am trying to do this. * and we do keep the records. * My kids are mixed race and I know part of the treatment is due to this.   Regards Lorraine Cordell  **Please See; [EXHIBIT J23]**  Dear Lorraine,   * Thank you for your email. * I can understand your frustrations with regard to the lack of response from the Police, after Mr Love's representations. * I have now made re-made these representations to the Borough Commander, “**Si Note:** Jane Johnson who made the Forged Asbo.” urgently chasing up this matter. * I have also informed **Joan Ryan** of your sons' cases and they should be in **contact with your shortly**. * I will contact you again once I receive a response from the Borough Commander. * In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if there is an update on your case * or if there is anything else, I can help you with.   Yours sincerely  Tara Mundy   * **List of dates**  1. There were no correspondents between the MPs, and the Now Claimants in the year of **2012. “Check Still”** 2. There were no correspondents between the MPs, and the Now Claimants in the year of **2013. “Check Still”** 3. The 01/05/2015 4. The 16/07/2015 5. The 22/07/2015 6. The 23/11/2016 Alev 7. The 24/11/2016 Formal Complaint made to the Enfield Council + x3 emails to Joan Ryan the MP Office: - “Automatic Reply.” 8. The 29/11/2016 9. The 30/11/2016 Alev 10. The 01/12/2016 Alev 11. The 05/12/2016 Update to my Formal Complaint please see attached letter of new Formal Complaint added to the Formal Complaint dated 24/08/2016 + x2: - “Automatic Reply.” From Joan Ryan the MP Office. 12. The 08/12/2016 Alev Cazimoglu, Paul Buck Ridge, MP Joan Ryan + x1: - “Automatic Reply.” From Joan Ryan the MP Office. 13. The 12/12/2016 Alev Cazimoglu, Paul Buck Ridge, MP Joan Ryan. 14. The 13/12/2016 Alev 15. The 14/12/2016 Alev 16. The 00/00/2017 17. The 00/00/2017 18. The 00/00/2017 19. The 00/00/2017 20. The 00/00/2017 21. The 00/00/2017 22. The 00/00/2018 23. The 00/00/2018 24. The 00/00/2018 25. The 00/00/2018 26. The 19/11/2018 Denise Cook-Smith in reply to Cllr Alev Cazimoglu Hi Alev Further to your enquiry regarding Simon Cordell. Please see the update below from Debbie Morgan. Doctors discharged SC from hospital on**15/11/2018.** 27. The 00/00/2018 28. The 00/00/2018 29. The 00/00/2018 30. The 00/00/2019 31. The 00/00/2019 32. The 00/00/2019 33. The 00/00/2019  * **More Information**  1. Due to the MPs not acting in accordance 2. An improved awareness of people’s causes in need of support. 3. Opportunities for new full-time and part time employment 4. A cultural boost to the local community 5. Development of a strong community 6. Improvements on cross community relations 7. Stronger Community relationships 8. Shared Business opportunities 9. A source of income for local projects through fundraising 10. Enhancing the image of the borough(s) 11. Stimulating inward and outwards investments 12. Buying goods for services for the public 13. Offering activities 14. People working together 15. Problem solving 16. Project management 17. A Companionship drive for youths & Adults 18. Groundwork foundations 19. Safer neighbourhoods 20. Supporting Children and Adults 21. Advice and support services 22. Running an Association 23. Kick start projects 24. Constructive Visions for the future 25. Developed strategy’s 26. What the problems are 27. What community groups can achieve for today’s people 28. Reduce the fear of positive change 29. Core management public service’s 30. Timing and speed in chaises situations  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Portrait** | | **Name (Birth–Death)** | **Term Of Office** | | **Elected** | **Political Party** | **Previous, Concurrent, And Subsequent Political Offices** | **Education** | |  | A person wearing a suit and tie  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | **MP**  Andy Love  **Labour** | **0** | **0** | **0** | Labour | 1. Andy Love is a British Labour Co-operative politician who was Member of Parliament (MP) for Edmonton from 1997 to 2015. | * 0 | |  | A picture containing wall, person, indoor  Description automatically generated | **MP**  Kate Osamor  **Labour** | **0** | **0** | **0** | Labour | 1. Kate Osamor was born **15 August 1968** and is a British politician who has served as a Member of Parliament as an (MP) for Edmonton since **2015.** 2. Kate Osamor serves as a member of the Labour and Co-operative parties; she was Shadow Secretary of State for International Development from **2016** to **2018.** 3. She is a member of the Socialist Campaign Group parliamentary caucus | * 0 | |  | A person with long hair smiling  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | **MP**  Joan Ryan  **Labour** | **0** | **0** | **0** | Labour | 1. Joan Marie Ryan born **8 September 1955** is a British politician who served as Member of Parliament (MP) for Enfield North from **1997** to **2010** and from **2015** to **2019**. 2. the Labour Party first elected her as an MP but later defected to join Change UK. 3. Ryan studied sociology and worked as a teacher, before becoming a Labour councillor on Barnet London Borough Council in **1990,** serving as deputy leader of the council from **1994** to **1998.** | * 0 | | End | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | **After The Magistrates Trial Getting a New Solicitor for An Appeal / Legal Aid; 03/08/2015 & 04/08/2015**  &  **Or Keeping the Old Solicitors**  &  **In the Meantime**  **[EXHIBIT J28]** |
| * **Solicitor Stuff**  1. My Solicitor tried to get stuck of the case more than once and  * **After The Magistrates Trial Getting a New Solicitor for An Appeal / Legal Aid**  1. The Now Claimants mother with righteous concern contacted more than one Solicitor to try and get a new Solicitor to take over the Asbo case but this even become at bit tricky as each time she spoke to a Law Firm they told her that Solicitors will not take a case on at an appeal stage due to how much legal aid pays out for appeal hearing, so, she could not get a representing Solicitor for her son. 2. The legal aid department believed the Solicitors that acted for the magistrates hearing would be dealing with the Appeal hearing at the Crown Court also. 3. As any Court should know there is a set amount that Legal-Aid pays out for appeal hearings and this fee would not cover a new Solicitor going over the complete case other than a Pro-Bono situation.  * **Or Keeping the Old Solicitors**  1. The Now Claimants mother believed it was best to keep the old Solicitors on record as it was better to have a Solicitor we knew and knew the case history than having non due or an unprepared representative.  * **In the Meantime**  1. The acting Solicitors had seemed to have lost the Now Claimant bundle as the Solicitor Firm had removed the files from their office and this was because their office conduct an official financial inspection of their accounts in the year and month of **October 2015,** Staff working for the Solicitor Firm was not able to find the Now Claimant bundle afterwards, and all the missing documents that was meant to have been within the bundle.  * **The Solicitor Listed the Appeal Stuff**  1. My Solicitor tried to get stuck of the case more than once and 2. The Judge listed the Appeal for a hearing on the **26 October 2015.** | | | |
|  | | | **The Metropolitan Police Service Posted on Their Website a Guilty Verdict: 13/08/2021; [EXHIBIT J29] & [EXHIBIT J30] & [EXHIBIT J31]** |
| * **The Metropolitan Police Service Posted on Their Website a Guilty Verdict**  1. Undeniably for the Metropolitan Police, on the **13 August 2015,** the Metropolitan Police: - “Sounded the Trumpets” in part because of “Interrelating Side Issues with Members of his Neighbours due to Government Figures Trying to Avoid Justice,” and done so, by posting on their website that Mr. Simon Paul Cordell won’t be a problem to Enfield anymore as he has been found guilty of Organising Illegal Raves and if any member of the public sees him: - “At Once, They Are To Call The Police,” and this led to: -“Alarms-Ringing,” in the Now Claimants name as all the local newspapers begun printing the story about the Now Claimant.   **Please See Notes [EXHIBIT J30]**   1. It was wrong for the police to be: “The First Runners Up,” having printed this information in the middle of a Court Appeal taking place as the Now Claimant was: - “Balancing Up,” that the Prosecution had not demonstrated illegality alongside more relevant factors. 2. This led to the Now Claimant having stones thrown at his windows, and a gun being pulled out on him, which then took the police six days to come out to take a report, and afterwards do no fair investigation, we know the reason why it took the police so long to come and take the report it's how much the police dislike the Now Claimant, and his family this has been ongoing for over 23 years as was explain at the start of the Asbo trial proceedings and is in the transcripts.   **Please See Notes [EXHIBIT J31]**   1. **A**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Portrait** | | **Name (Birth–Death)** | **Term Of Office** | | **Elected** | **Political Party** | **Previous, Concurrent, And Subsequent Political Offices** | **Education** | |  | [A person with white hair  Description automatically generated with low confidence](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Boris_Johnson_July_2015.jpg) | [**Boris Johnson**](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Boris_Johnson) **(Born 1964)** | **4**  **May**  **2008** | **9**  **May**  **2016** | **2008**  **&**  **2012** | Conservative | 1. Member of Parliament for Henley **(2001–2008)** 2. Member of Parliament for Uxbridge and South Ruislip **(2015–)** 3. Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs **(2016–2018)** 4. Leader of the Conservative Party **(2019–2022)** 5. Prime Minister **(2019–2022)** | 1. Eton College 2. University of Oxford | |  | [A person in a suit  Description automatically generated with low confidence](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Sadiq_Khan_2020.png) | **Sadiq Khan** **(Born 1970)** | **9**  **May**  **2016** | **Incumbent** | **2016**  **&**  **2021** | Labour | 1. Member of Parliament for Tooting **(2005–2016)** 2. Minister of State for Transport **(2009–2010)** 3. Shadow Secretary of State for Justice and Shadow Lord Chancellor **(2010–2015)** | * Ernest Bevin School * University of North London * University of Law | |  | | | | | | | | |   **Please See Notes [EXHIBIT J31]**   |  | | --- | | **11/27/2015**  **Man given a five-year ASBO - Metropolitan Police Service**    **MAYOR OF LONDON**  A picture containing vector graphics  Description automatically generatedAccessibility  A picture containing text  Description automatically generated   * **MAYOR'S OFFICE: - “for Policing and Crime 2015.”** * http://content.met.police.uk/News/Man-given-a-five-year-ASBO/1400033211719/1257246745756   **METROPOLITAN**  **POLICE**  [**TOTAL POLICING**](https://www.google.com/url?q=http://content.met.police.uk/Home&sa=D&source=editors&ust=1667417206477439&usg=AOvVaw1umMertyt4hYGshfmD0ZGG)  [Your Home Borough](https://www.google.com/url?q=http://content.met.police.uk/Page/YourBorough&sa=D&source=editors&ust=1667417206477693&usg=AOvVaw0I8dm1lfhUCMcAffgGskCZ) [Contact JS](https://www.google.com/url?q=http://content.met.police.uk/Site/ContactUs&sa=D&source=editors&ust=1667417206477910&usg=AOvVaw0RFm5qrguefEuqn8mo7yI4) [News & Appeals](https://www.google.com/url?q=http://content.met.police.uk/Page/NewsAppeals&sa=D&source=editors&ust=1667417206478124&usg=AOvVaw0f0HQDQxNsIze9VlfmW6LN) [About JS](https://www.google.com/url?q=http://content.met.police.uk/Site/About&sa=D&source=editors&ust=1667417206478327&usg=AOvVaw325mhGJVdT6D8UPdbJ4b_e) [Advice](https://www.google.com/url?q=http://content.met.police.uk/Site/Advice&sa=D&source=editors&ust=1667417206478536&usg=AOvVaw1PW9CJeAnBe7eSwC6gHKzQ) [Careers](https://www.google.com/url?q=http://content.met.police.uk/Page/Careers&sa=D&source=editors&ust=1667417206478737&usg=AOvVaw1d5oc1cKD0YbV6M047HWJK) | | **Man given a five-year ASBO**  **13 August 2015**  A person with a beard  Description automatically generated with medium confidence   1. “A 34-year-old man who organised illegal raves across London has been given a five-year Anti-Social Behaviour Order (ASBO) at Highbury Corner Magistrates' Court on **Tuesday, 04th of August.**” 2. “Simon Cordell, thirty-four of Burncroft Avenue, Enfield the police have given the following prohibitions: 3. "Cordell is well known for organising illegal raves in Enfield and across London." 4. Attending a rave as defined by **S.63 (1)** of the **Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994**. 5. Be concerned in the organisation of a rave as defined by **S.63 (1)** of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act **1994.** 6. Knowingly using or supplying property, personal or otherwise, for use in a rave as defined by **S.63(1)** of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act **1994.** 7. Enter or remaining in any disused or abandoned building unless invited to do so in writing by a registered charitable organisation or Local Authority. 8. Enter or remaining on non-residential private property on an industrial estate between the hours of 10pm and 7am without written permission from the owner and/or leaseholder of the property; and 9. Engage in any licensable activity in an unlicensed premise. 10. A breach of any of these conditions could lead to imprisonment for Simon Cordell. 11. Police Sergeant Allan Seth, from Enfield's Licensing and Partnership Unit, said: "Cordell is well known for organising illegal raves in Enfield and across London. This order will go a long way to allowing residents of Enfield and London to live in the peace they deserve. 12. "We urge that should Cordell be seen to breach the above conditions, that they contact Police immediately." 13. Police request that should you see Simon Cordell breach any of the above conditions, then please contact Police on 101, or Crime Stoppers on 0800 555 111. |   **Please See Notes [EXHIBIT J31]**   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Prime Minister Office**  **Portrait** | | **Name (Birth–Death)** | **Term Of Office** | | **(Lifespan)** | **Political Party** | **Ministerial Offices Held as Prime Minister** | |  | **[photograph](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:David_Cameron_official_(cropped).jpg)** | David Cameron **MP for Witney (born 1966)** | **11**  **May**  **2010** | **13**  **July 2016** | 6 years and 64 days | **Conservative** | * First Lord of the Treasury * Minister for the Civil Service | |  | **[photograph](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Theresa_May_Official_(cropped).jpg)** | Theresa May **MP for Maidenhead (born 1956)** | **13**  **July**  **2016** | **24**  **July 2019** | 3 years and 12 days | **Conservative** | * First Lord of the Treasury * Minister for the Civil Service | |  | **[photograph](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Boris_Johnson_official_portrait_(cropped_3).jpg)** | Boris Johnson **MP for Uxbridge and South Ruislip (born 1964)** | **24**  **July**  **2019** | **6 September 2022** | 3 years and 45 days | **Conservative** | * First Lord of the Treasury * Minister for the Civil Service * Minister for the Union | |  | **[photograph](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Liz_Truss_official_portrait_(cropped).jpg)** | Liz Truss **MP for Southwest Norfolk (born 1975)** | **6 September**  **2022** | **25 October**  **2022** | 50 days | **Conservative** | * [First Lord of the Treasury](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/First_Lord_of_the_Treasury) * [Minister for the Civil Service](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Minister_for_the_Civil_Service) * [Minister for the Union](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Minister_for_the_Union) | |  | **[photograph](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:PM_Rishi_Sunak_(cropped).jpg)** | Rishi Sunak **MP for Richmond (York’s) (born 1980)** | **25 October**  **2022** | **Incumbent** | days | **Conservative** | * First Lord of the Treasury * Minister for the Civil Service * Minister for the Union | |  | | | | | | | |  * **A List Mayor of the Municipal Borough of Enfield by Years Relevant**  1. This is a list of people who held the office of Mayor of the Municipal Borough of Enfield, Middlesex and of the London Borough of Enfield. 2. “The Enfield Urban District was granted a charter of incorporation in **1955** and the office was created this continued in **1965** when the area became part of the larger London Borough of Enfield, absorbing the mayoralties of Edmonton and Southgate.” 3. **2014-2015:** Ali Bakir 4. **2015-2016:** Patricia Ekechi 5. **2016-2017:** Bernadette Lappage 6. **2017-2018:** Christine Hamilton 7. **2018-2019:** Saray Karakus 8. **2019-2020:** Kate Anolue 9. **2020-2021:** Sabri Ozaydin 10. **2021-2022:** Sabri Ozaydin (second term) 11. **2022-2023:** Doris Jiagge 12. **A** | | | |
|  | | | **The Appeal Hearing; 26/10/2015; [EXHIBIT J32]** |
| * **The Appeal Hearing; 26/10/2015**  1. On the **26 October 2015** we attended Court for the Judge to: - “Send Us Around in Circles,” as we found out that the Judge had only listed the hearing for 1-hour and so, the Judge cancelled the hearing, due to the case needing to be for three days. The Court Clerk set the new date as the **09th of November 2015** rather than: - “Hoop Diving Around.” 2. We also, asked for Discloser yet again.  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **The 1st Appeal Stage**  **8 Out of 20 of 20 Court dates the 1 of 13 appearance towards the 1st Asbo**  **At Wood Green Crown Court and the Judge s was** | | | **Date:** | 26/10/2015 | | **Defendants Name:** | Mr Simon Cordell | | **Court House:** | Wood Green Crown Court | | **Reason:** | The 1st Appeal Stage / Mention Hearing | | **Case Number:** | A2015006 | | **Judge s Name:** | Lyons | | **Contra’s Name:** | Robert Talalay | | **My Barrister Name:** | Mr. Andrew Locke | | **Note 1:** | (Mention Hearing) | | **Note 2:** | Ms Sally Gilchrist Legal Executive Director Met Police was Present! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Portrait** | | **Judge Name** | **Went To the Bar** | **Court** | **History** | |  | [A picture containing text, road, clothing, suit  Description automatically generated](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Boris_Johnson_July_2015.jpg) | **His Honour Judge**  Shaun Lyons CBE | **4** | (Magistrates’ courts | 1. M | |  | [A person in a suit and tie  Description automatically generated with medium confidence](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Boris_Johnson_July_2015.jpg) | **His Honour Judge**  Shaun Lyons CBE | **4** | (Magistrates’ courts | 1. M | | **End** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | **All Parties to Be Ready and At the Crown Court; 09/11/2015; EXHIBIT J33]** |
| * **All Parties to Be Ready and At the Crown Court**  1. In advertence to the **09th of November 2015,** thisis one of days that the: - “Asbo-Mention-Hearing, Went Ahead.” 2. The Judge residing theses proceeds ruled for all the Asbo bundles to be ready at the Crown Court and ready, by the date set of the **23December 2015.** 3. The Court Clerk then relisted: “Three-Days,” for an Appeal to start on the **22 February 2016.** 4. We also, asked for Discloser yet again as we did not receive non, but really the Now Claimant and his other representing persons believed the Judge should have made the Asbo Proceedings: “Disappear,” but the Judges did not when considering the grounds, we already presented.  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **The 1st Appeal Stage**  **9 Out of 20 of 20 Court dates the 2 of 13 appearance towards the 1st Asbo**  **At Wood Green Crown Court and the Judge s were: -** | | | **Date:** | 09/11/2015 | | **Defendants Name:** | Mr Simon Cordell | | **Case Handler:** | Ms Sally Gilchrist Legal Executive Director Met Police and she was Present! | | **Court House:** | Wood Green Crown Court | | **Reason:** | The 1st Appeal Stage / Mention Hearing | | **Case Number:** | A2015006 | | **Judge s Name:** |  | | **Contra’s Name:** | Robert Talalay | | **My Barrister Name:** | Mr. Andrew Locke | | **Note 1:** | (Mention Hearing) | | **Note 2:** |  | | | | |
|  | | | **Failed Meetings by the Now Claimants Solicitor;** **December 2015**  &  **Multiple Texts and Calls We Made**  &  **Exhibiting Just One of the Occasion Texts and phone Calls Stayed Ignored**  **EXHIBIT J34]** |
| * **Failed Meetings by the Now Claimants Solicitor**  1. In the **December 2015** arrangements was made for the acting Solicitors to attend the Now Claimants mother's home to go over the case bundles, at this point the Now Claimants mother made sure that all the CADs and intelligence reports was gone over by the Solicitor, upon seeing all the errors the Solicitor was shocked, maps were made up to be included in the Now Claimant bundle and the Now Claimant bundle was remade as it was due to be handed into Wood Green Crown Court on the **23rd December 2015** emails were also sent by the Solicitor to the police. 2. The Now Claimants mother agreed to print of multiple documents including all maps needed to complete in colour, just prior to the Christmas holiday the Now Claimants mother done all the printing, and the afterwards contacted the Solicitor firm in order to get the Now Claimant bundle Paginated and indexed.  * **Multiple Texts and Calls We Made**  1. By the **22 December 2015,** the Now Claimants and his mother had made multiple texts and calls to the acting Solicitor due to the fact the bundle needed to be to the Court by the **23 December 2015,** but the acting Solicitor firm did not reply in a reasonable time and therefore become anon in effective litigation.  * **Exhibiting Just One of the Occasion Texts and phone Calls Stayed Ignored**  1. Just to mention one of the occasion out of the many when the acting Solicitor did not reply in a timely manner, is to say that when the Solicitor did finally reply she stated, that she will hand in the Asbo bundle when she got back from the Christmas and her New Year holidays, this was clearly not adequate as there should have been a case handler in her position to handle the Now Claimants case load while she was away on leave. 2. Effectually we sent a text to the Solicitor saying that this was going to have a negative effect on the Now Claimants’ family and friends Christmas as well as New Year and this email sent is when the Solicitor finally replied to. 3. The Now Claimant knew that the Courts Judge had ordered for the Asbo Response bundle to ready to the Court within the time limit permitted but the timeline had overreached its obligated limit and therefore he worried whether the Solicitor firm had prepared his defence and then if they would be able to submit it to the Court in time to get merited. The text received back from the Solicitors said the following: - “to be at the office by 18:00 PM.” 4. The Now Claimants mother attended the Court, and the two Asbo bundles she had paginated while indexing which took her until around 01:30 AM got handed over. 5. Ms Ward was not happy due to the time that she had to spend dealing with this as she was due to fly out in the early hours to Ireland. | | | |
|  | | | **The Solicitor Left the Bundles with The Now Claimants Mother; 23/12/2015**  &  **The Now Claimants Case Handlers; 23/12/2015**  **[EXHIBIT J35] & [EXHIBIT J36]** |
| * **The Solicitor Left the Bundles with The Now Claimants Mother; 23/12/2015**  1. The Solicitor left the bundles with the Now Claimants mother, so that one mastered copy could behand-delivered to the Court in the morning on the **23 December 2015** and the other bundle recorded delivered via the Post Office to the police. 2. Ms Ward the acting Solicitor had prior explained to the Now Claimant and his mother that she would get the Now Claimant bundle ready after the Christmas and New Year holidays so that he and others would get a copy. 3. The Now Claimant had not seen the new bundle once the Solicitor and his mother had built them due to the lateness of the development of the files and the isolation the Solicitor had created by not allowing a meeting to take place where the Now, Claimant could be present.   **Please See Notes [EXHIBIT J36]**   1. This is a couple of texts that the Solicitor firm sent to the Now Claimants mother proving this fact, please see below. 2. The Now Claimant’s Solicitor said: that on the **22/12/2015,** 3. “*This is a legal aid case Lorraine and Simon need to recognise that he is not paying privately so needs to work within the constraints of the legal aid system.*” 4. And upon the Now Claimants mother receiving the text, she felt terribly upset as it was the Court who had set the day for the bundle to be within the Court and not the Now Claimant. The Solicitors should have dealt with the case promptly and made sure that things were not last minute for Court. All that the Now Claimant ever wanted was for the Solicitors to do what was right and needed for the Now Claimant their client, to which never happened.  * **The Now Claimants Case Handlers**  1. When overseeing the past activities of: “the case handlers”, it is a sure fact that things was always left or not achieved at all, this would always lead the Now Claimants to his disappointment, in turn, causing wrongful suffering and loss, this seems to continue to leave the Now Claimant being in receipt of getting the blame, when he should not. 2. It was also upsetting because it seemed as if: - the Now Claimant paid for the Solicitor's services then things would get adhered to by themselves differently. I feel it should make no difference between paying privately or having legal aid put in place, a Solicitor's job is to stand for their client to the best of their ability seek justice for their client in the best way they can, this was not the case throughout this case.  * **Put Bang to Rights!**   **Please See [EXHIBIT J37]**   * **From Diary 23/10/22**  1. **13/02/2016 Email Me to Mother or Reverse: Asbo Case** / Simon Cordell v. The Metropolitan Police Commissioner - appeal against the imposition of an ASBO heard at Wood Green Crown / Time 12:43 PM. 2. **15/02/2016 Asbo R: Freedom of Information Results from Licensing Unit** / London Borough of Enfield / My Company Too Smooth / Time 10:21. 3. **15/02/2016 Enfield Council & The Neighbourhood Watch Team:** Simon Cordell Complaint [SEC=PROTECT]/ Time 11:03 - “Dear Louise Brown / Jackie Gubby, I have still not heard anything about the complaint that we put in on the **16/10/2015.** 4. **17/02/2016 Email Me to Mother or Reverse:** Asbo Case / Updated it a bit more **/ Time** 22:07 - “I have taken time to listen to my Solicitor’s advice regarding the applicant’s proposal to an Asbo order that was on the.doc – “ | | | |
|  | | | **After the Christmas and the New Year's Holidays; 01/01/2016 till the 19/02/2016** |
| **After the Christmas and the New Year's Holidays**   1. After the Christmas and the New Year's holidays, we had to keep asking for the Now Claimant bundle, we managed to get this in the beginning of **February 2016**, not long before the trial was due to start, it would also seem the Solicitors was having problems getting a Barrister to act for the Now Claimant, so, he still had not seen a Barrister, this was as the full hearing at the Magistrate's Court was soon to take place. 2. The original Barrister that stood for the Now Claimant at the Magistrate's hearings, was on sabbatical leave. 3. The acting Solicitors exasperated the Now Claimant as she still refused to meet with him and would only meet with his mother instead.   **On the 04/02/2016 The Following Happened:**   1. On the date of the **04/02/2016** the Now Claimant and his mother Received two emails once they got home from court. 2. Sally Gilchrist sent one email in particular as she continued to hide away in the back sits of the Courtrooms throughout the Asbo Proceedings. 3. The Now Claimant mother received the email in question at the time of 21:08PM. 4. Sally Gilchrist & Teams email contained three hundred pages in an attachment to the email and the pages in that attachment were at the time impossible to read due to the printout being such a bad copy and the malicious intent to make the Asbo Court Proceedings harder to solve on the Now Claimants behalf. 5. The: - “Chain-of Command” the email passage through was: - “The Now Claimant received his copy of the file from his mother, who received it from his solicitor, and they initially received it from Sally Gilchrist & Team.” 6. The Contexts subject in the letter head is: - “The Skeleton Argument for The Respondent,” 7. The skeleton argument is a Large File and was Unreadable When First Received but the Now Claimant has found the book the Prosecution photocopied the pages out of and at the same time found in the middle of all the photocopied book pages a hand typed letter of the Crown Prosecution Case handler a Robert Talalay. 8. The Now Claimant Has **Exhibited** the hand typed letter found in the middle that is wrote by Robert Talalay below \*\*\*\* so, any person of relevance can also, read the document 9. The Email the skeleton argument of the prosecution sent stars by Stating: - “Dear Ms Cordell, please find the papers attached. Could you please provide us with your son's email address as well too?” 10. The Now Claimant has contained and archived the file below: -   **Please See [EXHIBIT J37]**  **88,**   |  | | --- | | **23 After the Christmas and the New Year's Holidays; 01/01/2016 till the 19/02/2016**  Simon Cordell’s Skeleton Argument (2) Pdf  **Case No A2Q150064**  **Case No A2Q150064**  **IN THE WOOD GREEN CROWN COURT**  **IN THE MATTER OF AN APPEAL AGAINST AN ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR ORDER**  **BETWEEN:**  **SIMON CORDELL**  **Now Claimant**  **-and-**  **THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS**  **Respondent**  **SKELETON ARGUMENT FOR THE RESPONDENT**  References to page numbers are in [square brackets], [AX] being the Now Claimant’s bundle and [RX] being the Respondent’s bundle  **1\**  **Listing;** For appeal hearing, **22-24/02/2016** for Three-days.  **Issues:**   1. Whether The Now Claimant Has Acted in An Anti-Social Manner 2. Whether An ASBO Necessary Recommended   **Pre-Reading**:   * For an Application for The ASBO [**Rl-3**] * The ASBO Made On **04/08/2015** [**R13**]  1. The Statements of DC Elsmore, The OIC [**R**14-35] 2. Statements Of “**R’s” Witnesses** [**R** 36-66] 3. **“A’s” Statements** [A1-X5] 4. Statements Of **“A’s” Witnesses** [**A**16-30, **A** 258-272]   **Introduction**   1. The Now Claimant is appealing against a decision made by the district judge at Highbury Corner Magistrates’ Court on **04th of August 2015** pursuant to S.1 of the Crime and Disorder Act **1998** (“the **1998** Act”) to make him subject to an anti-social behaviour order (ASBO) to last for 5 years. 2. The facts relied upon by the Respondent are set out in the bundle of evidence placed before the court and, in particular, the witness statements of the Respondent’s officers **[R.14-35].** The Now Claimant has also provided a bundle for this appeal hearing **[A],** |   **89,**   |  | | --- | | Simon Cordell’s Skeleton Argument (2) Pdf   1. The Respondent’s case is that the Now Claimant has been integrally involved in the organisation of raves in London, particularly Enfield, and/or the supply of sound equipment to those raves. 2. The Respondent relies on each incident set out in the application notice to support his case [Rl-3]. 3. The Respondent submits that it is necessary for an ASBO to be in place to protect the public from further anti-social acts, specifically the organisation of raves, done by the Now Claimant. 4. “A chronology of events is appended to this Skeleton Argument.”   **Legal framework**   1. Whilst the relevant provisions of the **1998** Act “were repealed by the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act **2014**,” s.21 of that Act provides that these proceedings are unaffected except that, on **23rd of March 2020**, the Now Claimant’s ASBO will automatically become an Injunction under as if made under S.1 of that Act. 2. **Section 4 of the 1998** Act provides that an appeal against the making of an ASBO lies to the Crown Court. 3. **Section 79(3)** of the Senior Courts Act **1981** provides that an appeal to the Crown Court is by way of a re-hearing. 4. The relevant test, therefore, is that set out in S.1 of the Act. 5. Pursuant to **S.1 (4) of the 1998** Act, the court may exercise it discretion and make an ASBO if the two-part test set: out in S.1(l) is satisfied. Section 1(1) states: 6. An application for an order under this section may be made by a relevant: authority if it: appears to the authority that the following conditions are fulfilled with respect to any person aged ID or over, namely that the person has acted, since the commencement date, in an and-social manner, that is to say, in a manner that caused or was likely to cause harassment: alarm or distress to one or more persons not of the same household as himself; and that such an order is necessary to protect relevant persons from further anti­social acts by him.   2 |   **90,**   |  | | --- | | Simon Cordell’s Skeleton Argument (2) Pdf   1. It is for the Respondent to satisfy the court to the criminal standard that the Now Claimant has acted in a manner that caused or was likely to cause harassment, alarm, or distress to one or more persons not of the same household as himself. 2. However, the second limb of the test “does not involve a standard of proof: it is an exercise of judgment or evaluation” (R ***(McCann) v Manchester Crown Court*** [**2003**] l A.C. 787 at [371). 3. In ***R v Dean lioness*** [**2006**] 1 Cr. App. II. (S.) 120, the Court of Appeal provided general guidance as to the creation of prohibitions forming an ASBO, the court held that: 4. “Prohibitions should be individually tailored to the individual and that each individual prohibition must be necessary [28].” 5. “An ASBO can include prohibitions not to undertake minor criminal activity that may be covered under separate legislation [30-1].” 6. “However, an ASBO should seek to prevent a person from being able to commit that offence, rather than further penalise him when he does commit it [35]; and: 7. the terms of the ASBO must be proportionate so as to be commensurate with the risk identified [37.]”   **Submissions**   * The first limb of the test under **S. 1 (l)(a) of the 1998** Act  1. The organisation of large-scale raves, whether or not they fall within the parameters of **S.63** of the Criminal justice and Public Order Act **1994** and whether on private property or common land, fall within the definition of anti-social behaviour. 2. The Home Office Guidanc**e:** ***‘A Guide to antisocial beamer orders’*** specifies noise nuisance, particularly when late at night, as an example of anti-social behaviour. 3. It is submitted that, a person who helps organise or supplies equipment for a rave, where there is loud music late at night (except where there is a licence to do so and/or the music is played on licensed premises), has ***prana jade*** done an act in contravention of **S.1(l)(a) of the 1998** Act.   3 |   **91,**   |  | | --- | | Simon Cordell’s Skeleton Argument (2) Pdf   1. The Respondent relies on the evidence provided in die witness statements provided by various officers as well as supporting intelligence reports, the page references for this evidence are set out in the appended chronology. 2. “The court is invited to take particular note of the evidence supporting the conclusion that the Now Claimant was integrally involved in the organization of raves and/or the supply of equipment:” 3. “The Now Claimant was identified by gate security as the organizer of a rave of about three hundred people on **07th & 08th of June 2014**.” 4. (See evidence of Insp. Hamill JR38] and supporting evidence of PS Miles [R36]). 5. The Now Claimant admitted to Insp. Skinner that he was the organiser of the rave on **7/8 June 2014** [R41]. 6. The Now Claimant admitted to Insp. Skinner that he was the organiser of the rave organised and prevented on **19th of July 2014** [R39, R41]. 7. The Now Claimant admitted to PC Edgoose that he lent his sound equipment for use at raves and that he could get a considerable number of people to turn out for a rave [R48, R88] 8. And the Now Claimant was the organiser of the rave on **09th of August 2014** and provided the sound equipment as well as laughing gas [R42, R44-5, R47]. 9. When a crowd turned up and tried to force entry, the Now Claimant encouraged them to break the police line [R43, R45-6]. 10. The Respondent further relies on the information set out in the intelligence reports and the documents provided to the court in the Respondent’s bundle. 11. The evidence show the Now Claimant has witnessed by different police officers supplying equipment for or helping to organise a rave. 12. “The court will be invited to reject the Now Claimant’s account as to his activities on the relevant, days as not credible.”  * The second limb of the test under section 1 of the Act  1. “It is first submitted that an ASBO is, in general terms, necessary.”   4 |   **92,**   |  | | --- | | Simon Cordell’s Skeleton Argument (2) Pdf   1. There is a significant body of evidence showing the impact of raves on people who live near where they occur **[R51-66, R155-298].** The level of distress that these individuals suffered as a result of the raves organised by the Now Claimant was high. 'There is a need to prevent these events occurring in the future. 2. The ASBO (and interim ASBO beforehand) have been effective. “The only time where the Now Claimant’s behaviour has improved is when these proceedings were commenced, and it was made clear to the Now Claimant that his actions could not be tolerated.” 3. "The Now Claimant has denied the acts alleged by the Respondent. He has shown no acknowledgment or desire to change his ways that might make an ASBO unnecessary. 4. “As to the particular prohibitions on the ASBO, significant effort was made by the Respondent and by the court to ensure that any legitimate business activities that the Now Claimant wished to undertake would in no way be inhibited by this order.” 5. For the Now Claimant to provide recorded music to a gathering of people he would either need to have a licence for that event or to provide the music on a licensed premise for fewer than five hundred people with, a general licence to play recorded music (see s. 1 and Sch. l of the Licensing Act **2003**). 6. This order specifically does not preclude him from providing regulated entertainment under the auspices of a valid licence. 7. The only amendment that the Respondent would seek is that the words “or s.63(l. A)” be added after the words “s.63(l)” in prohibitions a, b, and c of the ASBO. 8. “It is submitted that the terms of the ASBO as drafted are necessary and proportionate in that they should have minimal impact on the Now Claimant’s life and legitimate business activities.”   **Robert Talalay** Chambers of 1 'torus Barton OC 5 Essex Court  **29th January 2016**  5 |   **93,**   |  | | --- | | Simon Cordell’s Skeleton Argument (2) Pdf  **Case No A20150064**  **IN THE WOOD GREEN CROWN COURT**  **IN THE MATTER OF AN APPEAL AGAINST AN ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR ORDER**  **BETWEEN:**  **SIMON CORDELL**  **Now Claimant**  **-and-**  **THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS**  **Respondent**  **SKELETON ARGUMENT FOR THE RESPONDENT**   * **1C Essex Court** * **Hugh Giles (Director)** * Metropolitan Police Service   Directorate of Legal Services  New Scotland Yard  Broadway  London  SW1H OBG  6 |   **94,**   |  | | --- | | Simon Cordell’s Skeleton Argument (2) Pdf  **Case No A20150064**  **IN THE WOOD GREEN CROWN COURT**  **IN THE MATTER OF AN APPEAL AGAINST AN ANTI-SOCIAL**  **BEHAVIOUR ORDER**  **BETWEEN:**  **SIMON CORDELL**  **Now Claimant**  **-and-**  **THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS**  **Respondent**  **CHRONOLOGY**   * **12/01/2013**  1. Information pertaining to this date entered by PC Purcell that a vehicle belonging to the Now Claimant (Ford hocus Silver MA57LDY) was supplying equipment for a rave in Canary Wharf [R152-4]. Now Claimant accepts attendance but denies any organisational/supply role for a rave [A3]  * **24/05/2013**  1. “Information pertaining to this date entered by PC- Jackson that the Now Claimant was seen with another individual who told PC- Jackson that they were looking for a place to set up a rave over the ban holiday [R118- 120].” 2. Now Claimant’s account at [A4]  * **25/05/2014**  1. Information pertaining to this date entered by PC Hoodless concerning a 2. report that there were trespassers on private premises. 3. “The Now Claimant was spoken to and had a set of large speakers in his van (White Ford I transit CX52JPZ) [R112-4].” 4. Now Claimant accepts attendance but denies any organisational/supply role for a rave [A4]  * **06th till the 08/06/2014**  1. Police attended and broke up a rave at Progress Way, Enfield. 2. Evidence of the Now Claimant’s alleged organisational involvement [R36-41, 110]; impact statements [R51-66]; CAD reports [R155-298]. 3. Now Claimant denies attendance on **06th or 08th June 2014** and admits attendance on **07th June 2014** but denies any organisational/supply role for a rave [A5] |   **95,**   |  | | --- | | Simon Cordell’s Skeleton Argument (2) Pdf   * **20/06/2014**  1. Rave in Neasden closed down. White Fold Transit CX52JRZ removed from the site [R102]. 2. “Now Claimant’s account is that he provided sound equipment for a gentleman’s birthday party and was informed the following day that his equipment had been seized [A5, A253-6]”  * **19/07/2014**  1. Police attended and closed down a putative rave on Great Cambridge Road, Enfield. Evidence of the Now Claimant’s alleged organisational involvement [R39-41, R91]. 2. “Now Claimant’s account is that stopped his car to help a homeless person from being arrested when he was arrested for a breach of the peace; he denies any organisational/supply role for a rave [A6]”  * **24/07/2014**  1. “Conversation reported by PC Edgoose in which the Now Claimant is alleged to have bragged about organising raves [R48, R88].” 2. The Now Claimant’s account is at [A6-7]  * **27/07/2014**  1. Information pertaining to this date entered by PC Chandler that the Now Claimant driving a White herd transit CX52JRZ was present at powering speakers at a rave on Millmarsh Lane, Enfield [R83-6J. 2. Now Claimant, accepts attendance at a birthday party but denies any organisational/supply role for a rave [A7]  * **09/10/08/14**  1. Police attended and broke up a rave on Millmarsh Lane, Pm field. 2. Evidence of the Now Claimant’s alleged organisational involvement **[R42-7, R80-1].** 3. Now Claimant accepts attendance at a birthday dinner but denies any organisational/supply role for a rave |   **Please See [EXHIBIT J37]**   1. **The Context from Here Is Missing.**  |  | | --- | | **Simon Cordell’s Response to the Crown Prosecution Team Skeleton Argument** | | 1. **1\ Listing** 2. The listing for the Asbo Appeal Hearing, was on the **22-24/02/2016** for three-days. 3. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and the Crown Prosecution brought an Asbo Application against the Now Claimant for the “Organisation of Illegal Raves,” the Now Claimant disputed their clams to be true. 4. The three-day Crown Court Appel Trial Hearing did not go ahead with the Now Claimants and his Litigation Team and/or Support Network, present in court. 5. The reason for their absinth was the review and re trial of the Asbo was to be an overview of the way the Now Claimants and his Litigation Team and/or Support Network, were: 6. One. Treated. 7. Two. To receive a fair overview of the Highbury Corner Magistrates Courts proceedings in pursuit of the Asbo. 8. “While within the constraints of the Judicial system within the Wood Green Court the Now Claimants and his Litigation Team and/or Support Network, knew that justice was not going to be prevailed due to the way they were foul treated through Magistrates and then after the Crown Court proceedings.” 9. “Access to justice is a fundamental Human Right in the United Kingdom’s and a Common Law and is an essential part of the rule of law that mandates Citizens Rights to be enforced.” 10. “The United Kingdom’s Laws have to be capable of being enforced; every person should be more than able to seek legal redress for unlawful acts committed against themselves and not feel victimised.”  * **1\ Issues a) and b)**  1. The Crown Prosecution had to prove the burden of proof in the two-stage test at the HMM Court Highbury and Islington and with them two stages in the test being: 2. Whether The Now Claimant Has Acted in An Anti-Social Manner. 3. Whether An ASBO Necessary Recommended.  * **1\ Pre-Reading: a) and b) and c)**  1. The Now Claimant Contended that the prosecution or judges could met the required standards of the two-stage test due to: 2. The Application for The ASBO [**Rl-3**] Being 3. The ASBO Made On **04/08/2015** [**R13**] contained fraudulent Statements of DC Steven Elsmore, The OIC [**R**14-35] 4. The OIC a DC Steven Elsmore had frauded his own statement and allowed the submission of other frauded police officers statements inclusive of modifying government protected data. 5. An exceptionally substantial proportion of the Asbo is frauded material set out by the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and the Crown Prosecution to paint the Now Claimant in a bad light to gain a wrongful guilty conviction that has led to restraints and the demoralising of the Now Claimant and this frauded material includes the Statements Of “**R’s” Witnesses** [**R** 36-66] 6. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and the Crown Prosecution **“A’s” Statements** [A1-X5] that are Statements of **“A’s” Witnesses** [**A**16-30, **A** 258-272] are also, frauded material that they created. 7. When The Crown Prosecution Teams, Asbo Case handler a Robert Talalay [Bracketed] the Skeleton Argument or in other words paginated and chronologically entered specifics, he as the prosecutor understood by being able to see the Prosecutions files pertaining towards the Asbo that: - 8. **[“R’s” Witnesses** **R** 36-66**]** 9. **[“A’s” Statements]** 10. **[“A’s” Witnesses]** 11. Were all not in fact real people that could attend court to be tested by The Now Claimants and his Litigation Team and/or Support Network in front of a Judge or Jury and as a member of the Attorney General’s B Panel and therefore acting on behalf of that Counsel Robert Talalay working since **August 2022** must have understood the probations permitting the abuse of **“Public Law Sectors.”**  * **Introduction 1)**  1. The Now Claimant is appealing against a decision made by the district judge at Highbury Corner Magistrates’ Court on **04th of August 2015** pursuant to S.1 of the Crime and Disorder Act **1998** (“the **1998** Act”) to make him subject to an anti-social behaviour order (ASBO) to last for 5 years.  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Judge s Name: 06/10/2014** | Defendant Judge Pigott?  Defendant Judge Cordell?  Defendant Judge Williams? | | **Judge s Name: 22/10/2014** |  | | **Judge s Name: 05/11/2014** | District Judge Newham | | **Judge s Name: 10/03/2015** | District Judge Williams | | **Judge s Name:**  **03/08/2015 & 04/08/2015 Mag Trial** | Defendant Judge Pigott |  1. The Now Claimant is appealing against the decision made by the judges at Wood Green Crown Court’ on **26th of October 2015** pursuant to S.1 of the Crime and Disorder Act **1998** (“the **1998** Act”) to make him subject to an anti-social behaviour order (ASBO) to continue for its duration of time up to 5 years.  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Judge s Name: 26/10/2015** | His Honour Judge Shaun Lyons CBE | | **Judge s Name: 09/11/2015** |  | | **Judge s Name: 19/02/2016** | HHJ Sean Morris | | **Judge s Name: 22/02/2016** | HHJ Pawlak | | **Judge s Name: 04/04/2016** | HHJ Pawlak | | **Judge s Name: 16/09/2016** | HHJ Noel Lucas KC | | **Judge s Name:**  **21/09/2016 + 22/09/2016** | HHJ Pawlak | | **Judge s Name: 26/09/2016** | HHJ Pawlak | | **Judge s Name: 14/10/2016** | HHJ Pawlak | | **Judge s Name: 19/10/2016** | HHJ Pawlak | | **Judge s Name: 25/10/2016** | HHJ Pawlak] | | **Judge s Name:**  **17/01/2017 + 18/01/2017 + 19/01/2017** | HHJ Pawlak | | **Judge Justice 1:** | Raja Bashhm | | **Judge Justice 2:** | Allan Bevon |      1. The Now Claimant is appealing against the decision made by the judges at JR Stage’ Court on **\*\*\*\*** pursuant to S.1 of the **Crime and Disorder Act 1998** (“the **1998** Act”) to make him subject to an anti-social behaviour order (ASBO) to continue for its duration of time up to 5 years.  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Judge s Name:** |  |  * **Introduction 2)**  1. The facts relied upon by the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and Crown Prosecution are still set out in the Asbo Bundle of evidence that was also, placed before the court and, in particular, the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and Crown Prosecution relied upon in **[R.14-35].** 2. The Witness Statements are not real as are not the victim Statements and all statements police officers made alone. 3. A couple of the Police officers’ statements are of police officers that were not present at the wrongly accused incidents. 4. The police are the only persons who signed the victim’s statements so, they are not real. 5. The Now Claimants and his Litigation Team and/or Support Network provided a response bundle for the: - “The Highbury Corner Magistrates Court 51 Holloway Road London N7 8JA,” and: - “The Wood Green Crown Court Lordship Ln, London N22 5LF.” 6. “No Evidence was accounted for within the Now Claimant Response to Asbo Bundle, or else this Evidence would have provided a fair trial as if explaining: - “A Non-Guilty Verdict,” as the response to Asbo Bundle contained the following vital elements within its factual and therefore true evidence:   --   1. A Conclusive Summery of True Events That Took Place. 2. Items that are Relevant to the Contrary. 3. Important Material That Shows Unquestionable Stability in Truth. 4. Un-Doubtable Evidence on All Pages. 5. Non-Doubtable Factors That Display in Large the Now Claimant Innocence. 6. Safe To Say Document that Are True and Correct to their Artefacts That Are Relevant to The Asbo Proceedings. 7. Correspondence that are Certain in Stability & Evident the Now Claimants True Guiltlessness. 8. Easy To Read Incontrovertible Facts, Leaving the Crown Prosecution Team in A Situation That They Are Unable to Deny or Dispute Against, As the Files Contained in The Now Claimant Response to Asbo Bundle Guarantee His Innocence.   --   1. The Now Claimant Response to Asbo Bundle contains Overwhelming Evidence, and as the Crown Prosecution Case handler a Robert Talalay was made aware of the Evidence by the Now Claimant and his support network, Robert Talalay refused to act in accordance to law as the Prosecutor of the Asbo Case by not accounting for these evident factors inside of the Now Claimant Response to Asbo Bundle, in knowing that he and other involved were committing crimes that breached the Now Claimant “Civil Liberties.”  * **Introduction 3)**  1. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and the Crown Prosecution Team changed the direction of the Asbo case throughout proceeding to suit their own needs, as, when the Now Claimants and his Litigation Team and/or Support Network keep pointing out to the Council and Police that they filed the Asbo Court Order erroneously they failed to file a new Asbo Application fulfilling the requirements accurately to the Courts and Now Claimant again. 2. The Crown Prosecution Case handler a Robert Talalay clearly understood the above comments when he changed the name from: - “the organisation of illegal raves,” to: - “the organisation of raves,” within his copy of the: - “Skeleton Argument indexed under: - “Introduction,” Sections: - “three.” 3. The Prosecution also, stated that the Now Claimant supplied sound equipment to these raves which is not true, and he or police failed to prove within reason.  * **Introduction 4)**  1. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and the Crown Prosecution Team relied on each incident they set out in the Asbo applications notice to support their case **[Rl-3,]** falling to provide victims or witness other than police officers at Court.  * **Introduction 5)**  1. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and the Crown Prosecution Team submitted to the Judge that it was necessary for them all to place an Asbo Order upon the Now Claimant in knowing that the Now Claimant was innocent in what they accused him of and at no time was the Now Claimant the organiser of the wrongly accused incidents they chronology listed as, events. 2. The Crown Prosecution Case handler a Robert Talalay has changed the wording of the allegation put against the Now Claimant in his wrote skeleton Argument at chapter (Introduction 5) to pursue the Now Claimant confusing him for what he was defending himself against, the Prosecutor Robert Talalay yet again has taken the word illegal out.  * **Introduction 6)**  1. The prosecutor adduced a chronology list of events appended to their Skeleton Argument and this list the Now Claimant has amended as below.  * **Legal Framework 7 & 8 & 9)**  1. The Crown Prosecution Case handler a Robert Talalay stated: - “*Whilst the relevant provisions of the* **Crime and Disorder Act 1998** *were repealed by the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act* **2014***, s.21 of that Act provides that these proceedings are unaffected except that, on* **23rd of March 2020***, the Now Claimant’s ASBO will automatically become an Injunction under as if made under* **S.1 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.”** 2. By The Crown Prosecution Case handler, a Robert Talalay stating the above he clearly was knowledgeable how about the: - “Laws,” pertaining to the: - “repealed Anti-social Behaviour Acts of stationery obligations in pursuit of the: - “Crime and Disorder Act **1998,**” 3. So, being a specialist in the areas of: - 4. “Police Law,” 5. “Public Law,” 6. “Human Rights” And 7. “Civil Liberties,” 8. “Data Protection” And 9. “Information Law,” 10. “Malfeasance Claims,” 11. “Prison Law,” 12. “Inquests,” 13. “Personal Injury Claims,” 14. “Employment Law” And 15. “Professional Misconduct.” 16. How could The Crown Prosecution Case handler a Robert Talalay of missed the facts listed below and contained in this document? 17. When the government repealed the relevant provisions of the Crime and Disorder Act **1998,** the Crown Prosecution was aware of these facts, as for when the amendments took place to the Anti-social Behaviour policy, by the Government replacing the provisions to the Crime and Policing Act **2014,** how could the Crown Prosecution still have used the repealed Act when another policy had been passed through royal assent. 18. The New Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act **2014** received royal assent on: - “**13/03/2014.**” 19. The Act introduced simpler with: - “More Effective Powers,” to: - “Tackle Anti-Social Behaviour,” that the Government said would: - “Provide Better Protection for Victims and Communities.” 20. One significant aspect of the Crime and Policing Act **2014** is that it replaced the anti-social behaviour orders, what was the primary civil order in the United Kingdom since **1998**, with **(CBO)** Criminal Behaviour Orders. 21. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police Failed Service of the: - “**Asbo Stand Alone” Court Order Application;** on the **12/09/2014** and this is well after the date of the **13/03/2014** when the Crime and Policing Act 2014 came into force. 22. The Crown Prosecution Asbo Case handler a Robert Talalay knew that by continuing the Asbo proceedings that the Now Claimant would suffer by the affect from the new amended changes brought in by The Crime and Disorder Act **1998** as the Asbo Application was filed wrong as a “**Asbo Stand Alone” Court Order Application;** and not the new correct **CBO** Court Order Application as they must apply to the court for. 23. The Crown Prosecution Asbo Case handler a Robert Talalay continued by saying: - “*Except that, on* **23rd of March 2020*,*** *the Now Claimant’s ASBO will automatically become an Injunction under as if made under* **S.1 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998**.” And by him stating the quoted he clearly realised the date of the Asbo Order being past the date of the **23rd of March 2020** and would have also known that it continued till the **04/08/2020** breaching the two-year time limit without the Now Claimant breaching the Asbo Order to cause a five-year sentence the prosecutor Robert Talalay also, requested of the Judge a lifetime Ban.  * **Legal Framework 8)**  1. The Crown Prosecution Asbo Case handler a Robert Talalay also, implied that: - “Section 4 of the Crime and Disorder Act **1998** provides that the burden lies down to the Crown Court for an appeal against the making of an Asbo Order. 2. Section 4 of the Crime and Disorder Act **1998** therefore provided the Now Claimant with his legal rights to be able to appeal against the decision Ruled by the Magistrates Court with an overview taken by the Crown Court in respect of the making of the Asbo Court Order the Magistrates Court made being constructed in all fairness. 3. The Crown Court failed in their obligation to the Now Claimant when overviewing the key factors pertaining to the making of the Asbo Court Order. 4. Prosecution Clearly reminded the court and others about the Asbo and that it was for the Crown Court that the burden lied upon when overviewing the rightfulness of the guilty verdict ruled in the case of the Asbo Proceedings held at the Magistrates Court at Highbury and Islington Corner against the Now Claimant on the **04/00/2014**. 5. On the Following dates listed below the Now Claimant attended the Wood Green Courthouse in complacent to the laws above to appeal the decision made in the lower court.: -   --   1. On the **26/10/2015** the Now Claimant attended the Wood Green Courthouse for a fair appeal hearing. 2. On the **09/11/2015** “” 3. On the **19/02/2016** “” 4. On the **22/02/2016** “” 5. On the **04/04/2016** “” 6. On the **16/09/2016** “” 7. On the **21/09/2016 + 22/09/2016** “” 8. On the **26/09/2016** “” 9. On the **14/10/2016** “” 10. On the **19/10/2016** “” 11. On the **25/10/2016** “” 12. On the **17/01/2017 + 18/01/2017 + 19/01/2017 “**the Now Claimant: - “Did Not Attend,” the Wood Green Courthouse: - “Due to Not Getting a Fair Appeal Hearing.”   **--**   1. Section 79(3) of the Senior Courts Act **1981** maintained that the Now Claimants appeal would be by way of a re-hearing held at the Crown Court. 2. The relevant test, which was therefore, conducted by the Crown Court and the Crown Prosecution Team followed out of S.1 of the Crime and Disorder Act **1998.** 3. Throughout all of the listed Court dates the Crown Court Judges and the Crown Prosecution Team members failed to balance out the principles set out in the Crime and Disorder Act **1998** by not presiding over the proceedings with the relevant cautioned laws that parameter the boundaries of theirs and the Now Claimants safety and this included: -   --   1. On the **26/10/2015** at the Crown Court the Judges and the Crown Prosecution Team never prevented the Asbo from continuing once we pinpointed out, the corruption causing the Now Claimant to suffer lifelong damages to his life. 2. On the **09/11/2015** at the Crown Court the Judges and the Crown Prosecution Team failed to raise concerns 3. On the **19/02/2016** at the Crown Court the Judges and the Crown Prosecution Team did not 4. On the **22/02/2016** at the Crown Court the Judges and the Crown Prosecution Team continued to 5. On the **04/04/2016** at the Crown Court the Judges and the Crown Prosecution Team diminished of 6. On the **16/09/2016** at the Crown Court the Judges and the Crown Prosecution Team refused to   --   * **Grounds**  1. The Grounds made for an Appel, still are: - 2. An Asbo order must only be issued for: - **“Two Years”** maximum and if breached then the Asbo becomes a Criminal Offence, and the Maxim sentence is then: - **“Five Years.”** 3. The Now Claimants suffered wrongly for: - **“Two Years”** wating for a trial and then after received: - **“Five Years”** to run none consecutively totalling: - **“Seven Years”** and this happened without the Now Claimant breaching the Asbo Order. 4. If police had arrested the Now Claimant for the arrestable charge of: - “The Organisation of Illegal Raves” and the Judge found the Now Claimant guilty, then the Maximum Sentence is imprisonment for a term not exceeding: - **“Three Month” and/**or a fine not exceeding: - **“Level Four”** of the standard. 5. The Government will follow the: - **“Three Month”** sentence with half time equalling the Now Claimant to: - **“One Half Month”** and with good behaviour or an overpopulated prison the Now Claimant would receive an advance release licence and/or with an Electronic Tag Totalling to: - **“One Month,”** in prison. 6. By the Asbo case continuing for: - **“Two Years”** till the trial took place and then the Jude sentencing the now claimant to: - **“Five Years.”** And refusing to run both times consecutively, inadvertently the Now Claimant received no half time and basically if he had served: - **“Seven Years”** in jail he would have served a: - “**Fourteen Year Sentence.**” 7. The Government never served the Now Claimant in accordance with service. 8. The Now Claimant showed the Judges unmistakable evidence of corruption taken out by the prosecuting team and refused to act upon these facts. 9. The prosecutor and Judges all refused to release disclosure to the Now Claimant in knowing it would prove his innocence. 10. At no time did police or the council alongside the Prosecution team account for the Pace Code of Practice “Code D” Identification as no victims or witness identified him as an offender. 11. The Judge refused to order the prosecution team to strike out of the Asbo application everything we proved to be inaccurate to its contents. 12. Police and Criminal Evidence Act **1984**  * **Legal Framework 9)**  1. “Section 79(3) of the Senior Courts Act **1981** *provides that an appeal to the Crown Court is by way of a re-hearing*.” 2. The definition, of a second Court Hearing was not adhered to by the Crown Court in a fair manner. 3. The evidence and arguments that the Now Claimant brought before the Court due to the Asbo Case being frauded was not overviewed or listened to fairly. 4. **Under “Section 79(3) of the Senior Courts Act 1981 the Judges was to:** 5. Check That the Service of The Asbo Application Was in Accordance with The Law. 6. Overview The Respondent’s Notices Served for The Magistrates Court 7. Manage The Now Claimants Form of Appeal and Respondent’s Notices 8. Outline The Duty of Magistrates’ Court Officer 9. Run-Through the Duty of the prosecutor keeping the exhibits 10. Reference By the Criminal Standards A Case Review of The Commissioning Court Order. 11. Go Over the Preparation for The Asbo Appeal 12. Manage The Asbo Appeal Hearings So, A Fair Trial Could Take Place by Making the Right Decisions 13. With Reasonable Cause Abandon the Asbo Appeal. 14. With Reasonable Cause Strike Out the Asbo Application. 15. Enforce The Court’s Powers to Vary Requirements Under This Part of Law. 16. But the Crown Court Judges failed to meet the required standards as listed above.  * **Legal Framework 10)**  1. “*The relevant test, therefore, is: -* “Set Out in S.1 Of the Senior Courts Act **1981**.”  * **Legal Framework 11) a) “**Pursuant to **S.1 (4)** of the **1998** Act, the court may exercise it discretion and make an ASBO if the two-part test set: out in **S.1(l) i**s satisfied. **Section 1(1)** states:  1. “*An application for an order under this section may be made by a relevant: authority if it: appears to the authority that the following conditions are fulfilled with respect to any person aged and ID and, namely that the accused person has acted, since the commencement date of an incident , in an anti-social manner, that is to say, in a manner that caused or was likely to cause harassment: alarm or distress to one or more persons not of the same household as himself; and that such an order is necessary to protect the relevant persons from further antisocial acts by him.*” 2. The **Crime and Disorder Act 1998** primary objectives are to give more responsibility to local authorities so authorities can implement strategic approaches to help with the reduction of crime and public disorder within the local communities. 3. The Government passed the bill of rights for the Crime and Disorder Act **1998** through royal assent with its key elements put into place to be able to tackle areas of the Government concern with those primarily areas objectives being as follows: 4. **Anti-Social Behaviour: -**These orders are issued by the government against people who have conducted anti-social behaviour which has caused (or is likely to cause), distress, Harassment, or alarm to a person(s) who do not reside in the same household as the alleged offender him or herself. In other words, the Government deem an Asbo necessary to protect people from potential further anti-social acts conducted by the alleged offender. 5. **Abolishment Of the Death Penalty: -** The Crime and Disorder Act **1998** abolished the death penalty for piracy and treason, alongside with the Human Rights Act **1998.** 6. **Child Under 10 Years: -** The Crime and Disorder Act **1998** also, abolished the presumption that a child under 10 years of age could be incapable of committing a criminal offence. 7. **Sex Offender Orders** 8. **Parenting Orders** 9. **Racially Aggravated Offences.** 10. In Pursuant to **S.1 (4)** of the **Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (“the 1998 Act”)** the court had the right to exercise it powers of discretion if the prosecuting team could meet the two-parts of the Asbo test as set out in **S.1(l).** of (**“the 1998 Act”)** 11. Part one of the test to be meet is a requirement of all authorities involved in the Asbo Application to   is satisfied. Section 1(1) states:  Everything that The Crown Prosecution Case handler a Robert Talalay wrote is Deception at its best  “No Evidence of a Past Durations of Times Relating to Any Arrests of My Person for A Similar Natured Offence.”  The Reasons as To Why the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and The Crown Prosecution Team Did Not Use the New Crime and Policing Act 2014 was to deliberately conspire to mislead any person in what the laws are set out to establish.  The 1998 Crime and Disorder Act provides a definition of antisocial behaviour as. 'Acting in a manner that caused or was.  Civil liberties groups argue that Asbo’s mark an unacceptable blurring of criminal and civil law because while they are issued on a civil burden of proof (the "balance of probabilities"), a breach can incur criminal penalties   * **Legal Framework 12)**  1. “*It is for the Respondent to satisfy the court to the criminal standard*.” 2. It is for the Respondent to satisfy the court to the criminal standard that the Now Claimant acted in a manner that caused or was likely to cause **harassment, alarm, or distress** to one or more persons not of the same household as himself but no persons from any other households would attend court for the Now Claimants Legal team to Contend against.   The criminal standard would mean that officers warned, fined, or arrested a person but officers never done any of the past tense to the Now Claimant.  The balance of probabilities only applies to civil law matters.  You will have heard of the more-famous criminal law standard of proof: beyond reasonable doubt.  Just as it sounds, it is a much higher standard of proof than the balance of probabilities civil law has to meet.  **Published By the**: - “Home Office Communication Directorate **March 2003**.”  **The Document Below IS Headlined As**: - “A Guide to Anti-Social Behaviour Orders and Acceptable Behaviour Contracts.”  --   * ASBOs are civil orders that exist to protect the public from behaviour that causes or is likely to cause harassment, alarm, or distress. * An order contains conditions prohibiting the offender from specific anti-social acts or entering: - “Defined Areas” and is: - “Effective for A Minimum of Two Years.” * The orders are not criminal penalties and: - “Are Not Intended to Punish the Offender.” * Officials should not view an Order as a last resort option. * **Stand-Alone Applications for ASBOs** the Government and victims make to the: - “Magistrates’ Court Acting in Its Civil Capacity.” * The order can be applied for: - “During Related Proceedings in The County Court;” and requested: - “Without the Need for A Formal Application” if: - “a defendant is convicted of an offence in the criminal courts.” * “It remains a civil order irrespective of the issuing court.” * The: - “civil status of ASBOs” has: - “implications” for the: - “Type of Court Proceedings at Which Applications Are Heard.” * **The civil nature** of the order means that hearsay and professional witness evidence can be heard. * This is an extremely important feature of ASBOs because those subjected to the anti-social behaviour or those reporting the behaviour can be protected (see page 28). * **Legal definition of anti-social behaviour for the purpose of obtaining an order** * Under the terms of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 the agency applying for the order must show that:   + the defendant behaved in an anti-social manner **and**   + an order is necessary for the protection of persons from further anti-social behaviour by the defendant. * This is the “two stage test.” Section 1(1) of the Act defines acting in an “anti-social manner” as “a manner that caused or was likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to one or more persons not of the same household” as the perpetrator. The definition is intentionally wide ranging to allow for the orders to be used in a variety of circumstances. * The expression “likely to cause” has the effect that someone other than a victim of the anti-social behaviour can give evidence of its occurrence. This is intended specifically to validate the use of professionals as witnesses where those targeted by the behaviour feel unable to come forward, for example, for fear of reprisals or intimidation. * **Standard of Proof** * The House of Lords confirmed in the case of McCann3 that ASBOs were civil orders and set out the law on the standard of proof as follows: “they [magistrates] must in all cases under section 1 apply the criminal standard… it will be sufficient for the magistrates, when applying section 1(1)(a) to be sure that the defendant has acted in an anti-social manner, that is to say in a manner which caused or was likely to cause harassment, alarm, or distress to one or more persons not of the same household as himself.” (Lord Steyn, paragraph 37) * This means that the criminal standard of proof applies to the past acts of anti-social behaviour alleged against the defendant. * *House of Lords, Clingham (formerly C (a minor)) v Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea (on Appeal from a Divisional Court of the Queen’s Bench Division); Regina v Crown Court at Manchester Ex p McCann (FC) and Others (FC), October 2002* * However, Lord Steyn went on to explain, “The inquiry under section 1(1)(b), namely that such an order is necessary to protect persons from further anti-social acts by him, does not involve a standard of proof: it is an exercise of judgement or evaluation.” * The Lord Steyn noted that it is the: - “Effect or Likely Effect” of the behaviour on other people that determines whether the behaviour is anti-social. The agency applying for the order does not have to prove an intention on the part of the defendant to cause harassment, alarm, or distress. * The Court will, however, disregard any behaviour shown to be reasonable in the circumstances under section 1(5) of the 1998 Act. * **“The Second Limb of The Asbo Test!”** * **Legal Framework 13)**  1. The second limb of the Asbo test “does not involve a standard of proof: it is an exercise of judgment or evaluation” (R (McCann) v Manchester Crown Court **[2003] l A.C. 787 at [371).**  * **Legal Framework 14) a) and b) and c) and d)**  1. 27/ The Crown Prosecution Asbo Case handler a Robert Talalay also, submitted in case law: - “***R v Dean lioness*** [**2006**] 1 Cr. App. II. (S.) 120, were the Court of Appeal provided general guidance as to the creation of prohibitions forming an ASBO, and   Within their guidance the court ruled the following occurrences as prohibited: -   1. For Asbo Prohibitions not to be harshly Tailored against the Now Claimant as they were. 2. Asbo Prohibitions set out against a defendant to be necessary, but they were not. 3. The prosecuting team Asbo and its probations were based on illegal Criminal Activities rather than civil case law. 4. The Asbo Application Penalised the Now Claimant as if he were a hardened Criminal when he Did not Commit any Crime and Government Law prohibits these actions. 5. The Risk the Enfield Council and Metropolitan police state they Identified the Now Claimant committing did not happen and the probations the Enfield Council and Metropolitan police commissioned are too widespread as they did not correspond to the correct extent of the geological locations of the incidents that they contained in the Asbo Application and therefore the proportions were unbalanced in degree. 6. The Asbo Terms Must Be Proportionate So as To Be Commensurate with but they were not. [37],  * **Submissions 15)** * The first limb of the test under S. 1 (l)(a) of the **Crime and Disorder Act 1998**  1. “*The organisation of large-scale raves, whether or not they fall within the* ***parameters of s.63 of the Criminal justice*** *and Public Order Act* ***1994*** *and whether on private property or common land, fall within the definition of anti-social behaviour.*”  * **Bringing The Laws, the Prosecutor and Court Used Together and How They Work.**  1. **The Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 Section 63.** 2. For an illegal rave to take place it must be on open air land, and this includes whether the land is private or not. 3. The Government and its servants are not to use the words: - “Illegal Rave” by law when accounting for indoor events. 4. In the Asbo Case pages none of the accused event’s was on open air land as required by Section 63 of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act **1994.** 5. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and the Crown Prosecution Team wrongly prosecuted and then penalised the Now Claimant under section 63 Criminal Justice and Public Order Act **1994** as printed in the Asbo on page **7**  * <https://serverone.hopto.org/A)%20New%20Website%20Page%204%20Flip%20Books%20%20x4colums.html>  1. Through the Asbo Application there is no evidence that supports the Crown Prosecution Case proving the Now Claimant planned to or did play music during the night. 2. The Criminal Justice and Public Order Act **1994** Section 63 also, States   The Victims and/or officers must experience loud music due to the alleged incident but  The prosecuting team needs to prove the duration and the time at which a person plays music as this evidence is a crucial factor to prove Section 63.  Where a gathering must extend over days, in law believe is not merely enough for a conviction  No raves or private parties were setup within the following 24hrs of any police directions given and this happened even aloe the police never confiscated any equipment.   1. **The Licencing Act 2003.** 2. Exhibited Below is **Exhibit** \*\*\*\*\* which is an attribute of the licencing Act **2003** which prohibits certain outdoor events from not being licenced. 3. If an organisers event falls into the permeators of an event that the licencing Act 2003 requires for them to regulate and the organisers do not obtain a license then that event is an: - “Illegal Rave,” that is taking a place and without Legal Authorisation. 4. The **2003** licencing Act also, provides for entertainment in buildings to be abstained as a regulated provision when providing entertainment in spathic circumstances. 5. In the licencing act **2003** the Government clearly explain that in door events are licensable activity’s and prosecutable under the Licensing Act 2003 but only if the organiser has a view of making a profit and the officers apprehend the circumstances in an official investigation. 6. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police gave the Crown Prosecutor a Asbo Case that showed no intentions of the Now Claimant being ambiguous to make profit and the Asbo File Pages the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police submitted they filled wrongly for laws that cover outdoor event and not indoor events that the Government may or may not require any organiser to be licenced for under the **Licencing Act 2003.** 7. A private party that is on private land and that is not in the open air is a civil dispute & for the Council to give warning for whereas trespass is also a civil dispute but can become an arrestable offence under Section 63 of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act **1994.** 8. The organisation of a private party on private land while in a building does not amount to an illegal rave.   **Please See [EXHIBIT J37]**  **A Snippet from the Licencing Act 2003**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **PROVIDED FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENTERTAINMENT**  **APPENDIX 4** | | | | | * **The Descriptions of Regulated Entertainment:**  1. Plays “both performance and rehearsal.” 2. The showing of films (or any exhibition of moving pictures including videos.) 3. All indoor “inside a building” sporting events “in which physical skill is the main factor **e.g.,** Tennis.” 4. Outdoor boxing and wrestling matches; “no other form of outdoor sport is regulated.” 5. Music “both for public performance of live music and public playing of recorded music.” 6. The performance of dance; or 7. Entertainment of a similar description to any of the above. | | | | | **Venues** | **Licensable Entertainment** | **Not Licensable** | **Special Considerations** | | **Restaurant** | 1. “Recorded music not incidental to eating or drinking.” 2. “Playing of live music.” 3. “Unamplified music in a pub.” | 1. “Where satellite TV is provided, or recorded music that is incidental to drinking or eating, no licence conditions can be imposed on the premises.” 2. “Piano music played in the background in a restaurant.” 3. “Music played in lifts.” | 1. “Any pub may obtain permission to stage live musical events at no extra cost when obtaining permission to sell alcohol.” | | **Community Centres and Village and Parish Halls** | 1. “Live music.” 2. “Singing and Dancing.” | 1. “The installation of big screens and a large sound system, and provided no alcohol is sold on the premises and there is no singing or dancing.” | 1. “Benefits from a more informal system of permitted temporary activities. Anyone can notify up to five of these per year, or fifty if they are a personal licence holder. Each event can last up to a maximum of 96 hours and up to twelve events can take place at anyone premises in any year where maximum five hundred people attend at any one time.” | | **Entertainment in Schools and Colleges** | 1. “Where there is public admittance.” 2. “If those attending are charged with the aim of making a profit including raising funds for charity” | 1. “A concert or other performance which takes place for parents and students without payment.” 2. “Charging parents and students but only to cover costs.” 3. “Any performance of music, dancing, e.g., that is being performed for students as part of their education.” | 1. “Charging simply to recover costs is not licensable.” | | Licences/DBC Guides/Entertainment | | | |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **REGULATED ENTERTAINMENT**  **APPENDIX 4**  “**PROVIDED FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENTERTAINMENT”** | | | | | **Venues** | **Licensable Entertainment** | **Not Licensable** | **Special Considerations** | | **Private Homes and Gardens** |  | 1. “Private parties and weddings will not be licensable unless the host takes the unusual step of charging the guests to attend with a view to making a profit.” | 1. “Charging simply to recover costs is not licensable.” | | **Churches, Synagogues, Mosques, and other places of worship** |  | 1. “If incidental to, a religious meeting or service.” 2. “Engagement by any faith in worship or any form of religious meeting.” 3. “Rave held in a Church providing no alcohol Is sold” 4. “Classical concerts.” 5. “Singing of hymns or other religious material events.” |  | | **Sports Clubs** | 1. “Where there is public admittance.” 2. “If those attending are charged with the aim of making a profit including raising funds for charity.” |  |  | | **Music and Dance Studios** | 1. “Studio is being used to provide entertainment to the public.” 2. “People take part in the entertainment.” 3. “A dress rehearsal is provided for the public.” | 1. “Performances in a rehearsal studio or broadcasting studio where there is no audience /spectators present.” 2. “A broadcasting studio recording a programme without an audience/spectator.” |  | | Licences/DBC Guides/Entertainment | | | |  1. Supported in the Asbo Bundles context is proof that when asked the event stopped when police first asked. 2. The behaviour of other persons arriving 3. It is obvious that no person agreed to the police that they were the organiser on the dates in question or as a standard police protocol the officers present would have arrested this or these persons, but the police have left no trace of this happening in the Asbo Application. 4. The police and council showed no intent of the Now Claimant deliberately organising a rave be it legal or not. 5. Neither did the police or council show in their Asbo application that the Now Claimant in person acted in an anti-social manner. 6. Playing music in a private property on a first occasion is not Anti-Social Behaviour especially if the accused complies with any fair request. 7. No persons in any household suffered with Anti-Social Behaviour due to the Now Claimant putting himself within line of the Anti-Social Behaviour orders scope. 8. The Prosecution team failed to show evidence of the Now Claimant organising any large-scale raves. 9. Police officers finding five hundred people together and persecuting one person out of the five hundred people present is not correct practice and especially without any evidence of the one person actually organising the rave is not justice. 10. The Police and council did not contain any evidence displaying whether the parties were legal private parties held by squatters or actorly illegal raves promoted by a person. 11. In different police accounts the police accuse the Now Claimant of being the Sound Equipment provider and therefore the organiser but within the police statements it is clear that he is in his car and Police done checks on any vans present. 12. Within the parameters of S.63 Of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act **1994** the act of law clearly gives officers the powers to arrest and seize any organiser of an illegal rave, but the Police Officers did not arrest the Now Claimant on these dates. 13. Whether or not they are arrestable 14. Whether on private property or common land 15. Each location the police and council officers believed a rave to be taking place those officers are to give the accused occupier of the premises a noise abatement notice in the form of a verbal and written warning of notice and no police officer gave any warning notice to the Now Claimant, as he was not the organiser of any event but even so, whomever the police supplied with a Notice and verbale warning complied with the police officers first request and stopped what they called their private party and due to this their behaviour was reasonable with the police officer requests or the police would have arrest their suspect but no police arrest took place 16. Whatever reported nuisance police officers become aware of and then afterwards speculated the incident to be an illegal rave taking place the occupiers never continued whether on private land o  * **Submissions 16)**  1. The Home Office Guidanc**e:** ***‘A Guide to antisocial beamer orders’*** specifies noise nuisance, particularly when late at night, as an example of anti-social behaviour. 2. The home office guidance 3. Guide to antisocial beamer orders 4. Noise nuisance particularly when late at nigh  * **Submissions 17)**  1. The prosecution has submitted that, a person who helps organise or supplies equipment for a rave, where there is loud music late at night (except where there is a licence to do so and/or the music is played on licensed premises), has ***prana jade*** done an act in contravention of S.1(l)(a) of the **Crime and Disorder Act 1998.**  * **Submissions 18)**  1. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and the Crown Prosecution Team relies on the evidence provided in the witness statements provided by various officers as well as supporting intelligence reports, the page references for this evidence are set out in the appended chronology. 2. How can the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and the Crown Prosecution Team rely on the evidence provided in the witness statements provided by various officers 3. Then how can the Crown Prosecution Case handler a Robert Talalay use the wording: - “Supporting,” and knowingly continue with no victims after all the Now Claimant had been saying. 4. Did a Robert Talalay not find it funny when the Now Claimants and his Litigation Team and/or Support Network were asking him to be able to evaluate the victims at court and he could not provide them. 5. The Crown Prosecution knew what they were doing was wrong to the Now Claimant when they were using their supported while fabricated intelligence reports that the Now Claimant and his Litigation Team and/or Support Network were continually pointing out to be frauded.  * **Submissions 19)**  1. “The court is invited to take particular note of the evidence supporting the conclusion that the Now Claimant was integrally involved in the organization of raves and/or the supply of equipment:” - 2. The police officers stated that they spoke to people at a gate on the 07th & 08th of June 2014. And ever since y police the persons said this the persons, they spoke to at the gate became invisible and even when the Now Claimant asked for them to be present in the court so, for questioning. 3. No gate security names were present in the Asbo Files or Police Notes. 4. (See evidence of Insp. Hamill JR38] and supporting evidence of PS Miles [R36]). 5. Insp. Hamill JR38] evidence 6. PS Miles [R36]) so, called and supporting evidence 7. The Now Claimant admitted to Insp. Skinner that he was the organiser of the rave on **7/8 June 2014** [R41]. 8. Another police office and with a high rank named as, an Insp. Skinner 9. The Now Claimant admitted to Insp. Skinner that he was the organiser of the rave organised and prevented on **19th of July 2014** [R39, R41]. 10. Insp. Skinner again with his higher rank 11. The Now Claimant admitted to PC Edgoose that he lent his sound equipment for use at raves and that he could get a considerable number of people to turn out for a rave [R48, R88] 12. The Now Claimant yet again set up by police 13. And the Now Claimant was the organiser of the rave on **09th of August 2014** and provided the sound equipment as well as laughing gas [R42, R44-5, R47]. 14. This is an example of the Crown Prosecution Team making wild speculated guess again when there is no evidence to support his test case claims. 15. When a crowd turned up and tried to force entry, the Now Claimant encouraged them to break the police line [R43, R45-6]. 16. The Now Claimant Was Wrongly Accused Of encouraged a crowd to break the police line [R43, R45-6]. And gave a good statement of the true fact. 17. No police provide any form of evidence to support their claims or that of their victims. 18. Only one police officer says he heard this statement made aloud and he believed it to be the Now Claimants voice out of different people when not in a close vicinity. 19. Aloe police were wearing police body cams no police officers supplied any video evidence supporting or enforcing this claim. 20. The police never arrested the Now Claimant for the organisation of illegal raves as they should have because it is a Criminal Offence.  * **Submissions 20)**  1. The Crown Prosecution Team further relies on the information set out in the intelligence reports and the documents provided to the court in the Crown Prosecution Team Asbo bundle. 2. Intelligence Reports 3. Documents Provided to The Court in The  * **Submissions 21)**  1. The evidence show the Now Claimant has witnessed by different police officers supplying equipment for or helping to organise a rave. 2. witnessed by “Many Different Police Officers” supplying equipment for or helping to organise a rave.  * **Submissions 22)**  1. “The court will be invited to reject the Now Claimant’s account as to his activities on the relevant, days as not credible.” 2. The prosecutor Robert Talalay invited the court to reject all accounts of the Now Claimant as creditable in a bid to undermine the evidence that the Now Claimants and his Litigation Team and/or Support Network put before himself to aid in a wrongful guilty conviction.  * **The Second Limb of The Test Under Section 1 Of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998** * **Submissions 23)**  1. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and the Crown Prosecution Team submitted that an ASBO is, in general terms, necessary against The Now Claimant and this is not true because he 2. \*\*\*\*\*  * **Submissions 24)**  1. There is a significant body of evidence showing the impact of raves on people who live near where they occur **[R51-66, R155-298].** 2. The level of distress that these individuals suffered as a result of the raves organised by the Now Claimant was high. 'There is a need to prevent these events occurring in the future. 3. The Prosecutor states that there is a significant body of evidence that show that the Now Claimants Guilty and this is not true. For a start. 4. The Frauded Asbo Application is supposed to Show the impact of raves on people who live near where they occur but at no time has the Now Claimant or his litigation team or support network had the opportunity to question the integrity of these none show to Court Supposed to be victims,  * **Submissions 25)**  1. The ASBO (and interim ASBO beforehand) have been effective. 2. “The only time where the Now Claimant’s behaviour has improved is when these proceedings were commenced, and it was made clear to the Now Claimant that his actions could not be tolerated.” 3. The Crown Prosecution Team lied when they submitted that the Now Claimant’s behaviour had improved as for a fact, they knew he was innocent of the offences they set him up for and he was on bail conditions for another case for a year prior and stayed in doors on police curfew by order of the Court. 4. Arrested on the **25/06/2013** and brought to the “Police Station” and Court. 5. Won the case on the **01/07/2014 and** No more Bail Conditions.  * **Submissions 26)**  1. "The Now Claimant has denied the acts alleged by the Respondent. 2. He has shown no acknowledgment or desire to change his ways that might make an ASBO unnecessary. 3. \*\*\*\*\*  * **Submissions 27)**  1. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and the Crown Prosecution Team submitted: - “that as to the particular prohibitions on the ASBO, significant effort was made by themselves and by the court to ensure that any legitimate business activities that the Now Claimant wished to undertake would in no way be inhibited by this order and this is also, not true because it has destroyed his life and company. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan police force understood the fraud they committed against the Now Claimant would have everlasting damaging effects and has damaged any close working relationship they need to have to protect lives at a music event.  * **Submissions 28)**  1. For the Now Claimant to provide recorded music to a gathering of people he would either need to have a licence for that event or to provide the music on a licensed premise for fewer than five hundred people with, a general licence to play recorded music (see s. 1 and Sch. l of the Licensing Act **2003**). 2. \*\*\*\*\*  * **Submissions 29)**  1. This order specifically does not preclude him from providing regulated entertainment under the auspices of a valid licence. 2. \*\*\*\*\*  * **Submissions 30)**  1. The only amendment that the Respondent would seek is that the words “or s.63(l. A)” be added after the words “s.63(l)” in prohibitions a, b, and c of the ASBO. 2. \*\*\*\*\*  * **Submissions 31)**  1. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and the Crown Prosecution Team submitted that the terms of the ASBO as drafted are necessary, and they set them proportionately so, that they: – “Should Have Minimal Impact on The Now Claimant’s Life and Legitimate Business Activities,” and this clearly has not been the case as for a fact the conditions were 2. \*\*\*\*\*   **Robert Talalay** at the Chambers of: -  5 Essex Court  Temple, London, EC4Y 9AH  020 7410 2000  clerks@5essexcourt.co.uk  **Dated:** - **29th January 2016**   * **Who is Robert Talalay?** * **Hugh Giles (Director)** * Metropolitan Police Service   Directorate of Legal Services  New Scotland Yard  Broadway  London  SW1H OBG   1. **Part Two Chronology** 2. Chronology **12/01/2013**: a) 3. Chronology **24/05/2013**: a) and b) 4. Chronology **25/05/2014**: a) and b) and c) and d) 5. Chronology **06+07+08/06/2014**: a) and b) and c) 6. Chronology **20/06/2014**: a) and b) 7. Chronology **19/07/2014:** a) and b) 8. Chronology **24/07/2014:** a) and b) 9. Chronology **27/07/2014**: a) and b) 10. Chronology **09/10/08/14**: a) and b) and c) | |   **Please See [EXHIBIT J37]**   1. A  |  | | --- | | **The Crime and Disorder Act 1998: General Anti-Social Behaviour Orders.** | | **1.** – “An application for an order under this section may be made by a relevant authority if it appears to the authority that the following conditions are fulfilled with respect to any person aged ten or over, namely:”-   1. that the person has acted, since the commencement date, in an anti-social manner, that is to say, in a manner that caused or was likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to one or more persons not of the same household as himself; and: - 2. “That such an order is necessary to protect persons in the local government area in which the harassment, alarm or distress was caused or was likely to be caused from further anti-social acts by him:” -   and in this section "relevant authority" means the: - “Council for The Local Government Area,” or any: - “Chief Officer of Police Any Part of Whose Police Area Lies Within That Area.”   1. A: - “relevant authority,” shall: - “Not Make Such an Application Without Consulting Each Other Relevant Authority.” 2. “Such an application shall be made by complaint to the magistrates' court whose commission area includes the place where it is alleged that the harassment, alarm, or distress was caused or was likely to be caused.” 3. “If, the judge proves such an Asbo application, then the conditions mentioned in subsection (1) as above become fulfilled and the Judge may make an ("anti-social behaviour order") order which then will prohibit the defendant from doing anything described in the Judge’s order ruled.” 4. For the purpose of determining whether the prosecuting team has fulfilled the condition mentioned in subsection (1)(a) above, the court shall disregard any act of the defendant which he shows was reasonable in those circumstances. 5. “The prohibitions that may be imposed by an anti-social behaviour order are those necessary for the purpose of protecting from further anti-social acts by the defendant”-    1. persons in the local government area; are    2. persons in any adjoining local government area specified in the application for the order.   and a relevant authority shall not specify an adjoining local government area in the application without consulting the council for that area and each chief officer of police any part of whose police area lies within that area.   1. An anti-social behaviour order shall have effect for a period (not less than two years) specified in the order or until further order. 2. Subject to subsection (9) below, the applicant or the defendant may apply by complaint to the court which made an anti-social behaviour order for it to be varied or discharged by a further order. 3. “Except with the consent of both parties, no anti-social behaviour order shall be discharged before the end of the period of two years beginning with the date of service of the order.” 4. “If without reasonable excuse a person does anything which he is prohibited from doing by an antisocial behaviour order, he shall be liable:”-    1. on summary conviction, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months or to a fine not exceeding the statutory maximum, or to both; and: -    2. “On conviction on indictment, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years or to a fine, or to both.” 5. Where a person is convicted of an offence under subsection (10) above, it shall not be open to the court by or before which he is so convicted to make an order under subsection (1)(b) (conditional discharge) of section 1A of the Powers of Criminal Courts Act **1973** ("the **1973** Act") in respect of the offence. |   **Please See [EXHIBIT J37]**   |  | | --- | | **The Now Claimants New Response Dated 07/11/2022**  **The Crime and Disorder Act 1998: General Anti-Social Behaviour Orders.** | | **1.** **The Crime and Disorder Act 1998: General Anti-Social Behaviour Orders.**   1. Neither the less **[ Section 1. ]**of the Crime and Disorder Act **1998** states: - “That for an Asbo Order to be made it must be accomplished with the following: – “Conditions That Are Fulfilled Withinside of the Asbo Application Are Done So, By Authorities with Respect,” but in the case of The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and the Crown Prosecution Teams Vs the Now Claimant the: - “fraud they committed against the Now Claimant and with malicious process does not amount to respect.” 2. **[ Section 1a] of** the Crime and Disorder Act **1998** the Act states that: - 3. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and the Crown Prosecution Team are stating that: - “they caught with fake victims the Now Claimant acting in in an anti-social manner and at no point in time did they induce any evidence proving this. 4. In between the commencement date, of their Asbo Application and this would mean that 5. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and the Crown Prosecution Team are stating that: - “Victims with the police and Enfield Council caught the Now Claimant acting in a manner that caused or was likely to cause harassment, to one or more persons not of the same household as himself. 6. The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and the Crown Prosecution Team are stating they: - “caught the Now Claimant acting in a manner that caused or was likely to cause harassment, alarm to one or more persons not of the same household as himself and this is untrue or why would they make up fake victims. 7. Or The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and the Crown Prosecution Team are stating: - “The police and or Council with caught the Now Claimant with fake victims acting in a manner that caused or was likely to cause harassment, distress to one or more persons not of the same household as himself. 8. **[ Section 1b ]**of the Crime and Disorder Act **1998** the Act states that: - “*That such an order is necessary to protect persons in the local government area in which the harassment, alarm or distress was caused or was likely to be caused from further anti-social acts by him: and in this section "relevant authority" means the: - “Council for The Local Government Area ,”or any: - “Chief Officer of Police Any Part of Whose Police Area Lies Within That Area.*” 9. **A** 10. **[ Section 2] of** the Crime and Disorder Act **1998** the Act states: - “*A: - relevant authority,” shall: - “Not Make Such an Application Without Consulting Each Other Relevant Authority.*” 11. **A** 12. **[ Section 3] of** the Crime and Disorder Act **1998** the Act states: - “*Such an application shall be made by complaint to the magistrates' court whose commission area includes the place where it is alleged that the harassment, alarm, or distress was caused or was likely to be caused.*” 13. **A** 14. **[ Section 4 ]**of the Crime and Disorder Act **1998** the Act states: - “*If, on such an application, it is proved that the conditions mentioned in subsection (1) above are fulfilled, the magistrates' court may make an order under this section (an "anti-social behaviour order") which prohibits the defendant from doing anything described in the order.*” 15. Throughout the Asbo application, the prosecuting team knew that the application was heavily frauded but continued to pursue the Now Claimant. The Judge played a blind eye to all the relevant facts in the case, so, he and the prosecutor with police and Council could wrongly prove the Asbo application against the Now Claimant in Knowing what he was doing with others was illegal. The conditions mentioned in subsection (1) a Judge would understand the Asbo proceedings filed as they were could never fulfil the criteria necessary, in any fair trial. 16. **[ Section 5] of** the Crime and Disorder Act **1998** the Act states: - “*For the purpose of determining whether the condition mentioned in subsection (1)(a) above is fulfilled, the court shall disregard any act of the defendant which he shows was reasonable in the circumstances.*” 17. **A** 18. **[ Section 6 a & b] of** the Crime and Disorder Act **1998** the Act states: - **“** 19. The prohibitions that the Court imposed for an anti-social behaviour order were not necessary for the purpose of protecting victims as the victims are fake people.     (a) persons in the local government area; are  (b) persons in any adjoining local government area specified in the application for the order.  and a relevant authority shall not specify an adjoining local government area in the application without consulting the council for that area and each chief officer of police any part of whose police area lies within that area.   1. **[ Section 7] of** the Crime and Disorder Act **1998** the Act states: - “*An anti-social behaviour order shall have effect for a period (not less than two years) specified in the order or until further order.*” 2. **A** 3. **[ Section 8] of** the Crime and Disorder Act **1998** the Act states: - “*Subject to subsection (9) below, the applicant or the defendant may apply by complaint to the court which made an anti-social behaviour order for it to be varied or discharged by a further order.*” 4. **A** 5. **[ Section 9] of** the Crime and Disorder Act **1998** the Act states: - “ 6. **A**   “Except without the consent of both parties:  **one.** The Enfield Council and  **Two**. The Metropolitan Police Force,  It is against the rule of the law for an anti-social behaviour to “be discharged” before the end of: - “The Period of Two Years,” beginning with the date of service of the order.”   1. **[ Section 10 a & b] of** the Crime and Disorder Act **1998** the Act states: - “ 2. **A**   (10) If without reasonable excuse a person does anything to which the Asbo prohibits him or her from doing they shall be liable-  (a) on summary conviction, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months or to a fine not exceeding the statutory maximum, or to both; and:  (b) “on conviction on indictment, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years or to a fine, or to both.”   1. **[ Section 11 ]**of the Crime and Disorder Act **1998** the Act states: - “*Where a person is convicted of an offence under subsection (10) above, it shall not be open to the court by or before which he is so convicted to make an order under subsection (1)(b) (conditional discharge) of section 1A of the Powers of Criminal Courts Act* **1973** *("the* **1973** Act*") in respect of the offence.*” 2. **A**   **The Document Below IS Headlined As:** = “**Asbo’s Are Dead, Long Live Asbo’s**.”  **Which Is Dated The**: - “CJM no. 86 **December 2011**,”  **And Published By**: - “Centre for Crime and Justice Studies, 2 Langley Lane, Vauxhall, London SW8 1GB.”   1. On **20th of October 2014,** the Government introduced new anti-social behaviour (ASB) sanctions as a Criminal Behaviour Orders **(CBOs),** and they replaced post-conviction anti-social behaviour orders (ASBOs). 2. But the Anti-Social Behaviour was already well-known to breach Human Rights. 3. By the year of **2010,** The United Kingdom Government Members Such as Theresa May had already agreed that Asbo infringed civil liberties and pushed for them to as phased out. 4. The Anti-Social Behaviour: - “Crime and Policing Act **2014**,” transferred much of the Court Cases relating to anti-social behaviour from the criminal courts to the civil courts.   Under the: - “Crime and Policing Act **2014**,” Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (Asbo’s) are replaced by: - “ASBIs,” which the Government intended to better tackle the root causes of anti-social behaviour  **Please See [EXHIBIT J37]** |   **A page of a book  Description automatically generated with low confidence A picture containing text, newspaper  Description automatically generated**   |  | | --- | | **The Document Below IS Headlined As:** = “**Asbo’s Are Dead, Long Live Asbo’s**.”  **Which Is Dated The**: - “CJM no. 86 **December 2011**,”  **And Published By**: - “Centre for Crime and Justice Studies, 2 Langley Lane, Vauxhall, London SW8 1GB.”   1. **Quoted**: - “In **July 2010** Theresa May, the New Home Secretary in the Coalition government, announced a review of Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs),” 2. **Quoted by**: - “Theresa May arguing in **May 2010** that under New Labour the sanctions against anti- social behaviour were: - 3. Too Complex And: 4. Bureaucratic. 5. There Were Too Many of Them. 6. They Were Too Time Consuming And: 7. Expensive And: 8. They Too Often Criminalised Young People Unnecessarily, Acting as A Conveyor Belt to Serious Crime and Prison’” 9. **Quoted by**: - “Theresa Mays speech therefore: - “Held Out a Promise of a Fundamental Reform of Asbo’s,” one that might address: - “Serious Criticisms,” regarding their: - 10. Effectiveness. 11. **Application To Inappropriate Groups** and. 12. Asbo’s due process problems relating to: - 13. **The Use of Hearsay,** And: 14. **Counterproductive Effects**. 15. **Quoted**: - “In the Centre for Crime and Justice Study it states: - “It is questionable whether the move from the magistrates’ court to the county court will in itself make a great deal of difference either to recipients of orders or communities.” 16. **Quoted**: - “In the Centre for Crime and Justice Study it states: - “The academics have argued for: - “move from the magistrates’ court to the county court, “on the basis that: - “Magistrates pay insufficient regard to the statutory test of necessity when deciding whether to make an order’ and that ‘prohibitions contained in ASBOs made by magistrates are often formulaic and poorly targeted.” 17. **Quoted**: - “In the Centre for Crime and Justice Study it states: - “The academics have said the latter failing of ASBOs is in large part due to the orders being granted wholly or largely in the form in which they have been drafted by applicants,” and: - “Since it is likely that applicant local authorities and police forces would continue to draft CPIs, the county court would have to be relied upon to take a restrictive approach, removing overbroad prohibitions and requirements where appropriate.” 18. **Quoted**: - “In the Centre for Crime and Justice Study it states: - “the change to the proposed standard of proof is more than likely to affect the Judicial system even further, as under the consultation’s proposals, the relevant past anti- social behaviour for a CPI – the same as that necessary for an ASBO, and not necessarily ‘crime’ at all would have to be proved to the civil standard, on the balance of probabilities. 19. **Quoted**: - “In the Centre for Crime and Justice Study it states: - “In the well-known case of McCann (R v Manchester Crown Court, Ex p McCann and others, [**2002**] UKHL 39), in the face of statutory silence in the Crime and Disorder Act **1998** on the question of the standard of proof, the House of Lords read in the requirement that, as a matter of pragmatism, anti-social behaviour founding an ASBO application should be proved to the criminal standard – that is, beyond reasonable doubt. However, if legislation specified that, for CPIs, the standard was to be the balance of probabilities, the courts would be unlikely to issue a declaration of incompatibility under the Human Rights Act **1998**, meaning that the civil standard would apply. The requirement to prove past behaviour to the criminal standard is a high hurdle; its removal will, it is suggested, mean that CPIs will be easier to obtain on limited evidence from professional witnesses, e.g., police officers.” 20. **Quoted**: - “\*\*\*” |  * **23 After the Christmas and the New Year's Holidays; 01/01/2016 till the 19/02/2016**  1. On Page Number 5 2. In ***(Shane Tony)*** **[2004**] 2 Cr. App. R. (S.) 63 (p.343) the Court had stated that the terms of the order: - “Must Be Precise And Capable Of Being Understood By The Offender,” the findings of fact giving rise to the making of the order must be recorded: - “The Order Must Be Explained To The Offender,” the exact terms of the order must be pronounced in open court and a: - “Written Order Must Accurately Reflect The Order As Pronounced.”  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Portrait** | | **Judge Name** | **Went To the Bar** | **Court** | **History** | |  | [A person wearing glasses and a suit  Description automatically generated with medium confidence](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Boris_Johnson_July_2015.jpg) | **Robert Talalay** | **9** | L |  | |  | [A person wearing glasses and a suit  Description automatically generated with medium confidence](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Boris_Johnson_July_2015.jpg) | **Hugh Giles** | **9** | L |  | | **End** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **The Now Claimants then Solicitor Requested to Come of the Records; 19/02/2016**  **&**  **Failure of Any Received Disclosure.** | | |
| * **The Now Claimants then Solicitor Requested to Come of the Records**  1. On the **19th of February 2016,** the light in the Courtroom seemed dull till it looked as if someone flashed the lights on and took the stage. 2. The Now Claimants acting Solicitor had put into the Court for a mention hearing to take place. 3. The reason the Now Claimant believed his Solicitor had requested the **19/02/2016** to be a day of Court was due to non­disclosure and not for them to; - “swing of ropes that was not there as one might say!” 4. At the Court, the Now Claimant Solicitors put sneaky plans into action that had dramatic effects on him, the Solicitor Firm had prior to the date decided to create and deliver a hidden Court application that would then unknowingly get handed-up to the Judge and this application contained two parts, and one being a: - “Break in Fixture,” that his honour refused, as he did not accept the change of any further advancements of a further prearranged Court Date, alongside with part two: - the Solicitor Firms explanation as to why they wanted the break in fixture and that reason being they wanted to come of the records so, not to have to represent the Now Claimant again as they felt a breakdown in communication had happened. 5. When his Judge Morrison refused, the reasons given by his honour as to why was: - 6. “Too Late of Notice Given” due to the request being three days before the date took a place of the Trial and spoke: - 7. “The Court will not and does not accede to any application for the Now Claimants.” Solicitors to come off the record or to cease acting for the Now Claimant, such an application was prior dismissed by His Honour the Judge Morrison on the **19th of February 2016.** 8. It was also, instated that if any other attempts by the Solicitor firm to repeat this application the Court will require the Senior Partner of Michael Carroll & Co to attend.” 9. This information is especially important due to what occurred on the **21/09/2016** when HHJ-PAWLAK removed the Solicitors from the record, without the Now Claimant or a Senior Partner of Michael Carroll & Co being present in Court. 10. (“See date **21/09/2016** as more notes”) 11. The reason the Solicitor prior gave for not defending the Now Claimant was they did not want to fight obvious fraud that they agreed existed in the Asbo Application against the police and this then caused a breakdown in communication between the Now Claimant and themselves. 12. On the day at Court the Barrister gave the reasons to why the Solicitor firm wanted to come of the record was blunt in explanation as he merely explained the following a breakdown in communication has happened and they also could not get a Barrister to deal with this case, this was in part misleading but meant that the claimant understood that the case was not at its best prepared for the appeal hearing and with him knowing good reasons such as the Solicitor firm did not want to meet with their client. 13. His Honour Judge Morrison had never heard off a Solicitor firm that could not get a Barrister and ordered that a Public Defender took over the case to act for the Now Claimant as his Solicitor firm seemed to be: - “Playing all the Fiddle.”  * **Failure of Any Received Disclosure**  1. Afterwards his Honour Judge Morrison relisted for the case to take a place on the **22/02/2016** in front of HHJ-PAWLAK, and this was due to issues raised once again about nondisclosure as the Judge felt he was not the best person to answer these issues. 2. The Court Clerk used his powers to book a three-day Appeal hearing listed for **22/02/2016, 23/02/2016** and **24/02/2016.** 3. By this date the only things that the Now Claimant was to be sure of: - “Was His Innocence in the Asbo Proceedings,” and that the Prosecuting team had not used a: “Magic-Eraser” to unredacted the Asbo files because all he could see inside the Asbo Bundles was: - “Marker-Pen-Marks,” for what he was wrongly accused and not to forget that the disclosure to most people was still: - “Invisible.”  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **The 1st Appeal Stage**  **10 Out of 20 of 20 Court dates the 3 of 13 appearance towards the 1st Asbo**  **At Wood Green Crown Court and the Judge s were: -** | | | **Date:** | 19/02/2016 | | **Defendants Name:** | Mr Simon Cordell | | **Court House:** | Wood Green Crown Court | | **Reason:** | The 1st Appeal Stage / Mention Hearing | | **Case Number:** | A2015006 | | **Judge s Name:** | Morrison | | **Court Room:** | 4 | | **Contra’s Name:** | Robert Talalay | | **My Barrister Name:** | Mr. Andrew Locke | | **Note 1:** | (Mention Hearing) | | **Note 2:** | Ms Sally Gilchrist Legal Executive Director Met Police was Present! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Portrait** | | **Judge Name** | **Went To the Bar** | **Court** | **History** | |  | A picture containing person, indoor, clothing  Description automatically generated | **HHJ**  **Sean Morris** | **4** | (Magistrates’ courts | 1. HHJ Sean Morris, Appointed **17/06/2019 .**.. Southeast, Wood Green Crown Court, 1**8th of June 2019** Park Square Barristers 2. His Honour Judge Sean Morris who practised at the Criminal Bar at No6 for over 20 years has become appointed as the new Recorder of York. 3. Judge Morris left the Chambers in **2008** and he then became appointed as a Circuit Judge. 4. He started his judicial career in Birmingham before moving on to be the Recorder of Lincoln. In recent years HHJ Morris has sat in Newcastle and Teesside. | | **End** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | **The Case Was too be Ready for Trial as It Was The; 22/02/2016**  &  **Interrelating Side Issues / Mental Health Team Workers**  &  **While still at Court Facing the Asbo**  &  **After the Court Hearing** | |
| * **The Case Was too be Ready for Trial**  1. Mr Morris the acting Public Defender attended Court on this day with a smile to act for the Now Claimant; the Now Claimant had not met Mr Morris before this date and grind back to him. 2. Once chatting Mr Morris explained to the Now Claimant that he had only had the case files since the **19/02/2016** and was not ready for the three-day Appeal hearing to take place as he thought it best to do things professionally and the Now Claimant fully agreed. 3. The Barrister of the Now Claimant made it easy to understand that they both would need to meet to go over the defence and said he was going to request of the Judge for an adjournment with the two main reasons being: - 4. He wanted time to be able to go over all the large case bundles and: 5. To be able to sit down and talk to the Now Claimant. 6. So, off together and into the Courtroom they all went to see the Judge: - “the Now Claimant & his mother and with their new Barrister the public defender,” and before they all knew it the Asbo books had flipped open. 7. Mr Morris the acting Public Defender started the Court of by asking the Judge a polite request and with good reason: - “For the Well Needed Adjournment.” 8. But after Mr. Morris had finished his request to the Judge: “it was like Fireworks had got shoot of into the Courtroom Ceiling.” 9. The Judge HHJ-Pawlak said that Mr Morris application for more time was uncreditable in a very unsympathetic way towards the Now Claimants Human Rights as he made it clear that he had declined the request. 10. The Judge HHJ Pawlak said to Mr Morris that they have until the weekend to get the case ready and that: - “The Appeal Must Go on No Matter What!” 11. When considering this was the Public Defender that His Honour Judge Morrison had given to the case only three days beforehand it seemed that the Now Claimant was the one being penalised for the incompetence of his acting Solicitors Firm & Co. 12. The Now Claimant's health had deteriorated due to all of what was happening within this case and its “Interrelating Side Issues with Members of his Neighbours due to Government Figures Trying to Avoid Justice.”  * **Interrelating Side Issues / Mental Health Team Workers**  1. The mental health team continued to harass the Now Claimant and all because the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police had educed “Interrelating Side Issues with Members of his Neighbours due to Government Figures Trying to Avoid Justice,” by using their media departments such as their website to advertise negative information about the Now Claimant and that then spiralled out of control tarnishing his life and them staff also, made unneeded Mental Health referrals rather than addressing the facts that were complained about formally to themselves. 2. Specific official Members of the Mental Health Team had set out on an ambush against the Now Claimant, and this happened from the start of the Now Claimant complaining about the Asbo proceeding being fraudulent. 3. Herein, the complained about Mental Health Team Workers used unorthodox methods that are not humane or fit for a person in a fair society against the Now Claimant in the hope of using their given company entitled powers from their places of work with evil intentions in mind and these involved members of staff having their negative ploy, then afterwards played out of the bounds to which there forbidden to do and as soon as their crimes humanity were committed the Now Claimant suffered an abusive style of Mental-Health-Treatment. 4. The Doctors were not shy, when documenting down their notes and into the NHS computer systems as well, their reasons as to why they would not leave the Now Claimant alone become: - “A Twisted Truth of Muddles.” 5. We can prove intentions and what really took a place against the Now Claimant when the Mental Health Team members tried or did get their grip on to him and be it that he was in person or not, and what those involved staff done, was: - “commit more crimes against humanity,” as: - “One Official Person After the Other Official Person,” handled his case. 6. Those Mental Health Team Members committed Criminal Crimes & Civil Wrongs when they obtained mutable amounts of: - “Section 135 Warrants Under the Mental Health Act,” throughout the Asbo proceedings, “To Help Government Figures Trying to Avoid Justice,” but luckily for the Now Claimant he recorded and requested their abuse so, he can now prove the truth.  * **While Still at Court Facing the Asbo**  1. As a person that prefers the Sun, it felt as if to the Now Claimant that a storm had been over his head throughout all the yearly, seasons and this storm was not about to: “Blow Away,” any time soon. 2. While still at Court facing the Asbo Proceedings the Now Claimant, felt the disdain building inside of himself, while the Court’s with other’s forced him to suffer the equal of: - “a Storm named to him as the Asbo Bundles,” and this storm turned the Courtroom from cold too colder for himself and the same for his support network.” 3. As the pages in the Asbo bundles unrevealed: - “more-and-more fraud” and the Now Claimant and other persons showed any fraud they found to the Judge, the Judge made it feel to them as if: - “Any Sunshine Had Just Turned into A Cloudiness.” 4. The more the Now Claimants and his team asked the Judge for a fair trial: - “The More It Seemed to Rain,” 5. The Courtroom temperature for the Now Claimant turned into: “Freezing,” as his support network and himself all warned the judge of more inaccuracies they found that are contained in the Asbo Bundles, and by doing so, making the Asbo application become more: - “Unstable,” and it is obvious that the earlier and greater the risk raised by a defence team to any Judge the faster the response and higher the caution they should alert to the relevant government bodies but the Judges sitting these proceedings failed to: - “Call The Police.” 6. This Storm of the: - “Asbo Bundles,” Brought into the Court by the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and Crown Prosecution could have been: “Closer Analysed,” by all of the Judge’s for them to have: “Prevented These Ongoing,” and this would have stopped the Now Claimants life from being put into: - “Danger,” but the Judges failed to see the warning signs given to them and failed to: - “Set The Sirens Of,” and now the Now Claimants life has been swept away with a significant amount of turbulence, created in fierce winds within the storm of the: - “Asbo Bundles,” 7. It is upsetting to be able to work out that the Courts themselves might as well have: - “Blown fire out of their mouths to have saved the Now Claimant.” 8. At the same time as the above storm taking place the Now Claimants Mother had a: - “Lightning Moment,” when she decided to make sure that the Courts were aware of the: - “Interrelating Side Issues with Members of his Neighbours due to Government Figures Trying to Avoid Justice.” 9. But the Now Claimants Mother only told the Judge in brief, as everything the Now Claimants and his support teams said to the Judge, they all watched: - “Being Washed Away,” or “Just Not Heard.” 10. The Judge gave: - “No Forecast,” and due to this no fair warnings were issued in any time, and this happened even aloe the Now Claimants & his teams: - “Blowed the Whistles at Her,” the Judge’s simply done nothing right. 11. The Now Claimants Mother explained in short about the effect the Now Claimant was being forced to suffer with that was like: - “Wind-Driven Snow That Causes Reduced Visibility,” rather than what she fully understood to be happening to her son by in short explained about the extra pressure the Metropolitan police force, Enfield Council and Doctors were illegally putting onto the Now Claimant alongside with members of his Neighbours and all while the Asbo Court proceedings amerced. 12. The Now Claimants Mother done this explaining to the Judge, as she knew in the back of her thoughts that the Judge should have already worked this all out: - “By Being a Judge.” 13. Mr Morris The Now Claimants New Barrister then showed another magic moment by pulling out: - **“1”** different documents to the Judge and hoped the Judge would place them into line. 14. **Attachments:** Simon Cordell Appellant Response to Respondent Skeleton Argument 20/02/**2016**.Docx 18.90 KB.” 15. The Judge new he had: - “Jump on the wrong side of the Line,” and then unwilling adjourned the Appeal hearing until the **26/09/2016** for a three-day hearing. 16. The Judge listed the case for a mention hearing also, on the **04/04/2016.**  * **After the Court Hearing**  1. After this Court hearing, HHJ-PAWLAK wrote a letter to the acting Solicitors Michael Carroll and co that they had to be reply to by the **04/04/2016.** 2. See Attached Letter from Judge: - 3. See attached response from Solicitors dated **03/04/2016: -** 4. ln the letter that the Judge wrote to the Now Claimant's Solicitors on the **22/02/2016**, he asked Ms Ward who was dealing with this case for the Now Claimant at Michael Carroll & Co, if she knew that the response had to be in the Court for the **04/04/2016** for when the case was next listed. 5. Ms Ward did not start working on the response to the Judge 's letter until the **03/04/2016** when the Judge sent his email on the **22/02/2016** when on the date of the **03/04/2016** we received her email. The Now Claimant only understood that miss ward was finally working on the Asbo case because she wanted any amendments that needed to be complied for the response letters return. Ms Ward had rushed a response to be ready at the last moment and when he had asked his Solicitor repeatedly to address the letter promptly from the Judge and us. 6. By doing this she had not given the Now Claimant any time to go over the response she had written. 7. The Now Claimant amended Ms Wards Letter in a fast time as he did not have the need time. The Now Claimant included multiple points that she had missed out and sent it back to Ms Ward via email. 8. The Now Claimant knew that his Solicitor firm had let him down again from any fair process of litigation and his defence was not adequate as the firm had rushed it.   **Please See [EXHIBIT J37]**  The Judge HHJ-Pawlak Letter  **Text, letter  Description automatically generatedText  Description automatically generated**   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Wood Green Crown Court**  Woodall House  Lordship Lane  Wood Green  London  N22 SLF  DX 130346 WOOD GREEN 3 | **Wood Green Crown Court**  Woodall House  Lordship Lane  Wood Green  London  N22 SLF  DX 130346 WOOD GREEN 3  T 020 8826 4100  F 020 8826 4230  E  Minicom VII 020 7210 2231  (Helpline for the deaf and hard of hearing)  [www.hmcourts-service.gov.uk](http://www.hmcourts-service.gov.uk) |   A black and white drawing of a tree  Description automatically generated with medium confidence **HM Courts**  **& Tribunals**  **Service**   |  | | --- | | Michael Carroll & Co Solicitors  798, High Road,  Tottenham,  London,  N17 ODH |  |  |  | | --- | --- | | Date: 22"d February 2016 | **Our Ref.** A20150064 |   Dear Sir.  **Re: - The appeal of your client Mr Simon Cordell**   1. “This case (Simon Cordell) is now reserved to His Honour Judge Pawlak and a mention will take place on **04th April 2016**; the appeal has now been fixed for **3** days commencing **26/9/2016**.” 2. “The purpose of the mention among other things, is to ensure that the issues, factual and legal have been adequately identified, in particular the court will wish to be told.” 3. “What involvement in each event (rave) relied on by the Respondent, the Appellant admits to having had.” 4. “Whether the Appellant contends that the involvement he admits, was in fact within the law if so why.” 5. “Whether the Appellant agrees that any of the raves did or could have caused distress to local residents by way of noise or the movement of persons participating in the raves.” 6. “Whether the Appellant agrees that a premises licence was required for each rave.” 7. “Whether the Appellant concedes that for any of the raves in which he was involved, whether by helping to arrange or by providing sound equipment he believed the event to be a licensed event and therefore was an innocent supplier of equipment, and, if so for which rave or raves in particular.” 8. “If the Appellant wishes to rely on any medical evidence as to his mental health, then any report dealing with such matters must be before the court on the **4th of April 2016.**” 9. “The Court will not and does not accede to any application for the Appellants Solicitors to come off the record or to cease acting for the Appellant.”   **“**Such an application was dismissed by His Honour Judge Morrison” on the **19th of February 2016.**”  **“**If any attempt is made to repeat this application the Court will require it to be made in person by the Senior Partner of Michael Carroll & Co.”  A black and white logo  Description automatically generated with low confidenceDiagram  Description automatically generated with medium confidence •   1. “The Respondent is to serve by the **04th of April 2016** a hearsay notice identifying by reference to pages of Bundle R what hearsay it wishes to rely on and why it should be admitted in evidence.”   A picture containing text  Description automatically generatedYours Sincerely  HHJ W. Pawlak  Cc C.P.S.  Page 2 |   **From Diary Rough Temp Notes 23/10/2022**  **This day is the 22/02/2016**  **Asbo Skeleton:** Email Me to Mother or Reverse - “**22–23–24 /02/2016** Set for Asbo appeal in the crown court but did not go ahead again or investigated even low I handed a section 6 asking the judge to investigate the case as of the cad timestamps police and council have fabricated. **Attachments:** Simon Cordell Appellant Response to Respondent Skeleton Argument 20/02/**2016**.Docx 18.90 KB.”  **Enfield Council 2nd Injunction Order Indexed:** Page 228 **/** “Lemmy made a mistake or tried to confuse us by saying that on the 22 February **2016** he and co at the Enfield council requested a meeting with me about Anti-Social behavior,” that they frauded to set me up with.  **24/02/2016**  An Email from Me to My Solicitor: Asbo / R v Simon Cordell Appeal Letter / Time 05:38:59 PM – “I am in the right by asking you to look into the time stamps so that I can have a fair trial and you will not, I have many emails of myself and my mother asking you to act with my best interest at heart and write to the witness in time for my appeal date, to which this was not done in time as I had explained I was worried about as well as the true points of law relevant to the applicant’s case. The Jude did set a fair time period for you to set the key objectives so that I could be ready to stand a fair and speed trial. You have refused to meet myself in this time set and would only meet my mother, this was due to me asking you on the phone, if I could take a copy of the minutes in audio format of our meeting, to which you took as a fret, I have the texts of me being polite to you straight after our conversation stating that I meant no offence and saying sorry if I did upset you, as I class you as a close family member after you representing me over the years. I have not sent you any correspondence to show that I am not of well health as you are claiming an  **24/02/2016**  **From:** Josephine Ward <[josie@michaelcarrollandco.com](mailto:josie@michaelcarrollandco.com)>  **Sent time:** 24/02/**2016** 04:18:47 PM  **To:** [re\_wired@ymail.com](mailto:re_wired@ymail.com)  **Cc:** [lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk](mailto:lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk)  **Subject:** Fwd.: **Re:** R v Simon Cordell Appeal Letter  Dear Simon / Lorraine  I am forwarding across to you a letter that I have received from HHJ Pawlak, “who will be adjudicating at the appeal hearing on 26th September **2016**.” He will also be presiding over the mention hearing on 4th April **2016**.  The first point that “must be addressed” in question 3 and this concerns your mental health Simon and your fitness to follow proceedings, instruct Solicitors and consider advice. I am therefore going to apply for funding so that “you can be assessed” so that this area “can be clarified.”  This is important. Your behaviour in court on Monday raised concerns surrounding this point.  The second point is answering and responding to question 2. This question can “only be properly addressed” once we receive confirmation from a psychiatrist that you are able to follow proceedings extra.  Paragraph 4 makes it clear that the Court will not allow Michael Carroll & Co to come off the record unless the Senior Partner attends in person. We cannot advance your case or respond to question 2 until such time as the psychiatric confirms that there are no issues with your ability to follow proceedings.  You will note the areas that the court wishes to concentrate on he listed in paragraph 2. All the points will have to be “carefully considered;” in my view they are: “loaded questions” that are seeking to achieve foundation for the ASBO application. The Judge is referring to events but in brackets using the word rave. He is not stating illegal rave. There are five subsections but subsections 2(c) is the question that Judge is most interested in knowing your response to.  Paragraph 4 makes it clear that the Court will not allow Michael Carroll & Co to come off the record unless the Senior Partner attends in person or unless you wish to transfer legal aid.  Paragraph 5 deals with the hearsay application served by the respondent.  Superintendent Coombes is forwarding his statement in the post. I will forward this on receipt.  Can you please confirm by return email Simon whether you are willing to have an assessed by a psychiatrist so that we can determine whether you are “fit to follow proceedings?”  I await hearing from you by return email.  Yours sincerely  Josephine Ward MICHAEL CARROLL & CO.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **The 1st Appeal Stage**  **11 Out of 20 of 20 Court dates the 4 of 13 appearance towards the 1st Asbo**  **At Wood Green Crown Court and the Judge s was** | | | **Date:** | 22/02/2016 | | **Defendants Name:** | Mr Simon Cordell | | **Case Handler:** | **Ms Sally Gilchrist** Legal Executive Director Met Police and she was Present! | | **Court House:** | Wood Green Crown Court | | **Reason:** | The 1st Appeal Stage / Mention Hearing | | **Case Number:** | A2015006 | | **Judge s Name:** | HHJ Pawlak | | **Court Room:** | 5 | | **Contra’s Name:** | Robert Talalay | | **My Barrister Name:** | Mr. Andrew Locke | | **Note 1:** | (Mention Hearing) | | **Note 2:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Portrait** | | **Judge Name** | **Went To the Bar** | **Court** | **History** | |  | [A picture containing person, person, indoor, bowed instrument  Description automatically generated](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Boris_Johnson_July_2015.jpg) | **HHJ**  Pawlak | **4** | (Magistrates’ courts | 1. M | | **End** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | **Upon Attending Court; 04/04/2016** |
| * **Upon Attending Court.**  1. Upon attending Court on the **04/04/2016** it was like on the **19/02/2016** his Honour Judge Morrison had shown us all: - “that he had the power while in the Court House,” by: - “Clicking the Back of His Shoes Together Three Times and making Mr Morris Show Up at All the Asbo Proceedings.” 2. The New Now Claimants Barrister Mr Morris presented: - “A Sudden Rush of Magic,” that the Now Claimant was not too sure about due to the Judge selecting him after letting his old Solicitor firm get away. 3. The Rush of Magic was that the New Barrister Mr Morris had made his own: “Drafted Response to The Judge.” 4. When wanting to inspect the letter the Now Claimant and his mother were at: - “Wits Ends,” when deciding who should read the document first as there was little time before the Courts speaker tannoid would call them into the Courtroom. 5. Knowing better the Now Claimant politely looked over his mother shoulder as she read it first, and he listened to her quoting comments about what she was reading, and this is when the Now Claimant heard her mumbles say that the document was the same as the one as his last Solicitor firm had just made: “Who Prior Run Away from Proceedings and Left Him Abandoned.” 6. The Now Claimant felt: - “The Judge Should Have Been on Stilts While Looking Down at Such Bad Behaviour,” but we saw none of the Judges doing this and they could only notice that the Judge had allowed a form of: - “Puppetry” to go Ahead with his Legal Teams.” Instead. 7. The Now Claimant can remember being at his mother’s home with his mother again, next, while they were working out together: “Hair Hanging Stuff,” to conclude that the response was almost identical to Ms Ward's Letter apart from it included one crucial section about the hearsay rule that Ms Ward's did not induce in her letter. 8. The Now Claimant agreed on this point about the hearsay rule as he had been explaining this to Miss ward since the start of the ongoings of the Asbo, as he knew the Solicitor firm needed to include this information into the Asbo Case Proceedings. 9. But while still in the Court the Now Claimant knew it would be best for him to: - “Springboard On,” with his own reply till he had more time to confirm things hadn’t: - “Been Fooled Around With,” and for this very reason the Now Claimant stayed adamant it was going to be his letter that was going to be handed into the Judge.   **Please See [EXHIBIT J37]**  Text, letter  Description automatically generatedText  Description automatically generatedText  Description automatically generatedText, letter  Description automatically generatedText, letter  Description automatically generated   |  | | --- | | **R**  **SIMON CORDELL**  **RESPONSE TO HHJ PAWLAK'S LETTER DATED 22nd FEBRUARY 2016** | | 1. **SUMMARY OF THE APPELLANTS CASE** 2. The Appellant does not accept that he was the organiser of any illegal rave or supplied equipment for any such purpose. 3. On various occasions he was present with explanations below. 4. The Appellant believes that the police have pursued a malicious Prosecution against him, which includes targeting him and his brother. 5. He cites his human rights to a fair trial and asks the Respondent to disclose items listed in (6) below. 6. The Appellant asks the Respondent to prove to the criminal standard every aspect of this Prosecution including whether a rave took place and whether there is any evidence that he organised any illegal rave. 7. The Appellant believes that the CAD messages relied on have been “unfairly presented” as redacted, edited, and doctored. 8. “CADs have not been served.” 9. “The Appellant will state that any CADs that relate to any other location than the ones relied on by the Respondent should be removed from the bundle.” 10. He requests disclosure and editing of CAD's as per (6) below. 11. The Appellant on no occasions cited in the Respondent's bundle hired out any sound equipment, audio equipment or organised any rave in the London Borough of Enfield on the dates cited in the original application. 12. **WHAT INVOLVEMENT IN EACH EVENT (RAVE) RELIED ON BY THE RESPONDENT, THE APPELLANT ADMITS TO HAVING HAD.** 13. **25.05.2014 - 5 ST GEORGES INDUSTRIAL ESTATE. WHITE HART LANE** 14. There was no rave, no sound equipment, lights, generators, or other equipment in his van. 15. The Appellant believes that there was a section 144 LAPSO notice clearly displayed by the occupants who were treating the premises as their home. 16. The Appellant had empty speaker cases in his van. 17. “The van was used to store the speakers.” 18. **PROGRESS WAY 6™. 7th AND 8th JUNE 2014** 19. The Appellant disputes any involvement whatsoever in the event at Progress Way. 20. The Appellant accepts that he approached the gates with a view to dropping off house keys to a friend. The Appellant did not enter the premises / venue at Progress Way. 21. The Appellant did not provide any sound equipment, speakers, and generators to any person inside Progress Way. 22. **FALCON PARK 20TH JUNE 2014** 23. The Appellant was not present at this event. 24. The Appellant accepts that he hired out his sound equipment in good faith for what he believed to be a house party. 25. “The Appellant will state that he was at home when he was contacted by the hirer to come to collect his equipment which was then seized by police.” 26. “The Appellant will state that his equipment was restored to him by the police.” “♦” 27. **CARPET RIGHT 19th JULY 2014** 28. The Appellant denies organising or supplying equipment for the above event. 29. The Appellant does not accept that an illegal rave took place at this premises. 30. The Appellant never entered the premises Carpet Right. 31. The Appellant will state that the true organisers were inside the premises and the police ought to be in possession of their details. 32. The Appellant will state that none of his vehicles were inside the premises. 33. **ALMA ROAD - 24th JULY 2014** 34. The Appellant does not accept that any illegal rave took place at this premises. 35. The Appellant disputes the conversation with PC Edgoose regarding raves. 36. The Appellant will state that he did discuss with PC Edgoose his entertainment company and his dream of hosting a local festival at Picketts Lock for the benefit of the community. 37. He will also say that he discussed other charitable events that he had participated in and events in the pipeline. 38. The Appellant did not supply any sound recording equipment. 39. **MILLMARSH LANE- 9th AUGUST 2014** 40. “The Appellant will state that he was invited to a private birthday party by one of the persons occupying the premises at Millmarsh Lane.” 41. “The Appellant will state that there was a section 144 LAPSO notice displayed, and the building was being treated as a home.” 42. The Appellant will state that he was an invited guest and not a trespasser. 43. “The Appellant will state that there was no rave as the location was not open air and by virtue of him being invited by one of the occupiers who had established a section 144 LAPSO notice he was not a trespasser so the legal definition of a rave could not be made out.” 44. The Appellant was a guest at the location and not an organiser. 45. He attended the location in his private motor vehicle. 46. He did not provide any audio or sound equipment. 47. The second event at Millmarsh Lane the Appellant disputes that he was an organiser. 48. He disputes that he was operating the gate. 49. The Appellant will state that this was not an illegal rave but a private party that he attended as a guest and not as an organiser. 50. The Appellant will state that there were no residential areas close by. 51. **WHETHER THE APPLICANT CONTENDS THAT THE INVOLVEMENT HE ADMITS, WAS IN FACT WITHIN THE LAW, IF SO WHY** 52. Please see above. 53. **WHETHER THE APPELLANT AGREES THAT ANY OF THE RAVES DID OR COULD HAVE CAUSED DISTRESS TO LOCAL RESIDENTS BY WAY OF NOISE OR MOVEMENT OF PERSONS PARTICIPATING IN RAVES** 54. The Appellant can only comment on his own behaviour, and he refers the court to the fact that he himself has not acted in an anti-social manner. 55. “He has not been arrested for any criminal offences.” 56. The Appellant accepts that such events could cause noise nuisance, but he did not organise or supply equipment for any of the events cited in the Respondent's application. 57. **WHETHER THE APPELLANT AGREES THAT A PREMISES LICENCE WAS REQUIRED FOR EACH RAVE** 58. “The Appellant will state that he believes that no licence was required for Millmarsh Lane as the premises were being occupied and treated as a home due to a section 144 LAPSO notice being displayed.” 59. “The building was being used as a home and not as a commercial building.” 60. “The Appellant will also state that as the building was being occupied as a home then no licence was required for a private house party and also no money was charged for persons entering.” 61. **WHETHER THE APPELLANT CONCEDES THAT FOR ANY OF THE RAVES IN WHICH HE WAS INVOLVED, WHETHER BY HELPING TO ARRANGE OR BY PROVIDING SOUND EQUIPMENT HE BELIEVED THE EVENT TO BE A LICENSED EVENT AND THEREFORE WAS AN INNOCENT SUPPLIER OF EQUIPMENT, AND IF SO FOR WHICH RAVE OR RAVES IN PARTICULAR.** 62. The Appellant will state that he supplied equipment on one occasion only [FALCON PARK], in good faith to what he believed to be a private party. 63. “He did not attend the premises beforehand and therefore did not know the equipment would be used at a different place.” 64. “The Appellant will state that his equipment was restored to him by police after they concluded he had no part in the event and had innocently hired out his equipment.” 65. The event the Appellant is referring to is Falcon Road. 66. **HEARSAY** 67. The Magistrates Court Hearsay Rules **1999** do not apply to the Crown Court. 68. The Defence do not accept that the Respondent has relied on the correct legislation to apply under the Hearsay rules. 69. In any event the Appellant request that the Respondent call the witnesses who made CAD entries for cross examination. 70. It is neither professionally appropriate nor suitable for the Appellant to call Police Officers and question their credibility, as proposed by the Respondent through their application under Magistrates Court Hearsay Rules. 71. The Appellant submits that questioning the credibility of one's own witnesses the Court would not permit. 72. The Respondent has put forward no good reason for why we cannot call these witnesses to Court, save as to say it is not in the interests of justice to do so. 73. **DISCLOSURE** 74. The Appellant request the Respondent discloses the following items: - 75. Any CCTV of the persons breaking into any of the premises, the CRIS and details of any persons arrested for criminal damage / burglary. 76. Full details of the original intelligence report inputted on **25th of May 2014** and also reasons why there was a need to update this report on **19th of June 2014.** 77. All CAD messages prepared in connection with this Prosecution, all in unedited form. 78. Any CAD message from **06th of June 2014** 79. Any evidence or intelligence that would tend to suggest that the organisers of the events in question were someone other than the Appellant.   Andrew Morris PDS Advocacy Unit **04th of April 2016** |   **Please See [EXHIBIT J37]**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **AAA** | | | 1. **A1 Clearly States:** - “ 2. **A2 Clearly States:** - “   **-**-   1. **B1 Clearly States:** - “ 2. **M Clearly States:** - Hearsay “   **1.** The Magistrates Court Hearsay Rules **1999** do not apply to the Crown Court.  **2.** The Defence do not accept that the Respondent has relied on the correct legislation to apply under the Hearsay rules.  **3.** In any event the Appellant request that the Respondent call the witnesses who made CAD entries for cross examination.  **4.** It is neither professionally appropriate nor suitable for the Appellant to call Police Officers and question their credibility, as proposed by the Respondent through their application under Magistrates Court Hearsay Rules.  **5.** The Appellant submits that questioning the credibility of one's own witnesses the Court would not permit.  **6.** The Respondent has put forward no good reason for why we cannot call these witnesses to Court, save as to say it is not in the interests of justice to do so.   1. **N Clearly States:** - Disclosure “   **1.** The Appellant request the Respondent discloses the following items: -  **2.** Any CCTV of the persons breaking into any of the premises, the CRIS and details of any persons arrested for criminal damage / burglary.  **3.** Full details of the original intelligence report inputted on **25th of May 2014** and also reasons why there was a need to update this report on **19th of June 2014**.  **4.** All CAD messages prepared in connection with this Prosecution, all in unedited form.  **5.** Any CAD message from **06th of June 2014**  **6.** Any evidence or intelligence that would tend to suggest that the organisers of the events in question were someone other than the Appellant. |  1. His Honour Pawlak, accepted the file’s and started to: - “Juggled the Documents,” For him to grant the hearsay application that Mr Morris had created but at the same time, HHJ-Pawlak then: - “Done-A-U-Turn-Quickly,” by refusing the application and all while the Now Claimants: - “Feet Had Just Touched the Ground.” 2. HHJ- Pawlak Ruled: - “That Mr Morris opposition to hearsay is in Mr Morris legal document, for which the Now Claimant did not allow him to hand up,” and due to the Barrister of the Now Claimant informing His Honour Pawlak, that his client wished to hand up his own document instead of Mr Morris Letter and against Mr Morris advice the Now Claimants document is what he the Judge will act upon. 3. And for that reason, the Judge then Ordered all sides involved to read the Now Claimants Document. 4. Please see the Now Claimant document then given: -   **Please See [EXHIBIT J37]**   1. Considering the Judge: - “Done-A-Quick-U-Turn,” by accepting acknowledgment of Mr Morris created defence letter, he the Judge should have then balanced the facts between both of those documents fairly but did not. 2. Mr Morris letter & the Now Claimants’ letters both raised immediate action for concern and opens the question of how the Asbo application continued in proceedings as allowed to do so, by the Court’s Judge’s. 3. Michael Carroll and Co had also not prepared a: “Skeleton Argument.” 4. The Judge said that the letter that had then been handed in by the Now Claimant would become the Now Claimant's skeleton argument. 5. “Wearing An Outfit Too Fit,” it turned out that Ms. Ward was sitting in the back of the Court taking notes of what the Judge said and asked.” 6. And in the same: “Chain of Events,” The Judge ordered for a meeting to take a place, between the Now Claimant and the Public defender Mr Morris; but after Court no person: - “Could be Found,” to arrange this meeting with the Now Claimant.  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **The 1st Appeal Stage**  **12 Out of 20 of 20 Court dates the 5 of 13 appearance towards the 1st Asbo**  **At Wood Green Crown Court and the Judge s was** | | | **Date:** | 04/04/2016 | | **Defendants Name:** | Mr Simon Cordell | | **Court House:** | Wood Green Crown Court | | **Reason:** | The 1st Appeal Stage / Mention Hearing | | **Case Number:** | A2015006 | | **Judge s Name:** | HHJ Pawlak | | **Court Room:** | 1 | | **Contra’s Name:** | Robert Talalay | | **My Barrister Name:** | Mr. Andrew Locke | | **Note 1:** | (Mention Hearing) | | **Note 2:** | **Ms Sally Gilchrist** Legal Executive Director Met Police was Present! | | | | |
|  | | | **In Between The Two Past Dates of The Court Mention Hearings of the: 19/02/2016 & The Last Mention Hearing of the: 04/04/2016 Taking A Place** |
| **Between The Dates**   1. In between the dates of the Asbo Court mention hearings of the **19/02/2016** and the **04/04/2016** when the Judge’s awarded the Now Claimant a Public Defender to act on his Behalf, Michael Carrol and Co Solicitor Firm who was supposed to be the acting Solicitor Firm for the Now Claimant continued to fail to be able to arrange a meeting with Mr Locke, who was the Barrister in the Magistrates Court for the Now Claimant, when they asked. 2. There was also, the fact that Michael Carrol and Co Solicitor Firm staff, keep asking the Judge’s to be stuck of the record so, they did not have to act of the Now Claimant behalf. 3. A total of three months without the Now Claimant having any consultations with his legal representatives had passed by and what is unfair, and this happened even though they continually sent emails to Ms Ward, asking her to address and deal with their concerns. 4. Emails went unanswered for months by the acting Solicitor firm and this had continued from the start of proceedings in the year of **2014** an up until date of the **19/02/2016**. | | | |
|  | | | **Finding an Email:** - **12/07/2016** |
| **12/07/2016**   1. The Date turned to the **12/07/2016** and the Now Claimant mother received an email from the Solicitor firm named as Michael Carroll and Co and as the email from the Solicitors Firm was: - “Opened & then Read.” It showed the Solicitor firm: - “Aerobating Backwards,” in their decision not to represent the Now Claimant, as they then said they would. 2. The Email Contained the following: - 3. “*Please note that Mr Andrew Locke has returned from a career sabbatical, and he has agreed to deal with the Appeal against the imposition of an ASBO.*” 4. “*I am in the process of confirming a conference date with Mr Locke, hopefully within the next two weeks.*” 5. “*I have notified Mr Morris from the Public Defender Service that Mr Locke is your preferred choice and I have requested the written submissions that he had prepared for the mention hearing in* ***April 2016*** *that you did not consent to or permit us to serve upon the Prosecution, instead, your own document was served at your insistence and contrary to the advice given by both Mr Andrew Morris and me.*” 6. “*Please confirm any dates that you are not available so that this conference can be arranged.*” 7. As for the list of police officer the Now Claimant wanted to call to Court, he and his mother both had asked Ms Ward over and over again to put into place, the list given to her containing the names of Police Officers from the Public Order Investigation unit at Scotland Yard and other officer offices such as Superintendent Specialist Operations Adrian Coombs. | | | |
|  | | |  |
| **14/08/2016**   1. The “Interrelating Side Issues with Members of his Neighbours due to Government Figures Trying to Avoid Justice,” continued to happen and since **2014.** 2. On the **14th of August 2016,** the police and Council with the NHS used what they had allowed members of his Neighbours to continue with illegally against him: - “Creating Crimes,” interrelating to the Asbo Proceedings, by the addition of the: - “Doctors: - “Cannon Balling In,” to the Police Station to Section him Under the Mental Health Act, Section 2 of that Act. 3. The police had invaded the Now Claimants home by: - “**Please See Notes Exhibited As 7: - CRIMINAL RECORD ACRO REPORT.”**   The Christine & Carron Case who were helping Stain 111 Burncroft Avenue hurt me and getting involved themselves.  Arrested for completely made up lies by them **14/08/2016** after me and mother put in complaint about my Neighbours with no fair follow up.  **“Won.”**  NFA (No Further Action) **28/10/16** At 01 (Metropolitan Police) Fs/Ref: 01 (Metropolitan Police)  02 Months 14 Days  Set up to go to the Mental Health Hospital then Conditions to stay at my mother’s home.   1. When the Doctors: - “Stepped Around in the Police Station,” they refused to listen to the Now Claimant: - “Yet Again,” and just: - “Took Him Away,” and from the: - “Police Station.” To the Mental Health Department of the Hospital and detained him. 2. The Now Claimant got treated as if he was: “A Punching Bag,” by his local Authorities and the Neighbours in his Housing Community Group and the Doctors because he would not: Shut-Up-Screaming,” out aloud, the illegal abuse that he had caught them all doing to him, and he keep: “Swinging Around his Found Truthful Accusations,” so that they would get into a lot of trouble, such as the following: - “Police Officers Arresting Police Officers, Council Officers Running from the Law and Neighbours, locked behind bars.” 3. Even more concerning for them was the fact that the Now Claimants had built a website and had induced paginated flipbooks of the crimes they had committed against him in an orderly manner, and adding these files into his website: - “Webpages,” and the Doctors on this day finally Sectioned him to: - “Help Those Caught,” their plan was to stop the Now Claimant from organising his found crimes any further than he already had and all before he made them go: - “Officially Public,” by placing the documents in the: - “Correct Departments.” 4. But the Doctors could not diagnose him with a Mental Health issue, as he played: - “Smart.” 5. In the time the Now Claimant was detained by the Doctors to help cover up the Interrelating Side Issues with Members of his Neighbours due to Government Figures Trying to Avoid Justice, and what the Government Officials had encouraged the Neighbours to do to him such as: - “Illegal Activities,” to help themselves: - “Get Out of Trouble,” the time the Doctors had with the Now Claimant for this days occasion was: -“Soon Faded Away” and this meant that the Now Claimant did not get put under a Section 3 of the Mental Health Act: “By being Quick,” and that is what would have allowed the Doctors to start Mental Health Treatment’s on him: - “To Shut Him Up.” 6. The Hospital Tribunal Judge’s at the hearing just could not: - “Hold Him,” as they were not able to find the Now Claimant unwell enough to diagnose him with a Mental Health Disorder and for this reason: - “He Got Away.” 7. The Now Claimant said to the Judge’s in the Hospital Tribunal that he was willing to stay in hospital voluntarily, but once back on the ward and less than a day later the staff in the hospital discharged him to go back home and their explanation as to why they done this was due to bed shortages. 8. The St Ann’s Hospital staff had tried to be cunning from the start of meeting towards the Now Claimant by trying to trick him into believing he needed to take medication as he was in a Mental Hospital and if he did not do so, then he would not: - “See Day or Light Again,” without them being beside his side. 9. The Now Claimant did not like what he was being told and felt forced to have to hide the tablets in his mouth and put them in a: - “Dust Bin,” once he got rid of the staff around him and of course the Doctors and staff done their checks but remember the Now Claimant was: - “Smart.” 10. By the Tribunal Stage the Doctors had already shown him what they would do to him if they caught him: “Not Taking the Medication,” by using their: - “powers,” to stick needles into other patients that would not listen to them. 11. The Doctors and staff made it very: - “Clear,” to the Now Claimant and his family members that he could not go back home unless he: - “Took Prescribed Medication,” and he also, accepted: - “Home Treatment.” 12. The Now Claimant was not going to let Doctors force medication down his throat that would make him think that: - “Time Can Go Backwards,” in the Asbo Application” or the witness statements were: - “Signed by Victims,” in the Asbo Application so, avoided the Medication. 13. The Doctors also, made it clear, that they wanted to use (ECT) treatments, what is an electro-convulsive-therapy, were the Doctors send: - “Electric into The Now Claimant Brian,” because of what he said the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and Crown Prosecution had done illegally to him in the Asbo Application and while covering up using the: - “ Neighbors Wicked Ways,” to try and take his life away. 14. The day the hospital released the Now Claimant in **August 2016,** members of his Neighbours, started their: - “Illegal Brutal Attack on Him,” and within: - “One Hour,” of him being back in his rented home again. 15. The Now Claimant: - “Stood Strong,” and he used his computer to read up more on the: – “Mental Health Act **1963,**” as he did not agree with what the Neighbours done to him. 16. The home treatment team arrived with tablets and their schedule of his Home Treatment Appointments at his home front door, but the Now Claimant had everything he needed already as he had found out: - “The Truth,” about the Mental Health Acts and endeavoured to stop the Doctors and staff for delivering there: - “Medieval Treatments,” to him before they: - “ Fried His Brian” and while: - “Demoralizing Him,” for self-gain.  * **“The Truth he had found on the Internet, about the Mental Health Acts, is the following: -**  1. Section 2 of the Mental Health Act is an assessment wing   If a person does not have a Mental Health History beforehand  Section 3 is for treatment of patients  When a person is first detained, they will experience  The doctor’s diagnosis is based on your time spent  Home treatment is as the name says and must not full out of the laws and regulations to which governs it: - “Treatments Carried Out by Professional Persons in A Patient’s Home.” Is for persons that need treatment and Doctors will place those ill patients onto a Section 3 Treatment wing and with a diagnosis of a Mental Illness, as I was not.   1. The Milgram experiment(s)  * **The Test**  1. A Man named as Stanley Milgram conducted Theatrical Experiments on Human Subjects. 2. Stanley Milgram studied at Yale University as a psychologist and was fascinated with the “Darkside of Obedience,” his experiments that took place were named as “Obedience.” 3. The experiments began in July **1961,** a year after the trial of Adolf Eichmann in Jerusalem. 4. “Obedience,” was a: - “Behavioural Study” and the experiments were finally: - “Banned” from taking a place against: - “Humanity,” in the: - “United Kingdom.” 5. Records state Stanley Milgram conducted a total of eighteen, experiments at the Yale University but in today’s modern society if a person or more attempted the same experiment again or one similar of a nature: - “A Large Majority of The Governed States,” would find it to be: - “Unethical,” and this due to: - “Stricter Controls in Modern Psychology.” 6. The tests are also, known by the names of the “Milgram Experiments” or “Stanley Milgram Experiments.” and have become a famous psychology series of social experiments initialling sociological studies of: “Obedience to Authority.” 7. The theatrical experiments explored the willingness of individuals to follow the orders of: - “Administrative Power,” when those orders conflict with: - “An Individual's Own Moral Judgments.” 8. Whin the experiments, Stanley Milgram, conducted his iconic: - “Person Shocking Experiments,” for the world to see.  * **Selecting the Participants**  1. Stanley Milgram selected participants for his experiment by placing an advertisement in the newspaper of the: “New Haven Register.” 2. The Advertisement said: - “We will pay you $4 for one hour of your time,” it read, asking for “five hundred New Haven men to help us complete a scientific study of memory and learning.” And this is clearly only in part true. 3. Stanley Milgram: - “Obedience,” experiments were to take a place at Yale University. 4. A list of forty males, who were then in the **1960’s** aged between 20 to 50, years of age. 5. Those candidates selected ranged with jobs such as: - “Unskilled,” and to “Professional,” the university then invited those selected candidates to participate by attending.  * **To Experiment**  1. The “Obedience,” experiment procedures then continued to be: - “Rigged for the Candidates.” 2. When a participant went to help out by taking part in the: - “Study of Memory,” at the psychology department at Prestigious University, the researchers then introduced those participants to the (Experimenter) and he then afterwards the (Experimenter) paired the participants into pairs. 3. The Candidates turned to participants, would then: - “Play a Hoxed Draw,” to select their roles from two laid out options. 4. These two options gambled for were "Teacher" and "Learner." 5. The draw was: - “Fixed” from the very start, so, that the arriving participant would always be the “Teacher,” and this: - “Rigged Draw,” inadvertently allowed for the "Learner," to be one of Stanley Milgram’s confederates, who then would: – “Pretend to Be a Real Participant.” 6. Stanley Milgram’s confederate name was Mr. Wallace.  * **To Explain the Experiment**  1. We will be using three definitions to be able to label our explanation of Stanley Milgram’s experiments. 2. The first person, we will call **(Person (A) the Teacher)** who really is Stanley Milgram’s confederate and is called Mr. Wallace and the 2nd person, is called **(Person (B) the Learner,)** who in the “Obedience,” experiments was a person that replied to the advertisement put into the newspaper, while the third person, we will name as the **(Experimenter,)** and the (Experimenter,)was a part of Stanley Milgram Research Team. 3. The “Obedience” experiment was based on (Person (A) the Teacher’s) Moral Judgments and he was the selected candidate, who was participating in the trials unknowingly of what Stanley Milgram and his Team required of him in complete. 4. In the “Obedience” experiment, Stanley Milgram and his Team measured obedience by the level of shock that a (Person (A) the Teacher) would be willing to administer to (Person (B) the Learner.) 5. Stanley Milgram and his Team made sure that all the forty males they selected had never met each other beforehand. 6. The “Obedience,” Experiment required that the participants selected in the trials were not aware of the true ongoing and staff maintained these requirements so, that the research team could study the relationships between: - “Punishment, Learning, And Memory.”  * **The Experimenter**  1. The (Experimenter’s) job was to introduce (Person (A) the Teacher) and (Person (B) the Learner) to each other, but in a testing environment that the researchers oversaw. 2. The (Experimenter) & researchers overviewed that they had manipulated (Person (A) the Teacher) into believing that (Person (B) the Learner) was participating in the study as well. 3. The (Experimenter) led the Participants to believe that their roles of "Teacher" and "Learner." he had just then randomly assigned. 4. However, the (Person (B) the Learner) was Mr. Wallace acting out in his roleplay role. 5. (Person (A) the Teacher) was to act in an official capacity and person (Person (B) the Learner,) was to function as a Civil person, while in their rooms. 6. The instructions the (Experimenter) gave to (Person (A) the Teacher) and (Person (B) the Learner,) he made sure those rules stayed enforced and abided by themselves. 7. The (Experimenter) would give a list of instructions to each Participants: - “(Person (A) the Teacher) and (Person (B) the Learner,)” while they were in separate rooms that divided them apart by a wall and when the Participants were placed in those separate rooms (Person (A) the Teacher) and (Person (B) the Learner,) could still hear each other talking but could not see each other. 8. Stanley Milgram and the researchers had induced a feature into their experiment and with the purpose of (Person (A) the Teacher) being the controller and it was an Impressive looking instrument that Stanley Milgram called his: - “Crucial Measuring Instrument,” that was a: - “Machine Generator.” that delivered: - “Electric Shocks to People.”  * **Bring the First Person into a Room**  1. First the (Experimenter) will brings (Person (B) the Learner,) into his section of the room that he sits in. 2. When the (Experimenter) brings (Person (B) the Learner,) into room he will see a chair and a table that he is to sit down at then the (Experimenter) while talking to (Person (B) the Learner,) will start connecting the: - “Shock Machine Generator.” 3. When the (Experimenter) connects (Person (B) the Learner) to “The Shock Machine Generator,” he gets told that an electro paste is going to be placed onto an electrode that then (Person (B) the Learner,) can see being placed on to his arm and the reason given to (Person (B) the Learner,) for this happening to him is: - “The Research Team have provided the paste to make sure of a good connection to avoid any blisters or burns.” 4. When the (Experimenter) connects the “The Shock Machine Generator,” to (Person (B) the Learner,) he the asks him to Roll up his right sleeve and tells him that he is going to connect the Electric shock generator electrode to him and the (Experimenter) does so.  * **Bring the Second Person into a Room**  1. At the point of time (Person (A) the Teacher) goes into the room with the (Experimenter) he will stay present with him afterwards. 2. The (Experimenter) once in the room with (Person (A) the Teacher) would provide (Person (A) the Teacher) a table and chair to sit down on and on the table would be a“Control Panel,” that was wired to the “Shock Machine Generator,” that was then connected to the participating (Person (B) the Learner,) who was sitting down on his chair at their table in the divided room across the wall. 3. (Person (A) the Teacher) is told by the Experimenter that he is participating in a: - “Word Pair” where he will be asking questions and if (Person (B) the Learner,) gets the asked question right then (Person (B) the Learner,) does, not get punished and he as (Person (A) the Teacher) shall move on to ask (Person (B) the Learner,) the next “Word Pair.” 4. But at the same time the (Experimenter) also, explains to (Person (A) the Teacher) if (Person (B) the Learner,) makes a mistake he as (Person (A) the Teacher) must administer a punishment upon (Person (B) the Learner,) and do so, by flicking on the first switch that is on the: - “Control Panel,” that is sitting on the table in front of themselves, as this will initiate an “Electric Shock,” to occur to (Person (B) the Learner,) it was also, said by the (Experimenter) that the **“**Control Pannal” starts with switches that will administer 15-Volt’s and he is to increase the voltage on each error that (Person (B) the Learner,) makes and the (Experimenter) instated that (Person (A) the Teacher) is to increase the voltage as far as necessary and not to stop. 5. The (Experimenter) tells (Person (A) the Teacher) to continue if he as (Person (A) the Teacher) feels any doubt to disobey orders, by not being obedient and obeying the orders set and to keep administering electric shocks to (Person (B) the Learner,) as ruled. 6. The (Experimenter) also, reminded (Person (A) the Teacher) to be sure to remember not have any discrepancies against the (Experimenter) direct orders. 7. The (Experimenter) shows (Person (A) the Teacher) how to administer electrical current to (Person (B) the Learner,) by using the switches on the “Control Panel.” sitting on the table. 8. “The Shock Machine Generator,” Control Panel Displayed Lines of the Switches that went in a straight line vertically along its display with the addition of a set of: - “Verbale Designations,” that displayed labels above the switches stating: - “Slight Shock” to “Moderate Shock,” then “Strong Shock,” to “Very Strong Shock,” and then continued with “Intense Shock,” to “Extreme Intensity Shock,” and finally “XXX Danger Sever Shock.” 9. These labelled switches in real time only delivered in reality, fake electric shocks to (Person (B) the Learner,) who was on the other side of the wall, but (Person (A) the Teacher) believed that he was starting with a 15-Volt Switch and by moving sideways in Switches he would be administering up to 450 volts to (Person (B) the Learner,) as he followed orders. 10. The (Experimenter) leads (Person (A) the Teacher) into believe that the “Electric Shocks,” he was to administer to (Person (B) the Learner,) was real and the “Electric Shocks,” got more intense by each switch. 11. While the experiments commenced until finalised the (Experimenter) enforced his rules by saying the following quotes: 12. "Please Continue." 13. "The Experiment Requires That You Continue." 14. "It Is Absolutely Essential That You Continue." 15. "You Have No Other Choice; You Must Go On."  * **What Happened**  1. Throughout the experiments taking place (Person (B) the Learner,) who was really Stanley Milgram’s confederate and name was Mr. Wallace obviously answered more than one question wrong and (Person (A) the Teacher.) had his orders to punish him. 2. With, Mr. Wallace acting as (Person (B) the Learner,) still unknown to (Person (A) the Teacher) at this stage, screamed out aloud to (Person (A) the Teacher) to stop his suffering and the (Experimenter) continue to enforce his previously, already laid down, rules. 3. The experiment leaves the decision to (Person (A) the Teacher) moral discretion on whether to obey towards the (Experimenters) enforced rules and at majority of the trials experimented (Person (A) the Teacher) continued to flick the Switch on and therefore increasing the Voltage on the Human Shock Machine Generators Control Panel which increased (Person (B) the Learner,) quotes for Help. 4. From analysing the studies of the researchers of those present and making a conclusion out of the events that took place, it is easy to say that 65% of the Candidates who became participants turned the power up while understanding that (Person (B) the Learner,) was pleading for the experiment to stop as he continued to shut quotes such as the listed below: - 5. Ahh. 6. We are Experimenting That Is All. 7. Let Me Out of Here. 8. I Have Heart Troubles and My Heart Is Starting to Hurt Me Now. 9. Please, Let Me Out. 10. Stop Doing This to Me. 11. You Have No Right to Keep Me in Here, Let Me Out. 12. I Cannot Stand the Pain Let Me, Out of Here. 13. Stanley Milgram himself was horrified by his test results based on his experiment, as they showed in a “remote condition” that above, 65 percent of the subjects from (26 yrs. of age and up to 40 years old) continued to inflict shocks right up to the 450-volt level, despite the learner's screams, protests, and, at the 330-volt level, disturbing silence. 14. And Stanley Milgram Human Experiments had more to them as this was not all the research the team studied  * **The Yale University Repeated the Experiment Mutable Times, And Each Time Under Different Conditions, Including:**  1. **(Remote Feedback)** the Researchers placed the (Person (A) the Teacher) in a separate room from (Person (B) the Learner,) but able to hear learner thumping on the wall. 2. **(Voice Feedback)** the (Person (A) the Teacher) as placed in a separate room from (Person (B) the Learner,) but able to hear (Person (B) the Learner’s) responses through a dividing wall. 3. **(Proximity)** the (Person (A) the Teacher) in the same room as the (Person (B) the Learner.) 4. **(Touch Proximity)** the (Person (A) the Teacher) in the same room as (Person (B) the Learner,) and required to hold the learner's hand on a metal plate to ensure he receives a shock. 5. **(Alternate Venue)** the experiment conducted in a venue not associated with the university. 6. **(Closeness of Authority)** the (Experimenter) was not present in the room with the (Person (A) the Teacher,) but delivering "prompts" over a telephone. 7. **(Women)** the experiment conducted with female (Person (B) the Learner’s.) 8. **(Peers rebels)** two confederates of the (Experimenter) are “described as (Other Teachers,) but show resistance to the (Experimenter) authority when told to apply shocks. 9. Administering Prescription medication works terribly similar to the Milgram Experiments, when Doctors admit a patient into a Mental Health Hospital under Section 2 of the Mental Health Act and with the reason being 99% of the time while any patient is at Hospital for Doctors to assess that person will spend with nurses and not the Doctors who prescribed the medication 10. And now by us by studying the history pertaining to these events it is easy to conclude to 11. Mental Health Act **1963** 12. Medication act **1968** 13. Medicines act **2012** 14. Human medicines regulations **2017** 15. Misuse of Drugs Act **2001** 16. Prescription Act **1832** 17. Care Act **2014** 18. Care Standards Act **2000** 19. Human Rights Act **1998** Section’s 2) 3) 4) 5) + 20. The 6 R's = (Right Drug, Right Dose, Right Route, Right Time, Right Patient, Right Documentation) of Medication Safety.  * **What Happened to Stanley Milgram?**  1. Stanley Milgram left Harvard in **1967** to return to his hometown, New York City, accepting a position as head of the social psychology program at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. Tragically, he **died of a heart attack** at the age of fifty-one.   Image result for what stopped the stanley milgram   * **Other Sociological Experiments the United Kingdom Have Banned Include:**  1. The Bobo Doll experiment was another set of experiments trialled on humans that got: “Banned,” in the **1960** as the test was unethical?  * **Back in the Courtroom:**  1. The Hospital staff had tried to hold onto the Now Claimant but failed and then afterwards still would not let the Now Claimants go, and this continued after they discharged him back to his home. 2. The Hospital staff have no legal right or obligation to trick any person if they believe that person is: - “vulnerable or not,” 3. And these Hospital Staff tried to deceive the Now Claimant that they in the hospital would not allow him out unless he agreed to their: “Needle Stabbing, Tablet Taking, Brain Frying, Jail Sentencing, Stage of Combat.” 4. The acting Solicitors in the Asbo proceedings were aware of the above, and so, was the Court from **September 2016,** when the Now Claimant was due to attend Court and at this point in time the Now Claimant and his mother, inclusive of the Barristers all together knew that the Asbo Bundles are a Frauded: - “Explosive Material,” that is like a “Ticking Bomb,” that keeps: - “Re-Blowing-Up: - “Time And Time Again,” and with a pretence of a sound going: - “Tick, Tick, Boom,” “Tick, Tick, Boom,” “Tick, Tick, Boom,” “Tick, Tick, Boom,” I think you will get the gimmick, and without: - “Justice Prevailing” and: - “Right Now,” to find the: - “Truth,” it cannot be: - “Disabled,” and needs to be in the near on: - “Future.” | | | |
|  | | | **From the Housing Transfer Files 15-08-2022 =39.9.1**  **Asbo:** 14/08/2015 **Asbo:** 16/08/2015 **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 16/08/2015: The Newspaper articles: --**  **Enfield Council** Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews: **18/08/2015**  **Enfield Council** Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews: **20/08/2015**  **Enfield Council** Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews: **28/08/2015**  **Enfield Council** Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews: **29/08/2015**  **Enfield Council** Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews: **30/08/2015**  **A Meeting at the Court with the Barrister; 16/09/2016** |
| **A Meeting at the Court with the Barrister; 16/09/2016**   * **A Meeting at the Court with the Barrister**  1. On **16 September 2016,** the case was in the diary for a mention hearing between, the Now Claimant & his litigation friend, so, the Now Claimant & his mother attended the arranged destination of the Courts Chambers and at the time of 09:00 Hours, for the meeting but we had to find first as: - “Mr Andy Locke,” was: - “Nowhere to Be Found.” 2. The Now Claimant and his mother’s had on their minds the listed topics below to talk to him about so, keep looking for him in the Court House: - 3. They both Had Requested for Disclosure of Documentation and Still Had Not Received Any. 4. The Material, In the Asbo Bundles Was Frauded. 5. The Asbo Bundles Were Still Ticking Around the Clock. 6. The Files in The Asbo Were Blown Up Out of Proportion. 7. Time And Time Again, The Judge Never Addressed Anything. 8. Justice Had Not Prevailed. 9. And All While the Prosecutor Manipulated Who Was Wearing the Hat. 10. But beforehand they had to find: - “Mr Andy Locke.” 11. After time they: “Caught him,” the Now Claimant and his mother had finally found: - “Mr Andy Locke,” so, they all went into a small room and started to have a meeting, the Now Claimant and his mother were sitting down with the: - “Asbo Cases Files Original Barrister.” 12. The Now Claimant and his mother were both happy that they could chat about the things they needed to go over in the Now Claimant defence. 13. On the agreed date the Now Claimant and his mother arrived at Court in an efficient time to defuse the: - “Asbo Bundles,” but his Barrister was: - “Sliding on Thin Ice,” with his Brief Case, as he did not arrive until around 09:40Am, disappointingly, to go over the Asbo’s: - “Explosive Material,” and this lateness of: - “Mr Andy Locke.” did not leave time for a conference to take a place for him to be able to analyse the situation and before we all knew it, we had to go back into the Courtroom and the Asbo Bundles were not: - “Disabled.”. 14. But at this stage, the Judge still had not lifted up his: - “Gavel” as no person had seen him with: - “His Wooden Hammer” and no person also, see him then: - “Bang” it down on his table, while ruling out his: - “Verdict,” so the day at the Courthouse went ahead. 15. While still in a Small room and just before they got back into the Courtroom, Mr Locke and the Now Claimant could not go over any desiccations in relation to the Asbo case Mr Locke said: - “He Was Sorry He Was Not Feeling Very Well,” and that he had also, received mutable emails from Ms Ward, that he could not find the time to read and with his reason being on trying to open those emails he realized he could not. 16. After a shot time of Mr Locke having no success with analysing any of the Asbo’s: - “Explosive Material’s Inclusive of His Emails,” with his brief case laid out on the table, there was a request that came through the speaker tannoid in the Court that asked for everyone involved in the Now Claimants Asbo Case to reattend into the Courtroom and it was at this point in time that Mr Locke hurried his belongs back into his Brief Case and rushed back into the Courtroom, with the Now Claimant and his mother following behind him. 17. Subsequently, once Mr Locke was in front of the Judge, he asked his honour for a Court adjournment so, that he could go over his Emails, make a telephone call to Ms Ward, and talk to us while looking over the Asbo correspondences and the Judge agreed to Mr Locke request to him by allowing an adjournment of the Court to take place. 18. Once the Judge had adjourned the Asbo Court proceedings the Now Claimant inclusive of his mother and Barrister went back into the small room, they had gone into with Mr Locke in the morning, believing they were going to finally have a chat and sort things out as they still already had not talked about any of their listed topics. 19. At first, Mr Locke started with a phone call to Miss Ward as he then secondly, started to shuffle throw his belongings once again and at the time spent around four minutes talking to Ms Ward on his Telephone phone, before ending the call. 20. The Now Claimant and his mother, watched Mr Locke: = “Playing with the Time,” and they both could do nothing about it disappearing as they: - “Sit, Waited,” and: - “Look at their Watches.” 21. At around 10:00 hours the speaker tannoid called the Now Claimant name to go back into the Courtroom but the claimant had yet, to have a chat with Mr Locke, as Mr Locke had not had any the time to talk with them. 22. Mr Locke hurried his belongings away again and rushed out of the small room door and he then he: - “Speedily Fled,” towards the Courtroom Door. 23. The Now Claimant tried to stop Mr Locke as he wanted to explain to him, what his: - “Topics Concerns,” were about as he knew that’s what would: - “Disabled,” the Asbo Bundles. 24. For an instance, the Now Claimant was genuinely concerned about what was being done to his life and even more by this date than prior back to **2014** and in part about the nondisclosure that he his mother nor legal teams had never received, as the Judge had continually managed to: – “Jumped Out of Sight,” at any correct inference in between these dates, he or she could of had on the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and Crown Prosecution to make them make the documents: - “Appear,” to be able to be checked by his Legal Teams. 25. There was also, the fact that there was: - “Even More Disclosure,” they all still needed to be able to request to be able to defend the Now Claimant and those documents the Judge had not yet seen. 26. The Now Claimant and his mother understood it necessary to have copies of the undisclosed and redacted documents / records they requested. 27. The Now Claimant asked Mr Locke if he could ask the Judge to adjourn the case for five or ten minutes more as they had not had sufficient time to complete their meeting. 28. The Now Claimants knew that the Asbo was a: - “No Laughing Gas,” matter. 29. Mr Locke replied aloud as he continued to speed to the Courtroom door: - “No the Hearing Is Only for Disclosure About the Schedule.” 30. The Now Claimant said to his Barrister: - “He Knows That His Barrister Is Mistaken,” by believing the hearing is just about disclosure of the schedule and that this was one of the reasons that he wanted to speak with him and: - “First Thing In The Morning,” but could not and at: - “No Fault of His Own,” so, the Now Claimant again asked: - “If The Barrister Would Ask The Judge To Postpone For Ten Minutes Again” and his Barrister Mr Locke replied back in a: - “Harsh Voice,” yet again by saying “No,” at which point in time the Now Claimant asked Mr Locke, “Why He Would You Not Want To Speak To Him,” and continued by saying: - “Should I Act For Myself?” 31. By this time, the Barrister had arrived at the Courtroom door and was about to: - “Opened It,” as he continued forward and it became clear that Mr Locke had no time to litigate with the Now Claimant and his mother as, Mr Lock had: - “Quickly Frozen In His Tracks,” turned around and then facing the Now Claimant asked him: - “If He Was Dismissing His Solicitor Firm And Himself,” to which the Now Claimant: - “Chuckled,” towards and then replied: - “No.” 32. Mr Locke: - “Opened,” the Courtroom door; and entered so, the Now Claimant and his mother, followed him into the Judges Hands. 33. Once in the Courtroom and in a raised voice, the Now Claimant said to Mr Locke who was ahead of him: - “So, Am I Acting for Myself Then?” 34. Mr Locke never replied to the Now Claimant question and just went ahead to take a stand behind the Courts Counsel. 35. Mr Locke started to talk to the Judge and the Asbo Court Proceedings seemed as if they together with the prosecutor were about to: - “start spinning the wheels into motion,” but funnily enough, none of them seemed to be able to find the: - “Keys,” and the Now Claimant Barrister soon afterwards walked out of the Courtroom door and we all : - “Ushered Out.” With him. 36. At this point the Now Claimant had no idea what was going on but proceeded to follow Mr Locke outside the Courtroom door with his mother and as we got closer to him, it was at this point of time when Mr Locke turned around and said quite curtly “I Do Not Want You to Speak Anymore.” Mr Locke also, informed the Now Claimant it was not good to shout out, “in an open Court,” to which the Now Claimant agreed with. 37. Feeling so let down by his Barrister and the Law the Now Claimant wanted answers. 38. The Now Claimants mother, who had witnessed all of this knew she could not just: - “Close Her Eyes,” to make it all go away, so, she tried to explain to the Barrister, the reasons to why her son: - “Wanted to Speak to Him,” as did she. 39. Tactfully, she asked Mr Locke, what had just occurred in the Courtroom and asked Mr Locke to explain what the schedule was all about that he had talked to the Now Claimant and his mother, earlier about. 40. The Now Claimant also, see a chance to get a: - “Word,” in: - “Edge Ways,” and took it by asking his Barrister about the two documents he handed into the Court Clerk at the last Court occasion, who then gave them two documents to the Judge as they both showed the infringements pertaining to breaches of his Human Rights that he was then getting subjected too through the Asbo Proceedings, with such Human Rights Breaches involving: - “ Article 6 the Right to a Fair and Speedy Trial,” which the Judge never addressed proper afterwards. 41. In then become apparent to the Now Claimants and not by: - “Surprise,” his Barrister still had not: - “Found Out,” nothing about these ongoings. 42. Mr Locke knew absolutely, nothing about the information the Now Claimant was then explaining to him about and the Now Claimant knew this would be: - “The Case,” and that is why he felt it then so, important to explain this information to him. 43. Mr Locke looked at the Now Claimants: - “Mother,” and started to explain that the schedule was what the Judge had asked for on the **04/04/2016.** 44. The Now Claimants mother with her: - “Eyes Opened,” replied: - “This Was Not All the Judge Had Asked For!” 45. Mr Locke never even: - “Replied,” to the Now Claimants mother and walked back into the Courtroom, so once again: - “We All Followed Him Back In,” and it was then at this point when the Now Claimant said to the Barrister: - “I feel I should stand for myself,” and he done this with a: - “Sad Face On,” because he felt his Barrister did not wat to hear any sense. 46. The Now Claimant just wated to talk to him about the: - “Two Different Documents,” he handed to the Court Clerk, who had then given them to the Judge at the earlier hearing, but Mr Lock just would not: - “Let Him.” 47. Once they all entered back into the Courtroom door, the Now Claimant Barrister Mr Locke addressed the Judge and said the Now Claimant did not want him to act for him, but this was not fully the case Because the Now Claimant only wanted to be able to: - “Speak to His Barrister.” 48. The Judge informed the Now Claimants Barrister to: - “Remain in the Courtroom.” 49. The: - “Wheels Spun into Motion,” as the Judge asked: - “What the Case Was Listed For,” and the Prosecuting Barrister addressed the Court by, answering the question: - “The Asbo Proceedings, but with his polite: “Face On.” 50. The Prosecutor also: - “Quickly,” disclosed a schedule to the Now Claimants Barrister: - “Sneakily,” as, he did not give over the rest of the disclosed, that we all had asked the judge to: - “Smashed the Picture,” of Nondisclosure: - “Over His Head,” but the Judge could not hear us: - “Complain.” 51. Then the Prosecutor made a: - “Horrible Jester,” by saying to the Judge the Now Claimant had been sending letters to the Court and the Prosecution himself, which stated: - “I Simon Cordell Throughout the Document.” 52. This still is not the case, and the Now Claimant did not understand their comment to be: “True,” or even: - “What Document the Prosecuting Team and his Barrister Were Talking About.” 53. The Now Claimant and his mother were wating for: - “The Copers,” to: - “run in,” to the courtroom and: - “Arrest Everyone.” while they started to do: - “Fingerprints,” but they knew: - “This Would Not Happen,” and if it did they would only find: - “Crumbs,” Anyway. 54. The Judge then addressed the Court and asked the Now Claimant did he still want his: - “Barrister,” to act for him and asked the Now Claimant to answer why if so? 55. The Now Claimant replied “Yes” he did still want his: - “Barrister,” to the Judge, as: - “He Needed Him,” and continued by saying that he only wanted time to speak to his Barrister beforehand, as he had not spoken to his Barrister since the Magistrate's hearing, and this conversation with the Judge, went on as, the Now Claimant said, that he has worked with his Solicitor firm, since he was a child and never had a breakdown in communication with them, were they: - “Blow the Horn,” to stop the proceedings, the Now Claimant: - “Rolled Out More,” by expressing his Solicitor Firm has been: - “Paid The Money,” for the: - “Asbo Case,” and with the Solicitor Firm being the original: - “Asbo Case Handlers!” they already understand the case, while not forgetting to: - “Add In,” and by the Judge allowing them to leave the Now Claimant as a Litigation Friend he would become a: - “Party Popper,” as, the Now Claimant would then have to transfer his legal aid at such a: - “Late Stage,” and this would put him at an even further: - “Disadvantage.” 56. The Judge then addressed the Now Claimant Barrister and he explained: - “ He Feels the Same Way,” as the Now Claimant does and considering that the Now Claimant still wants them to act on his behalf as the acting Barrister & Solicitor firm, this is what he as the Judge agrees to and Rules as his Order, the Now Claimant Barrister: - “Smiled,” and agreed to the Judges, Final Order. 57. The Judge then after said aloud: - “He Feels That He Is Not the Best Person to Be Hearing This Case,” and disappeared by: - “Passing the Asbo Appel Back Over,” to the Judge that was hearing the Appeal beforehand. 58. After coming out the Courtroom, the Now Claimant and his mother, knew the: - “Tight Rope,” had not finished as, the Now Claimant and his mother & the Barrister all walked like: - “They Never Had the Feet to Fill the Big Shoes,” when the Now Claimant and his mother new the Barrister should have: - “Turned Up,” to all of the: - “Other Asbo Court Proceedings,” and: - “Meetings,” or not try to: - “Get Away!” as he did. 59. The Barrister led the way, till they all ended up back into the: - “Small: - Side Room,” to have a chat. 60. The Now Claimants knew with his mother that they might as well of: –“Pulled the Cream Out of The Asbo,” and: - “Put it on a Plate” and then given it to the Barrister: - “But he Missed,” the chance to: - “Stop,” the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and Crown Prosecution by letting them all: = “Get Away!” 61. The Now Claimant and his mother explained about the: - “Letters,” and what was: - “Inside,” of them and that they had handed them with Mr. Morris to the Judge on the **04/04/2016** and the Now Claimant mother carefully, handed Mr. Morris the copies for him to: - “Read” and as they knew he would he: - “Mumbled,” some words quickly to say: - “That He Never Knew Anything About The Letters.” 62. When the Barrister read parts of the document in front of us, he read them to fast as he: - “Flicked Through the Pages,” and his reply was fast as well, his words were: - “He Knew Nothing About These Letter,” and that he had only seen one document that kept saying: - “I Simon Cordell,” when at the time the Now Claimant and his mother had: - “No Idea Still of What He Was Going On About!.” 63. The Now Claimants mother went ahead to explain this is why the Now Claimant wanted to talk to him before they went into Court, as this is part of the non-disclosure asked for. 64. The Barrister: - “Popped Out Again With,” he only knew about the schedule, to which the Now Claimant mother replied: “This Is Not Funny.” 65. The Now Claimant Mother, started to explain to the Barrister in a: -“Slow,” and “Steady,” voice that she made: - “Very Clear,” that it was Mr. Morris who was in the Courtroom, on the date of the **04/04/2016**, and it was: - “Michael Carroll and Co,” that had: - “Not Prepared.” a: “Skeleton Argument,” also, Mr. Morris handed to the Judge “Two Documents,” and not one but “Two Documents,” and this is when the Judge on that day: - “Stepped In,” in addition to him reading the “Two Documents.” 66. The Barrister Mr. Locke: - “Continued,” to look at her: - “Straight in the Eyes.” 67. Then the Now Claimant Mother, told the Barrister the: - “Judge” was the one who stated it would be the: - “Now Claimants Letter” that: - “Shall Stand,” and as the “The schedule.” 68. Mr. Locke the Barrister continued to listen as the Now Claimant Mother continued by saying: - “and this all happened, when the Now Claimants Solicitor Firm was present as they were also, taking notes in the back of the Courtroom, so, Ms. Ward knew exactly what the Judge had asked for!” 69. The Barrister Mr. Locke: - “Stayed in the Room.” 70. The Now Claimants mother still with Mr Locke, then pulled out her: - “Mobile-Phone,” and telephoned up Ms. Ward and as the Now Claimants and his Barrister Mr. Locke watched her and before they knew it: - “Had Taken a Place,” they were all having: - “A-Four-Way-Telephone-Conversation” and: - “With-the-Strings-Still-Attached.” 71. The Now Claimants mother asked the Solicitor Ms. Ward: - “While-Still-On-The-Phone,” as to what the Judge had ordered on the **04/04/2016**, Ms Ward stated she: - “Could-Just-Not-Remember,” the Now Claimant mother being: - “Dumbfounded,” by this, she then said in reply to her:- “It-Was- The-Other-Day,” the Now Claimant mother continued as she was not being: - “Stopped” as that would have let the Solicitor firm conceal the truth, when she knew different from the Barrister, what she: - “Then-Uncloaked-Even-Further,” in front of the Barrister would then soon after: – “End-The-Telephone-Call,” in an abrupt manner. 72. A simple reminder:- “Flowed Out,” of the Now Claimant Mother:- “mouth” stating to Ms. Ward While the Now Clamant and his Barrister Watched to the effects of: - “It was only last week at the mention hearing when you were sitting in the back of the Courtroom taking notes, when afterwards you said to me and Simon both that you will have everything that the Judge ordered ready for court and this would include what was asked for in the Now Claimants letter, that you know was handed into the Judge, Plus, this would include disclosure and the rest of the information, we wanted the Judge to address and as, a matter of urgency.” 73. The Now Claimant mother then handed the: - “Mobile-Phone,” to the Now Claimant and he asked his Solicitor Ms. Ward, about the letter he was supposed to have sent to the Court and the prosecuting Barrister which stated: - “I-Simon-Cordell-Throughout-The-Document.” due to when being in the Courtroom earlier and the Prosecutor and Barrister both saying: - “It Was The Now Claimant Who Had-Wrote-This-Letter-Himself,” which was not the case but they both could not come to an understanding of the true events as it: - “Left Them Walking Around Tables,” and it was at this point in time when the telephone call come to an End. 74. At no point prior to the telephone call did Ms Ward ever make the Now Claimants mother feel that she did not know what was to be completed after the past Court hearing or the Now Claimant mother would have asked her to relist the Asbo case Proceedings to the Court and request for Solicitor Firm to do this to clarify, what was ordered by his honour as the documents and inconsistencies as well as breaches to the claimant needed to be rectified. 75. The Now Claimant mother has later on checked her correspondence to see when and who sent the letter., for herself to work out that the claimant’s Solicitor firm did and he later amended it and then returned to her on the **03/04/2016,** as to who wrote what 76. please also, see the attached email / letter (marked **03/04/2016** as Ms Ward.)   **Please See [EXHIBIT J37]**   1. The Now Claimant Barrister was listening to the phone call and after the call ended, the Barrister said I will need to think about still representing you as you called your Solicitors a lair. 2. Then the Now Claimant: - “Back Flipped In,” and said that he can prove that Miss Ward wrote the letter and she was denying this to be true by mistake and he continued by saying “how would anyone body else's feel, if she had lied about them?” and before the Barrister could say a word, the Now Claimant said he is not being: – “Played As The Fool,” while everyone is: - “Horse Around!” 3. The Now Claimants is Innocent 4. The Asbo Cads Are Frauded and Witness Statement and Police Officers Statements. 5. The Cads Time Stamp Go Backwards. 6. Police Officers Are the Only People We Can Question. 7. The Prosecutor Is Hiding the Files. 8. And The Prosecutor Is Still Somehow Wearing the Hat. 9. The Now Claimant Barrister then replied that if he were still going to represent the Now Claimant then there would need to be a meeting at the Now Claimant Barrister chambers, at this point the meeting concluded, as it had become a bit heated. 10. It was as if a: - “Penny or More Had Hit the Ground,” as the Barrister: - “Disappeared” and if we were to try and look for any of it: - “It wouldn’t be Found!” the Now Claimant and his mother knew that they had all, as, good as: - Skipped Away,” and before they addressed these issues: 11. Days before the Appeal hearing was due to start again, we were still no better prepared. 12. A while after and on the date of the **20/09/2016** the claimant mother received an email from the Now Claimants Solicitor, the mentioned email was also CC to the Court and the email requested for the acting Solicitor to try once again to be removed from the record this was typical behaviour of our litigation friends and came as no surprise to us, the Judge relisted the Court to be heard on the **21/09/2016** in respect of this email. There were large sections of this letter that were incorrect and did not happen so therefore are not true; the Court transcripts prove this as well from the **16/09/2016.**  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **The 1st Appeal Stage**  **13 Out of 20 of 20 Court dates the 6 of 13 appearance towards the 1st Asbo**  **At Wood Green Crown Court and the Judge s were: -** | | | **Date:** | 16/09/2016 | | **Defendants Name:** | Mr Simon Cordell | | **Case Handler:** | Ms **Sally Gilchrist** Legal Executive Director Met Police and she was Present! | | **Court House:** | Wood Green Crown Court | | **Reason:** | The 1st Appeal Stage / Mention Hearing | | **Case Number:** | A2015006 | | **Judge s Name:** | Lucas | | **Court Room:** | 4 | | **Contra’s Name:** | Robert Talalay | | **My Barrister Name:** | Mr. Andrew Locke | | **Note 1:** | (Mention Hearing) | | **Note 2:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Portrait** | | **Judge Name** | **Went To the Bar** | **Court** | **History** | |  | [A picture containing person, person  Description automatically generated](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Sadiq_Khan_2020.png) | **S** | **9** | L | 1. HHJ Noel Lucas QC is the first Resident Judge at Wood Green Crown Court to receive this title. 2. Her Majesty the Queen has appointed Noel Lucas QC of Red Lion Chambers as a Circuit Judge, on the advice of the Lord Chancellor. The Right Honourable the Lord Thomas of Camfield, Lord Chief Justice of England and Wales, deployed HH Judge Lucas QC to the South-eastern Circuit, based at Guildford Crown Court with effect from **08th of May 2014.** 3. The Bar Middle Temple called Noel Lucas QC in **1979.** 4. He joined Red Lion Chambers in **2006** and appointed Queen’s Counsel in **2008.** 5. His prior judicial appointments are as Assistant Recorder in **1999** and as a Recorder in **2000**.” 6. Also known as Noel John Mac Lucas 7. Good luck to former & distinguished 8. [@RedLionChambers](https://twitter.com/RedLionChambers) 9. [#barrister](https://twitter.com/hashtag/barrister?src=hashtag_click) [#silk](https://twitter.com/hashtag/silk?src=hashtag_click) HHJ Noel Lucas QC as starts his judicial career [http://judiciary.gov.uk/media/judicial-appointments-and-retirements/judicial-appointments/**2014/**appt-of-a-circuit-judge-lucas…](http://t.co/KZViULqM5w) 8:38 pm · **09th of May 2014·** | | **End** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | **Sally Gilchrist: - 02/09/2016** |
| * **Sally Gilchrist**   **Please See [EXHIBIT J37]**   1. **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   **Stage 1**  **1x Recording**  01m. first sally 02/09/2016  **Page Number:  Update Page Number**1,   1. [01m. 1st Sally - Asbo Case Handler Scotland Yard 02\_09\_2016.docx](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%201st%20Sally%20-%20Asbo%20Case%20Handler%20Scotland%20Yard%2002_09_2016.docx) 2. [01m. 1st Sally - Asbo Case Handler Scotland Yard 02\_09\_2016.htm](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%201st%20Sally%20-%20Asbo%20Case%20Handler%20Scotland%20Yard%2002_09_2016.htm) 3. [01m. 1st Sally - Asbo Case Handler Scotland Yard 02\_09\_2016.mp3](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%201st%20Sally%20-%20Asbo%20Case%20Handler%20Scotland%20Yard%2002_09_2016.mp3) 4. Sally Gilchrist, the Legal Director of Law, and Governance tells the Now Claimant that: - “His Dead,” down the phone and when he was explaining to her about the Fraud and displaced laws in and around the Asbo Bundles. 5. Sally Gilchrist, the Legal Director of Law, and Governance was at all Court Case and in control of the proceedings for the Enfield Council & Metropolitan Police Force and Neighborhood Watch Team 6. “Check red text or if not red ctrl F & search for dead in Html File then check the Audio MP3 file. 7. Also, if you type dead into my diary / **2016** year and use ctrl F & search you will see the transcribes of the neighborhood team and others telling me the same more than once in most conversations. 8. The Judge ordered Sally Gilchrist, the Legal Director of Law, and Governance to index the 1st Asbo Bundles halfway through the proceedings in the Magistrates Court and when she followed the judge’s orders it unravelled the More Fraud the Now Claimant was complain about to herself and others. 9. Sally Gilchrist, the Legal Director of Law, and Governance clearly understood that the victim’s did not sign their own statements and only the Police Officers did as she had to mark this information it into the schedule of index for the Asbo Bundles.   **Please See [EXHIBIT J37]**   1. up as on page 3 and 4 of the 1st Asbo Book.  * <https://www.horrificcorruption.com/1st-asbo-folder>  1. She indexed them all as Police Officers alone.   **Asbo Appel Stage Pages**   1. Sally Gilchrest is or was the Legal director of the United Kingdom’s Governance and Laws at the time of overseeing the Asbo application. 2. In the appeal stage of the Asbo and also, documented in the Court transcripts below Sally Gilchrest stated the following: - 3. It is a pity of course that none of the people whose sleep in particular “was disturbed” during this three-day or two-day event felt able to give evidence. 4. They all wanted anonymity. 5. They all refused to give evidence, but when one looks at the detail of the CADS it is quite plain that what was happening was causing distress to residents.  * <https://www.horrificcorruption.com/1st-asbo-2nd-folder> | | | |
|  | | | **From the Housing Transfer Files 15-08-2022 =39.9.1**  **Enfield Council** Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews: **18/09/2015**  **At Court; 21/09/2016** + **22/09/2016** |
| * **At Court**  1. We all know that in the Courtroom: - “There is No Stairs that Lead Upwards,” but the prosecutor somehow managed to: - “Walk Up Stairs That Was Not There,” so, the Now Claimant and his mother could not: - “See Him,” in the Court. 2. On the **21/09/2016** the Now Claimant and his mother were on their way to Court and: – “Like Performer’s,” the Court Clerk & Judge let: - “The Show Go on and: - “Without,” them.” 3. The traffic along the route to Court had stopped the Now Claimant and his mother from arriving at their destination the Court in time. 4. Stuck in the traffic, the Now Claimant and his mother contacted the Court to get a message to the Judge and it said: - “Sorry Were Going to Be Ten Minutes Late as Were Stuck in Traffic,” and they both knew that the Judge: - “Got-The-Message.” 5. When the Now Claimant and his mother got to the Court and through the: - “Hallway!” they had to wait outside of the Courtroom for a long time to see the: - “Judge.” 6. But while they were sitting down on the Courts chairs: - “Outside,” of the Courtroom waiting to be: - “called in,” and: - “A New Person,” just: - “Appeared,” **she** said: - “I’m a Barrister and I’m acting for Michael Carroll & Co,” 7. The Now Claimant and his mother, thought: - “It was like the Mr. Morris and the Mr. Locke, had: - “Crashed Into Each Other,” and right in the middle of: - “Nowhere,” as they found out this New Person was: - “a New Barrister,” and for the: - “Asbo Proceedings,” but as, thing went on they just: - “Got Worse.” 8. The New Barrister had approached the Now Claimant and his mother from the: – “Side,” and said: - “Michael Carroll Co Are Removed from The Record,” and that: - “Their Solicitor Firm Was Therefore No Longer Standing for The Now Claimant.” 9. “Amazed,” the Now Claimant and his mother were left: - “Siting in Shock.” 10. The Now Claimant picked up the: “Courage,” to ask the first question to the New Barrister and asked: - “How Could This Have Happened?” with his mother: - “Jumping In,” by saying: - “Considering, the Now Claimant was not present at Court?” And there was not a senior Partner from Michael Carroll and Co here. 11. The Now Claimant: - “Instantly,” knew all about what his mother was on about and: - “Straightened,” her words, by stating to the New Barrister that he was also, present in the Courtroom when: – “His Honour Judge Morrison said on the **19/02/2016**,” that this could not happen and the Now Claimant had also, read what: - “His Honour Judge Palak had wrote in his letter to his: - “Solicitor Firm” dated the **22/02/2016.**” 12. The New Barrister listened. 13. The Now Claimant mother said: - “The Judges Were the Ones Who Said,” what would happen to the Now Claimants Solicitor firm if they tried a similar Application again to get stuck of the record and what would happen to them if they tried again in regard to this not being allowed to: - “Happen,” but according to the New Barrister the Judges had just: - “Helped,” them: – “Get Away!” with it 14. What the Now Claimant and his mother were prior informed by the Judges had just: - “Been Stolen,” and by: - “The Judges Themselves,” according to the New Barrister. 15. Then, New Barrister said aloud the Judge wanted to see the Now Claimant and his mother, soon and they will call them both into Court soon, to then afterwards: - “Despair & Without a Chase.” 16. Left alone, the Now Claimant and his mother felt confused to find out that: - “The Asbo Case,” had been herd in their absinth and a New Barrister had: - “Come,” and then just: - “Gone.” 17. Right in front of the Now Claimant and his mother: - “Eyes,” the Frauded Asbo Application that the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police had: - “Created,” and with the Crown Prosecution Team and Judges having in their: - “Hands,” the Asbo application simply: - “Blow Up,” into a real: - “Frauded Crime Scene,” leaving no person: - “Available,” to report it to as the: - “New Barrister,” “Took Away” the “Solicitor Firm.” 18. Not even the New Barrister would wait with the Now Claimant and his mother when they asked **her** to, as **she** had: - “Vanished” and would not even: - “Stay,” to go into the Courtroom to see the Judge again. 19. At around 16:00 hours the Now Claimant and his mother walked into the Courtroom and without their: - “Then, New Barrister,” and as the Judge Lucas proceeded the Court to amerce the Now Claimant and his mother asked his honour: - “What He Had Done with Their Legal Representation?” 20. The Judge’s decision was of a person that had: - “Picked the Wrong Card from The Pack,” as he the Judge explained that the New Barrister that we had just: - “Outside,” the Courtroom had requested with disposing of the responsibility of acting for the Now Claimant in the Asbo application proceedings and he the then Judge Lucas had allowed for their application as accepted: - “By Order of the Law.” 21. The Now Claimants wanted to: - “Blow A Whistle,” at: - “Him,” by: - “Shout Out Aloud,” in the Courtroom, but he knew better and choose not to. 22. The Now Claimant and his mother still argued their case, but the Now Claimant knew it best to let his mother do the speaking as, she quoted, what the past Judges had stipulated and then she asked the Judge Lucas a question: - “Was Michael Carroll Present in The Court?” when he done this. 23. His Honour Judge Lucas: – looked at the Now Claimant’s mother and seemed to: - “Snicker,” as he: -“Admitted His Guilt,” and to all present in the Courtroom by saying, that he as, the Judge: - “Has Just Allowed Michael Carroll & Co, to: - “Strike Themselves Away,” from The: - “Courts Records,” and: - “No,” to the question of : - “Michael Carroll being Present!” when he as the Judge agreed to their: - “Application.” 24. The Now Claimant mother looked as if she had: - “Hit the Roof,” and then: - “Landed Back Down on The Floor Again,” to say: - “This is Wrong,” of his Honour to do this as he as, the Judge has: - “Admitted,” to allowing: - “Michael Carroll,” himself to: - “Escape,” when Michael was not present in any part of the Courthouse himself and then he as the Judge Lucas has stuck the company Michael Carroll & Co of the records for the Court to act for the Now Claimant in the Asbo Proceedings and when there is: – “Notes,” in the: - “Courts Asbo Files,” for him the Judge to: - “Read,” to make sure of his : - “Directions,” to make sure that this: - “Does Not Happen,” and would: - “Never be Permitted,” but his Honour Judge Lucas had already made the decision causing the: - “Error,” for Michael Carroll & Co to be able to: - “Escape,” by: - “Striking Them Away.” 25. His Honour Judge Lucas did make a reply by saying: - “That He Could Not Force A Solicitor To Continue With A Case They Clearly Did Not Want To Act For,” and then he: - “Escalated Up,” what he had done wrong by: - “Adding,” that the Now Claimant Could: - “Stand For Himself,” while continuing to state that; - “The Asbo Case Is In A Much Better Order Now,” but the Now Claimant and his mother knew he was: - “Manipulating the Truth” and as, good as: - “Rocking the Boat,” in the: - “Asbo Storm.” 26. The Now Claimant and his mother spoke to the Judge about the: - “Injustices,” throughout the Court pertaining to the Asbo Proceedings and the position that he his Honour Judge Lucas had just left the Now Claimant in and this part of the conversation brought up the: - ““Interrelating Side Issues with Members of his Neighbours due to Government Figures Trying to Avoid Justice,” which the Court were made: - “Well Aware Of Prior,” and in same conversation with the Judge, the Now Claimants mother also, mentioned another fact and that was: - “the Appeal was to take a place within a few days away from this date and now, the Now Claimant has got no legal Team in place again. 27. It is a questionable decision of his honours at the time of whether he conducted the laws that he takes a part in maintaining in an orderly manner that was correct in practise, as, the Judge’s Order, now, shows a direction of an incorrect process that immediately, needs to be investigate as verified due to the inconsistent evidence contained in the Asbo Bundles delivering: - “Fraud,” and due to failures around the adjudicating standards of the law to be upheld throughout the: - “Asbo Proceedings,” turning to a non. 28. As, when his Honour Judge Lucas was concluding his facts: - “Without,” the Now Claimant and his mother in the Court he should have shown the ability to conclude the facts: – “In a fair Way,” but he did not. 29. The Now Claimant and his mother applied for a: - “Legal Aid Representative,” in advance to act on the Now Claimant behalf rather than the Now Claimant have to act in law by himself and because of this what His Honour Judge Lucas done is: - “Dazzling,” and not to forget the reasons to why it is: - “Dazzling,” of His Honour Judge Lucas: 30. When contemplating over the remarked and taking a note of the case proceeding: it is easy to notice: the Asbo proceedings are of a complex nature in law. 31. The: - “Stress,” of a: - “Three-Day Court Trial,” being place upon the Now Claimant would be three-days: to: - “Long,” of a duration to prepare a fair defence 32. Judges are not 33. Members of the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police have 34. Members of the Crown Prosecution Teams pretend 35. And when elaborating even further “Interrelating Side Issues with Members of his Neighbours due to Government Figures Trying to Avoid Justice continue to happen. 36. Bringing along the Addition of the Mental Health Teams Doctors and staff implicating the Causing of 37. How he as the Judge Lucas could believe that it would be fair for any person to have to litigate for themselves in a Solicitor and Barristers’ Capacity is: – “Totally Absorbed.” 38. The Now Claimant and his mother did try to get the Judge to adjourn the Appeal hearing so, they could try and get representation put in place, but his honour disallowed the request and said that the Appeal hearing would go ahead no matter what and then his Honour relisted the Asbo appeal trial date to start on the **26/09/2016** and for three days. 39. The Judge functioned as if he: - “Blamed,” the Now Claimant for letting his solicitor: - “Get Away,” for what was ongoing in this case, when the Now Claimant and the Now Claimant mother had done all, they could, about the: - “Explosive Material,” in the: - “Frauded Asbo Bundles,” so for them to be able to: - “Disabled,” and before the Trial but the Judges ignored helping the Now Claimant and his mother in any way. 40. The Judge Lucas did not seem at all: - “Displeased,” with his decisions and left Now Claimant to get on with the case with his mother all on their own they both knew that the circumstances: - “Stunk.” 41. Once again, the Solicitors had: - “Come,” and then just: - “Gone,” and done nothing for the Asbo Case and the: - “Judge,” had took a part in making it all happen. 42. The Judge had made both the Now Claimant and his mother: - “walk away.” And without a: - “Solicitor Firm,” in place for the Asbo trial to start on the **26/09/2016.** 43. when the Judge said this could not happen and it seems as if everything that went wrong in the Court house the Judge blamed the Now Claimant for. 44. The Judge then noticed an: - “Inkling,” that would have a bearing on the trial date when he managed to work out that the Now Claimant and his mother had only got copies available to them of some of the pages in the 1st Asbo application and due to them only having the parts that found left scattered on the floor in the communal hallway of Burncroft Avenue. 45. The Judge Lucas may have worked this out because of what the Now Claimant and his mother had been saying to him, but they cannot be sure, how, but what they are sure of is that the Now Claimant had never been served because the Asbo Bundle was put in the police station Lost Property in the year of **2014** and now it is: - “Magically Gone,” and not even the: - “Metropolitan Police,” know where it is. 46. The Now Claimant and his mother looked at the prosecutor and he gave them a: - “Candy Pitch,” by saying: - “ARRRR, that’s correct I never noticed, and as, he spoke the: - “Cat Was Out the Bag,” and the Now Claimant and his mother realised it was their time to: - “Speak” as the Now Claimant was his own: - “Solicitor & Barrister.” 47. And Before the Now Claimant mother could: - “Get a word in Edge Ways,” the Now Claimant stood up proud and: - “Looked,” the: - “Prosecutor,” in the: - “Eyes,” and said to him: - “The Asbo Application Bundles pages were never paginated and since the year of **2014** and this was unfair as he was never served also, everything had been updated in the Asbo bundle they all had because of this and his only seen his solicitors copy in full and did not touch it, the Police statement are easy to see lies, and there is no Victims or witness or you would bring them to court so, I can question them, the also, time goes backwards in the Cads. 48. The Now Claimant and his mother spoke to the Judge by saying the Prosecutor has added included more statements from the police officer in charge of the case. 49. The Judge then made an order for the Prosecutor to finally give the Now Claimant and his mother a complete copy of the Asbo Bundles. 50. The Prosecutor then stated they had sent new Asbo Bundles to the acting Solicitors Michael Carroll and co three times since the being of **January 2016.** 51. The Now Claimant and his mother replied at the same time: - “they had never received any set of Asbo bundles since the Asbo case had started in **2014.** 52. The Now Claimants Solicitor firm never informed them about any new Asbo bundles sent and never gave them any new copy of any bundles and this meant that the Now Claimants Asbo bundle were different from the Asbo bundles that the Prosecution and Judge were using in the Courts. 53. The Now Claimant and his mother explained to the Judge about the lack of service of the Asbo application and had done so, on more than one occasion. 54. The Judges: - “Faecal,” expressions changed that then made it: - “Clear,” that he was not going to accept any: - “responsibility,” for any of the Asbo Proceedings. 55. The Judge: - “Quickly,” ordered the: - “Court Clerk,” to contact: - “Michael Carroll and Co Solicitors,” to bring the: - “Asbo Bundles to the Court at once.” 56. And the Court Clerk: - “Disappeared,” only to: - “Appear, again a couple of minutes later and he then he said to the Judge, that the Solicitors firm informed him the Clerk that the bundles were at Nexus Chambers. 57. The Judge made it look as if he was: - “Surprised,” again but the Now Claimant and his mother believed he was not. 58. The Now Claimant and his mother thought this might be the case that: - “The Files Were Not in Their Office,” but stayed: - “Quite.” 59. Then the Now Claimant's uncle: - “made the everyone present: - “Jump,” when he spoke from the back of the Courtroom by saying to the Judge: - “That he was willing to go to Nexus Chambers and pick up the Asbo bundles. |” 60. After a moment of silence, the Judge replied by: - “agreeing,” with the Now Claimants Uncle by remarking with the words of: - “That would Help,” the Judge then relisted the hearing for the **22/09/2016** and after 14:00 hours to make sure we were all working from them same set of Asbo Bundles. 61. Upon the Now Claimant's uncle: - “Agreeing to Defuse the Situation,” all hope: - “Was Not Lost.” 62. The curtains then as good as, closed, on the Courts proceedings as the Judge: - “Spun Around,” to then: - “Disappear.” 63. The Now Claimant's uncle collected the files latter the same day and once The Now Claimant and his mother got their: - “Hands-on-to-them,” they knew for things still not to be complete as, they only had a part of the Asbo applications: - “Skeleton Bundle,” induced.  * **At Court on the 22 September 2016**  1. The **22 September 2016** was the second day that the Judge had book in the Court’s diary for the Now clamant to attend Court and on this day, we attended in a suitable time. 2. The Judge was informed by the Now Claimant and his mother that they 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 a copy of the complete Asbo bundles for the proceedings and the Judge ordered again for the bundles to be brought to Court before 4 PM by the firm. 3. The Now Claimant's mother stated that it would be easier and faster for her to pick the complete Asbo bundles up from the Solicitors on the way home from Court, the Judge asked if she were sure, and she agreed it would be all right. 4. When the Now Claimant's mother and he left the Court they both hurried towards the Solicitor firm location with due diligence for safety. 5. A telephone call to the Solicitor firm happened to inform them of the ongoings as the office was to close soon but instead the person, they spoke to told them both that the office would be closed by the time they got there so, the Now Claimant mother agreed to pick the bundles up first thing in the morning on **23 September 2016** and this is what happened.  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **The 1st Appeal Stage**  **14 Out of 20 of 20 Court dates the 7 of 13 appearance towards the 1st Asbo**  **At Wood Green Crown Court and the Judge s were: -** | | | **Date:** | 21/09/2016 + 22/09/2016 | | **Defendants Name:** | Mr Simon Cordell | | **Court House:** | Wood Green Crown Court | | **Reason:** | The 1st Appeal Stage / Mention Hearing | | **Case Number:** | A2015006 | | **Judge s Name:** | HHJ Pawlak | | **Court Room:** | 3 | | **Contra’s Name:** | Robert Talalay | | **My Barrister Name:** | Mr. Andrew Locke | | **Note 1:** | (Mention Hearing) | | **Note 2:** | Ms Sally Gilchrist Legal Executive Director Met Police was Present! | | | | |
|  | | | **From the From the Housing Transfer Files 15-08-2022 =39.9.1**  **Enfield Council** Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews: **21/09/2015**  **Collecting the Court Bundles from Michael Carroll's Office;** **23/09/2016**  **From the From the Housing Transfer Files 15-08-2022 =39.9.1**  **Enfield Council** Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews: **23/09/2015** |
| * **Collecting the Court Bundles from Michael Carroll's Office**  1. On **23-09-2016** The Now Claimant mother left home early in the morning: - “Not to Get Stuck in The Traffic,” as she was on her way to Michael Carroll's office to collect the Asbo bundles but this time she took her brother, Mr A Cordell. 2. Once they both arrived at the building on time, they went into the office together to collect the Asbo bundles. 3. When a Solicitor came down the stairs, he had a receipt that the Now Claimant mother needed to sign, this receipt was a Release and Waiver of Liability of (Property) which stated: - “That the Asbo Bundles Had Been Collected from The Office” that she then signed. 4. Upon getting home and looking at the Asbo bundles, 5. The Now Claimant mother and both noticed that the file had increased in size, and this caused them concern and they took it upon themselves to do an investigation of the Asbo files once again and as expected from a bunch of the word’s dumbest criminals “thirteen new fabricated statements existed when we were already screaming aloud fraud.  * **From the Housing Transfer Files 15-08-2022 =39.9.1**  1. The Enfield Council put in the date of the **23/09/2016** first to cover up the frauded Asbo then to cover up this fact as well: - Because my mother had also been contacting Dawn Allen for months prior and without any reply back or update in Debra Andrews Mental Health Records or Enfield Council History even aloe, she was a substantial risk and had her children taken away from her. 2. The Now Claimant and The Now Claimant mother had never seen these documents before and continued their investigation and the listed below is a couple of the found results. 3. We knew that in the first bundle there were only four public witness statements and there now seems to be sixteen. 4. 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 four contained in the past Asbo bundles folders minus one. 5. The above shows that each member of the public's statements is Police Officers only and the Now Claimant and his mother can prove this because the victim statements only have Police Officers’ signatures on them. 6. Each police officer has signed their signatures on two different statements each, in a pretence of portraying to own two houses each in Edmonton N9 Gardens that is the surrounding road to Progress way. 7. The Police Officers are claiming to be victims of this case in unusual ways while on active duty as they also made the first emergency 999 phone call in CAD 1047. 8. When the Now Claimant noticed the additional documentation withinside of the Asbo Bundles he decided to go to the contact the Edmonton police stations lost property room, so too for him to arrange collection of the original bundle, which failed service to him 9. Once the Now Claimant arrived at the Edmonton police station, he handed the officer a copy of the receipt   **Please See [EXHIBIT J37]**   1. to the officer deployed in the station and requested the Asbo folder, he went in search of the lost property. After time, the officer reappeared and said that is strange the property room manager could not find the Asbo application and tried to question if the Now Claimant had forged the receipt the Now Claimant felt insulted and held the receipt up in the air and showed him the watermarked paper and police stamp present in the document. The officer said his lost for words but also, quoted “it must have been misplaced.” The Now Claimant knew he meant stolen and left the police station. 2. The lost property if found would clearly shows that there was only ever four potential members of the publics witness statements attached within side of the original Asbo application so, the Now Claimant made telephone calls to the police to aid in them finding the files. These telephone calls we present as: -   **Please See [EXHIBIT J37]**   1. These telephone calls prove funnily enough that the commissioner Sir Bernard Hogan Howe was aware of the ongoings to do with the Asbo application yet again.  * **Caught More than Three Times**  1. Sir Bernard Hogan Howe name is in the Asbo application as the person to whom authorised the app. 2. He understood about Crown Road as he had meeting about the place as printed in the newspapers 3. The x commissioner Sir Bernard Hogan Howe used his voice to change the greeting message when you first call the 999-emergency telephone line to stop the Now Claimant from being able to complain about lost property unless he went to the police station again himself. 4. Upon looking at The Now Claimant's bundles the documentation withinside of the files where not indexed or updated since **2015,** so all the new documents that we sent as induced to The Now Claimant's bundle our Solicitor did not file when they should have been. 5. Though the case history multiple documents had been handed to the Court and those documents did not get patronised correctly or indexed into The Now Claimant's bundles, this includes the Court and the Respondent bundles that they were using also, so, over the days leading up to this, The Now Claimant 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 were always problems at Court due to this not being completed correctly. 6. We spent a whole weekend trying to add missing documents to the Now Claimant's bundle and making copies so that on the Court date of the **26/09/2016;** the Judge would have the missing files we could work out in the time given. 7. The Now Claimant mother also spent part of the weekend writing a letter to the Judge in regards to what had gone on with the breaches in The Now Claimant'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 were always being raised when at Court and the reason as to why legal aid had been granted: 8. Due to the complexity of the case: - 9. Due to The Now Claimant's learning difficulties: - 10. Due to the concerns of The Now Claimant health. 11. A 12. This letter we emailed to the Court and asked for it to given to the Judge. 13. Please see letter that we emailed to the Judge: -  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Portrait** | | **Judge Name** | **Went To the Bar** | **Court** | **History** | |  | [A person in a uniform  Description automatically generated with medium confidence](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Boris_Johnson_July_2015.jpg) | **Commissioner**  **Sir Bernard Hogan Howe**  **Met Police** | **4** | (Magistrates’ courts | 1. M | | **End** | | | | | |   **Please See [EXHIBIT J37]**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Caught More than Three Times**  **Sir Bernard Hogan Howe** | | | **Inside of the Asbo** |  |   **Please See [EXHIBIT J37]**   |  | | --- | | **Caught More Than Three Times**  **Sir Bernard Hogan Howe**  **This Proves That the Enfield Council Had Control of The Old Man Building**  **&**  **Sir Bernard Hogan Howe Knew About Crown Road and Went to A Meeting About the Building** | | * **My 1st Asbo Response Bundle/ pub Book Issue: one!**   MEDIA ARTICLES RE COMPLAINTS AT CROWN  ROAD**/**  **Page Numbers:** 297,298,299,300,301,302  **Enfield INDEPENDENT**  **Enfield Neighbours' anger over 15-hour rave in Southbury Road**  Charlie Peat / Friday 25April **2014** / News  Follow @ Enfield Andy Chaz   1. Ravers took over abandoned business building for more than 15 hours, 2. The former HAN building in Crown Road, on the junction with Southbury Road, was the venue for an illegal party that began on Saturday night. 3. According to residents in Anglesey Road, adjacent to crown road, the loud noise and disturbance continued until 3pm the next day. 4. One resident, who wanted to remain anonymous, said that the 15-hour rave was "ridiculously loud/' 5. He said: "It was so loud the whole house was shaking like an earthquake was happening. There are no clubs or bars near us, so this was quite a shock. We understand that sometimes it could be loud late at night but for it to continue until 3pm the next day Is not right. "I walked along to check out what was going on, it was ridiculously loud. Things were getting smashed up in the building and people were spray painting everywhere." Police say they attended late on Saturday evening and returned the following day and music was still “Being Played.” 6. **TOTAL POLICING COME AND TALK TO THE COMMISSIONER WHAT WOULD YOU ASK?** We are inviting you to meet the: - 7. “Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police Service. Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe.” 8. **DATE:** Wednesday 14th October **2015** TIME: **6.30pm -7.30pm** 9. (Doors open at 6.00pm for refreshments! LOCATION: Aylward Academy, Windmill Road.   **298,**  10/9/**2015**  **Enfield INDEPENDENT**  **Rave in disused office went on for 15 hours (From Enfield Independent) experience.**   1. Kate Laird, also of: —**Anglesey Road**,” said: “We are furious that nothing was done at the time” I have children and we could not sleep all night. one of our neighbors saw police show up but they did not do anything.”   **299,**  09/09/**2014**  **Enfield INDEPENDENT**  **The Man Building, Enfield, wrecked by graffiti**  Anna Slater, Chief Reporter - north London / Tuesday 9 September **2014**/ News  Follow @AnnaTimesSeries 1,663 followers   1. Listed building ’wrecked' by graffiti (From Enfield Independent) 2. Vandals have “completely wrecked” an abandoned building by painting graffiti on the front and squatting inside. 3. The NAN building, in Crown Road, at the junction with Southbury Road, Enfield, has also “been used” for illegal raves and parties in the last few months. 4. Formerly used as a car factory, the Grade II listed building closed more than a year ago and: - **“Enfield Borough Council** **is now looking for a new owner.”** 5. David Cockle, the chairperson of the Enfield Society, has “been left” concerned about the way the building has fallen into disrepair. 6. He said: ‘It once was a genuinely nice, manicured garden – “but now it has just been completely wrecked.” It is a huge shame. 7. “I recently discovered that squatters have been on site, and it is in a deplorable state, it does not give a good impression to people visiting the area for the first time. 8. “It’s such a high-profile site and one we should be proud of, but now it just looks awful.1’ 9. Earlier this year, people in nearby Anglesey Road, said their houses were “shaking like an 10. The party included loud music and continued until 3pm the next afternoon - a total of 15 hours. 11. Graffiti tags have now “been emblazoned on the front of the building, which has been boarded up.” 12. Mr. \*\*\*\* added: “For a listed building to be left like that, it is terrible.” 13. “The plants and shrubs have overgrown - it is sad to see it so run down. 14. “It used to be such an attractive building. 1M 15. The Enfield Independent is awaiting comment from Enfield Borough Council   **302**  “Na Page” |   **Please See [EXHIBIT J37]**   |  | | --- | | **Caught More Than Three Times**  **Sir Bernard Hogan Howe** | | 1. The police and Enfield Council never indexed the Original Asbo Folder, or page numbered it before they left outside of the Now Claimants front door on the date: **12/09/2014**  * **The 2nd Asbo Folder**   PC Sophie Theodoulou Police Officer Who Lied and said that she Served me the First Asbo Folder!  **Date: 12/09/2014 “Look in the Diary!”**  **Page Numbers.**  57,58  **-**   1. My mother collected the folder from outside near to where the police officers had left it laying the day before and then she took the files home and photocopied them as the police and council addressed them to me her son, she then brought the files to the Edmonton police station to which the police had also, addressed them to. 2. Once at the Police station she got a receipt from the lost property department and my mother signed it as property of Mr. S. Cordell found in a public place. 3. This receipt is on page **301,302,303** of the 1st Asbo flipbook. Ps click the page numbers at the bottom of the flipbook and type page number when looking! 4. I also tried to make phone calls to the police about this but Sir Bernard Hogan-Howe changed the intro audio to say they no longer take calls about the property room, I have before and after phone calls that prove this with his voice, he knew I would not want to go to the station with what they were all doing to me.  * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   **Stage 1**  **1x Recording**  01m. 7TH Sir Bernard Hogan- Howe Commissioner of Police audio Recording no property room bit 1 OF 2 – 12/02/2017  **Page Number:  Update Page Number**1,  **12/02/2017**   * [01m. 7TH Sir Bernard Hogan- Howe Commissioner of  Police audio Recording no property room bit 1 OF 2 – 12/02/2017.mp3](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%207TH%20Sir%20Bernard%20Hogan-%20Howe%20Commissioner%20of%20Police%20audio%20Recording%20no%20property%20room%20bit%201%20OF%202%20-%2012_02_2017.mp3) * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   **Stage 1**  **1x Recording**  01m. seventh police CALL Sir Hogan audio Recording no property room bit 2 OF 2 **12/02/2017**  **Page Number:  Update Page Number**1,  **12/02/2017**   * [01m. seventh police CALL Sir Bernard Hogan - Howe Commissioner of  Police audio Recording no property room bit 2 OF 2 – 12/02/2017.mp3](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%207TH%20police%20CALL%20Sir%20Bernard%20Hogan%20-%20Howe%20Commissioner%20of%20Police%20audio%20Recording%20no%20property%20room%20bit%202%20OF%202%20-%2012_02_2017.mp3)  1. The Now Claimant tried to collect the Asbo folder afterwards, but the police told him it has gone missing from the Edmonton Police Station Property Room. 2. The Now Claimant found this to be horrific News as he understood that Edmonton Police officers had already had issues with their property room such as police officers burning it down to cover up their crimes and that also, of another investigation against police who worked at the station selling the publics property to each other. 3. The Now Claimant and his mother worked from her photocopies for months at the courts while the prosecution and judge worked from a new paged Asbo folder right up until the Judge told us what was going on. 4. Documented below.   **News Links**   * <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/>   **Link**   * [https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/4681739/Nine-Metropolitan-police- officers-suspended-over-alleged-property-racket.html](https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/4681739/Nine-Metropolitan-police-officers-suspended-over-alleged-property-racket.html) * **Nine Metropolitan police officers suspended over alleged property racket**  1. “Nine Metropolitan police officers have been suspended in connection with an alleged stolen property racket.” 2. By Richard Edwards, Crime Correspondent **17th of February 2009** • 8:47pm 3. Anti-corruption officers swooped on Edmonton police station in north London yesterday, turning it into a crime scene, following an operation lasting week. 4. Those under investigation are Pcs attached to the local crime squad. Two more police officers are also, placed on restricted duties. 5. The investigation concerns the alleged taking of items from the property stores at the station - which hold items such as iPods recovered from robbers. 6. “Listening probes and secret cameras are to have been set up at the station to try and catch suspect officers. 7. “The operation follows the recent jailing of a female civilian property officer at Edmonton who was caught setting fire to records.” 8. The Met said there were no arrests. 9. A spokesperson said: "Nine officers were today suspended and two also put on restricted duties following a pro-active investigation by the anti-corruption team. 10. "The investigation centres on the alleged mishandling of property. All the officers are based on Enfield borough. There have been no arrests and inquiries continue." 11. The spokesperson added: The Metropolitan Police demands the highest levels of honesty and integrity from its officers and staff. 12. “All allegations of malpractice are taken extremely seriously and are investigated swiftly and thoroughly.” 13. "This investigation will not affect day-to-day policing in the area."   **Link**   * [https://www.standard.co.uk/hp/front/entire-crime-squad- is-investigated-for-corruption-6831591.html](https://www.standard.co.uk/hp/front/entire-crime-squad-is-investigated-for-corruption-6831591.html)   **Link**   * <https://www.express.co.uk/news/uk/337612/Shamed-police-row> | | | | |
|  | | | **At the Court on; 26/09/2016** |
| * **At the Court**  1. The **26 September 2016** was the “Day-of-the-Three-Day-Appeal-Hearing”, and the Now Claimant mother did not want him to attend Court due to “**Interrelating Side Issues with Members of his Neighbours due to Government Figures Trying to Avoid Justice.**” Meaning that the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police inclusive of the NHS had allowed their members and members of his Neighbours to attack him for a long duration of time and when they first incited the problems and executed causing them by still inspiring evil wrongdoings. 2. There is also the fact that the Now Claimant had not yet found a litigation friend to act on his behalf so, his mother was very worried and for another fact that the whole Asbo Application stunk of Corruption as did the Court proceedings. 3. Instead, a Mr A Cordell the brother of a Ms L Cordell attended the Court to speak to the Judge. When the Judge entered the Courtroom, he stated that he had received a letter of the Now Claimants mother addressed to himself and continued by saying that he felt the Asbo application and its proceedings will go to judicial review, His Honours last remarks were that he had three options: 4. One being: - Continue with the Appeal in the hope that The Now Claimant would turn up the following day. 5. Two: - To Dismiss the Appeal: - 6. Three: - Adjourn the Appeal to a new date. 7. 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. 8. The Judge decided to adjourn the case until the **16/01/2017;** the Judge latter substituted the date to the **17/01/2017.** 9. The Respondent object to the Appeal adjournment but his honour had made the decision already. 10. The Judge said that the Now Claimants mother should try to find a new Solicitor to take on the Appeal for her son and that he would help by making sure that legal aid was in place. 11. The Judge asked why The Now Claimant was not in Court and The Now Claimant mother said The Now Claimant had become so unwell due to what was going on in this case and that he was not coping. 12. Information was also, passed to the Judge that showed The Now Claimant was unwell. 13. Mentioned in Court; was also the missing documents that was missing from The Now Claimant's bundle and that there were no statements within the Response bundle, 14. The Now Claimants mother stated to the Judge that she had spent the weekend trying to update The Now Claimant's bundle and made sure that she indexed them correctly. 15. The Now Claimant mother handed the documents in to the Court that she was able to get ready the Now Claimant mother also stated that she knew there was still documents missing from the Now Claimant's Response Bundle, she also explained that she was not sure about what files these were because of the shortage in time she had to view the associated files. 16. The Judge continued to listen as the Now Claimant mother talked to him and the Judge noted her remarks down as she went on to say: - “that there were around thirteen statements the Solicitor firm had never submitted in the past that she worked out and that she had now contained them within the Respondent bundle and that the files dated prior to the Magistrate's trial.” 17. The Judge was very unhappy to hear this information and then he requested to see a copy of the documentation so, the claimants mother advised him to pass her down his honours copy and she can compare the bundles, upon looking into the Judge 's Asbo bundle, the Now Claimants mother noticed files that were not there and that it was easy for her to see that his honours Asbo bundle had not been updated since the year of **2015,** startled looked the Judge but this trick did not full the Now Claimants mum. 18. The Now Claimant mother passed the Judge 's bundle back up to the Judge and while she explained to him that his copy of the Asbo Bundle is not up to date. 19. At this the Prosecution said they would make new copies of the bundles and have copies sent to us and the Judge. 20. The Judge was very unhappy, and the Judge said he is not dropping this and would not allow this to happen, and the Judge again made the Clerk of the Court make a phone call to Michael Carroll and co, to order them to attend Court on the **14/10/2016,** in regard to the missing documents. 21. The Now Claimant Mother stated she would try and add the missing documents as she could but was unsure of what documents were missing, the reason being as so much had been handed to the Court and Solicitors. 22. The Now Claimant mother asked the Judge if the Now Claimant would need to attend Court on the **14/10/2016,** as the hearing was due to only be regards to the missing documents, The Now Claimant mother felt The Now Claimant did not need to be there the Judge agreed to this.  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **The 1st Appeal Stage**  **15 Out of 20 of 20 Court dates the 8 of 13 appearance towards the 1st Asbo**  **At Wood Green Crown Court and the Judge s were: -** | | | **Date:** | 26/09/2016 | | **Defendants Name:** | Mr Simon Cordell | | **Case Handler:** | Ms Sally Gilchrist Legal Executive Director Met Police and she was Present! | | **Court House:** | Wood Green Crown Court | | **Reason:** | The 1st Appeal Stage / Mention Hearing | | **Case Number:** | A2015006 | | **Judge s Name:** | HHJ Pawlak | | **Court Room:** | 2 | | **Contra’s Name:** | Robert Talalay | | **My Barrister Name:** | Mr. Andrew Locke | | **Note 1:** | (Mention Hearing) | | **Note 2:** |  |   **Please See [EXHIBIT J37]**   * **The Response Folder = Asbo R** / **Letter to Judge**   **Email Dated;** 26/09/2016  Letter To Judge**/**  **Page Numbers:** 431,432,433  **--**   1. As we made the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and the Crown Prosecution Team aware at the mention hearing on the **22/09/2016** there is inaccurate data police hold in my sons Simon Cordell PNC record, there are also, errors in police officer’s statements regarding my character within the Respondent case. 2. I was genuinely concerned that a court has once again been able to see this inaccurate information and when made aware of the errors did nothing to rectify them. 3. I called a helpline on the **23/09/2016** and explained about the inconsistencies on my PNC and the errors in the police officers’ statements the ICO informed me that I could address this matter while the judge was still hearing the case and was also, told to put a form of concern into the ICO. 4. I have now done this and believe I need to make you aware. 5. I believe the police and council have diminished my son’s reputation in the court and previously in the Magistrate’s Court and am under the assumption this is a beach of my son’s human rights, am I correct in my assumption? 6. “My son when this case started legal aid refused legal aid; the judge sitting at the lower court overturned their decision due to these facts. 7. The importance of what is at stake, the complexity of the case, the capacity to represent himself effectively.” 8. “On the **21/09/2016** when you removed my son’s solicitor from record the protection above was revoked, you are aware my son cannot read and write effectively to deal with this trial.” 9. “At this stage I would also like to draw your attention to your letter that was dated **22/02/2016** and section 4.” 10. The Court will not and does not accede to any application for the Appellants Solicitors to come off the record or to cease acting for the Appellant, His Honour Judge Morrison dismissed such an application on the **19th of February 2016.** 11. “If any attempt is made to repeat this application the Court will require it to be made in person by the Senior Partner of Michael Carroll & Co” 12. On His Honour Judge Morrison dismissing the solicitors who was acting for my son and not allowing the Now Claimant to replace them breached his Human Right and the Right to a fair and speedy trial. 13. Guide on Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights Effectiveness of the legal aid granted: 14. The State is not accountable for the actions of an officially appointed lawyer. 15. It follows from the independence of the legal profession from the State ***(Staroszczyk v. Poland, 133),*** that the conduct of the defence is a matter between the defendant and his counsel, whether legal aid appointed the council under a legal aid scheme or privately financed. 16. The conduct of the defence as such cannot, other than in exceptional circumstances, incur the State's liability under the Convention ***(Tuzinski v. Poland (Dec.)*** 17. However, assigning a lawyer to represent a party does not in itself guarantee effective assistance ***(Sialkowska v. Poland, 110 and 116).*** 18. “The lawyer appointed for legal aid purposes may be prevented for a protracted period from acting or may shirk his duties.” 19. If persons notify the national authorities of this situation, the competent national authorities must replace the lawyer; and if they should fail to do so, the defendant will suffer from deprivation of an effective assistance in legal practice, despite the provision of free legal aid ***(Bertuzzf v. France, 30).*** 20. It is above all the responsibility of the State to ensure the requisite balance between the effective enjoyment of access to justice on the one hand and the independence of the legal profession on the other. 21. The Court has clearly stressed that any refusal by a legal aid lawyer to act must meet certain quality requirements and if those requirements are not met where the shortcomings in the legal aid system deprive individuals of the "practical and effective" access to a court to which they are entitled ***(Staroszczyk v. Poland, § 135; Sialkowska v. Poland,*** ***114 - violation).*** 22. I am no lawyer myself and I am trying to go through the human rights act which is an exceptionally long document and extremely difficult to understand. 23. “You were also aware my son and I have been working from older bundles and ordered the solicitors who were acting for my son before they were removed from record on the **21/09/2016** by your honour to pass the correct bundles to us.” 24. “Upon seeing these bundles, it has come to light that there are statements we have never seen before this date and never have seen them before the trial of the lower court.” 25. I am not sure if the extra police and additional fake victim statements, if police added them into the Asbo Bundles after the last trial when we applied for the appeal or if my son’s last solicitor had these statements given to them by the police beforehand and she never give them to us. 26. “I do know they are dated before the last trial took place.” 27. How was my son ever meant to have a fair trial without having and seeing all the documents within the case against him? 28. Upon also looking at my son’s own bundle the barristers were using for this Appeal there were many documents missing from this bundle that I have had to take time to update this bundle to the correct version with all statements included as there were no statements in there and other documents, it was not even indexed, how was the barrister even meant to have dealt with this Appeal with so many documents missing. 29. “The police have targeted my son and family for years mostly being Simon Cordell, and I believe they have pursued a malicious prosecution against him also trying to include his brother’s name in this case, this can be proven.” 30. The Magistrates court hearsay rules **1999** do not apply to the crown court. 31. The defence do not accept that the Respondent has relied on the correct legislation to apply under the hearsay rules. 32. In any event the Appellant requests that the Respondent call the witnesses who made CAD entries for cross examination. 33. It is neither professionally appropriate nor suitable for the Appellant to call police officers and question their credibility, as proposed by the Respondent through their application under the Magistrates Court Hearsay Rules. 34. “The Appellant submits that questioning the credibility of one’s own witnesses would not be permitted by the court.” 35. “The Respondent has put forward no good reason for why these witnesses cannot be called.” 36. As to say it is not in the interests of justice to do so. 37. Burden of proof and standard of proof are set high in this appeal case and any Judge must be satisfied beyond reasonable doubt that the respondent case they have proved to the criminal standards in every aspect. 38. I do not feel the Respondent application bundles could ever prove beyond reasonable doubt that the Appellant my son was concerned in the organisation of illegal raves / provided sound equipment for illegal raves. 39. The Appellant and his mother inclusive of legal teams are still not sure what offence the Appellant is meant to be defending himself from in this Asbo case and we have asked the Judges this question more than a couple of times and without us receiving any fair reply. 40. Even the Respondent skeleton argument bundle has had the word illegal removed from its case, but the police and council using the definition of the word illegal in the first Asbo application everyone can clearly see still in the original Asbo bundle. 41. The inaccurate data that is within the Respondent original application namely my son’s PNC and statements of police which is relied on in the Respondent original application bundle, the large concern that the Respondent has refused to unedited the CAD’s and intelligence reports they rely on in their original application bundle, why there was a need to update original intelligence reports, why no CAD reports was included for the 6th June **2014** in the original application, why there are so many missing CAD’s, why the police refuse to admit in the lower court that CAD’s they had in their original application bundle clearly relates to an illegal rave in Crown Road and CAD’s from that have been placed in the Respondent original application bundle. 42. (Please see freedom of information request to Enfield council in the Appellants bundle **page** 274 to 284 which clearly shows this) why they refuse to disclose information held on the police public order unit Scotland Yard systems and why Steven Elsmore did not ask DS Val Tanner from the police public order unit in Scotland Yard to write a statement after he spoke to her why Steven Elsmore deleted emails that was sent to DS Val Tanner and received from DS Yale Tanner and he only felt the need to do an updated statement dated **26/06/2015** in regard to this what did he ask DS Val Tanner and what was he told? 43. Why a statement was never asked from, from DS Chapman of the public order unit Scotland Yard who when he spoke to Miss Lorraine Cordell on the phone checked their system and told Miss Lorraine Cordell that Mr Simon Cordell name was only listed on their systems once and that was the day he was arrested on the **19th July 2014,** so how Steve Elsmore can put in his updated statement that the public Order Unit hold no information about Mr Simon Cordell and Enfield is beyond me. 44. In a letter you the judge wrote on the **22/02/2016** you asked the Respondent in section 5 (Please see below) “Why there are no pocketbooks of any police officers in the Respondent original Asbo application Bundle,” but the Judge never addressed these issues and we have never received this information from the Respondent. 45. *"51* The Respondent is to serve by the **04th of April 2016** a hearsay notice identifying by reference to pages of Bundle R what hearsay it wishes to rely on and why it should be admitted in evidence" 46. The abuse of process is a great concern in regarding the Appellant’s right to a fair trial. 47. The evidence brought against the Appellant are not credible enough to prove the Respondent’s application beyond reasonable doubt. 48. Prosecution’s failure to prove the Respondent’s application will entitle him an acquittal from Respondent’s application. 49. At this stage I ask Your Honour to discharge acquit this Appeal case for an anti-social behaviour order (ASBO) in favour of the Appellant Mr Simon Cordell, and if this cannot be done the case be adjourned until matters in this letter are addressed and the Appellant Mr Simon Cordell can have a fair trial, but the conditions he is on for this ASBO removed.   Yours Sincerely  Ms Lorraine Cordell | | | |
|  | | | **No Solicitor at Court;** **14/10/2016** |
| * **No Solicitor at Court**  1. On the **14 October 2016** Mr A Cordell and the Now Claimant's mother attended Court on this date, the Solicitors did not turn up. 2. The Now Claimant mother had a list of documents that she had made up and indexed that needed to be added to the Now Claimant's bundle's, which she passed to the Judge, she also, stated to the Judge that she could not be sure if there were still documents missing and that she had tried to call Miss Ward and had no reply. 3. The Judge was terribly upset that the Solicitors had not turned up; the Judge asked the Court Clerk to email Michael Carroll and co and when doing so, tell them that they had to be in Court on the **19/10/2016** or they would have his honour to face. 4. The Claimants mother also stated to the Judge that she had made many phone calls to other Solicitors and due to the case being at the Appeal stage no one was willing to take the Appeal on due to the cost they would get under legal aid, in more detail it was explained that legal aid is a set amount and continued to explain that the Solicitors dealing with the Appeal should be the same Solicitors that dealt with the original trial, because Appeals are set at a standard rate, so any Solicitor taking on a case would not get paid to go over the complete bundles and to take updated instructions from the client. 5. Again, the Now Claimant mother asked the Judge if The Now Claimant needed to attend Court on the next date, to which the Judge replied no to.  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **The 1st Appeal Stage**  **16 Out of 20 of 20 Court dates the 9 of 13 appearance towards the 1st Asbo**  **At Wood Green Crown Court and the Judge s were: -** | | | **Date:** | 14/10/2016 | | **Defendants Name:** | Mr Simon Cordell | | **Court House:** | Wood Green Crown Court | | **Reason:** | The 1st Appeal Stage / Mention Hearing | | **Case Number:** | A2015006 | | **Judge s Name:** | HHJ Pawlak | | **Court Room:** | 10 | | **Contra’s Name:** | Robert Talalay | | **My Barrister Name:** | Mr. Andrew Locke | | **Note 1:** | (Mention Hearing) | | **Note 2:** | Ms Sally Gilchrist Legal Executive Director Met Police was Present! |  1. The Email below is long in length.   **Please See [EXHIBIT J37]**   * **My 1st Asbo Response Bundle/ pub Book Issue: one!**   ISSUES OF CONCERN Letter to Judge**/**  **Page Numbers:** 434,435,436,437,438,439,  440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448,  459, 450,451,452,453,454,455,456,457,458.  459,460,461,462,463,  **Email, Date;** 14/10/2016  --  **434**   |  | | --- | | **Address:** 109 Burncroft Avenue  **Dated:** 14/10/**2016**  Enfield London  EN3 7JQ | | To whom it may concern  **Issues Of Concern:**   1. Local Authorities and Metropolitan Police Consultation that was in Regard to the Applicant 2. On the **13th of August 2014,** the local authority and the police held a consultation meeting in regard to the Appellant and reached a decision to be took in the matter of the Appellant, the issuing of a stand-alone Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) order for what they would place upon the Appellant Statue of Liberties. 3. An anti-social behaviour order (ASBO) **(2003)** is / was a civil order made in the United Kingdom against a person who the police or Council, victims and/or witness have shown, on the balance of evidence, to have engaged in anti-social behaviour. 4. Tony Blair introduced the order in **1998** with the legal framework and protocols to create a successful Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) application. 5. Within an Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) guidance it states the pursuant should considered Voluntary solutions and other remedies, prior to the multi-agency working together in Co-Hurst at a statutory conference, regarding any application. 6. Any of the following voluntary solutions and alternative remedies the police and council should have considered and then implemented, prior to them applying for an Antisocial Behaviour Order but they did not consider or apply any of the following: 7. Mediation: - 8. Verbal and written warnings from the relevant authorities including Police: - 9. Support Packages: - 10. Diversionary schemes and activities: - 11. Rehabilitation programs: - 12. Criminal investigation: - 13. The above list we have not exhausted to its limits. 14. At no point of time has the police or council given the applicant any of the above listed opportunities, neither have they asked him to attend any official meetings prior to this Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) application and this should have been the opportunity for them to talk to him about a pre-warning or other actions that could have taken place. 15. Please also take note to page number 15 (taking a strategic approach) which clearly states: “The more serious the behaviour, the greater the likelihood that the court will grant a geographically wide order, order’s that seek to operate in the whole of England and Wales will not be granted without evidence to the actual or potential geographical extent of the problem. 16. The Government give further detail about effective prohibitions in Chapter 7.” 17. For the applicant legally to have any conditions imposed, of such a wide scale of areas without correct proof to that extent, is another breach of applicant’s Human Rights. 18. The Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) that the Judge granted in the lower court upon the applicant they wrongly executed for the whole of the UK.   **Section 63 Of the Criminal Justice (Raves) Bill and Related Act: -**   1. The Criminal Justice and Public Order Act **1994** is an amendment to the Raves Bill and states the following: - **Section 63 Powers to remove persons attending or preparing for a rave.** 2. This section applies to a gathering on land in the open air of 20 or more persons (whether or not trespassers) at which amplified music is played during the night (with or without intermissions) and is such as, by reason of its loudness and duration and the time at which it is played, is likely to cause serious distress to the inhabitants of the locality; and for this purpose: - 3. Such a gathering continues during intermissions in the music and, where the gathering extends over days, throughout the period during which amplified music is “played at night with or without intermissions;” and 4. “Music” includes sounds wholly or predominantly characterised by the emission of a succession of repetitive beats. 5. **(1A)** this section also applies to a gathering if: - 6. It is a gathering on land of twenty or more persons who are trespassing on the land; and 7. It would be a gathering of a kind mentioned in subsection (1) above if it took place on land in the open air.   **In Reference to Section 63: -**   1. As noted in the highlighted copy of a Section 63 above and then in reference to take the correct notes about the fundamental basics of the building blocks of the Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) application that has now been brought against the Appellant, will in fact reveal that all incidents that are sighted within the case bundle are of incidents when a person(s) personal living quarters, was or is contained in a building otherwise known as a place of residence, this key element mentioned and noted does play a vital factor in the on goings of the case at present, as for sure trespass must be present for a gathering to amerce in a building this must also be inclusive of 20 or more persons, so for any officer or official person(s) to be confident of their evidence supporting the incident’s in question, so for them incidents to constitutes to the word rave. 2. Within the respondent’s bundle, that is representing an Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) order, no police officers chose to follow the true lines of investigation that is needed to fulfil the key elements to obtain such an act, against the Appellants statue of liberty’s when using section 63 of the criminal and justice act **1994** and therefore the word rave cannot and should not be met to the criminal standards needed to obtain a Proven verdict. 3. The investigating police officers had lot of opportunities to achieve such goals, but never did and therefore any reader must agree to the quoted, this case does not meet the criteria for the incidents accused within its context and supported evidence.   **This Clearly Leads to The Fraud Act 2006 By Abuse of Position: -**   1. A person is in breach of this section if he— 2. Occupies a position, in which he is expects to safeguard, or not to act against, the interests of another person, 3. Dishonestly abuses that position, and 4. Intends, by means of the abuse of that position— 5. To make a gain for himself or another, or 6. To cause loss to another or to expose another to a risk of loss. 7. “An Official Person may be regarded as having abused his or her position even though their conduct consisted of an omission rather than an act.”   **Issue of the Prosecution Using the Word: - “Illegal”: -**   1. The second issue is the terminology regarding the word “illegal” the word Illegal also raises concerns of issues relating towards what the respondent’s case has been brought in motion for, all of the accused incidents that the respondent has alleged I took an organisation (role / or supplied equipment in, do in fact relate to the entertainment industry, what is governed under the licensing act **2003.** 2. As previously stated in this letter of concern, all incidents sighted in the Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) application do in fact relate to indoor private events and the Metropolitan Police and the Enfield Council did not prove trespass took place. |   **436,**   |  | | --- | | officer’s codes of conduct, neither does the CPS challenge nor dispute this fact, so there is no argument to the issue of illegality under the trespass grounds.   1. This leaves the police and council having to prove a breach of the licensing act **2003** because they used the word illegal. 2. When reading a copy of the licensing act **2003** as amended on the **07th January 2013** for the processes of creation of an investigation or defence towards a person’s rights, any person doing so will have to take note to appendix four of that Act, which clearly states it is not illegal to provide any entertainment within a back garden or place of residence, in fact the only clause relating to in private air is that no person shall have the right to charge for money with a few of making a profit and if a profit is made without true intention then the licensing act **2003** has no breach, with this full and whole understanding I believe that any person will agree that the respondent does not have the right to base their case on the fact of organising an illegal rave as no illegal concept has been adduced to be proven.   **Issues With the Police and Councils Using the Word: - “Illegal”: -**   1. As a third concern the police using the word “illegal in the Asbo Application does also make me make a reference to the following: 2. From the early stages of the application the Appellant felt the need to defend his legal Rights, as any other member of united kingdom and associated treaties should also do, this being said to be leading towards the wrongful accusations against any illegal allegations of criminal nature that any person(s) find themselves in defence towards, that any person(s) know they have not committed, neither am I in the wrong for just simply not understanding the crime I am being accused of but still playing a role in such criminal activities in turn as a figure of speech being blind towards my own actions and there consequences, such as the incident that have clearly been contained within the Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) application. 3. I know it would be morally wrong for me not to stand up and quire this matter myself as for I know the true facts, as I know this case should not be sitting in its civil capacity, when it clearly states an offence of an illegal natured concept this is a breach of a multitude of my human rights and should be managed under criminal legalisation and regulations in a criminal court, especially without no previous history of similar natured offences being present and this is also inclusive of no pre remand warnings ever being issued. 4. In the understanding of civil and criminal law, were some think is alleged to have taken place that is said to have been illegal the correct Police procedure in them circumstances is that a crime will be created under the crime and disorder act **1998,** in pursuit from the police reforms act **1964,** by way of a victim or witness making a report to police and then for members of the police to be allocated the incident in hand so for them to be able to start any needed investigations, this does also depend on the matter of relevance to the initial report and will be risk assessed and graded apriority to the listing to the resources available at the time. 5. The investigations may lead to an arrest what will lead the detainee to his or her statuary legal rights. 6. In the early **1980’**s the police did have the power to take cases to court without the decision of any other governing body, but now in **2016** the burden relays solely on the CPS who are in collaboration with Revenue and Customs Prosecution Office and is headed by the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP) who is independent but subject to the superintendence of the Attorney General that is accountable to members of Parliament that do work for the prosecution services. 7. If charged by police any person’s legal rights, they gain under section 24 and 25 which does relate to the rights of any person charged and the minimum standards of criminal procedure. 8. An issue I raise is the Asbo Case sit in a civil capacity at court and without the police and Council complying to none of the above and below Regulations and/or Legal Rights they must mandatory conducted as managed within accordance of the United Kingdom Stationary policies, e.g. United Kingdom Law clearly states the definition of illegal to be an illegal and therefore arrestable offence. 9. I ask please can any person explain this to me? I have no previous convictions of similar nature offence, neither was the Antisocial Behaviour Order **(ASBO)** application a **CBO,** Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) on conviction, it is in fact a stand-alone Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) and the legal guidance is for the application not to be based upon criminal natured activities. 10. I will continue with the principles of the respondent’s case which the Prosecution have induced with the title of “the organisation of illegal raves, for myself to be able to defend my legal right I need to be told what I am in trouble for and by reading the organisation of illegal raves this is what I went to court to defend myself against. The legal definition the police and council filed was wrong and the judge refused to act on sense and reason when told or for what he could read the role of the Jude is to make sure the case stays overseen in a fair manner and that the criminal standards stay met but no judge did this. |   **437,**   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 1. National Standards Incident Recording Regulations: - 2. I would first like any reader to have a full understanding of the knowledge needed to address this point inside of this complaint in reference to the “NSIR,” and what is the national standards incident recording regulations that they govern under the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act **2000**. 3. The NSIR does quote the following, when any state official is recording police information them procedures must comply in accordance with the national standards incident recording polices and them person(s) are to: 4. NSIR ensures that the police hold all their official information by following the accordance of the law. 5. The NSIR supports all the correct decisions that officials make through the intelligence process with utmost respect for “Vision and Purpose Statements for Crime Recording (NCRS & HOCR)” what are in respect to the Home Office Counting Rules for Recorded Crime. 6. Supply a fair and auditable decision-making process. 7. Corroborate all related and interlinked information. 8. Allow themselves to share all information in compliance with the data protection Act **1998** and Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act **2000**.   **Policing Values:**   1. The College of Policing “Code of Ethics” set out nine explicit values that are to ensure the standards of professional behaviour for both police officers and police staff: | | | | | | **1**.  Due responsibility with issues of Openness | **2.**  Due responsibility with issues of Integrity | **3.**  Due responsibility with issues of Accountability | **4.**  Due responsibility with issues of Respect | **5.**  Due responsibility with issues of Leadership | | **6.**  Due responsibility with issues of Fairness | **7.**  Due responsibility with issues of Selflessness | **8.**  Due responsibility with issues of Objectivity | **9.**  Due responsibility with issues of Honesty |  | | **Cps Reviewing of Case Files: -**   1. Duty Prosecutors must apply the Code for Crown Prosecutors when reviewing any case received from the police and continue to do so during the life of a case, to be satisfied that there is sufficient evidence to provide a realistic prospect of conviction against each defendant for each offence and that it is in the public interest to proceed. 2. Crown Prosecutors must also consider any human rights issues that arise.   **The Joint Performance Standards: -**   1. **Standard 1 –** Police will undertake an effective, early investigation to reduce use of pre-charge bail: - 2. **Standard 2 –** Police will obtain ‘key evidence’ before referral to a prosecutor for a charging decision: - 3. **Standard 3 –** Police will themselves charge or NFA cases in accordance with the DPP’s Guidance on Charging: - | | | | |   **438,**   |  | | --- | | 1. **Standard 4 –** CPS will supply an at once accessible service for the telephone referral of cases: - 2. **Standard 5 –** CPS will ensure early face-to-face consultations for serious, sensitive, and complex cases: - 3. **Standard 6 –** CPS will ensure that charging decisions are consistent and in accordance with the Code for Crown Prosecutors and appropriate legal and policy guidance.   **Police Personal Conduct: -**   1. These values underpin all policing functions and in respect of police personal conduct and require all person(s) working for the police service to “behave in a manner, whether on or off duty, which does not bring discredit on the police service or undermine public confidence in policing” (See Standard 9 – Conduct). 2. The Code explicitly states that complying with the National Crime Recording Standard (NCRS), which is the central rules from the Home Office that do comply with the Counting Rules for Recorded Crime (HOCR), is an example of meeting the standards.   **Regards to NSIR Standards: -**   1. With further regards to NSIR standards that do define any communication from any person to be otherwise known as a “CFS a caller for services” a CFS is any person(s) by whatever means of contact, about a matter that comes to police attention and which the police are require by the NSIR to record. 2. There are minimum data standards to be complied with when recording information on an incident record: 3. An incident unique reference number **(URN)** 4. The received time and date of the report. 5. The method of reporting. 6. “A clear and accurate time and date the report got recorded.” 7. Details of the person making the report (name, address, and telephone number) 8. Sufficient information to describe the location and nature of the report. 9. The opening and closing category. 10. Also, the Time and date of first and closing classification. 11. Contained within the respondent Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) application I take a problem with there being no URN numbers to a vast amount of the official documents contained within the respondent’s bundle. 12. The Prosecution Team Manual of Guidance For the preparation, processing, and submission of prosecution files **2011** (Incorporating National File Standard **2015**) also states the importance to case files URN numbers and continues to quote the following: -   **Unique Reference Number (“Urn”)**   1. An URN must be allocated to a case file at the earliest opportunity to allow tracking and monitoring of the case where possible. 2. This process should start at the CPS pre-charge advice stage where police will record the URN on the MG3/3A. 3. When police are completing a case file, they must enter the URN on all MG forms. 4. The endorsement of the URN on each page of each form ensures that if material becomes separated from the file, officers can easily identify it and the URN maintains continuity. 5. Allocating an URN for case files involving multiple offences and/or offenders’ officers will need to closely monitor to avoid duplications. 6. Specific guidance on when and how officers must file case is at 2.4 of Section 2. 7. This includes obtaining guidance from the CPS regarding the splitting or merging of case files. |   **439,**   |  | | --- | | **General Principles Charges for Any Offences Police Are to Include in The Same File with The Same Unique Reference Number / (URN) If Those Charges:**   1. If police find them on the same facts, or: - 2. Form, or are a part of a series of, offences of the same or a similar character. 3. As a result, case files containing charges which officers have not linked in either of the ways mentioned above officers will need to split into separate files, each with a different URN.   **Organisation: -**   1. In dispute to the Organisation role in the respondent’s pursuit for a convection for organising illegal raves, the applicant has not adduced no evidence in support of such a claim, I submitted a plea of innocents as for sure I know that I am innocent and because of that reason, there is no truthful evidence relating to the wrongful accusations that I find myself defending my character towards, this case leaves me every day of my life knowing that I never organised any event sighted in the respondent bundle leaving me suffering the consequences and if the allegations were true I believe the police intelligence would be able to prove some of the following as they have not got the following: 2. “No evidence of flyers.” 3. “No evidence of breaches of the licensing act.” 4. “No evidence of promotion on Social Networking Sites.” 5. “No evidence of Sound equipment sited within the Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) event dates being used for private reasons, neither seized under self-commercial gain.” 6. “No evidence of Video footage proving any origination or delegation roles.” 7. “No evidence of forensics.” 8. “No evidence of trespassing.” 9. “No evidence of Voice recordings.” 10. “No Evidence of a Past Durations of Times Relating to Any Arrests of My Person for A Similar Natured Offence.” 11. “No evidence of and therefore a complete absinth of firsthand oral evidence of victims.” 12. “This complete absinth also includes no police PNB notebooks, for all dates wrongfully accused and sited within the Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) application. 13. “Not to forget the complete disappearance of all **CAD** related emergency 999 / 101 calls, that I am in pursuit of disclosure towards, that do relate to the audio voice recordings that have been said to have been destroyed by police, the emergency 999 / 101 call voice recordings are governed by United Kingdom and continental legalization and Standard Functional Specifications for Law Enforcement Computer Aided Dispatch (**CAD**) Systems standards protected by communication standard operating procedures “SOP” and in all incidents should not be destroyed when they are part of an ongoing trial or appeal and this is to include, the commence of a Proven verdict otherwise known as a convection as them files should remain intact for up to 50 years after.”   **Hearsay I Challenge the Following Points of Concern: -**   1. The respondent when seeking pursuit of the Asbo application that they applied for at the lower court in conjunction to their powers, so for the respondent to Adduce an application notice of(Hearsay Evidence under Civil Proceeding) Rule **1999**. 2. The applicant took dispute to the legal factors of such a hearsay notice and declined the application. 3. The reason for the dispute was and is that the respondent is relying on the whole president of their case solely being based on hearsay evidence, with no substance of first-hand evidence and a complete disappearance of civil person(s) under oath supplying oral evidence, in turn no VPS witness, this does also include any other support of key materials that would aid in any convection as evidence, the notice to rely solely on hearsay was put before the judge on the **11/09/2014** and **30/10/2014** to Highbury Corner Magistrates Court this was challenged but was allowed by the judge sitting at the lower court. 4. How can anyone stand a fair trial when they can call no witnesses? 5. And all of the civil persons witness statements Victims did not signed themselves. |   **440,**   |  | | --- | | 1. Hearsay applications under the Magistrates Courts (Hearsay Evidence in Civil Proceeding) **Rule 1999** the prosecution is wrong to rely solely on hearsay within the Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) application and has been put in on the **23/02/2016**, **17/08/2016** to Wood Green Crown Court for the appeal hearing, this was challenged, this also has been allowed by the Judge hearing the appeal case. 2. The truthiness and accuracy of the witness statements that we contained in the format of an MG11 witness statement form. 3. Also, the capacity the court sits in as for the Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) proceeding sit in their civil capacity, but the respondent’s application states an offence of a criminal nature such as the organisation of illegal rave, so for any person to understand what rules the case should really be imposed to so that the Appellant could stand a legal and justified fair trail cannot clearly be established, this is for the reasons as listed below.: - 4. Magistrates and Crown Courts have different regulations when the court houses are sitting in a true and fair civil capacity when at trial and appeal. 5. A criminal case as the respondent application clearly states it is, has a different views towards the rules of hearsay, than a civil case does and requires a section 9 or 10 to be educed into the case proceedings, if the section 9 or 10 requirements are not agreed by the Judge, or challenged by any applicant, due to a witness not given oral evidence in court, then the context of their statement holds less weight and may not be read out in court verbally aloud that is to say on its own, by any members of the prosecution and in turn becomes inadmissible in criminal cases, but under civil proceeding where there is no criminal element, then them hearsay rule do not comply and the Civil Evidence Act **1995** will in fact apply, in any ongoing proceedings that are in pursuit of an Anti-social Behaviour Order, the Civil Evidence Act **1995** rules should come into force and will allow the admissibility of hearsay without an exception other than a hearsay notice, because of the clear difference that is allowed in the proceeding of criminal and civil law relating to hearsay and the respondent’s case being of a mixture of both laws, this leads me to the understanding that I could not stand, what must be a speedy and fair trial in respect to, The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) **1948,** the Human Rights Act **1998** (the Act or the HRA) and the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) **1953.**   **MG5: Police Report**  MG5 – Case Summary Guidance Notes   1. When the police or Council are accusing any person of an offence under the criminal justice public order act **1994** the police should arrest the accused and they must file an mg5 case summery in accordance with code A of the pace codes of conduct. 2. The officers will need to inform the prosecutor, defence, and court about what happened when they interviewed the defendant, and then the officer must follow the guidance contained in the header of section 2 of the MG5. 3. Where the suspect refuses to answer certain questions or to answer satisfactorily, after due warning, a court or jury may draw such inferences as appear proper under the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act **1994** sections 36 and 37. 4. In such circumstances as a defendant making a no comment interview the Officers in the case must record their notes into section 2 of the MG5, showing that they gave special warnings (as set out in a - e below) and also, the officer is to record the questions he or she asked following the warning. 5. The officer must record the exact words used by the defendant rather than paraphrasing. 6. For the police to draw an inference to on a suspect the police must explain to tell them, in ordinary language: 7. “What offence is being investigated?” 8. “What fact they are being asked to account for.” 9. “This fact may be due to them taking part in the commission of the offence.” 10. “A court may draw a proper inference if they fail or refuse to account for this fact.” 11. “A record is being made of the interview and it may be given in evidence if they are brought to trial.”   **Orders on Conviction: -** |   **441,**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | 1. An order comes into effect on the day the Judge made it. 2. Will be of a CBO nature the provisions relating to the CBO are in Part 2 of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act **2014** (the "Act"). 3. The provisions come into force on **20th of October 2014.**   **The Dates of The on Goings in The Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) Proceedings Are Below: -** | | | **12/09/2014** | The police tried to serve a bundle on the Appellant at 109 Burncroft Avenue, to which he disputes.  This Bundle police have said is the Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) Case Files, we sent a letter of complaint and served our letter to the police in regard to them not serving the Now Claimant and that bundle should still remain in the Edmonton police station lost property but then police cannot find it. | | **06/10/2014** | The Appellant was meant to have a hearing for an interim Order, but legal aid had not granted Legal Aid.  Michael Carroll acting solicitor came to court the judge overturned and granted legal aid.  The application for the Interim hearing the judge would not hear due to the claimants’ solicitors not having time to go over the case papers as legal aid had not granted legal aid at this point. The CPS and police were not happy about this.  The Judge put the hearing off until the **22/10/2014.** | | **22/10/2014** | **22/10/2014** Interim hearing could not go ahead due to Andy Locke Acting Barrister had a flood at his home address. CPS and Police were not happy about this and wanted it to go ahead.  Judge told them it is not down to the Appellant he has attended court and rightfully he should have a barrister. Interim The Judge put the hearing off until the **05/11/2014** | | 1. As seen from the details above the police and council did not put the Antisocial Behaviour Order **(ASBO)** before a Judge until the **22/10/2014** due to no fault of the Appellant and this must fall within the commence date of the **(CBO** Being Legal Authority for them to oblige towards rather than the old broken policies.) 2. Where the prosecution sought an order on conviction the police must supply sufficient details to the Prosecutor to justify their application for the order sought and they must attach their sufficient details to the file. 3. Such orders include: 4. The Courts can issue an exclusion order, such as banning a person from a licensed premises or a sporting ground. 5. Anti-Social Behaviour Order. 6. Protection from Harassment Act restraining order. 7. A judge may order a Compensation order on conviction, where there has been personal injury, loss, or damage to any person, for the offence charged or taken into consideration. 8. Courts often award compensation at the first hearing, so it is important that, where officers know, an estimate of the cost of loss or damage they include this information on the MG5 form. 9. Officers should make sure that any additionally, details of any victim a judge is likely to award compensation they show on an MG6 form.   **Issues with the Independent Members of the Public’s Witness Statements: -**   1. I continue to raise even more concerns about our issues in pursuit of the independent members of the public’s witness statements, as they and the police have forgot or could not get them to sign their statements themselves 2. . I am also further concerned and raise issue with there being no statement of truth attached to all of the mg11 witness statement forms, fulfilled in both the mentioned issues are a criminal offence under the Fraud Act **2006** as follows:  * Fraud  1. A person is guilty of fraud if he is in breach of any of the sections listed in subsection 2. (Which provide for separate ways of committing the offence).   **The Sections Are: -**   1. Section 2 (fraud by false representation): - 2. Section 3 (fraud by failing to disclose information), and: - 3. Section 4 (fraud by abuse of position). 4. A person who is guilty of fraud is liable   **442,**  on summary conviction, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 12 months or to a fine not exceeding the statutory maximum (or to both).   1. On conviction on formal accusation, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 10 years or to a fine (or to both).   **All MG Forms Are Managed Under Guidance From: -**   1. The home office manages all MG forms under guidance, so for the evidential and authenticity standards to be complied with, the 88) The home office have also, attached the associated tools required to create, transport, and store a Digital Witness Statement (DWS) to make sure officers are able to complete the Mg Forms with sufficient evidential authenticity and integrity.   **The Key Requirements of Digital Witness Statements Are: -**   1. The witness must be fully aware of the implications of signing. 2. The mechanism for proving a document must met the National Prosecution Team standards. 3. Where officers use vector representations of signatures, they shall use open standards and must also include a simple image of the signature. 4. Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act **1996** places a duty on investigators to pursue all reasonable lines of enquiry and to record and retain all relevant material. 5. Supervisors must check that the file complies with the National File Standard content as per the Director’s Guidance. 6. All cases files charged by police those officers are to notify the CPS through an amended MG5, to be known as the ‘Police Report’. 7. It is crucial that the content of the MG5, including the case and interview summaries, are objective, fair and balanced and are of the highest quality. 8. This is because all the stakeholders (e.g., prosecutors, court, and defence) rely upon its contents. 9. An inadequate quality MG5 is likely to lead to wasted time, increased costs, and delayed proceedings. 10. In all cases the supervisor must complete the ‘Supervisor’s Certification.’ 11. This certifies that the information in parts 1 to 7 of the Police Report is an accurate summary of the available evidence in the case. 12. It also ensures that police have built the file to the required standard. 13. If it has not been possible to obtain all necessary information to ensure the file has reached the required standard, officers must complete an MG6 to indicate why and when the missing information/evidence will be available. 14. The MG6 should also record the information necessary for common law disclosure in accordance with ***R v DPP,*** ex party ***LEE.*** 15. officers should also consider all reasonable lines of enquiry and confirm that the relevant agreed targets for the capture/submission of evidence they identified correctly, ***R v DPP,*** ex- party ***LEE (1999) 2 Cr App. R 304, DC 2.2.11.*** 16. Following the decision in LEE, the prosecutor should consider disclosing the following, at pre-committal stage, in the interests of justice: 17. Earlier convictions of the victim, or any material that might aid an application for bail. 18. Anything that may help the defense to argue that there should be no committal at all, or committal on a lesser charge. 19. Anything that may help an argument for abuse of process. 20. Information that may help the defense to prepare for trial where delay may affect such preparation (i.e., witnesses police officers have spoken to that they do not intend to rely upon). 21. The prosecution may not show this information to the defense since Justice Kennedy said this would depend very much on what the defendant chose to reveal about the nature of his case. 22. These are our examples and officers must not construe them as a definitive list of categories. 23. In all cases the prosecutor must consider disclosing in the interests of justice any material that is relevant to sentence (e.g., information that might mitigate the seriousness of the offence or assist the accused to lay blame in whole or in part upon a co-accused or another person).   **There are Three Types of Witness Statement: -** | |   **443,**   |  | | --- | | **Narrative Statements: -**   1. Made by the people who have played a part in the event at issue?   **Production Statements: -**   1. made by people who are employees, who have access to computer systems or documents, but: - 2. “Cannot testify as to how the information was entered on to the systems, as it may have been done by other people in the organisation.”   **Statements by expert witnesses:**   1. Include analysis and comment and can include personal opinion within their professional remit.   **What is a VPS Witness Statement?**   1. This is a statement made by the victim of a criminal offence. 2. The police recorded it on the MG11 form, and the content relates to the effect the offence has on them. 3. The Purpose of VPS forms are: - 4. These statements provide the victim with an opportunity to state how the offence has affected them: 5. Physically 6. Emotionally 7. Psychologically 8. financially, or 9. in any other way victim, an opportunity to say if they require further support, or wish to claim compensation. 10. To provide the Home Office and the courts with information on these matters and allow them to take an account of the consequences of the offence on the victim. 11. These statements are voluntary and are separate to other statements. 12. The prosecution disclosed to the defence VPS Witness Statements.   **Victim Personal Statements: -**   1. When officers use a VPS in court the prosecuting team put the VPS before the court after conviction in the sentencing bundle.   **(Impact Statement)**   1. If a police officer takes a witness statement in England, Wales, or Northern Ireland, they must record it on an MG11 form. 2. All investigating police officers must keep the original copies of all witness statements in the case file and send copies to the Crown Prosecution Service. 3. Before a witness signs a witness statement the investigating police officers must always explain to whomever is filling out the form: - “The Perjury Clause,” before they make the statement. 4. A statement taken in this form meets the legal requirements, and so they may not have needed to attend court: 5. But you must make it clear the Home Office cannot guarantee they will not have to attend the court because the court and the defendant have the right to call any witness to attend and give oral evidence. 6. When any police officer questions the witness they must make sure of the following: ask all relevant questions to satisfy their duty under the Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act **1996**, so to be able to pursue all reasonable lines of enquiry whether they point towards or away from the suspect.   **The Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) Witness Statements Do Not Contain Signature of Truth: -**  PRACTICE DIRECTION 22 – STATEMENTS OF TRUTH  **Official Documents that require a Statement of Truth include: -**   1. Rule 22.1(1) sets out the documents which officers must verify by a statement of truth. 2. The documents include: 3. A statement of case, 4. A response complying with an order under rule 18.1 to provide further information, 5. A witness statement, |   **444,**   |  | | --- | | 1. If an officer wishes to rely on matters that they have set out in their Court Order Application as evidence, then the officer’s is to verify the Application with a statement of truth. 2. The officers mat contains the statement of truth in the document it verifies, or it may be in a separate document served subsequently, in which case it must identify the document to which it relates.   **Form of the Statement of Truth: -**   1. The form of the statement of truth verifying a statement of case, a response, an application notice, or a notice of objections should be as follows: 2. ‘[I believe] [the (claimant or as may be) believes] that the facts stated in this [name document being verified] are true.’ 3. The form of the statement of truth verifying a witness statement should be as follows: 4. ‘The facts stated in this witness statement are true.’ 5. Where an officer or civil person contains a statement of truth in a separate document, the document containing the statement of truth they are to head both parts with the title of the proceedings and the claim number.   **The Document Being Verified Should Be Identified in The Statement of Truth as Follows:**   1. Statement of case: ‘the [defence or as may be] served on the [name of party] on [date],’ 2. Application notice: ‘the application notice issued on [date] for [set out the remedy sought],’ 3. Witness statement: ‘the witness statement filed on [date] or served on [party] on [date].’   **Who may Sign the Statement of Truth?**   1. All statement in any case, as well as any response statement or any application notice, must have a statement of truth and signed by: 2. The party or his litigation friend, or 3. The legal representative of the party or litigation friend. 4. The witness must sign a statement of truth verifying they signed it.   **In-House Legal Representatives: -**   1. “Legal representative is defined in rule 2.3(1).” 2. A legal representative employed by a party may sign a statement of truth. 3. “However, a person who is not a solicitor, barrister, or other authorised litigator, but who is employed by the company and is managed by such a person is not employed by that person and so cannot sign a statement of truth.” 4. (This is unlike the employee of a solicitor in private practice that would come within the definition of legal representative.) 5. However, such a person, may be a manager and able to sign the statement on behalf of the company in that capacity.   **Inability To Persons to Read or Sign Documents to Be Verified by A Statement of Truth: -**   1. Where a person is to sign a document containing a statement of truth, who is unable to read or sign the document, they must contain a certificate made by an authorised person in agreement.   **Consequences Of Failure to Verify: -** |   **445,**   |  | | --- | | 1. “If a statement of case is not verified by a statement of truth, the statement of case will remain effective unless it is struck out, but a party may not rely on the contents of a statement of case as evidence until it has been verified by a statement of truth.” 2. Any party may apply to the court for an order unless within such period as the court may specify. 3. All statements of a case the prosecuting team are to verify within their service, a statement of truth, or the judge will strike out the statement in the case. 4. The Government refers to recover of costs of a Court Order Application in paragraph 4.2 and the Government states that the party who has failed to verify a statement of truth in any event forthwith will be the: - “BEARER TO THE LOSS OF THE RECOVERED COSTS.”   **Penalty: -**   1. The Government draws attention to the rule 32.14 which sets out the consequences of verifying a statement of case containing a false statement without an honest belief in its truth, and to the procedures set out in rule 81.18 and paragraphs 5.1 to 5.7 of Practice Direction 81 – Applications and proceedings in relation to contempt of court.   **Possession Extra. Of Articles for Use in Frauds, Fraud Act 2006: -**   1. A person is guilty of an offence if he has in his possession or under his control any article for use in the course of or in connection with any fraud. 2. A person guilty of an offence under this section is liable— 3. On summary conviction, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 12 months or to a fine not exceeding the statutory maximum (or to both). 4. On conviction on formal accusation, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 5 years or to a fine (or to both).   **Fraud Act**   1. Making or supplying articles for use in frauds: 2. “A person is guilty of an offence if he makes, adapts, supplies, or offers to supply any article” — 3. “Knowing that it is designed or adapted for use in the course of or in connection with fraud, or” - 4. “Intending it to be used to commit, or assist in the commission of, fraud.” 5. “A person guilty of an offence under this section is liable— (a) on summary conviction, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 12 months or to a fine not exceeding the statutory maximum (or to both).” 6. “On conviction on indictment, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 10 years or to a fine (or to both).”   **Fraud Act**   1. “Article” (1) For the purposes of— (a) sections 6 and 7, and (b) the provisions listed in subsection (2), as far as they relate to articles for use in the course of or in connection with fraud, “article” includes any program or data held in electronic form. 2. Police are to sign All Impact statements, but second third hand information.   **PNBs are Requested as Disclosure: -**   1. The official pocketbook is a most important document which, when effectively use, provides the greatest support in court, and constitutes protection against false or mistaken attack upon the character of an officer or a member of staff. 2. It is a basic principle of police procedure that police officers and appropriate police staff will keep notes of their day-to-day duties to which they may later refer. 3. Every operational Police Officer, including Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs), members of the Special Constabulary, & Firearms Enquiry Officers shall carry an official PNB when on duty, and they are to ensure that they maintain it. |   **446,**   |  | | --- | | 1. It is fundamental that the police make their notes at the time of the incident, which they are recording or, where circumstances prevent this, as soon as practicable after the event. 2. All officers must carry their police pocket notebooks, and this includes all staff engaged on operational patrol, response and beat duties. 3. Officers that are engaged in all types of work duties must at all times carry their pocket notebook when they are performing work so, that were they is a likelihood of themselves encountering a working scenario their pocket notebook will be available to record the details. 4. The PNB is an official document, which is subject to disclosure in connection with any criminal investigation. 5. Individual persons maintain The PNB but “The Police Notebooks!” belongs to the Metropolitan Constabulary.   **Police Are to Record Pocket Notebook in The Following Circumstances: -**   1. Where the Police and Criminal Evidence Act **1984** require a record and none exists. 2. Details of audio recording interviews as highlighted in paragraph 5.1 of Code E. 3. Unsolicited comments made by a suspect outside the context of a formal interview, which may be relevant to an offence. 4. Evidential matters, civil and criminal where not recorded in another original document. 5. PNC and other police information database checks. 6. Critical, domestic and hate crime incidents. 7. Property found or handed to officers. 8. Under Section 170 of the Road Traffic Act **1988**, where any party insists that the police record an accident. 9. Arrests and incidents which may give rise to evidence in a criminal offence. 10. Incidents where the police officer thinks a complaint will seek resolution (bring to a supervisor notice as soon as possible.) 11. Observations / surveillance where no official log exists. 12. Any information that an officer regards as relevant to any aspect of police work, they should record. If in doubt, record everything. 13. The information, which police should record at any scene, will vary.   **The Following Is a Guide to The Minimum Information Required: -**   1. Time. 2. Exact location. 3. Occurrence or offence. 4. Name, age (DOB), occupation, address, self-defined ethnicity, and telephone number of persons involved. 5. Name, age (DOB), occupation, address, self-defined ethnicity, and telephone number of witness/informants. 6. Details of action by police officers and others all “Direct speech” those officers are to record in their pocketbooks. 7. Where a suspect makes any comment, which might be relevant to an offence, (including a reply after caution) the comments must be recorded in the PNB, and where practicable the person shall be given the opportunity to read the record and to certify and sign it as accurate or indicate the respects in which that person considers it inaccurate. 8. Police are to record any refusal to sign. 9. Even when there is collaboration, unless the circumstances are for reason exceptional, each officer should make a note in their own book and not rely on a note in another officer’s book. 10. If one officer has no recollection of a point observed or of a remark remembered by a colleague, they should not incorporate such a matter into their book. 11. An entry, whether made in consultation with a colleague or otherwise, must reflect only genuine personal observation and recollection. 12. It is the responsibility of all officers to keep their PNBs updated. 13. Supervisors are to ensure compliance by inspecting officers’ PNBs on a regular basis and endorsing the PNB accordingly. 14. Officers will retain their current and last two completed PNBs (if less than two years old). 15. Police are to submit all PNBs to the District Administration, where their staff will store them away until they are two years old. 16. PNBs that are over two years old the government will be store in alphabetical order at the Central Archive Facility. 17. Once the PNBs are over seven years old, the Government will destroy the police Notebooks as confidential waste.   **Overview Of the Role Of CCC: -** |   **447,**   |  | | --- | | 1. The Government formed Met CCC in **January 2008** upon completion of the C3i programme. 2. This saw public telephone contact and control of the deployment of MPS uniform policing assets move from a central Information Room (IR) located at New Scotland Yard; thirty-two local control rooms (known within the MPS as CAD (Computer Aided Despatch) Rooms); and three independent Telephone Operator Centres (TOC), to three purpose-built contact and deployment centres located at Lambeth, Hendon, and Bow. 3. CCC now operates within the Public Contact Portfolio of Territorial Policing (TP) as a single Operational Command Unit (OCU). 4. CCC oversees all emergency and non-emergency telephony for the MPS, co-ordinates the despatch of initial response to incidents for Borough Operational Command Units (BOCUs), provides command and control infrastructure for major incident and event policing through the Special Operations Room (SOR) and command and control for critical incidents. 5. On **06th of October 1998,** BT introduced a new system whereby all the information about emergency callers’ location their system automatically transmits electronically to the relevant service needed rather than themselves having to read the information out (with the possibility of errors). 6. The 999 Emergency system name is EISEC (Enhanced Information Service for Emergency Calls). 7. "The Communications Provider shall, to the extent technically feasible, make accurate and reliable Caller Location Information available for all calls to the emergency call numbers '112' and '999', at no charge to the Emergency Organisations overseeing those calls, until the time the call is answered by those organisations." 8. When a person(s), provide Open reach with a customer's name and address they pass it to BT's 999 Call Handling Service. 9. BT in turn uses that information to route 999 calls and passes the location on to the Emergency Authority (EA). 10. Then the emergency services allocate the order of importance, of the information need: 11. BT use the Postcode to route the call to the EA that is serving that geography location and then EA use the postcode to locate the caller. 12. End Username for: Consumer -the person most likely to make the call (not always the bill payer). 13. The End Username recorded and listed on the Emergency Services Database may be different to the Directory Listing and the two details are separate entries on the input xml provided by a CP when placing an order with Openreach. 14. The separate End Username that an officer provides they use to populate the details held on the Emergency Services Database and assist the emergency services with handling 112 and 999 calls effectively. 15. For WLR3, Openreach takes responsibility only for passing the address information to the Emergency Services Database. 16. For MPF, it is the CP's responsibility to pass the address information to the Emergency Services Database. 17. In a short summery the first CFS caller for services, person that calls any emergency 999 handler will speak to is a B-com operator, B-com accept responsibility for passing the callers location and telephone number on to British Telecom who, then route the incident with the same intelligence already gained to the emergency services desired. 18. Another issue of concern that I raise within this letter, is in regards to a vast majority of incidents, otherwise known as Cads that have been inter Linked with unrelated incidents and information, that is to say from what I am being accused of at court and that information being supported as hearsay evidence, which has a true outcome of containing incorrect geological address information relating to the Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) application, where on the dates that I do take reference towards, was on the **08th of June 2014** at Progress Way Enfield London, where in any sense it would have been impossible for the incident the applicant has been accused of to have played a role that had a negative effect on any other persons way of life. 19. Due to them locations distance being so far apart from one another, as can been seen by the Distance as the Crow Flies and Distance by Land Transport, which does in fact show that the distance between progress way and the initial location of the CFS emergency 999 callers, are too far apart for the respondent accusations for truth to be found upon, so because of this reason they have now been calculated into miles of distance as detailed below and them places are as follows, with geological markers supplied from:-  * <https://www.freemaptools.com/how-far-is-it-between.htm> |   **448,**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Numb** | **Name of 999 CFS Location Grid X to Y** | **Accused Location of Event Grid X to Y** | **Distance Between Both Locations in Miles** | | **1.** | Hardy Way Enfield  X. 531438  Y. 197711 | Progress way  X. 534380  Y. 195513 | Distance as the Crow Flies: 2.280 Miles  Distance by Land Transport: 2.788 Miles | | **2.** | Tynemouth Dr, Enfield  X. 534375  Y. 198125 | Progress way  X. 534380  Y. 195513 | Distance as the Crow Flies: 1.700 Miles  Distance by Land Transport: 1.808 Miles | | **3.** | 899 Great Cambridge Road, Enfield  X. 534396,  Y. 197692 | Progress way  X. 534380  Y. 195513 | Distance as the Crow Flies: 1.354 Miles  Distance by Land Transport: 1.450 Miles | | **4.** | Albury Walk  X. 535375  Y. 202125 | Progress way  X. 534380  Y. 195513 | Distance as the Crow Flies: 4.105 Miles  Distance by Land Transport: 4.619 Miles | | **5.** | Crown Road Enfield  X. 534960  Y. 196240 | Progress way  X. 534380  Y. 195513 | Distance as the Crow Flies: 0.751 Miles  Distance by Land Transport: 1.021 Miles | | **6.** | 93 Broadlands Ave, Enfield  X. 534981  Y. 196790 | Progress way  X. 534380  Y. 195513 | Distance as the Crow Flies: 0.874 Miles  Distance by Land Transport: 1.537 Miles | | **7.** | Lincoln Road, Enfield  X. 534152  Y. 195940 | Progress way  X. 534380  Y. 195513 | Distance as the Crow Flies: 0.302 Miles  Distance by Land Transport 0.372 Miles | | **8.** | Woodstock Crescent, Enfield  X. 534657  Y. 195453 | Progress way  X. 534380  Y. 195513 | Distance as the Crow Flies: 0.201 Miles  Distance by Land Transport 0.795 Miles | | **9.** | Leighton Road, Enfield  X. 534144  Y. 195627 | Progress way  X. 534380  Y. 195513 | Distance as the Crow Flies: 0.231 Miles  Distance by Land Transport 0.641 Miles | | **10.** | Mayfield Crescent, Enfield  X.  Y. | Progress way  X. 534380  Y. 195513 | Distance as the Crow Flies: 0.239 Miles  Distance by Land Transport 0.692 Miles | | 1. The above table lists the locations from the CADs giving mileage, 2. There are CADs that have all of the Map Grid reference blocked out, so no person other than the developers can research those Cad incident numbers, and they are as follows: - 3. 1722:7JUN14: - 4. 5206:7JUN14: - 5. 340:8JUN14: - 6. 793:8JUN14: - 7. 2410JUN14. 8. The appellant requests, the reply from the prosecuting team as to why would there be a need to block out any of the police Cads and/or Map data? 9. And the appellant asks the prosecution for them to serve all the redactions in a non-edited format | | | |   **449,**   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 1. I find it hard to understand why police officer(s) would send police officers to a location that the person was not at, as it seems PC Steve Elsmore is trying to imply in his statement dated the **24/09/2016 pages 327 to 332.** 2. Also, there is the matter regarding data blocked out in a multitude of CFS Emergency calls relating to: 3. **CAD** 3151 4. **CAD** 2410 5. We can understand just a few of the Names and just a couple of the Addresses and we have clearly not received what was requested as disclosure so, that we can read what is right and wrong to stand a fair defence, the police are clearly hiding a lot more data and while being blocked out data that is vital to the on goings of this case. 6. There is a problem with Cads missing like linked **CAD 2456 /7** shown on **page 290.** 7. The reason given by the respondent in court about explicitly linked to and implicitly linked to CADs seems very unreliable and is easy proved to be a lie as to when the officer said under oath to the judge and all present in the courtroom he said that the missing CADs he never added to the Asbo Application are not linked to Crown Road in anyway. 8. In PC Jason Ames statement that dated the **15/08/2014** the police officer state something but the **CAD 9717** which relates to his intelligence report someone has redacted, and we ask why they withhold this information also? 9. Using the jurisdictional GIS information and the law enforcement map layers, the dispatcher has a tactical view of the city and/or dispatch area. 10. The staff can control the map by specific CAD commands, such as zoom-and-pan, or pre - set commands, such as zooming to the address of a selected call for service. 11. The dispatcher can map/view all units and open calls for service for an area or the city. 12. Labelled on the map are police Units and calls. 13. Locational Systems Interfaces Locational systems provide automated access to address, geographic, and mapping information for law enforcements. 14. The primary locational systems include AVL, GIS, and Mobile and Real-Time Mapping:   **Geofile Maintenance: -**   1. The creation of a comprehensive Geofile is a significant undertaking. 2. The system should support the creation and maintenance of the Geofile using an available mapping/GIS 3. The Geofile contains the geographic information that is the basis decisions in a communications centre. 4. The system needs to provide the ability for an agency to enter and update all Geofile data, including the physical address and the X/Y/Z coordinates. 5. Police use the Geofile to validate and standardize location inclusive of address information. 6. A Geofile is also, used to cross-reference addresses and locations within law enforcements defined reporting areas, X/Y/Z coordinates, ZIP codes, and other identifiers. 7. The Geofile contains sufficient information to ensure that an address is valid. 8. Furthermore, it provides cross-references to addresses and locations using common place names (e.g., business names, parks, hospitals, and schools) and street aliases. 9. It includes information such as direction of travel on particular streets and can identify the side of a street for a specific address. 10. It is for all to be able to assume that all the addresses in the RMS are mandatory validated by using the system Geofile.   **The Time Stamps Are Inaccurate Relating to Police CAD’s Information: -**   1. Inaccuracy’s leading to incorrect time stamps contained within the applicant’s bundle created by Steve Elsmore on the **13/8/2014.**  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **CAD** | **Numb** | **Date** | **Time** | **Page** | | **CAD** | 26**37** | 07/06/2014 | 08:**18** | Page 191 to 195 | | **CAD** | 26**72** | 07/06/2014 | 08:**16** | Page 196 to 198 | |  | | | | | | **CAD** | 30**05** | 07/06/2014 | 09:**22** | Page 203 to 205 | | **CAD** | 30**37** | 07/06/2014 | 09:**20** | Page 179 to 183 | |  | | | | | | **CAD** | 104**81** | 07/06/2014 | 22:**47** | Page 233 to 237 | | **CAD** | 105**06** | 07/06/2014 | 22:**44** | Page 238 to 241 | |   **450,**   |  | | --- | | 1. Clock Synchronization Interface and synchronize all servers and CAD workstations work in Co-Hurst with the Master Time Clock (Net clock). 2. This ensures that each workstation and server provide an accurate time stamp.   **Time Protocol (NTP): -**   1. A Network Time Protocol (NTP) server is a reference time server used in a network for the management of precise time to various system devices. 2. The server recognizes all Ethernet devices that request a time source, and the Time Protocol (NTP) server ensures that the time distributes properly from machine to machine. 3. In this way every piece of equipment over the network infrastructure with a time display and Ethernet connection will remain uniform and match each other. 4. These servers are internal to the police facility and do not breach the security system to receive time. 5. When used alone without a master clock, an NTP server solely conveys time to Ethernet devices.   **A Master Clock: -**   1. A master clock, on the other hand, does more than convey time to Ethernet devices. 2. It also has the ability to distribute time to multiple different clock systems or retrofit with existing clocks systems through its programmable relays. 3. In addition, a master clock is capable of scheduling various incorporated systems to shut on and off at desired times automatically. 4. All the settings for the master clock people can easily configure through an easy-to-use web interface via an internet capable device. 5. Additional functions do not present in an NTP server include Daylight Saving Time changes, 12 or 24-hour formats, and the possibility of adding a countdown feature. 6. When have you put them together? 7. Aside from their differences, a master clock and NTP server actually have the ability to collaborate with each other to provide an even better timing solution for a given facility. 8. When the two systems pair together, the master clock will receive accurate time from the NTP server to distribute to all clocks in its system, while the NTP server will synchronise all networked devices to the same time it provides for the master clock. 9. Combining both the capabilities of a master clock and an NTP server ensures that every clock, computer, printer, and any other device with an Ethernet connection will display the exact same time, all while having the added features of a master clock.   **Real-Time Mapping: -**   1. All aspects of a CAD system must “be optimized” for rapid response time and system reliability. 2. Since time is of the essence**,** the CAD system must accurately provide a data and time stamp for every activity. 3. CAD systems collect the initial information for an incident and then provide the information to one or more RMS systems.   **Logging: -**   1. **CAD** will log all actions including security violations and attempted breeches, errors, changes, and updates. 2. Logs should be viewable and searchable by the system administrator.   **Police Or Council Never Induced Any CAD Voice Recordings of The Original 999 / 101 Calls: -**   1. Communications Data Standard Operating Procedure: - 2. In this document the definition of (CD) will mean Communications Data: - 3. This Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) establishes procedures that ensures the Police Service of (hereinafter ‘Police’) manages its acquisition and use of communications data (CD) in accordance with legislation, and the Home Office ‘Acquisition and Disclosure of Communications Data’ Codes of Practice. 4. The procedures described in the SOP, persons can find in the provisions of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act **2000**, (RIPA) Part 1, Chapter 2 (the Act) which provides a legal basis for the lawful access to CD by public authorities including police forces. 5. The main purpose of the Act is to ensure that the police use the relevant investigatory powers in accordance with ECHR. 6. The Act requires that police follow the human rights principles. 7. Officers must ask themselves the following questions before utilising any of the powers under this Act: |   **451,**   |  | | --- | | 1. Is the proposed action lawful? 2. Is the proposed action necessary (for a legitimate aim)? 3. Is the proposed action proportionate to the crime or incident police are investigating: - “Not A Sledgehammer to Crack a Nut?” 4. Is the proposed action non-discriminatory? 5. In **2014**, the Government introduced the Data Retention and Investigatory Powers Act **2014** (DRIPA.) 6. This was in response to the European Court of Justice (ECJ) judgment of **08th of April 2014** which declared a previous Data Retention Directive (**2006/24/EC**) invalid. 7. DRIPA makes it clear that anyone providing a communications service to customers in the UK, regardless of where that service is provided from, they involved must comply with lawful requests made under the Act and requires relevant companies to retain certain types of CD for up to 12 months, so this may later be acquired by law enforcement and used in evidence. 8. The Acquisition and Disclosure of Communications Data Code of Practice (COP) was issued by the Home Office and approved by Parliament on **01st of October 2007** and subsequently amended on **25 March 2015.** 9. The COP provides guidance to public authorities on the correct procedures for accessing CD under the provision of the Act. 10. The Government deemed The COP as admissible in evidence in both criminal and civil proceedings. 11. Part 1, Chapter 2 Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act **2000** (RIPA) (the Act) defines communication data into three separate types. 12. Number three of three being: 13. Traffic Data (section 21(4)(a)) – data comprised in or attached to a communication for the purpose of the postal or communication service – incoming call data, cell site / location information, call line identity, and other records. 14. Authorisation 15. “CD may only be sought if a DP believes it is necessary for one or more of the following statutory purposes to which I do claim disclosure towards:” 16. For the purpose of preventing or detecting crime or of preventing disorder (S22(2) b). 17. For the purpose, in an emergency, of preventing death or injury or any damage to a person’s physical or mental health, or of mitigating any injury or damage to a person’s physical or mental health (S22(2) g). 18. To assist investigations into alleged injustices (Article 2(a).   **Repeat CFS Caller’s: -**   1. There is a clear issue contained within the respondent’s application for an Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) order in regard to repeat callers CFS, there is an enormous number of instances where we can identify a duplicate call in the Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) when the call handler on the dates of the incidents in question must cross-reference the CAD to the original CFS. 2. The calls must be correctly linked for future retrievability but are not and have still been added to the case file by the developing and investigating police officer in such a way that it is hard for any person to be able to clearly define the difference from each suspected victim and I do not understand how this is fair or correct to display evidence in such a way to gain a Proven plea against any citizen of the state.   **Disclosure with Regards to the Communications Data Bill: -**   1. Communications Data Bill is the Bill that provides an updated framework for ensuring the availability of communications data and its obtaining by public authorities. 2. It contains standard provisions in respect of, amongst other things, orders and regulations, commencement, and extent. 3. The new regime replaces Part 1 Chapter 2 of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act **2000** (“RIPA”) and Part 11 of the Anti-Terrorism Crime and Security Act **2001** (“ACTSA”) and sits alongside the Data Retention (EC Directive) Regulations **2009**. 4. The Bill is in three Parts. |   **452,**   |  | | --- | | 1. Under the Data Protection Act **1988** the Met police are to also oblige to release to the any person information it holds about them or their address on any system including the CAD system and Therefore I request all information requested within this official document of complaint.   **For Criminal Cases to Request a Witness: -**   1. (Criminal Procedure Rules, err. 28.3 and 28.4. 2. This form is NOT for use where rule 28.5 (confidential information) applies.)   **For Civil Cases to Request a Witness: -**   1. N20 Witness Summons (05.14)   **We Request Full Disclosure**   1. We Request Full Disclosure of The Contents Contained **in MG6:** Case File Evidence/Information. 2. We Request Full Disclosure of The Contents Contained **in MG6B:** Police Officer/Staff Misconduct Records 3. We Request Full Disclosure of The Contents Contained **in MG6C:** Disclosure Schedule – Non-Sensitive Unused Material. 4. We Request Full Disclosure of The Contents Contained **in MG6D:** Disclosure Schedule – Sensitive Unused Material. 5. We Request Full Disclosure of The Contents Contained **in MG6E:** Disclosure Officer’s Reports. 6. We Request Full Disclosure of **All Cads and Any Missing Cads, In an Unedited Format:** The Appellant Requests Copies from The Local Council Authority Environmental Teams Under the Environmental Act **1990** This Is to Disclose Any CD Relating to A Section 80 Abatement Notice of Noise Nuisance from Amplified Music, Sighted Within the Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) Application in Pursuit of The Respondent. 7. In Regard to **MG9:** We Request the Following Witness to Attended Court 8. **The applicant Needs a Solicitor to help with:** 9. Help?   **In regard to MG10:**   1. Witness non-availability the applicant requests full disclosure. 2. We request full disclosure of the police PNB books to all officers sited in events contained in the incidents within the Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) application inclusive of all officers who attended Crown Road and other sited CFS location’s addresses.   **The Disclosure Process: -**   1. For the purposes of disclosure, “Document” means anything on which offices record any description of information. 2. This includes written material as well as photographs, plans, drawings, and video and sound recordings. 3. Importantly, it also includes any electronic records such as e-mails. 4. The disclosure process is a statutory duty under the Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act **1996** including Codes of Practice (CPIA). 5. The general rule in English litigation is that the parties should have access to all relevant documents, including those of their adversary. 6. This “cards on the table” approach the Government has enshrined in the Civil Procedure Rules that relate to disclosure. |   **453,**   |  | | --- | | 1. There is also a Common Law duty on the prosecutor to disclose material before the duty arises under the Act, where it is significant, e.g., a victim’s previous convictions or information that might affect a bail decision. 2. There is also a duty on the police to provide the CPS with information that may mitigate the seriousness of an offence. 3. The investigator must inform the prosecutor as early as possible whether any material weakens the case against the accused. 4. A party must disclose documents that are, or were in the past, in its control. 5. This means that in addition to having to disclose any documents that are in the actual physical possession of a party, a party must also disclose documents that they have lost or have disposed of prior to litigation. 6. Officials must describe any documents and provide an explanation giving the circumstances in which they lost or disposed of the document. 7. In practical terms, a reasonable search will often involve the retrieval of any relevant files held in a central filing system, by individual staff or from archives or storage, the retrieval of any relevant electronic records and the retrieval of diaries if they are likely to be relevant to any of the issues. 8. The extent of the search which officers must make will depend on the circumstances of the case and has to be proportionate to the value of the claim.   **When Does the Duty to Disclosure Arise?**   1. Each party is to share the relevant disclosure by preparing a list of the documents they are disclosing and serve it on the opposing party. 2. The list of documents must be in a prescribed form and will include the disclosure statement (see below). 3. **The List Is in Three Parts:** 4. “Documents presently in the disclosing party’s control which that party does not object to being inspected.” 5. “Documents presently in the disclosing party’s control which that party objects to being inspected.” 6. “Documents that have been in the disclosing party’s control but are no longer the list will give each document a reference number, will specify its date and will give a concise description.” 7. Every piece of information that the prosecuting team have they may not disclose to the defence, but the prosecuting team will always disclose all information to the CPS. 8. A Prosecutor’s duty is to disclose unused material to the defence and even if this might trigger: 9. A not guilty plea in the magistrates’ court, or: - 10. A committal, i.e., the service of evidence in an indictable only case sent to the Crown Court under section 51(1) Crime and Disorder Act **1998** or on transfer of a case for trial to the Crown Court. 11. A person making a false disclosure statement without an honest belief in its truth faces the prospect of contempt of court proceedings. 12. Therefore, it is important that all party’s understand and comply with the duty of disclosure. 13. The duty of disclosure continues as long as proceedings remain, whether at first instance or on appeal. 14. All of the unused material that officers have they must reveal to the prosecutor by way of schedules on forms MG6B, C, D, and E. 15. There is an agreement between the CPS and ACPO that their crime reports and incident log the CPS will always manage to reveal as a matter of routine. 16. Officers must record information at the time they obtained or seize, as soon as it becomes possible for them to do so, and officers must record that, material in a durable or retrievable form. 17. If it is not practicable to retain the original record, e.g., because it forms part of a larger record which Government officials are to destroy, they must transfer the information accurately to a durable and easily retrievable form. Photocopies are acceptable. 18. Officers must record details of all the relevant phone calls concerning a case.   **Continuing Duty: -**   1. The duty of disclosure continues for all parties involved until the Judge concluded the Court Proceedings. 2. If after serving its list a party becomes aware of further documents that ever party should have disclosed, it must notify the opposing party by preparing and serving a supplemental list of those documents.   **Disclosure Forms: -**   1. There are four distinct types of disclosure forms as follows: - |   **454,**   |  | | --- | | 1. **MG6B –** 2. This gives details of the discipline record and convictions (if any) of any police officer/member of police staff that participates in the case. 3. It also includes Penalty Notices for disorder. 4. If no officer/member of police staff has a disciplinary consideration (or conviction) there is no need to put the form on the file, an entry on the **MG6** to this effect will suffice. 5. “This form can also be used to declare the convictions/disciplinary matters of employees of other investigative agencies on behalf of whom the CPS prosecutes e.g., UK Border Agency.”   **MG6C –**   1. The prosecution will disclose the schedule of relevant non-sensitive material to the defence and any material described in the schedule is the afterwards disclosed to the defence by the instruction from the CPS. 2. Material that the prosecuting team must list on the schedule includes all relevant unused non-sensitive material recorded, retained, or generated during the course of an investigation. 3. The exception to this is material seized during the course of a major investigation which officers have not examined due to its lack of immediate and apparent relevance to the investigation. 4. This falls outside the CPIA and is not ‘unused material’ but the police or council must record its existence on the form **MG11** with the appropriate caption, i.e., ‘the following material has not been examined by the investigator or disclosure officer and is considered not to fall within the CPIA definition of prosecution material’. 5. If an item of unused material contains both sensitive and non-sensitive material, the officer must list this information on the **MG6C** as being an ‘edited version’ or ‘edited’ e.g., a pocket notebook entry containing both the personal details of a witness and the circumstances of the arrest. 6. Block out the sensitive part (witness details) on a copy of the original with a dark marker pen (never white correcting fluid). 7. The police or council must never mark the original. 8. Do not list the unedited version on the **MG6D**.   **MG6D –**   1. The prosecution will not disclose the schedule of relevant sensitive material to the defence if it is not in the public interest to do so. 2. Officers must state their reasons for an item they are not going to disclose to the defence. 3. For example, officers’ details that identify an observation post they must not disclose to the defence. 4. If there is no sensitive material in a case, endorse form MG6D to that effect and submit it with the **MG6C** and **MG6E.** 5. Where you think you have material that is extremely sensitive, such as information from a covert human intelligence source (CHIS), contact the prosecutor who will refer you, as necessary, to the appropriate person for advice.   **MG6E –**   1. Disclosure Officer’s Report. 2. On the **MG6E** the police must bring the following information to the attention of the CPS: Material which contains a first description of an offender (Para 7.3 CPIA Code of Practice); or Material which might undermine the prosecution case or assist the defence. 3. The disclosure officer must record on the form the following: 4. Whether officers originally listed any undermining or descriptive information on the **MG6C** or **MG6D** on the original item number from the **MG6C** or D. 5. Briefly, the officers must record this information on the **MG6E**, e.g., 6. ‘Contains first description of suspect,’ or 7. ‘May cast doubt on reliability of witness.’ 8. The prosecutor must always inspect, view, or listen to any material that a person may consider as capable of undermining the prosecution case against the accused or that may assist in the case for the accused. 9. The Disclosure officer may need to consult with and allow the prosecutor to inspect the retained material.   **Failure to Disclose: -**   1. The Government regulate all party’s disclosure obligations under the Civil Procedure Rules require it to disclose documents which could be very detrimental to its chances of success, but which the opponent may not know exists until disclosure. 2. This is an onerous obligation, much stricter than that in other jurisdictions and the extent of these obligations often takes litigants by surprise. 3. In order to ensure that parties comply fully and honestly with their disclosure obligations, the rules provide for profoundly profound consequences where a party fails to comply with those obligations. 4. **Firstly,** making a false disclosure statement can potentially put the person making the statement in contempt of court. 5. **Secondly**, a party’s credibility becomes seriously weakened if it transpires that it has destroyed or failed to disclose a relevant document, whether or not this omission was deliberate. 6. **Thirdly,** where a party fails to disclose a document which is damaging to its case and a fair trial is no longer possible, the Judge is to strike the case out altogether. 7. **Fourthly,** deliberate destruction of relevant documents is likely to be a contempt of court and may constitute the offence of attempting to pervert the course of justice. 8. “Documents damaging a party’s case are to be released and not withheld or destroyed under any circumstances.” |   **455,**   |  | | --- | | 1. Finally, where officers never disclosed a document, it cannot later be relied on in court except with the court’s permission. 2. The Now Claimants mother and he have both proved proof that Steven Elsmore has deleted emails that he sent to Val Tanner, asking for information and the judge heard him admit this in the lower court at trial. 3. The applicant knows that police and council are holding back discloser and that disclosure would give credibility to the Appellant innocent.   **Preservation of Documents: -**   1. Because of the potential sanctions outlined above, it is important for officers to preserve intact all relevant documents from the time they contemplate litigation. 2. If a party has a routine procedure for destruction of documents, such as the deletion of computer backup files or e-mail, they must stop this from happening until the lawyers have examined the documents and they confirmed the documents are not potentially relevant as disclosable data. 3. Officers are not to destroy Documents relevant to case pending action. 4. All persons within an organisation who has the responsibility for managing official documents must be aware of these obligations.   **Fraud Act 2006: -**   1. Fraud by failing to disclose information a person is in breach of this section if he: - 2. Dishonestly fails to disclose to another person the information which he is under a legal duty to disclose, and: - 3. Intends, by failing to disclose the information: - 4. To make a gain for himself or another, or: - 5. To cause loss to another or to expose another to a risk of loss.   **The right to Fair Trial: -**   1. Appellant is asking for a Former Judge to examine the role of police officers, who present the applicant cases of an Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) against himself. 2. The Appellant is asking for the response to terminate the Asbo Case or dismiss it under the grounds of Article 6 of the European Convention of Human Rights, with regards to the Right to a Fair Trial Act **1998.** 3. Which in legal terms, should be the best means of separating the guilty from the innocent and protecting against injustice. 4. Without this right, the rule of law and public faith in the justice system collapse. 5. The Right to a Fair Trial is one of the cornerstones of a just society.   **Article 6 the Right to a Speedy and Fair Hearing: -**   1. The applicant declares the right to a speedy a fair trial what is fundamental to the rule of law and to democracy itself. 2. The right applies to both criminal and civil cases, although certain specific minimum rights that are set out in Article 6 applies only in criminal cases. 3. The right to a fair trial is an absolute Legal Right for all and with no limit. 4. It requires a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law. 5. The procedural requirements of a fair hearing might differ according to the circumstances of the accused. 6. The right to a fair hearing, which applies to any criminal charge as well as to the determination of civil rights and obligations, contains numbers of requirements and I believe the causes below full within them requirements. 7. The concept of a fair trial involves fairness to the prosecution and to the public as well as to the defendant: DPP v Makin [**2006**] EWHC 1067. 8. **Data protection Act 1998: -** |   **456,**   |  | | --- | | * <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1998/29/data.pdf>  1. The Information contained and held on the police Nation computers is not accurate to its information. 2. Officers Statements in the Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) have incorrect information copied inside of them from the police systems.   **Regarding Previous Convictions That Should Be in Respect of The Data Protection Act 1998: -**  **MG16: Bad character: -**   1. As has: as if to say in a past occurrence of an duration of time and can still: as if in to be explaining to day as present in accordance to the date at the top of this official letter, any person(s) of interest can look inside the case files and openly read a copy of the applicants criminal record otherwise known and named as a “PNC” record, this conferential and official document, Should not be available and is an Abuse of Process as no official MG16 form supporting a Bad character reference has been abused into the Asbo case files. 2. For this reason, the applicant also reverses his rights of the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act **1974** and states time spent to any convection’s. 3. Any pervious offences contained within do not relate to a similar natured offence such as the respondent has based their case upon. 4. There is all so, an ongoing investigation in relation to errors on his PNC record which we are slowly rectifying, and there is evidence supplied from the courthouse in response to the stated and we will supply this information on request to the relevant persons of interest and there for the applicant does not agree with any records of his criminal record.   **MG16: Bad Character: -**   1. As has and can also still be seen, is a copy of the applicant’s criminal record otherwise known and named as a “PNC” record, this conferential and official document being openly present for any person to read in the Asbo case files is an Abuse of Process as no official MG16 form regarding Bad character supporting a bad character reference has been abused into the case files.   **Abuse of Process: -**   1. Abuse of process the Courts have defined in law as something that is so unfair and wrong that the Courts must not allow it to continue and within the case of (Hui Chi-Ming v R [1992] 1 A.C. 34, PC). The Courts stated: - “that the court should not allow a prosecutor to proceed with what is, in all other respects, an unsustainable case ***(Hui Chi-Ming v R [1992] 1 A.C. 34, PC).*** 'Unfair and wrong' is for the court to determine on the individual facts of each case. 2. It is for the inherent authority to correct and/or agree to stop a prosecution to prevent an abuse of process they are exercising but only in exceptional circumstances: Attorney General's Reference ***(No 1 of 1990) [1992] Q.B. 630, CA; Attorney General's Reference* (No 2 of 2001) [2004] *2 A.C. 72, HL.*** 3. The essential focus of the doctrine is on preventing unfairness at a trial through which the applicant suffers by prejudice in the presentation of his or her case. 4. As contained in a copy of the lower court transcripts on the day of trial, while under oath PC Steve Elsmore stated to the district Judge that “Intel would be by open source and checked by an officer but was not done by him.” 5. When in fact it is his login that created and printed the applicant’s bundle, this can be proved by his signature and also by the computer ID log that must be used to print the data and use the (CD) that is contained within the Police National Computer and now has been submitted and is contained with the applicants bundle and is verified at the top of most of the pages or within the Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) application. 6. PC Elsmore continued to state under oath that he did not conduct any further investigations in regard to speaking to the owners of any premises to fix that of a notice of trespass or conviction or of two as the codes of practice say the main investigating officer must. 7. He stated “I have not personal spoken to the owners of the venue” |   **457,**   |  | | --- | | 1. PC Elsmore states under oath “There was a rave on an adjourning Road but not on that day.” (Please Take Note Here of inspector Hamill stating under oath that he was sure all locations were to do with progress way on this date.) 2. “Phone calls received were not relating to Crown Rd Rave on that day. 3. On the day in question phone calls related to this particular rave. (Progress Way)”   **Witness 1 – Inspector Hamill –R. O – 11.15 Am**   1. Statement contained in tab 9-lead 2. DEF XEX 3. Intel would be by open source and checked by a police officer, but Inspector Hamill never done it. 4. The rave was taking place indoors. 5. I have not personal spoken to the owners of the venue. **(No true line of investigation to prove trespass)** 6. I only see the D on the Saturday on the evening of the 7th Saturday. **(This was in fact early Hours of the eighth at around 1:00am.)** 7. “I did not go inside the gates as they were closed.” 8. I did not see any vehicles. 9. D’S Van registration is known to the police, but I would not personally know. 10. There were vehicles parked but I did not notice whether defendants van was there. 11. He was not aware of people squatting in that building at that time. 12. (Hearsay of officers continues D @ venue but **(unreadable text)** 13. Officer (unreadable text) but is Not present here today.) 14. There was a rave on an adjourning RD but not on that day. (**Please Take Note Here of inspector Hamill stating under oath that he was sure all locations were to do with progress way on this date I believe a copy of his PNB book will prove he attended Crown Road on the same date.)** 15. Phone calls received were not relating to Crown Rd Rave on that day. “**But are contained within the respondent’s bundle”** 16. On the day in question phone calls related to this particular rave. (Progress Way) **(A clear example of abuse of power)** 17. Pc Steve Elsmore printed a vast number of the police CADS that officers contained within the respondents Asbo Bundle and as the leading investigator he would know the truth to what they concealed and how he complied such intelligence to present any Asbo Case Files. 18. Contained within the Asbo Bundle is a huge majority of Police Cads printed out by Pc Steve Elsmore that no person can read the locations because he retracted the information in other words **(blocked out so no person can see the true locations)** This leads to concerns regarding important and relevant aspects of disclosure so the applicant can be represented by his legal team at the appeal with a fair hearing?) 19. In fact, crown road is two miles away, so quite a far distance from progress way. 20. Also from research that was gained, from newspaper articles and freedom of information requests made to the local council, that where put in pursuit of a search for the truth, about the true on goings for the dates that the applicant stands wrongfully accused of by way of incidents that are compiled in the respondents bundle and that surely do relate to Crown Road and not progress way, determines the right truth by explaining that there was a completely different incidents reported by CFS callers to a house / ware house party or maybe even a rave that took place and police attendance was requested by them members of the public. 21. The freedom of information request applied to and in receipt from the local council, inclusive of additional evidence such as the local newspaper report/ articles we have since adduced into the applicant’s defence bundle and served on the prosecution. 22. In the Asbo’s on goings the police added other incidents to set the now claimant up. These intelligence reports are from another house party that is said to have taken a place less than a five-minute drive away from progress way and if police did not forget to block out the rest of the Cad grid numbers inclusive of other landmarks such as A&J cars based in Enfield, I would not have been able to prove my innocents in the on-going application leading to an unfair trial. 23. **CAD** number **2410** date **08th June 2014** Page number **288** states different CFS callers reporting an incident with the attached landmark of a well-known building next doors to the initial reason for the emergency CFS call, that landmark produces a running company named as “A& J cars” what is a taxi services and is next doors to “Crown Road, in Enfield,” police officers creating the Asbo application would have known this. 24. The applicant would not have been able to prove his innocence in this case, if the developers of the Asbo never messed up by leaving this information present: “A & J cars” in the context of the emergency 999 / 101 call, CAD. |   **458,**   |  | | --- | | 1. retracted the true location, giving the intelligence in the cad a fake pretence to be progress way, this is the same for other Cads retracted and contained within the ASBO application.   **Termination and a Stay of Proceedings: -**   1. The applicant requests the for the Judges to make an order for a termination of proceedings or a stay of proceedings ruled as by the court in the ongoing civil proceeding, with immediate effect and in turn terminating or halting further legal process in the Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) appeal. 2. I again ask for the court to subsequently terminate the case or apply a stay and resume proceedings based on events that really took a place but no one official would listen.   **The Harassment Act 1997: -**   1. The Protection from Harassment Act **1997** 2. **The United Kingdom Originally Introduced the Act of Law to Deal with Stalking. However, since 1997 It Also Covers the Aspects of Conduct, Including:** 3. “Harassment motivated by race or religion.” 4. “Some types of anti-social behaviour.” 5. “Some forms of protest.” 6. **The Act Gives Both Criminal and Civil Remedies Such as Two Different Criminal Offences: -** 7. Pursuing a course of conduct amounting to harassment: - 8. A more serious offence where the conduct puts the victim in fear of violence. 9. **Harassing Any Person(S) Includes Any of The Following: -** 10. Alarming a person(s) or: - 11. Causing a person(s) distress. 12. The key element within an incident is a negative “course of conduct,” which can include speech, should normally involve conduct on at least two occasions, although there are exceptions to this. 13. In addition to the criminal offences, a civil court can impose civil injunctions in harassment cases as well as awarding damages to the victim for the harassment. 14. Section 1 of the **1997** Act states: - that a person must not pursue a course of conduct which “amounts to harassment of another” and which “he knows or ought to know” amounts to such harassment. Such conduct should lead to a criminal penalty (under section 2). 15. Section 7(2) of the Harassment Act **1997** states, that, “harassing a person includes alarming the person or causing the person distress”. 16. The course of conduct the prosecuting team needs to prove the Government has defined in section 7(3) and this section creates an understanding that officers must conduct the law on at least two occasions or more.   **The Definition of A “Course of Conduct”**   1. The Government has defined this in section 7 of the **1997** harassment Act, and they make it clear that the Act protects an individual from collective harassment what two or more persons cause. 2. The Act provides three defences to a charge or allegation of harassment. 3. Where officers have proved harassment, the defendant would have to show one of the following: - 4. That the conduct was for the purposes of preventing or detecting crime: - 5. “It was pursued under an enactment or rule of law; or:” - 6. In the particular circumstances the conduct was reasonable; it is for the courts to decide whether the conduct was in fact reasonable in the circumstances.   **Section 2 Of The 1997 Act States the Following: -**   1. “A person who pursues a course of conduct that is in breach of section 1 is guilty of an offence”. 2. The offence is subject to a maximum penalty of six months’ imprisonment, or a fine of up to £5,000, or both, and is arrestable. 3. Conduct includes Speech relating towards verbal harassment. 4. There are three elements of the offence: |   **459,**   |  | | --- | | 1. There must be a “course of conduct,” not just a single act 2. It has to amount to harassment. 3. The person must know, or ought to know, that the conduct amounts to harassment. 4. For the last point, section 1(2) makes it clear that the person should know that the conduct amounts to harassment “if a reasonable person(s) in possession of the same information” would think that it did as well. 5. Harassment Civil Provisions Section 3 of the **1997** Act: - 6. Permits for a person(s) to take civil proceedings in respect of any on goings of harassment. 7. This includes “apprehended” harassment as well as actual harassment. 8. In such civil proceedings the applicant can or should seek a “non-harassment” order, and/or damages. 9. Section 3(2) of the Harassment Act provides for damages to be available for (among other things) ‘any anxiety caused by the harassment and any financial loss resulting from the harassment’. 10. Section 3(3) makes the breach of a non-harassment order a criminal offence, punishable in the magistrates’ court with up to 6 months' imprisonment, and/or a £5000 fine, or in the crown court with up to 5 years' imprisonment and an unlimited fine.   **Noise Abetment Notice Section 80: -**   1. The Councils Environmental Protection Team (EPT) are there to investigate complaints about noise made from certain commercial and licensed premises and events within the Councils boroughs, such as the following 2. Noise from factories: - 3. Industrial units: - 4. Construction sites: - 5. Shops: - 6. Pubs: - 7. Clubs: - 8. Restaurants and takeaways: - 9. Noise from a university residential student blocks/halls or a place of residence, are the responsibility: - of the property owner 10. Low level/minor noise problems and/or a one-off isolated report suggesting there is not a persistent problem emanating from Housing or social property or caused by the homeowner, officers may refer to Housing or the appropriate property owner for the investigation of a breach of tenancy. 11. This includes noise from businesses conducting construction work on domestic property i.e., Noise from businesses conducting sandblasting on a domestic property. 12. Where a reporting person(s) or victim submits a noise report for the first time, the noise and nuisance team will endeavour to contact them to acknowledge their report and provide advice to prevent further nuisance. 13. Officers will send a noise information pack to them together with a noise nuisance diary. 14. If the reporting person or victim has given their consent officers will send a letter to the accused to advise them that a person has made an allegation. 15. Highlighting to the accused, a problem they may not have been aware they were causing, may be sufficient to resolve the issue at an early stage. 16. The police or council are to log noise reports as an enquiry within the services customer relations management system (Siebel) if not already done so, updated, and closed until the victim returns the noise diary, or officers receive further reports/evidence. 17. Copies of any correspondence sent/received officers are to upload into the enquiry. 18. Where people have witnessed noise and officers deem it as unreasonable an Out of Hours team response officer may attend, even for the first time, the noise and nuisance team will endeavour to contact the reporting person or victim to discuss the issue and offer advice as well in a more convenient time. 19. (If not previously provided) and consent sought to send a warning letter to the occupier/s at the address where persons witnessed the noise. |   **460,**   |  | | --- | | 1. Reports of persons where they have suffered from noise officers will always consider with merits, and officers may open a case for further enforcement action to be took as appropriate. 2. Officers will open cases where they deem noise as a statutory nuisance and then they could use a warrant which is a Section 80 Noise Abatement Notice, by serving it on the accused but only where witness suffer from noise on a second occasion and the officers deem the noise a potentially persistent problem. 3. Officers may use the following evidence to support a noise nuisance investigation, however, does not solely determine what constitutes a statutory noise nuisance. 4. Professional judgement is necessary of officers to decide if they consider the noise as a statutory nuisance. 5. Evidence, officers may use to support an investigation, includes. 6. Noise diaries: - 7. Calls to the Council and the Out of Hours service to report that the noise is Ongoing: - 8. Visits by officers and Out of Hours service to witness the noise: - 9. Witness statements from officers/Out of Hours officers and the reporting Person/victim: - 10. Evidence from noise monitoring equipment. 11. **Noise Diaries: -** 12. Noise diaries completed by the reporting person or victim(s) can assist the noise and nuisance team in deciding whether the problem is actionable or reasonable by providing details of. 13. The nature of the problem: - 14. The frequency, time of day and nature of the noise. 15. Where police or a council are to serve an abatement notice, they are to draft their notice and serve them within 7 days, starting with the day on which the relevant officer was first satisfied that the nuisance existed, or was likely to occur or recur. 16. Where officers are to serve an abatement notice, they must draft and served the notice within 7 days, starting from the day on which the relevant officer was first satisfied that the nuisance existed, or was likely to occur or recur.   **MOTIVE –**   1. If a person is deliberately using noise to cause annoyance or distress, then the noise and nuisance team officers will consider the circumstances under which the persons witnessed the noise and conclude their decision by: 2. Finding out if the behaviour was reasonable? 3. Finding out if it is intentional? 4. Finding out if it its controllable? 5. And if the accused fails to comply with an officer’s previous request the officer may abate the nuisance? 6. **THE NOISE AND NUISANCE TEAM** 7. Recognises that there is no set decibel limit that a person needs to exceed for noise to be categorised as a ‘statutory nuisance.’ Noise that could potentially be a statutory nuisance includes. 8. Loud music: - 9. Loud TV: - 10. Loud parties: - 11. Playing musical instruments: - 12. D.I.Y at unreasonable hours: - 13. Dogs barking for prolonged periods: - 14. Cockerels crowing: - 15. Alarms. 16. By way of example, loud music which occurs every other day for a couple of hours after midnight is likely to be a nuisance, a cockerel crowing in an urban garden at 5am most summer mornings could be a nuisance and deliberate banging which occurs solely to cause irritation could also be a nuisance. 17. If the noise and nuisance team need to gain entry to a property to conduct a seizure of noise making equipment or for the silencing of an internal alarm, they are to make an application to the Magistrates Court for a warrant to do so. |   **461,**   |  | | --- | | 1. Where an internal alarm is sounding, and a breach of the notice is occurring the Government requires officers to obtain a warrant so, they can gain access to the property in order to silence the alarm and abate the nuisance. 2. The nuisance team when undertaking a seizure they will make the offender aware by a notice of removing noise making equipment in the property, but when it is likely that entry will be refused if attending at the property without a warrant, such action would then make the occupiers aware of the intention to seize noise making equipment, with the potential for them to remove their items of property before officers are able to return with a warrant. 3. The officer should attend at the court number given or if not given a court number go to the listings office to find the relevant court number. Once in court the officer should present only the application and the three warrants to the court clerk. 4. The officer should have the abatement notice, OOH reports, witness statements and any other relevant information in case they may require in or by the Court.   **Proceedings will be as follows.**   1. The Court clerk will swear the officer in, and the officer will then present the application.    1. The magistrate will then ask any questions they feel are relevant.    2. If the Judge grants a warrant all parties are to sign the three copies of the warrant.    3. The noise and nuisance team keep the applicant’s copy. 2. The police or council are to leave the occupier’s a note of the works conducted on the seizure/alarm address. 3. The court’s copy is for the police or council to return to the court after the seizure/alarm silencing has taken place with the second page of the warrant completed. 4. **Seizing Noise Equipment (Seizures): -** 5. The Council’s principal power to be able to seize noise equipment is in section 81(3) of the Environmental Protection Act **1990.** 6. The Act states: ‘Where an abatement notice has not been complied with the local authority may, whether or not they take proceedings for an offence under section 80(4), abate the nuisance and do whatever may be necessary in execution of the notice’ 7. Following a breach of an Abatement Notice the case officer will discuss with the noise and nuisance team Supervisors/Managers as to whether it is appropriate for them to send a PACE letter (refer to section 10.0) to the person that they believe caused the nuisance and letter will show the officers intentions to prosecute the person while they advise that legal proceedings are being considered. 8. The applicant is now left with the understanding that the Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) application was created in the understanding that by pc Steve Elsmore and other officers acting in such a manner of the claims listed within this document and or by allowing other officers to use his id logging to gain such wrongful and illegal convections they did do so upon oath to the legal services, new Scotland yard London sw1h bog Reference number L/107087/sag and stated that they was sure that the defendant was responsible for the acts to which particulars had been given, in respect to the complaints made and developed by them self’s which are all concealed within the Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) application, in turn knowingly and deliberately while intentionally misusing his or hers and their powers of conduct, while and with complete disregard for law and associated regulations, to aid in a manner to which was reckless and caused extreme disregard for the applicants and other human life’s, creating a breach of many human rights as some are listed within this document in accordance towards the relevant issues of concern in regards to accountably breaches. 9. The rights to respect for each person(s) Human right “Articles” are of fundamental importance. 10. Any invasion of the defendants’ rights a judge must strongly justify. 11. All “public authorities” for the purposes of the Human Rights Act **1998,** are directly subject to the legal obligation imposed by section 6 of that Act to act compatibly with Convention rights, the state cannot discharge its obligations under ECHR Article 8 in relation to the retention and storage of data.   **ASBO Are Disproportionate: -**   1. The applicant states that the Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) is disproportionate, and it prevents him from engaging in lawful business. 2. The Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) prevents the applicant from applying for licenses to hold events within each local council’s boroughs, without alerting each individual council of the |   **462,**   |  | | --- | | offence imposed upon himself, named “The organising of illegal raves” being present as a convection, as this is relevant to the information required by the local councils as for the nature of the offence.   1. Any other person(s) would be treated different and would not have to sit on an official special committee at a board room meeting in relation to each different ward licensing that is being applied for due to this convection, as the applicant now must do because of the similarity of the offence that is being put towards the application for event licensing. 2. “An Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) order must not be treated as a criminal record as procedure rules and the guidance applied states, but due to the description of the respondent’s accusations all rules do not legally comply.” 3. And due to this the applicant has emailed each individual council; ward and was put in receipt information by each relevant department, the official documents raise the issue of concern regarding a statement dated **10/02/2016** what was written by Miss Lorraine Cordell, which a no fault of the applicants own, does not seem to be in the Appellant’s Bundle and clearly should have been, which proves the fact that a mutable amount of calls was made by Miss Lorraine Cordell in seeking a response from Local councils and police forces licensing teams, so to obtain information stating weather the Appellant would be able to get licensing for events he wanted to manage, the reply back (please read enclosed statement as exhibit sc1 ) 4. The Appellant states that other Councils explained to him and others that once he become subjected to an ASBO order relating to the entertainment industry the Asbo Order will continue to prohibit him from applying for any entertainment license and that any applied for license application will automatically fail and therefore this is disproportionate. 5. The applicant’s mother did an updated statement that she dated **10/02/2016** the reason being due to what police officers wrote withinside of the **Skeleton Argument for the Respondent: Page 5 section 20:** 6. “As to the prohibitions endorsed upon the applicant and the respondent saying, that they made significant effort to ensure that any legitimate business activities that the Appellant wished to undertake have they in no way inhibited by creating this Asbo order, their statement is another lie as well. 7. For the Appellant to provide recorded music to a gathering of people he would either need to have a license for that event or to provide the music on a licensed premise for fewer than five hundred people with a general license to play recorded music (sec s.1 and Sch. l of the Licensing Act **2003**). 8. This order specifically does not prevent him from supplying regulated entertainment under the auspices of a valid license.” 9. This is a breach of the applicant’s human right as he should not need a license to play music in private air unless he is charging money with a view to making a profit. 10. Corruption is an enormous obstacle to the realization of all human rights — civil, political, economic, social, and cultural, as well as the right to development. 11. The core human rights principles of transparency, accountability, non-discrimination, and meaningful participation, when upheld and implemented, are the most effective means to fight corruption. 12. In **2013**, the Human Rights Council requested its expert Advisory Committee to submit a research-based report to the Council at its twenty-sixth session in June **2014** on the issue of the negative impact of corruption on the enjoyment of human rights, and to make recommendations on how the Council and its subsidiary bodies should consider this issue (resolution [23/9](http://ap.ohchr.org/documents/dpage_e.aspx?si=A/HRC/RES/23/9)). 13. The Advisory Committee submitted its final report on the issue of the negative impact of corruption on the enjoyment of human rights in **2015** ([A/HRC/28/73](http://ap.ohchr.org/documents/dpage_e.aspx?si=A/HRC/28/73)). 14. The applicant has designed a business plan; this creates community events leading to an international festival and that sets out clearly the plans for events including marketing, safety, stalls extra and specifically refer to co-operating with the police. 15. The ASBO prevents such applications from being successful. |   **463,**   |  | | --- | | 1. The applicant will say that he was never involved in the organisation of any illegal raves as sighted in the respondents bundle and as defined under section 63 of the CJPOA **1994.** 2. The applicant will say “that he was not rude to the police but does feel like he cannot even go out for the day, with his friends, without members of the police force stopping and searching him. 3. Kind Regards: 4. Signed: 5. **Date**d: **14/10/2016** | | | | |
|  | | | **The Solicitor No Longer Worked for The Solicitor Firm; 19/10/2016** |
| * **The Solicitor No Longer Worked for The Solicitor Firm**  1. On the **19/10/2016** again Mr A Cordell and the Now Claimants mother attended Court, to find out that once again the Solicitors was not in attendance, the Judge had received a letter from Michael Carroll constating that Miss Ward no longer worked for the company, the Judge was very upset and said he was not going to allow the issue of: the “Missing documents, legal aid certificate “to be dropped, the Judge asked the Clerk of the Court to email Michael Carroll and co, so for them to attend Court on the **25/10/2016.** 2. The Now Claimants mother again said to the Judge that she had made phone calls to other Solicitors to try and get them to take over the Appeal, and due to the case being at an Appeal stage no one was willing to take the Appeal on. 3. Solicitor firm after Solicitor firm explained that because they hand not oversaw the case from the start and the size of the files that would need to be gone other beside the consultation necessary to take place it would be imposable for them to recover costs under the legal aid act alone, as it is a set amount agreed for all cases. 4. Legal Aid themselves even believed that the Solicitors dealing with the with the original trial should be the same Solicitors that deal with the Appeal, so no other firm incur the added cost. 5. When the Now Claimant mother got home, she again tried to call Ms Ward, this was with no reply she done this by texting her with no receipt in reply.  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **The 1st Appeal Stage**  **17 Out of 20 of 20 Court dates the 10 of 13 appearance towards the 1st Asbo**  **At Wood Green Crown Court and the Judge s were: -** | | | **Date:** | 19/10/2016 | | **Defendants Name:** | Mr Simon Cordell | | **Case Handler:** | Ms Sally Gilchrist Legal Executive Director Met Police and she was Present! | | **Court House:** | Wood Green Crown Court | | **Reason:** | The 1st Appeal Stage / Mention Hearing | | **Case Number:** | A2015006 | | **Judge s Name:** | HHJ Pawlak | | **Court Room:** | 4 | | **Contra’s Name:** | Robert Talalay | | **My Barrister Name:** | Mr. Andrew Locke | | **Note 1:** | (Mention Hearing) | | **Note 2:** |  | | | | |
|  | | | **Attended Court:** - **25/10/2016** |
| * **Attended Court**  1. On the **25/10/2016** the Now Claimant and his mother attended Court, once again the Solicitors were not in attendance, the Judge was very upset and done an Internet search under Ms Ward's name to find out if she was working under a new Solicitor firm, he found the new Solicitor details and sent an email demanding that Miss Ward attended Court on the **11/11/2016.** 2. The mother of the Now Claimant said to the Judge yet again that we have tried our best to get a Solicitor but had failed due to the case being at the Appeal stage causing no one to be willing to take the case on because of the cost they would get under legal aid in return. 3. When The Now Claimants mother got home from Court at 15:48 she received a phone call from Ms Ward, she stated that she knew nothing about, what had happened meaning that she did not know the Judge had asked her to attend Court further to the explained that Michael Carroll and Co had not informed her in regard to any emails sent from the Court. 4. The Now Claimant mother said to Ms Ward while on the telephone that she herself had previously tried to call her, this was to include the sent text messages that she had spent inclusively but Ms Ward had not replied or picked the phone up. 5. Ms Ward said while still on the phone that Michael Carroll had previously told her while she was leaving his company as employed staff that she must not contact any of the client she had gained this was to include the Now Claimants and his family members. 6. The Now Claimant mother and Ms Ward arranged to a meeting on the **27/10/2016,** to go over The Now Claimant's bundle “case load” to check for any missing documents.  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **The 1st Appeal Stage**  **18 Out of 20 of 20 Court dates the 11 of 13 appearance towards the 1st Asbo**  **At Wood Green Crown Court and the Judge s were: -** | | | **Date:** | 25/10/2016 | | **Defendants Name:** | Mr Simon Cordell | | **Case Handler:** | Ms Sally Gilchrist Legal Executive Director Met Police and she was Present! | | **Court House:** | Wood Green Crown Court | | **Reason:** | The 1st Appeal Stage / Mention Hearing | | **Case Number:** | A2015006 | | **Judge s Name:** | HHJ Pawlak | | **Court Room:** | 6 | | **Contra’s Name:** | Robert Talalay | | **My Barrister Name:** | Mr. Andrew Locke | | **Note 1:** | (Mention Hearing) | | **Note 2:** |  | | | | |
|  | | | **The Now Claimant Mother Meet with Ms Ward; 27/10/2016** |
| * **The Now Claimant Mother Meet with Ms Ward**  1. On the **27/10/2016** The Now Claimant mother meet with Ms Ward to go over The Now Claimant's bundle, upon looking at the bundle and the documents that the Now Claimant mother had added, and indexed Ms Ward stated she believed there were no missing files but as time went on, more and more documents that were relevant become apparent, these missing documents were never adduced, and the Now Claimant mother did not want to have to go back to the Judge and say there were more documents that were missing. 2. When on the phone and at a meeting then afterwards Miss Ward stated she had to attend Court but gave a different date that the Judge had ordered her to be there, The Now Claimant mother stated to her that the Judge had given the date of the **11/11/2016** and while we were in Court, Miss Ward stated that this was not what was put into the email that was sent to the company she then worked for. 3. At the meeting between Ms Ward’s and the Now Claimants mother The Now Claimant mother said she would send an email over to the Court to tell the Court that they both had met up and checked the Now Claimant's bundle and they believed there were no more documents missing at that point. | | | |
|  | | | **An Email to The Judge:** - **01/11/2016** |
| * **An Email to The Judge**  1. On the **01/11/2016** The Now Claimant mother authored an email to the Judge to state that there had been a meeting with Ms Ward, and they had gone over The Now Claimant's bundle and believed there were no documents missing now. 2. The Now Claimant mother asked in the email to the Judge if the Applicant still needed to attend Court on the **11/11/2016** and if so, could he confirm this via email. | | | |
|  | | | **An Email from The Judge:** - **02/11/2016** |
| * **An Email from The Judge**  1. On the **02/11/2016** The Now Claimant mother received a reply from Wood Green Crown Court from the Judge saying that we did not need to attend on the **11/11/2016** as he had vacated the date. | | | |
|  | | | **More Email’s to The Judge:** - **19/12/2016** |
| * **More Email’s to The Judge**  1. On the **19/12/2016** The Now Claimant mother sent an email to the Judge again and this time it was because of the need to find a representing legal receptive as they still not finding a Solicitor, who was willing to take the Appeal on. 2. The Now Claimant mother asked the Judge to help in regard to getting a Solicitor to act for The Now Claimant about the Appeal as time was becoming short before the Appeal hearing started. | | | |
|  | | | **More Email from The Judge:** - **21/11/2016** |
| * **More Email from The Judge**  1. On the **21/12/2016** The Now Claimant mother received a reply in by email from the Judge; this explained that the Judge could not help with a Solicitor. 2. The Now Claimant mother and Now Claimant still did not give up, they both carried on trying to find one that was willing to take the Appeal on and they were both upset and with the reason being as the Judge did state he would help with the issue of the Solicitor on the **26/09/2016** and another part of the reason being the case was to be heard soon. 3. His mother and the Now Claimant did not wait till the last minute to ask the Judge for help and the Judge then changed his mind by saying that he could not help. | | | |
|  | | | **No Solicitor's Firms: 09/2016** |
| **No Solicitor's Firms**   1. The entire of the Solicitor's firms that we had contacted prior to **September 2016** had simply refused to act in the case. 2. On the **12/01/2017** late in the day The Now Claimant mother received a number form a Solicitors of a Solicitor's firm called MK-Law, which may be able to help and after a telephone call they agreed to take the Appeal on. 3. Throughout our attempts to find a Solicitor, No Solicitor firm that was called wanted to hear what we had to explain so to be able to understand what the case was about, on one occasion the Applicants mother broke down in tears to the company she was talking to and they agreed to take on the case, this was as long as the Judge agreed to an adjournment, the Applicants mother, stated to them she did nothing the Judge will agree to this as in **September 2016** the Judge had stated he would not adjourn it again. 4. The Solicitor stated that they would not have enough time to be able to get all of the bundles and then be able to get a Barrister to go over them and that this would not leave time for them as the new acting Solicitors to have time to have a meeting with The Now Claimant and take instructions due to the weekend. 5. The new Solicitor firm said that they would send a Barrister to Court on the **17/01/2017,** to asked for an adjournment, so that they could act in the best interest of the client, as that is what they are there to do and so that the legal aid could be addressed and then passed over to them or a new application would need to be applied for. 6. The Now Claimant's health had deteriorated, when The Now Claimant's mother told The Now Claimant she believed she had found a Solicitor to take the Appeal on this did bring his mood up a little bit, but he felt so much had gone wrong within the Asbo case that there would be a high chance of more going wrong at that point of time, he agreed that he would attend Court and meet the Barrister that the new Solicitors was sending, the problem was that this person could change at any time. 7. The Now Claimant does not leave his home which he treats as his prison cell due to the Asbo case and prudery the police have committed and without any disciplinarily action, punishment, for any wrongdoing they committed has been issued.  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Judge s Name:**  **25/10/2016** | HHJ Pawlak]  Let my solicitor go | | | | |
|  | | | **The Mother and Uncle Attended the Court due to Government Figures Trying to Avoid Justice: 17/01/2017** |
| * **The Mother and Uncle Attended the Court due to Government Figures Trying to Avoid Justice**  1. Judge Justice 1: HHJ Pawlak 2. Judge Justice 2: Raja Bashhm 3. Judge Justice 3: Allan Bevon 4. On the **17 January 2017,** the Now Claimant and his mother attended the Court, the new Barrister was there also, for The Now Claimant, so was the Now Claimants uncle, we all went into a side room and the Barrister spoke to The Now Claimant, this was in regards to what the plans were for the case in turn what the new Barrister was going to ask the Judge for, which was an adjournment, the reason being they needed an adjournment so that they could act in the best interest of their client, so that they could go over the complete case bundles, take instructions, make sure legal aid was in place correctly, and instruct a Barrister who would be dealing with the Appeal for The Now Claimant, The Now Claimant agreed that an adjournment could be asked for, again it was stated to the Barrister that we did not feel the Judge would grant an adjournment, the Barrister stated that the Judge should understand that an adjournment would be needed for the new Solicitors to act in a professional manner for their client and be able to get everything ready and have time to understand fully what the case was about, that an Appeal should be fair for all sides. 5. The Judge, called us all into the Courtroom and the Barrister started to explain to the Judge the situation and that he was asking for an adjournment, he spoke to the Judge in regard to the legal aid, and having the appeal ready for their new client and having time to be able to deal with it in a professional manner for their client. 6. The Judge stated that he believed legal aid was still in place and it could just be transferred, the Barrister stated if legal aid had been revoked then it would take at least two weeks for it to be put back in place, the Judge adjourned the hearing so that the Barrister could contact the legal aid department to check the status of the legal aid, the Barrister made calls to the legal aid department, but the legal aid department could not confirm whether legal aid had been revoked. 7. We made telephone calls to Michael Carroll and Co who said to us that when they removed themselves from the record that the legal aid that was in place at the time Legal-Aid revoked. 8. The Judge called the case back into Court and the Barrister explained that the legal aid department could not say whether or not the legal aid department had revoked Legal Aid, but when we made a call to the old Solicitors Michael Carroll and co they had said that the old legal aid that the Legal Aid department had put into place was revoked. 9. The Judge handed the Barrister a certificate of legal aid, the Barrister said that the certificate was not proof that legal aid had revoked legal aid. 10. The Judge stated I'm sure that you can be ready for the Appeal to go ahead by tomorrow, the Barrister stated that they have a professional obligation to act in the best interest of the client and that they would not have enough time in order to go over all the bundles take instructions from the client, and instruct a Barrister within half a day, and also to check fully whether a new legal aid application would have been need to be applied for. 11. At this the Judge said, well if you cannot be ready by tomorrow, then The Now Claimant will have to act for himself, we will not adjourn the Appeal again. 12. The Judge was putting the Now Claimant wrongly in the blame for the delay in the Appeal, but it was not due to The Now Claimant, The Now Claimant only wanted a fair hearing and Appeal from when this started in **2014** and from what was going on this clearly had not been. 13. The Barrister tried his hardest to get an adjournment of the Appeal, but the Judge would not allow an adjournment, the Judge started talking about the conditions that the Judge in the Magistrates Court imposed, he stated that he felt that parts was disproportionate, but he could see nothing wrong with the timescale of the Antisocial Behaviour Order of 5 years. 14. This was not the first time the Judge had mentioned the conditions that The Now Claimant was under, but this time the Judge went further to include what sections he thought were disproportional, to the people in the Court the Now Claimant, Mr A Cordell, Miss L Cordell, and The Now Claimants Barrister, the only way of looking at what the Judge was stating he had already made his mind up that he thought the conditions was the only problem. 15. But this was before the Judge even heard the Appeal, why a Judge would say this without even hearing the Appeal is to understand that he is only human. 16. The Judge would not allow an adjournment and said The Now Claimant could stand for himself if the Barrister could not be ready by 10 0'clock the next morning, the Judge raised and left the Courtroom. 17. The Now Claimant was in such a state when we left the Courtroom, he stated he knew the Judge would not allow the adjournment and felt the Judge did not want him to have representation and this is why the Judge removed his old Solicitors, he felt very let down and just wanted to go home. 18. The Barrister called us into a side room and had to ask The Now Claimant due to what the Judge has said, if they were to change the conditions to something proper would The Now Claimant accept it. 19. This put further stress on The Now Claimant, The Now Claimant knew he had done nothing wrong and had not done what the police was saying he had done, and The Now Claimant knew that if the Prosecution had disclosed the request information, then he would easily have proven this. 20. The police have been unwilling to give any disclosure since this case started. 21. The Now Claimant was not willing to accept having the conditions changed and accepting the Antisocial Behaviour Order as this would have said he was guilty; The Now Claimant was not willing to accept something he knew he was not guilty of. 22. The Court, Prosecution and Asbo Case developers’ wrongdoing against The Now Claimant distressed him more than usual as he felt he would never get justice. 23. Later that day The Now Claimant's mother contacted the Solicitors to see if anything could be done, but due to the Judge not allowing the adjournment the Solicitors stated they could not take the case on and could not attend Court the next day, the reason given was because they would be putting their company reputation at risk by not having enough time in order to prepare for the Appeal to be able to act in a professional and correct way for their client. 24. The Now Claimant's and his mother could totally understand this. 25. No Official person should force any vulnerable persons into a position where they have to act on their own behalf, in the opinion of practitioners, detrimental to the administration of justice but non took this into account for the Now Claimant. 26. But this is exactly what had happened, The Now Claimant and The Now Claimant mothers and others cannot understand or see any reason why the Judge did not allow for a short adjournment so that The Now Claimant had proper representation in place, especially when there was a Solicitor’s company willing to take on the Appeal hearing, in turn to allow a fair Appeal hearing. 27. The Now Claimant's and his mother had not stopped since the removal of the old Solicitors in **September 2016,** they continued to try and find a Solicitors firm company, to take the Appeal hearing on, many calls were made to Solicitors companies, advice lines, citizens advice, even in the search of a pro bono Solicitors, the reason why the pro bono unit would not take the case on, is because The Now Claimant was entitled to legal aid, if The Now Claimant or his family could have afforded to pay privately for a Solicitors company to act for The Now Claimant this would have been done a long time ago. 28. Justice is meant to be fair but in the case of The Now Claimant Asbo this is not the case.  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Judge s Name:**  **17/01/2017 + 18/01/2017 + 19/01/2017** | HHJ Pawlak  We went to court with a new solicitor the Solicitor explained he needed more time, or he could not have client’s best interest at heart as only got the case days before and need an extension judge was adamant when he said no the judge stopped the Asbo case so the Now Claimant had to act on his own at trial next day.  We never went court mother would not allow.  Who sent the email transcripts? We never requested. | | **Judge Justice 1:** | Raja Bashhm Fake Judge? | | **Judge Justice 2:** | Allan Bevon Fake Judge? |  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **The 1st Appeal Stage**  **19 Out of 20 of 20 Court dates the 12 of 13 appearance towards the 1st Asbo**  **At Wood Green Crown Court and the Judge s were: -** | | | **Date:** | 17/01/2017 + 18/01/2017 + 19/01/2017 | | **Defendants Name:** | Mr Simon Cordell | | **Case Handler:** | Ms Sally Gilchrist Legal Executive Director Met Police and she was Present! | | **Court House:** | Wood Green Crown Court | | **Reason:** | The 1st Appeal Stage / Mention Hearing | | **Case Number:** | A2015006 | | **Judge s Name:** | HHJ Pawlak | | **Judge Justice 1:** | Raja Bashhm | | **Judge Justice 2:** | Allan Bevon | | **Court Room:** | 2 | | **Contra’s Name:** | Robert Talalay | | **My Barrister Name:** | Mr. Andrew Locke | | **Note 1:** | (Appeal Hearing) | | **Note 2:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Portrait** | | **Judge Name** | **Went To the Bar** | **Court** | **History** | |  | A picture containing person, person, indoor, bowed instrument  Description automatically generated | **S** | **9** | L |  | |  | A close-up of a stethoscope  Description automatically generated with medium confidence | **Raja Bashhm** | **9** | L |  | |  |  | **Allan Bevon** | **9** | L |  | | **End** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | **More Interrelating Side Issues with Members of his Neighbours due to Government Figures Trying to Avoid Justice: 18/01/2017** |
| * **More Interrelating Side Issues with Members of his Neighbours due to Government Figures Trying to Avoid Justice**  1. On **18th January 2017** the Now Claimant was so unwell he did not attend Court on this day, nor did Mr A Cordell, or Ms L Cordell, Ms L Cordell did however write a letter to the Judge and in that letter, it asked for a stay on proceedings for the Appeal until it was taken to judicial review in regard to what had gone on. 2. The Judge decided to go ahead in the absence of The Now Claimant with the Appeal; he heard the witness statements from police on this date.  * **19 January 2017,**  1. On **19 January 2017,** the Now Claimant and his family did not attend Court as his mother would not let him due to him being forced to act litigant because of the way the Judge had overseen the case, as her son the Now Claimant would have to question corrupt local Police Officers under oath on his own and when those officers were already trying to take his life away from him with illegal activities causing a high risk of even further reprisals. 2. Instead, she requested a copy of the Court trial transcripts   case has made The Now Claimant so unwell, at the end of this day the Judge dismissed the Appeal against conviction, but he changed the conditions that The Now Claimant was under, the conditions are still a breach of The Now Claimant's human rights. Schedule of prohibitions are below.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **The 1st Appeal Stage**  **20 Out of 20 of 20 Court dates the 13 of 13 appearance towards the 1st Asbo**  **At Wood Green Crown Court and the Judge s were: -** | | | **Date:** | 18**/**19-01-2017 | | **Defendants Name:** | Mr Simon Cordell | | **Case Handler:** | Ms Sally Gilchrist Legal Executive Director Met Police and she was Present! | | **Court House:** | Wood Green Crown Court | | **Reason:** | The 1st Appeal Stage / Mention Hearing | | **Case Number:** | A2015006 | | **Judge s Name:** | HHJ Pawlak | | **Court Room:** | Raja Bashhm | | **Contra’s Name:** | Allan Bevon | | **My Barrister Name:** | 2 | | **Note 1:** | Robert Talalay | | **Note 2:** | Mr. Andrew Locke | | | | |
|  | | | **Probation Conditions** |
| Magistrates trial dates **03/08/2015** & **04/08/2015**   1. 1 of 13 appearance **26/10/2015** 2. 2 of 13 appearance **09/11/2015** 3. Court by the 23 December 2015 4. On the **21/01/2016** we were on our way to Court and traffic slowed us down 5. 3 of 13 appearance **19/02/2016** 6. 4 of 13 appearance **22/02/2016** 7. 5 of 13 appearance **04/04/2016** 8. 6 of 13 appearance **16/09/2016** 9. 7 of 13 appearance **21/09/2016** + **22/09/2016**   **Collecting the Court Bundles from Michael Carroll's Office;** **23/09/2016**   1. 8 of 13 appearance **26/09/2016** 2. 9 of 13 appearance **14/10/2016** 3. 10 of 13 appearance **19/10/2016** 4. 11 of 13 appearance **25/10/2016**   **The Now Claimant Mother Meet with Ms Ward; 27/10/2016**   1. 12 of 13 appearance **17-01-2017 + 18-01-2017 + 19-01-2017** 2. 13 of 13 appearance **18/01/2017 + 19/01/2017**   **Schedule of prohibitions**  You must not:  **1.** Be concerned in the organisation of a rave as defined by **S.63(1)** or **S63(1A)** of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act **1994.**  **2.** Knowingly use or supply property, personal or otherwise, for use in a rave as defined by **S.63 (1)** of the Criminal justice and Public Order Act **1994.**  **3.** Enter or remain in any disused or abandoned building unless invited to do so in writing by a registered charitable organisation or local authority or owner of the premises.  **4.** Enter any non-residential private property (by which words buildings and an open enclosed the Judge & Prosecution intend to be individual) or an industrial estate between the hours of 22:00 and 07:00 without written permissions from the owner and a leaseholder of such property. If you can prove that the purpose of your entry of such property is to buy goods or services from any shop or garage or fuel supplier which is open to the public at such times. Then in such event, you may enter but you must not remain on such property for longer than 30 minutes and you may do so on only one occasion during each separate nine-hour period between 22:00 and 07:00 daily.  **5.** Supply any service in respect of any licensable activity in an unlicensed premises.  For the sake of clarity, nothing in this order prevents the defendant from assisting, preparing for, engaging in licensed licensable activities,  This order expires on the **03rd of August 2020**  This order and its requirements amendments a previous order imposed by Highbury Corner Magistrates Court.  **Condition four states**  Enter any non-residential private property (by which words buildings and an open enclosed the Judge & Prosecution intend to be individual) or an industrial estate between the hours of 22:00 and 07:00 without written permissions from the owner and a leaseholder of such property. If you can prove that the purpose of your entry of such property is to buy goods or services from any shop or garage or fuel supplier which is open to the public at such times. Then in such event, you may enter but you must not remain on such property for longer than 30 minutes and you may do so on only one occasion during each separate nine-hour period between 22:00 and 07:00 daily.  With this condition in place any non-residential property The Appellant would not be able to attend only for 30 minutes on one occasion during a separate nine-hour period:  This would include hospitals, police stations, 24-hour supermarkets, petrol stations, cinemas, restaurants, bars, night clubs and any other public place open to the public between these times that is non-residential The Appellant would only have a 30 minute window to be able to enter any non-residential building, however is not feasible that within 30 minutes The Appellant could be seen in a hospital within 30 minutes, how would it be feasible if The Appellant went to dinner at a restaurant they would be completed within 30 minutes, how would it be feasible if The Appellant wanted to go to a nightclub or late-night bar as it would only have 30 minutes, places that are open to the public should not be restricted to The Appellant how is The Appellant meant to have a normal family life. The Appellant cannot go to without written permission which would be degrading for The Appellant to have to ask each time he wanted to go somewhere and explain why he needed it to be confirmed in writing by the owner and/or leaseholder of the property, how this condition could be applied by any Judge and state it is not a beach of someone human rights is beyond me.  **Conditions two states**  knowingly using or supplying property personal or otherwise for the use of a rave as defined under section 63.1 of the criminal justice and public order act,  The Appellants has spent the last 10 years building his business saving every penny and help from family it is within the entertainment industry, he will hire equipment out and his services, The Appellants business would seriously be affected, because if he hired his equipment and it ended up in an illegal rave The Appellant would be in breach of the conditions. When hiring out equipment you do asked what is going to be used for, and you do have a contract that is in place, but what the person tells you their reason for hiring the equipment out is not always the correct reason and is not used for the purpose the person told you The Appellant would be in breach of these conditions. Also, if The Appellant loaned someone any personal belongings and that person ended up at an illegal rave then The Appellant would again be in breach of his conditions, even if the item were something that did not even constitute as being for an illegal rave.  **Conditions five states**  supply any service in respect of any licensable activity in an unlicensed premises.  How is The Appellant meant to run his business, The Appellant would not be able to obtain a license that has already been  clarified by the police and councils due to the Antisocial Behaviour Order that is in place,  The Appellant would not be able to offer his services also due to the restriction that he has only 30 minutes within a non-residential building, most events go to the late hours in the morning even if there was a licensed premises and someone wanted to hire the services of The Appellant the Appellant would not be able to do this. If an Employee offered The Appellant an excellent job contract within two nightclubs to be the manager  if The Appellant were  again, offered contracts within nightclubs or late-night bars The Appellant would not be able to accept these contracts.  I cannot even say why condition five has been  imposed because condition four conflicts with condition five in certain parts. And who would want to hire or take on The Appellant if he had to ask for written permission which would be degrading for The Appellant to have to ask each time he wanted to go somewhere or had a contact and had to explain why he needed it to be confirmed in writing by the owner and/or leaseholder of the property,  These are concerns with the conditions that The Appellant is under, there is other concerns with other conditions set at by the Courts that are of concern.  When the Appeal hearing was over the conditions was  not served on The Appellant, they were  posted to him in the post.  The Appellant mother has put an application into the Crown Court on forms EX-105 and EX-107 requesting the Tape/Disc Transcription for all hearings, and is waiting to hear back from the Court, to see if it will be  granted.  The Appellant mother has also put an application into the police under a subject access request to get all The Appellant history with the police which will show the data protection errors and more data that has been inputted incorrectly by the police, it will also show a history of how much the police does not leave The Appellant alone.  Also, how the amount of ignored complaints that we have sent into the police about how the police have treated the Now Claimant over the years which when asked in this ASBO application case by the Judge was any of this the truth they replied no to. The Judge also asked if anyone else had had an ASBO application against them for an ASBO on the dates held within the ASBO application, the Judge did not get a reply and it was  not asked again.  The police have not only done this to The Appellant but The Appellant whole family so each family member have requested their records. So far, the police have refused The Appellant application and his brothers, they have allowed The Appellant mother and The Appellant sister but only part of the information has been  supplied. This has been  passed to the ICO to address, but due to the backlog the ICO has we have not been  told a timeframe this will take.  At this time there is also complaint still ongoing with The Appellant and the police and The Appellant brother with the police. We also, noticed that police in the Asbo application have completed statements have other separate complaints still standing against them, with The Appellant brother complaint.  But until we get all the data, we have requested there could be more Police Officers in this ASBO application who have had complaints put in about them.  There will also be a complaint regarding the DPS who investigated The Appellant complaint due to the fact they did not follow their own codes, when this complaint was passed the IPCC, they upheld The Appellant Appeal to the IPCC and the complaint has had to be reinvestigated, due to what the DPS allowed to happen, and allowed the police officer to resign. Before allowing The Appellant rights to take his complaint to the IPCC for Appeal before seeing the report and allowing a misconduct hearing to happen, before The Appellant had his right to appeal and the IPCC and they left a large section out in the investigation which pointed to discourtesy by the police. | | | |
|  | | |  |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | **JR**  **01 Out of 0 of 0 Court dates the 01 of 01 appearance towards the 1ST Asbo!**  **The 1st Asbo at the JR High Court Jude’s where** | | | **Date:** |  | | **Defendants Name:** | Mr Simon Cordell (Not Present) | | **Case Handler:** |  | | **Court House:** |  | | **Reason:** | JR Stage | | **Case Number:** |  | | **Judge s Name:** |  | | **Court Room:** |  | | **Contra’s Name:** |  | | **My Barrister Name:** |  | | **Note 1:** |  | | **Note 2:** |  | | | | |
|  | | |  |
|  | | | |
|  | | |  |
|  | | | |
| **END** | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **The Asbo Stages & Members of my Neighbour’s getting involved!**  **Exhibit K** | |
|  | * Within the 1st Asbo I have induced Letters Emails and statements inclusive of Video and Audio recoding’s of evidence in relation towards my truthful claims.  1. Throughout the case the government manipulated the truth in front of the public and endangered mine and my loved one’s life’s and by them official persons achieving my dissatisfaction Members of my Neighbours also started to illegal attack me! 2. Members of my neighbour’s that at I classed as close friends / Family started to attack me for no apparent reason other than that of these wrongful rumours getting spread about me and my loved ones, when those people involved got asked to stop their miss-placed behaviour towards me they continued to victimise me, even low I provided them with good reasons to why not and included strong evidence to them! 3. A couple of years past by with me getting degraded and tortured by others no matter what official routes I and others tried to take to get these issues resolved, with no change! 4. This wrongful behaviour case me to lose out on a fair decision from a Judge about the first Asbo case on top of degrading my name and reputation this also cause me physical and mental harm of my well-being. 5. Members of my Neighbours who are in this report just simply banged away my legal process any a huge amount of respect from other people wrongfully, partly because of the lies they spread. |
| **END** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **The Right to a Fair Trial**  **R v Horncastle and others**  **Exhibit L** | |
|  | * Principal issue raised by these appeals are: -  1. whether a conviction based “solely or to a decisive extent” on the statement of a witness whom the defendant has had no chance of cross-examining necessarily infringes the defendant’s right to a fair trial under articles 6(1) and 6(3)(d) which provide: “ 2. In the Judge s determination of The Now Claimants civil rights their obligations are of any criminal charge against him, every person’s entitled to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal set up by law. 3. Everyone charged with a criminal offence has the following minimum rights: . . . 4. to examine or have examined witnesses against him and to obtain the attendance and examination of witnesses on his behalf under the same conditions as witnesses against him.” |
| **End** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Image Slider Test**  **Exhibit M** | |
|  | * To make transitions work hover mouse to top of web tab and leave it or hover mouse of the web tab onto desktop. * <https://horrific-corruption-files.serveblog.net/Flipbook-Indexs/ImageSlider-Facebook> * The Now Claimant was on bail conditions to live at his home for another case that he eventually won at Court that we call the “Gazebo Case,” this case took a place just before the Asbo started. |
| **End** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Police Statements Asbo**  **Exhibit N** | |
|  | Witness Statement of **A/PS Charles Miles** dated **02/08/2014** |
|  | Witness Statement of **A/INSP Hamill** dated **06/08/2014** |
|  | * Witness Statement of “**Resident 1”** * **(Signed by PC McMillan)** dated **14/08/2014** |
|  | * Witness Statement of “**Resident 2”** * **(Signed by PC McMillan)** dated **14/08/2014** |
|  | Witness Statement of **Douglas Skinner** dated **15/08/2014** |
|  | Witness Statement of **Douglas Skinner** dated **09/09/2014** |
|  | Witness Statement of **Jason Ames** dated **15/08/2014** |
|  | Witness Statement of **Aaron King** dated **15/08/2014** |
|  | Witness Statement of **Aaron King** dated **07/09/2014** |
| **END** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Asbo**  **Exhibit O** | |
|  | * Witness Statement of “**Resident 3”** * **(Signed by PC McMillan)** dated **19/08/2014** |
|  | * Witness Statement of “**Resident 4”** * **(Signed by PC Anderson)** dated **19/08/2014** |
|  | * Witness Statement of “**Resident 5”** * **(Signed by PC Anderson)** dated **19/08/2014** |
|  | * Witness Statement of “**Complainant A”** * **(Signed by Eric Barker)** dated **19/08/2014** |
|  | * Witness Statement of **PC Edgoose** dated **31 August 2014** |
| **END** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Asbo Forged Cads Explanation!**  **Exhibit P**   * **We Took All Cad numbers from Cad 10967 of the 07/06/2014**  1. When reading a Cad that the police and the Enfield Council adduced in the Asbo Application you must take notes of various aspects. | |
|  | 1. You will notice numbers and dates at the start of each Cad that the police and the Enfield Council labelled as. 2. **Linked:** explicitly to 3. **Linked:** implicitly to: 4. One of the points to keep in mind is the date that the squatters occupied Progress way on the **7th 8th of June 2014.** 5. In both 1st Magistrates Court & 2nd Crown Court Asbo applications the Linked files are the same and each CAD in each application shows the same Information. 6. Any Dates before the **07 & 08th of June 2014** is in fact Crown Rd, this also includes the dates of the **07th & 08th June 2014** also being Crown Rd. 7. The dates of **07 & 08th of June 2014** are the only dates in the Asbo application that have any form of victims for the Crown to have prosecuted me. 8. Crown Rd 9. A 10. A 11. A  * **Grid References.**  1. The police made the 02nd 999 call to the police while on duty Cad 1047 Pc Shinnick from the police Patrol Centre 2. CADS that the police took from more than one location other than progress way and used against me in the Court of Law 3. Cad 10471 4. Redacted Information that would have proved my innocence 5. Remarks made by Police Officers and civil servants   **PRINTED** AT 15:56 11: AUG:14 GPC  **SINGLE INCIDENT PRINTOUT**  **INCIDENT No.** **2410:08JUN14**  711243 YE DIVISON  **Time Date**  Illegal rave going on opposite A&J Cars |
|  | * **CROWN RD**  1. CROWN RD is now known as Travis Perkins, but the original companies name was the “Man Building.” 2. The Enfield Council had Control of the assets for the building until they sold it.  * [https://www.google.com/search?q=A%26J+Cars+enfield&rlz=1C1CHBD\_en-GBGB926GB926&oq= A26J+Cars+enfield&aqs=chrome..69i57j46i13i175i199j0i13i30j0i8i13i30.5243j0j15&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8](https://www.google.com/search?q=A%26J+Cars+enfield&rlz=1C1CHBD_en-GBGB926GB926&oq=A26J+Cars+enfield&aqs=chrome..69i57j46i13i175i199j0i13i30j0i8i13i30.5243j0j15&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8) |
|  | * **This is a up to date picture** * [https://www.google.com/maps/@51.6490462,0.0539904,3a,75y,0.34h,74.14t/data= !3m6!1e1!3m4!1s0uXv0C7xlJMrM0NAZ91gqA!2e0!7i16384!8i8192](https://www.google.com/maps/@51.6490462,0.0539904,3a,75y,0.34h,74.14t/data=!3m6!1e1!3m4!1s0uXv0C7xlJMrM0NAZ91gqA!2e0!7i16384!8i8192) |
|  | * **This is a picture in 2014 what is relevant to my defense as it has the squatter section still on the gate.** * [https://www.google.com/maps/@51.6497149,-0.0538192,3a,75y,115.76h,95.16t/data=!3m7!1e1!3m5!1saz Wzy\_HhHaW6zAbqVnkjvA!2e0!5s20140701T000000!7i13312!8i6656](https://www.google.com/maps/@51.6497149,-0.0538192,3a,75y,115.76h,95.16t/data=!3m7!1e1!3m5!1sazWzy_HhHaW6zAbqVnkjvA!2e0!5s20140701T000000!7i13312!8i6656) |
|  | * **My mother put an FOI into the Enfield Council about this building and what we can prove is**  1. The Enfield Council & Met Pole force Were receiving complaints about the squatter in this building while I was on curfew for the Gazebo Case / before the Asbo. |
|  | * **The Enfield Council had Control of the assets for the building until they sold it.** “**Check my diary dated; 25/04/2014”** * <https://www.enfieldindependent.co.uk/news/11459487.the-man-building-Enfield-wrecked-by-graffiti/> |
|  | * **Enfield Patrol Base**  1. **Address:** Great Cambridge Industrial Estate, Unit 17-19 Lincoln Rd, Enfield EN1 1SH 2. This building was a newish building almost next doors to Progress way were Pc Shinnick Made the second 999 call on the **7th of June 2014** to Mett CCC Bow Cad 1047 3. It is the building under construction in front: “It was built by the **6th of June 2014** and running as a company.” 4. When using Google Maps look in the right corner for the words street view and click on the clock looking icon for a date timeline.  * <https://www.google.com/maps/@51.6422795,0.0606787,3a,90y,29.12h,102.53t/data=!3m6!1e1!3m4!1sWe3HJMmpd7lRY1D-RtbAeg!2e0!7i13312!8i6656> |
|  | * **Progress Ways back entrances Location is down this Ally “Next doors almost to the then newish Patrol Base.”** * <https://www.google.com/maps/@51.6421005,0.0607902,3a,75y,91.33h,69.57t/data=!3m6!1e1!3m4!1sWPsltiqjqolmxvz9KUutXA!2e0!7i13312!8i6656> |
| **End:** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **One Original Forged Asbo Cad Exhibit**  **Exhibit \*\*\*\*\***   * **Example Cad** * **Police Cad 1047** * **Dated 07/06/2014** | |
|  | **Table  Description automatically generatedText  Description automatically generatedText  Description automatically generatedTable  Description automatically generatedA picture containing letter  Description automatically generated** |
|  |  |
| 1. **END** | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Asbo Forged explicitly to Linked Example!**  **Exhibit \*\*\*\*\*** | | | |
| **Linked: explicitly to:** | | | |
| **Linked: implicitly to:** | | | |
| 943:07JUN14  2649:**01**JUN14  3274:**01**JUN14  1081:**03**JUN14  2141:07JUN14  2456:07JUN14  2672:07JUN14  2906:07JUN14  3326:07JUN14  4015:07JUN14  4809:07JUN14  8931:07JUN14  10471:07JUN14  10844:07JUN14  10742:07JUN14  340:08JUN14  930:08JUN14  1646:08J0N14  2456:08JUN14  2766:08JUN14  2904:08JUN14  3151:08JUN14  3319:08JUN14 | 2989:**01**JUN14  1571:07JU14  8528:**01**JUN14  2255:07JUN14  2525:07JUN14  2757:07JUN14  3005:07JUN14  3436:07JUN14  4322:07JUN14  5206:07JUN14  10311:07JUN14  10481:07JUN14  10967:07JUN14  10506:07JUN14  625:08JUN14  1667:08JUN14  2608:08JUN14  2796:08JUN14  2942:08JUN14  3179:08JUN14  3350:08JUN14  3515:08JUN14  3946:08JUN14 | 5586:**01**JUN14  3190:**01**JUN14  6851:**02**JUN14  1047:07JUN14  1608:07JUN14  1380:07JUN14  2271:07JUN14  2601:07JUN14  2354:07JUN14  3037:07JUN14  3838:07JUN14  4323.07JUN14  5571:07JUN14  10393:07JUN14  47:08JUN14  749:08JUN14  1206:08JUN14  1768:08JUN14  2654:08JUN14  2845:08JUN14  2948:08JUN14  3194:08JUN14  5644:08JUN14 | 7983:**01**JUN14  3754:**01**JUN14  5897:**03**JUN14  1722:07JUN14  1816:07JUN14  2291:07JUN14  1323:07JUN14  2637:07JUN14  2904:07JUN14  3252:07JUN14  3986:07JUN14  4598:07JUN14  8841:07JUN14  10462:07JUN14  169:08JUN14  793:08JUN14  1631:08JUN14  2410:08JUN14  2764:08JUN14  2890:08JUN14  3132:08JUN14  3260:08JUN14  1341:**09**JUN14 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Grid Reference Finder Instructions for Asbo Cads**  **Exhibit \*\*\*\*\***   * The website link below can is to check the grid reference number for inconsistencies to which they show. * <https://gridreferencefinder.com/> |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **All Wrongfully Asbo Submitted CAD’s For 1st June 2014**  **All Cad numbers from Cad 10967 07/06/2014**  **Exhibit \*\*\*\*\*** | | | | | | | |
| **CAD** |  | **Num** |  |  | **Date** | **Time** | **Page** |
| **CAD** | Cad 1 of the day | 2649 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 01/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 2 of the day | 2989 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 01/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 3 of the day | 3190 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 01/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 4 of the day | 3274 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 01/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 5 of the day | 3754 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 01/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 6 of the day | 5586 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 01/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 7 of the day | 7983 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 01/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 8 of the day | 8528 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 01/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page Mag  2 – |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **All Wrongfully Asbo Submitted CAD’s For 2nd June 2014**  **All Cad numbers from Cad 10967 07/06/2014**  **Exhibit \*\*\*\*\*** | | | | | | | |
| **CAD** |  | **Num** |  |  | **Date** | **Time** | **Page** |
| **CAD** | Cad 1  of the day | 6851 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 02/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page Mag  2 – |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **All Wrongfully Asbo Submitted CAD’s For 3rd June 2014**  **All Cad numbers from Cad 10967 07/06/2014**  **Exhibit \*\*\*\*\*** | | | | | | | |
| **CAD** |  | **Num** |  |  | **Date** | **Time** | **Page** |
| **CAD** | Cad 1  of the day | 1081 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 03/06/2014 | Missing  CAD |  |
| **CAD** | Cad 2  of the day | 5897 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 03/06/2014 |  | Page Mag  2 – |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **All Asbo CAD’s For 7th June 2014**  **Exhibit \*\*\*\*\***  **[Backwards Timestamps.]**  **[Wrong Locations.]**  **[Police on Active Duty Making Emergency 999 Calls.]**  **[Missing Police Cads.]**  **[Forged Cads.]**  **[Reacted Information.]** | | | | | | | | |
| **CAD** |  | **Num** |  |  | **Date** | **Time** | **Page** |
| **CAD** | Cad 1  of the  day | 943 | Missing  CAD  Crown Rd |  | 07/06/2014 | Missing  CAD |  |
| **CAD** | Cad 2  of the  day | 1012 | (In Progress  Way grid ref  534380,  195513) | Progress  Way / | 07/06/2014 | 01:53 | Page  Mag  2 –  178,179,  180,181 |
| **CAD** | Cad 3  of the  day | 1047 | (In  Progress  Way grid  ref 534380,  195513  Main cad police Insp Hillmill  sent to  location progress | Progress  Way / | 07/06/2014 | 01:59 | Page  Mag  2 –  209,210,  211,212,  213 |
| **CAD** | Cad 4  of the  day | 1323 | (Lincoln  Way grid 534657,  195453) | Lincoln  Rd  Lumina  Way  Enfield / | 07/06/2014 | 02:41 | Page  Mag  2 –  182,183,  184,185,  186 |
| **CAD** | Cad 5  of the  day | 1380 | Missing  CAD  Crown Rd |  | 07/06/2014 | Missing  CAD |  |
| **CAD** | Cad 6  of the  day | 1571 | Missing  CAD  Crown Rd |  | 07/06/2014 | Missing  CAD |  |
| **CAD** | Cad 7  of the  day | 1608 | (In  Progress  Way grid  ref  534380,  195513) | Progress  Way Great  Cambridge | 07/06/2014 | 03:34 | Page  Mag  2 –  219,220,  221 |
| **CAD** | Cad 8  of the  day | 1722 | (Orchard Terrance Progress  Way grid  ref  534380,  195513) | Blocked  Out / | 07/06/2014 | 03:58 | Page  Mag  2 –  187,188,  189 |
| **CAD** | Cad 9  of the  day | 1816 | (In  Progress  Way grid  ref  534380,  195513) | Progress  Way / | 07/06/2014 | 04:15 | Page  Mag  2 –  190,191,  192,193,  194 |
| **CAD** | Cad 10  of the  day | 2141 | (Hardy  Way  Grid  Ref  531438,  197711  miles  away  (Gordon Hill) | Hardy  Way | 07/06/2014 | 05:50 | Page  Mag  2 –  195,196,  197,198,  199 |
| **CAD** | Cad 11  of the  day | 2255 | (Leighton Road  Grid Ref 534144,  195627  Bush Hill Park) | Leighton  Rd Bush  Hill Park / | 07/06/2014 | 06:24 | Page Mag  2 –  200,201,  202,203,  204 |
| **CAD** | Cad 12  of the  day | 2291 | Missing  CAD  Crown  Rd |  | 07/06/2014 | Missing  CAD |  |
| **CAD** | Cad 13  of the  day | 2271 | (In  Progress  Way grid  ref  534380,  195513) | Progress  Way / | 07/06/2014 | 06:27 | Page  Mag  2 –  205,206,  207,208 |
| **CAD** | Cad 14  of the  day | 2456 | Missing  CAD  Crown Rd |  | 07/06/2014 | Missing  CAD |  |
| **CAD** | Cad 15  of the  day | 2525 | Missing  CAD  Crown  Rd |  | 07/06/2014 | Missing  CAD |  |
| **CAD** | Cad 16  of the  day | 2601 | (Ayley Croft  Grid  Ref  534219,  195697)  Police  Building | Great  Cambridge  Rd / Ayley  Croft / | 07/06/2014 | 08:09 | Page  Mag  2 –  222,223,  224,225 |
| **CAD** | Cad 17  of the  day | 2637 | (1st Time  Laps  08:18)  (In  Progress  Way  grid ref 534380,  195513) | Progress  Way / | 07/06/2014 | 08:18 | Page  Mag  2 –  226,227,  228,229.  230 |
| **CAD** | Cad 18  of the  day | 2672 | (1st Time Laps 08:16)  (In Progress Way grid ref 534380,  195513) | Progress  Way / | 07/06/2014 | 08:16 | Page Mag  2 –  231,232,  233 |
| **CAD** | Cad 19  of the  day | 2757 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 07/06/2014 | Missing  CAD |  |
| **CAD** | Cad 20  of the  day | 2854 | (In Progress Way grid ref 534380,  195513) | Progress  Way / | 07/06/2014 | 08:56 | Page  Mag  2 –  234,235,  236,237 |
| **CAD** | Cad 21  of the  day | 2904 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 07/06/2014 | Missing  CAD |  |
| **CAD** | Cad 22  of the  day | 2906 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 07/06/2014 | Missing  CAD |  |
| **CAD** | Cad 23  of the  day | 3005 | (2nd Time Laps 09:22)  (In Progress Way  grid ref 534380,  195513) | Progress  Way / | 07/06/2014 | 09:22 | Page  Mag  2 –  238,239,  240 |
| **CAD** | Cad 24  of the  day | 3037 | (2nd Time Laps 09:20)  (Ty ne mouth  Drive miles away  Grid Ref  534375,  198125) | Enfield  Safe Store | 07/06/2014 | 09:20 | Page  Mag  2 –  214,215,  216,217,  218 |
| **CAD** | Cad 25  of the  day | 3252 | (In Progress Way grid ref 534380,  195513) | Progress  Way / | 07/06/2014 | 10:07 | Page  Mag  2 –  241,242,  243,244 |
| **CAD** | Cad 26  of the  day | 3326 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 07/06/2014 | Missing  CAD |  |
| **CAD** | Cad 27  of the  day | 3436 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 07/06/2014 | Missing  CAD |  |
| **CAD** | Cad 28  of the  day | 3838 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 07/06/2014 | Missing  CAD |  |
| **CAD** | Cad 29  of the  day | 3986 | (In Progress Way grid ref 534380,  195513) | Progress  Way / | 07/06/2014 | 11:47 | Page  Mag  2 –  245,246,  247,248 |
| **CAD** | Cad 30  of the  day | 4015 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 07/06/2014 | Missing  CAD |  |
| **CAD** | Cad 31  of the  day | 4322 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 07/06/2014 | Missing  CAD |  |
| **CAD** | Cad 32  of the  day | 4323 | (In Progress Way grid ref 534380,  195513) | Progress  Way / | 07/06/2014 | 12:25 | Page  Mag  2 –  249,250,  251,252 |
| **CAD** | Cad 33  of the  day | 4598 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 07/06/2014 | Missing  CAD |  |
| **CAD** | Cad 34  of the  day | 4809 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 07/06/2014 | Missing  CAD |  |
| **CAD** | Cad 35  of the  day | 5206 | (No grid or ATT location)  Crown Rd | Blocked  Out / | 07/06/2014 | 13:57 | Page  Mag  2 –  253,254,  255 |
| **CAD** | Cad 36  of the  day | 5571 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 07/06/2014 | Missing  CAD |  |
| **CAD** | Cad 37  of the  day | 8841 | (In Progress Way grid ref 534380,  195513) | Progress  Way / | 07/06/2014 | 20:07 | Page  Mag  2 –  256,257,  258,259 |
| **CAD** | Cad 38  of the  day | 8931 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 07/06/2014 | Missing  CAD |  |
| **CAD** | Cad 39  of the  day | 10311 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 07/06/2014 | Missing  CAD |  |
| **CAD** | Cad 40  of the  day | 10393 | (Great Cambridge Road miles away Grid Ref 534396,  197692  Carter hatch Lane but states behind tops tiles) | Great  Cambridge  Rd / Tops  Tiles / | 07/06/2014 | 22:38 | Page  Mag  2 –  260,261,  262,263,  264,265,  266 |
| **CAD** | Cad 41  of the  day | 10462 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 07/06/2014 | Missing  CAD |  |
| **CAD** | Cad 42  of the  day | 10471 | (In Progress Way grid ref 534380,  195513) | Progress  Way / | 07/06/2014 | 22:45 | Page  Mag  2 –  277,278,  279,280 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Asbo Cads More Info**  **Exhibit \*\*\*\*\***  **[Evidence of Forged Police Officer Statements Dates & Cads.]**  **Dated 19/08/2014**  **Accused Date 06/06/2014**  **Accused Date 07/06/2014** |
| * **The rest of the 07/06/2014 table is below!** * **Statement off:** Eric Baker * Police Officer 219382 * **Dated 19/08/2014** * He is a police officer in London Borough of Enfield and tasked to contact residents of the Borough who had called police to inform them of an illegal rave that took place over Friday **07th June 2014** and Saturday **8th June 2014**, in a warehouse in Progress Way Enfield * On Tuesday **19th August 2014** I contacted the caller of CAD **10471/07June 2014** by telephone that was happy to give an impact statement about how illegal rave affected her and her husband over the above dates mentioned. * The caller wishes to remain anonymous. I will refer to her as complainant "A" The original notes taken from the below statement are present in my pocketbook serial 370/14, page 1. * Complainant "a" said it was a warm evening and we had to keep the windows shut because of the noise. The next day we could not even go out into the garden because of the noise. It kept me and my husband up all night and made us very anxious the next day. The illegal rave totally ruined us weakened" This concluded what complainant 'A" said about this matter.   **Mr. Simon Cordell will say,** “that at no point did he take part in any form of Anti-Social behavior, and he did not organize or hire any equipment to this private house party neither was he attending a rave on the **6th 7th 8th June 2014th?**  **Witness Statement**   * **A/Inspector Hamill 201566** * **Friday 06th June 2014 Progress Way** * **A/Insp Hamill 201566 states;** "I have had a CAD created reference **10471** 7June dispatched officers to the location to access numbers, crowd dynamics and gather information around times the event is likely to run until ----and also to make contact or identify the potential organizer. Officers have reported back that Tyrone Benjamin and Simon Cordell where at location and to be the believed the event organizers, there were approximately two hundred people in attendance, the event had security officers covering it who had said that they were volunteers and not licensed through SIA. Officers have spoken with staff to confirm that all fire escapes were clear, that there were sufficient fire extinguishers in place and that there were first aid kits available."   **Exhibit** \*\*\*\*  Text, letter  Description automatically generated |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cads**  **Exhibit \*\*\*\*\*** | | | | | | | | |
| **CAD** | Cad 43  of the  day | 10481 | (3rd Time Laps 22:47  to 22:44)  (Wood stock Cres  grid Ref 534657,  195453) | Blocked Out / | 07/06/2014 | 22:47 | Page  Mag  2 –  268,269,  270,271,  272 |
| **CAD** | Cad 44  of the  day | 10506 | (3rd Time Laps 22:47  to 22:44)  (In Progress Way  grid ref 534380,  195513) | Progress Way / | 07/06/2014 | 22:44 | Page  Mag  2 –  273,274,  275,276 |
| **CAD** | Cad 45  of the  day | 10742 | (Lincoln Way grid 534657,  195453) | Lincoln Rd / | 07/06/2014 | 23:01 | Page  Mag  2 –  281,282,  283,284 |
| **CAD** | Cad 46  of the  day | 10844 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 07/06/2014 | Missing CAD |  |
| **CAD** | Cad 47  of the  day | 10967 | (In Albury Walk Miles Away  grid ref 535375.  202125 Cheshunt) | A10 Great Cambridge Rd / | 07/06/2014 | 23:25 | Page  Mag  2 –  285,286,  287,288,  289 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **All Asbo CAD’s For 08th June 2014**  **Exhibit \*\*\*\*\***   1. There are 37 CAD/ Incident numbers for the **8th of June 2014,** to which there is only seven in the ASBO application and only Cad Number 47 is Progress Way, the rest represent 32 Crown RD other premises then occupied under section 144 LASPO 10 minutes away from progress way. According to the statistics, the call center receives on the **08th of June 2014,** 300 people call per hour.  * <https://gridreferencefinder.com/> | | | | | | | |
| **CAD** |  | **Num** |  |  | **Date** | **Time** | **Page** |
| **CAD** | Cad 1  of the day | 47 | (In Progress Way grid ref 534380,195513) | Progress Way Enfield /Safe Hal Unit / | 08/06/2014 | 00:00 | Page  Mag  2 –  290,291,  292,293,  294 |
| **CAD** | Cad 2  of the day | 167 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 3  of the day | 340 | Blocked Out Page  Crown Rd | Blocked Out / | 08/06/2014 | 00:29 | Page  Mag  2 –  295,296,  297,298 |
| **CAD** | Cad 4  of the day | 625 | Lincoln Road, Bush Hill Park, Southbury, London Borough of Enfield, London,  534152,195940  To Far | Lincoln Rd / | 08/06/2014 | 00:54 | Page  Mag  2 –  56,57,  58,59 |
| **CAD** | Cad 5  of the day | 749 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 6 of the day | 793 | **Reason one**  Is Crown Rd and this I will easily prove because of the Linked in CAD on page 3 at the top line “Re Linked CAD 1380” What must be **07/06/2014** due to them only being 793 calls as of this Cad.  Cad 1380 would be the 5th CAD input inside of the Asbo folder for the 07th day and given this place meant because only Pc Shinnick call while on duty was above other than cads 943 & 1012, Cad 943 was never place fully inside of the Asbo and belongs to Crown Rd. While Cad 1012 linked to cad 943 allowing all calls about Crown rd. to get blamed on Progress Way.  **Reason two**  Another piece of evidence is that in Cad 793 on page 1 at the bottom and page 2 at the top there is a list of Linked: explicitly to &Linked: implicitly to: Cads and if you take note to the  “Linked: explicitly to: “you will notice cad 2456 and if you look at the “Linked: implicitly to:” and take a note of CADS   1. 2649:01 Jun14 2. 2989:01 Jun14 3. 3274:01 Jun14 4. 3754:01 Jun14   **Page 2**   1. 5586:01 Jun14 2. 7983:01 Jun14 3. 8190:01 Jun14 4. 8528:01 Jun14 5. 6851:02 Jun14   **Reason three**  Time Laps If Cads 793 is the seven hundred and nighty third call of the day at the time of  And Cads 2410 is the Also, Cad 3151 is the Cad 2410  Cad 3151 Caller is 3 HOURS: 25 Minutes, should equal 741 callers the same as Cads 793 to  On average there would have been 168 - 999 emergencies 999 calls made to the call center. | Blocked Out / | 08/06/2014 | 01:10 | Page  Mag  2 –  60,61,  62,63,  64 |
| **CAD** | Cad 7 of the day | 930 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 8 of the day | 1081 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 9 of the day | 1206 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 10 of the day | 1631 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 11 of the day | 1646 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 12 of the day | 1667 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 13 of the day | 1768 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 14 of the day | 2410 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd  4-page top line = A&J cars  Crown Road | Blocked Out / | 08/06/2014 | 05:35 | Page  Mag  2 –  65,66,  67,68,  69 |
| **CAD** | Cad 15 of the day | 2456 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 16 of the day | 2608 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 17 of the day | 2654 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 18 of the day | 2764 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 19 of the day | 2766 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 20 of the day | 2796 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 21 of the day | 2845 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 22 of the day | 2890 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 23 of the day | 2904 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 24 of the day | 2942 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 25 of the day | 2948 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 26 of the day | 3132 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 27 of the day | 3151 | (In Crown Road  grid ref 534960,196240 | Southbury Rd / Crown Rd / | 08/06/2014 | 09:08 | Page  Mag  2 –  70,71,  72,73,  74 |
| **CAD** | Cad 28 of the day | 3179 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 29 of the day | 3194 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 30 of the day | 3260 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 31 of the day | 3319 | (In Crown Road  grid ref 534960,196240 | Southbury Rd / Crown Rd / | 08/06/2014 | 09:39 | Page  Mag  2 –  75,76,  77,78 |
| **CAD** | Cad 32 of the day | 3350 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 33 of the day | 3515 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 34 of the day | 3946 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 35 of the day | 5644 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **CAD** | Cad 36 of the day | 5897 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd |  | 08/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag  2 – |
| **End:** | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **All Asbo CAD’s For 9th June 2014**  **Exhibit \*\*\*\*\*** | | | | | | | |
| **CAD** |  | **Num** |  |  | **Date** | **Time** | **Page** |
| **CAD** | Cad 1  of the day | 1341 | Missing CAD  Crown Rd  Steven Elsmore |  | 09/06/2014 | Missing CAD | Page  Mag 2 – |
| **End:** | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Robert Talalay the Asbo Prosecutor**  **Exhibit \*\*\*\*\*** | | | | |
| * **Asbo Response Bundle Pages:**  1. I requested my legal right to cross examine any victims or witness under the Crown Prosecution files 2011 and none attended Court as they were fictional. | | | | |
| **Hosted in:** <https://flipbooks.zapto.org/Flipbook3/mobile/index.html> | | | | |
| **NUMB** | **INFORMATION** |  | **DATE** | **EXHIBIT** |
|  | **Issues Of Concern Letter to Judge** | 1598 | **14/10/2016** | **Pages:**  434,435,436,437,438,439,450,451,452,453,  454,455,456,457,458,459,460,461,462,463  **The Prosecution team manual guidance 2011**   * Page 30 is the main one and the rest is good to read in the manual * [http://www.patrolofficer.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/ Manual-of-Guidance-2011-July.pdf](http://www.patrolofficer.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Manual-of-Guidance-2011-July.pdf) * Link to above [We Request Full Disclosure](#We_Reques_tFull_Disclosure)   **Robert Talalay Prosecutor.**   * I also requested any reprimands against him, and they refused to tell me about the 5 documents below the index as: [https://www.horrificcorruption.com/ 1st-asbo-folder](https://www.horrificcorruption.com/%0b1st-asbo-folder) * Named as; Bristolspotlight * Link to above [We Request Full Disclosure](#We_Reques_tFull_Disclosure) |

**Robert Talalay Prosecutor.**

Timeline

Description automatically generated

A screenshot of a person's face

Description automatically generated with medium confidence

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **In Ruff.**  **The Neighbours**  **Exhibit BB**.” | | | |
| * **The Neighbours**  1. Like a circle is a rotation along a circular path, they involved become “Afro-Caribbean-Killers**.**” 2. Towards the lead up and through the Asbo timeline and then UpToDate of this official document, we have and will continue to display an overwhelming amount of evidence that surly shows how Members of the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police Force tag teamed up with members of the NHS and Crown Prosecution to fake profile build and use forged official documentation that they fabricated and this includes a forged Mental Health history to aid in themselves violating **Article 2:** of the Now Claimants Human Rights of the **1998** Act. 3. Within this document we have exhibited the named offenders and we will evident how the named offenders attempted to take away the Now Claimants Right to Life. 4. The Right to life is an absolute must and this must mean that no person including Government officials had or have the Legal Right to try and end any person’s life inclusively of the Now Claimant life as mutable different people can easily prove they have attempted to. 5. **Article 2** is a stationary obligation and the Article means that all Government officials are to take the appropriate measurements to safeguard life by simply upkeeping the existing law while implementing any Bills Of Legal Rights to protect persons of the United Kingdom in a fair an informal manner but members of the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police Force who tag teamed up with members of the NHS and Crown Prosecution failed the Now Claimant by not taking the appropriate steps to protect his life in a non-bias way and as a result they involved have all now endangered his life while torturing him and this has caused him trauma for the rest of his life and all due to curl and evil crimes they committed. 6. All Public authority members are made fully aware at the start of their interval for the company of their stationery duties to the public and that of their requirements when handling sensitive or non-sensitive case enquires pertaining to company ongoings and that their decisions must mandatorily consider all person’s legal rights, and this clearly includes the Right to life. 7. All Government representatives are to take the correct Government protocols so, that they as staff do not affect or endanger the expectancy of any person’s life but yet again Members of the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police Force when and before tag teamed up with members of the NHS and Crown Prosecution deliberately tried to shorten the Now Claimant life expectancy by trying to murder him while allowing members of the public to try and murder him as well. 8. Members of the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police Force that were tag teamed up with members of the NHS and Crown Prosecution refused to arrest any person for any of the criminal offences he as the Now Claimant and his Support Network reported and those Government staff representatives used the reported Criminal offenders to fraudulently negative profile build against him to aid in themselves diminishing any responsibility for trying to take away his life and/or at minimal well-being. 9. There are more infringements that Members of the Enfield Council and the Metropolitan Police Force with their allied members of the NHS and Crown Prosecution all together allowed on purpose and took a part in on purpose to happen and these incidents are legal and Civil wrongs that had staff done their jobs correctly would not have taken a place against the Now Claimant and they are in short text as follows. 10. **Article 3:**Freedom from Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment. 11. **Article 5:** Right to Liberty and Security. 12. **Article 6:**Right to A Fair Trial. 13. **Article 7:** No Punishment Without Law. 14. **Article 8:** Respect for Your Private and Family Life, Home, And Correspondence. 15. **Article 12:** Right to Marry and Start a Family. 16. **Article 14:** Protection from Discrimination in Respect of These Rights and Freedoms. 17. **Protocol one, Article 1:**Right to Peaceful Enjoyment of Your Property. 18. **Protocol thirteen, Article 1:**Abolition of The Death Penalty.  * **The Neighbours**  1. **Hazzan Ozman**  * **Number:** His address is 97 Burncroft Avenue, and this is in the next Block of Flats. * **Neighbours Name:** Known as Ozzie * **Real Name:** Hassan Ozman * **Housing:** Secure Council Tenants * **Present Occupation:** Still the Current Occupier dated **07/11/2022.**  1. Ozzie normally rents his Council Flat out to loggers. 2. Ozzie loggers are and stays a big problem. 3. Hassan Ozman has committed crimes against the Now Claimant and these crimes the Now Claimant has documented in his diary, and also, recorded by Audio, Recorded by Video and other persons witnessed Ozzie in the middle of his illegal frenzied escapade. 4. The Crimes that Hassan Ozman has committed the police and the Enfield Council refused to fairly investigate. 5. Hassan Ozman front room and bedroom walls are side to side with the Now Claimants. 6. To the Now Claimants understanding Ozzie has lived in the block of flats Burncroft Ave since the year of **2004** and this is up until Date of the **05/10/2022.** 7. Ozzie = one person + another. 8. Ozzie = one person + 2 more sub-renters.  * **The Neighbours**  1. **Christine Smith**  * **Number:** 95 Burncroft Avenue * **Neighbours Name:** Known as Christine Smith * **Housing:** Secure Council Tenants * **Present Occupation:** Still the Current Occupier dated **07/11/2022.**  1. The Now Claimants has a large magnitude of evidence that has amounted over the years against Christine Smith. 2. Christine Smith made sure she rooted herself as the main cause to a wide-ranging of the illegal activities that took a place against the Now Claimant because none of the court order applications or documents on the government computer systems would not exist without her and her companion co-defendants. 3. X 1 person + others  * **The Neighbours**  1. **Karen Dunno**  * **Number:** 99 Burncroft Avenue This is in the next Block of Flats to Mr S. P. Cordell’s the Now Claimant. * **Neighbours Name:** Known as Karen Dunno * **Real Name:** Karen Becky * **Housing:** Unsecure Tenants * **Present Occupation:** Moved out of premises  1. Number 99 Burncroft Avenue does not run alongside 109 Burncroft Avenue internal rooms. 2. The flat is above number 95 and on the second floor. 3. Karen Dunno joined in with Christine Smith and Stain Curtis alongside with other Neighbours in the year of 4. X 1 person  * **The Neighbours**  1. **Stain Curtis**  * **Number:** 111 Burncroft Avenue * **Neighbours Name:** Was Known as Stain Curtis * **Real Name:** Was Stain Fisher * **Housing:** Was a Secure Council Tenants * **Present Occupation:** premises reclaimed by Enfield Council  1. 111 Burncroft Avenue is in the same block of flats as my rented home and is on the ground floor, 2. 111 is the only flat that faces 109 as the front doors face each other in a small separate communal landing to the main building and the kitchens in both flats run aside to each other. Both these flats have back gardens that also, run a join. 3. X 1 person 4. Stain is now deceased as of the date **17/04/2020.**  * **The Neighbours**  1. **Janice Barton**  * **Number:** 111 Burncroft Avenue * **Neighbours Name:** Known as Janice Barton * **Real Name:** * **Housing:** Secure Council Tenants * **Present Occupation:** Moved out of premises gave up her tenancy.  1. The flat of 111 Burncroft Avenue is empty at the current date of **05/10/2021** and has stayed that way for months prior.  * **The Neighbours**  1. **New Man**  * **Number:** 111 Burncroft Avenue * **Neighbours Name:** New Man * **Real Name:** New Man * **Housing:** Secure Council Tenants * **Present Occupation:** Still the Current Occupier dated **07/11/2022.**  1. Re Occupied 30/09/2022  * **The Neighbours**  1. **Debra Andrews**  * **Number:** 113 Burncroft Avenue * **Neighbours Name:** Known as Debra Andrews * **Real Name:** * **Housing:** Secure Council Tenants * **Present Occupation:** Moved out of premises  1. X 1 person 2. **was one** of the Now Claimants’ Neighbours who lived directly above him 3. Debra Andrewsbecame a friend of the Now Claimant when she moved into 113 Burncroft Avenue in the year of 0000 4. Her details are here within **Exhibited** as \*\*\*\*. 5. Through the years of \*\*\*\* till \*\*\*\* the Now Claimant 6. Debra had been seeing an Eardley man named Stain Curtis **Exhibited as** \*\*\*\*\*   after his wife passed away who lived on the same floor as me before he deceased.  Both Debra and Stain were heavy alcoholics and together they should not have been.  the local Authority’s understood this of Debra but not of Stain as he had not been an acholic for years prior to his wife passing away in the year of 2010.   * **The Neighbours**  1. **George Quinton**  * **Number:** 113 Burncroft Avenue * **Neighbours Name:** Known as George Quinton * **Real Name:** * **Housing:** Secure Council Tenants * **Present Occupation:** Moved out of premises  1. X 4 people  * **The Neighbours**  1. **Ambrose Tariq**  * **Number:** 113 Burncroft Avenue * **Neighbours Name:** Known as Ambrose Tariq * **Real Name:** Ambrose Atoro * **Housing:** Secure Council Tenants * **Present Occupation:** Moved out of premises  1. X 1 person  * **The Neighbours**  1. **Richard Edward Skinner**  * **Number:** 113 Burncroft Avenue * **Neighbours Name:** Known as Richard Edward Skinner * **Real Name:** * **Housing:** Secure Council Tenants * **Present Occupation:** Still the Current Occupier dated **07/11/2022.**  1. X 1 person  * **The Neighbours**  1. **Young White Couple**  * **Number:** 115 Burncroft Avenue * **Neighbours Name:** Young White Couple * **Real Name:** Young White Couple * **Housing:** Unsecure Tenants * **Present Occupation:** Moved out of premises  1. X 2 people 2. N/a.  * **The Neighbours**  1. **Turkish Looking Woman**  * **Number:** 115 Burncroft Avenue * **Neighbours Name:** Known as Turkish Looking Woman * **Real Name:** * **Housing:** May be a homeowner * **Present Occupation:** Moved out of premises  1. X 1 person  * **The Neighbours**  1. **Light skin Girl Rebecca O**  * **Number:** 115 Burncroft Avenue * **Neighbours Name:** Light skin Girl Rebecca O * **Real Name:** * **Housing:** Unsecure Tenants * **Present Occupation:** Still the Current Occupier dated **07/11/2022.**  1. X 2 person  * **The Neighbours**  1. **Mathiyalagan family**  * **Number:** 117 Burncroft Avenue * **Neighbours Name:** Known as Mathiyalagan Family * **Real Name:**   1/ Real Name Markandu Mathiyalagan  2/ Real Name Ravathy Mathiyalagan  3/ Real Name Ravathy Thambirasa  4/ Real Name Kajenthiran Thevarasa   * **Housing:** Unsecure Tenants * **Present Occupation:** Moved out of premises  1. The Mathiyalagan Family & Kanathran the Logger 2. X 3 people 3. Above Debra Andrews flat, lived the Mathiyalagan family 4. who were unsecure tenants that the Enfield Council accommodated 5. their information we **Exhibited as** \*\*\*\*\* 6. The history based around the Now Claimant had the Mathiyalagan family is that he helped a Mr. Markandu Mathiyalagan when he got himself into trouble. 7. The trouble started when the family first moved onto the Burncroft Avenue Estate. 8. They had a logger who lived with them called Kanathran. I believed Kanathran lived in the flat opposite to   was a heavy acholic and had her light skin children taken away from her got scared as I walked behind her as I was coming into the block of flats, I live in   * **The Neighbours**  1. **The 2nd Turkish family**  * **Number:** 117 Burncroft Avenue * **Neighbours Name:** Known as the 2nd Turkish lot 2x Adults 1 male and 1 female + 3x young children and 1x one new-born. * **Real Name:** * **Housing:** Unsecure Tenants * **Present Occupation:** Moved out of premises  1. X 3 people  * **The Neighbours**  1. **Rasheedah Lynch And Mica Cowan**  * **Number:** 117 Burncroft Avenue * **Neighbours Name:**   Known as Rasheedah Lynch  And Mica Cowan   * **Real Name:** Rasheedah Lynch & Mica Cowan * **Housing:** Unsecure Tenants * **Present Occupation:** Moved out of premises  1. The 3rd Set of occupiers 2. Black Woman & Man and young child Black family 3. X 2 people  * **The Neighbours**  1. **Ryhnna Daniels**  * **Number:** 117 Burncroft Avenue * **Neighbours Name:** Known as Ryhnna Daniels * **Real Name:** * **Housing:** Unsecure Tenants * **Present Occupation:** Moved out of premises  1. The fourth occupier 2. X 1 person 3. N/a Problems  * **The Neighbours**  1. **Louisse Miller**  * **Number:** 117 Burncroft Avenue * **Neighbours Name:** Known as Louisse Miller * **Real Name:** * **Housing:** Unsecure Tenants * **Present Occupation:** Moved out of premises  1. The 5th Set of occupiers  * **The Neighbours**  1. **Dakoto Dunn**  * **Number:** 117 Burncroft Avenue * **Neighbours Name:** Known as Dakoto Dunn * **Real Name:** * **Housing:** Unsecure Tenants * **Present Occupation:** Moved out of premises  1. The 6th Set of occupiers 2. X 1 person  * **The Neighbours**  1. **John Irving**  * **Number:** 117 Burncroft Avenue * **Neighbours Name:** Known as John Irving * **Real Name**: The Homeowner * **Housing:** The Homeowner * **Present Occupation:** Still the Current the Homeowner dated **07/11/2022.**  1. Re  * **The Neighbours**  1. **N/a**  * **Number:** 119 Burncroft Avenue * **Neighbours Name:** N/a * **Real Name:** * **Housing:** * **Present Occupation:** Still the Current Occupier dated **07/11/2022.**  1. Re Occupied Around the **07/11/2022**   **Overt Act**  **Malice**  **Libel** | | | |
| **Hosted in:** | | | |
| **NUMB** | **RESPONSIBLE PERSONS** | **DATE** | **EXHIBIT** |
| **2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011** | | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors & Enfield Council for Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/2006**  **Till**  **2011** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 1 / 00/00/2006:**   1. We contain the Evidence in the Now Claimants Diary!   **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 2 / 00/00/2006:**   1. **This is a picture of the front layout of Burncroft Avenue**   A screenshot of a video game  Description automatically generated  **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 3 / 00/00/2006:**   1. **This is a picture of the front layout of Burncroft Avenue**   **A screenshot of a video game  Description automatically generated with medium confidence**  **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 2 / 00/00/2006:**  **A picture containing graphical user interface  Description automatically generated**  **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 2 / 00/00/2006:**  **A picture containing text, indoor, display  Description automatically generated**  **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 2 / 00/00/2006:**  **A picture containing text, indoor  Description automatically generated**  **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 2 / 00/00/2006:**  **Graphical user interface, website  Description automatically generated**  **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 2 / 00/00/2006:**  **A picture containing text, television, screen, flat  Description automatically generated**  **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 2 / 00/00/2006:**  **A picture containing text, monitor, television, screen  Description automatically generated**  **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 4 / 00/00/2007:**   1. We contain the Evidence in the Now Claimants Diary!   **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 5 / 00/00/2008:**   1. We contain the Evidence in the Now Claimants Diary!   **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 6 / 00/00/2009:**   1. We contain the Evidence in the Now Claimants Diary!   **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 7 / 00/00/2010:**   1. We contain the Evidence in the Now Claimants Diary!     **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 8 / 00/00/2011:**   1. We contain the Evidence in the Now Claimants Diary! |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 1 / 00/00/2006**   1. When the Now Claimant moved into 109 Burncroft Avenue he met his new neighbours and what he can remember of them is some of the following: 2. The First on Now Claimants list is **Stain Curtis and his partner Brenda Fisher** as they lived the closest and shared a hallway together. 3. In the years of **2006** is when they first all met and throughout the years of **2007, 08, 09, 2010,** they stayed friends but not of the closest sort. 4. A simple hello and a quick chat would happen when their paths crossed whenever, or wherever that may be but always when on their ways out or in their front doors and at these moments in time is where their friendship mostly developed and showed aloe they keep the commonly other known morals and resect between themselves as neighbours, should always keep, the Now Claimant can remember that most of their intervals would tend to be over the back garden fence or in the Corridor of the block of flats. 5. The short interviews between the Now Claimant and Stain Curtis and his partner Brenda Fisher stayed short due to stain always being happy as he stayed preoccupied with Brenda. 6. A fond memory of the Now Claimants is of Stain being happy as he went on his journeys with his wife. Stains partner Breda would be in her wheelchair as Stain pushed her along their merry way and what else the Now Claimant can remember about these occasions is that when they both see him they would holt the wheelchair for a quick chat then afterwards speeds of again back along their route. 7. The Flat of 111 Burncroft Avenue were Stain and Brenda lived inside of belonged to Brenda and is the second flat out of two flats that are based on the ground floor facing each other. 8. There was also at first a **young female** that lived inside of 117 Burncroft Avenue which is the top floor flat out of two above the Now Claimants. 9. A 10. The middle flat directly above the now Claimants is 113 Burncroft Avenue and there was a tall **white man** who lived inside of it when the Now Claimant moved into his rented flat. 11. The Now claimant thought the man was around 35 to 40 years of age and as the days passed the now Claimant realised that the man would stand at his bedroom window facing the street and dive behind his bed like a bomb went off when he could hear noise and this became worse whenever the Now Claimant went into his back garden, due to this issue the Now Claimants spoke to his mother and his mother spoke to the gentleman to make sure everything was ok with him and he explained to her that he was Scared of noise due to being in the war. 12. The Now Claimant never had any issues with this man in the time that they lived next to each other. 13. The Two flats above Brenda’s flat are 115 and 118. 14. The now claimant can remember a **young couple** that seemed as if they were studying in collage together living inside of 115 and they all just said hello to each other when their paths crossed each other polity 15. As for the flat of 118 Burncroft Avenue the Now Claimant can remember an **oldish gentleman who was Indian** and very polite also. 16. The Now Claimant also met **Ozzie Hassan** due to being his neighbour as their flats and gardens run alongside each other but are in separate blocks of flats. 17. Ozzie’s nationality is Greek and he lived with his logger who was also Greek. 18. Ozzy had his bed set up in his front room and sleeps in there and this was up and till the year of **2019** as he rents out the Bedroom. 19. When a person first walks into the flats of 95, 97, 109, or 111 Burncroft Avenue they would notice that these are all ground floor flats adjoined but separated by two blocks of flats, with 95, 97 in one block and 109, 111 in the next block. 20. All four premises have back gardens and once inside the front door of one you will be in the hallway. With three doors of choice to go through. If a person takes the door to the right they will enter the bathroom and if they enter the door in front of them they will go into the bedroom and the third door to the left will take them into the front room. 21. Once in the front room there are two more doors one to the left which is the kitchen and the last door is at the end of the front room and enters into the back garden. 22. Ozzie’s logger became incredibly good friends with the Now Claimant as they always went out together to night clubs, raves, and on raving holidays together. 23. Ozzy’s logger is slightly older than the Now Claimant and Ozzy is the oldest of all three. 24. The Now Claimant drove before he moved into Burncroft Avenue and so did Ozzy but his logger did not. 25. Ozzy’s logger 26. Fake pills 27. From Night Clubs to festivals 28. Board of old fragilistic tricks 29. Not Cheating on his partner then at the time. 30. Giving something back on stead of always taking meant that the Now Claimant would provide a service of balloons 31. Noise in the Bedroom 32. Going outside of the block of flats 33. On the **19/11/2014** the problems with Ozzy exploded as he phoned the police on the Now Claimant and they called the Metal Health Team to do an assessment on him.   **A Bit of History About the Now Claimant.**  The Now Claimant went to Turkey in the years of **1990** with a friend of his and his friend’s family, while on holiday abroad for the first time he noticed how hot it was when they were on the beach and he also noticed how busy it was and that there was a high demand for cold & hot beverages and this gave him the idea of creating his own establishment within the catering industry.  After the holiday and when back at home the Now Claimant started to do research on how he could get involved in earning an honest living selling hot and cold Beverages.  By the year of **1996**  **No One Is Perfect and Some People Are a Lot Worse Than Others.**  **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 2 / 00/00/2007**   * **2007,**  1. Door number 95 in the Second block of flats the Enfield Council rent to **Christine Smith.** 2. The Now Claimant moved into Burncroft Avenue after Christine Smith did and Christine Smith met the Now Claimant because of an incident the Now Claimant caused in: - “**Chapter 18**” of his diary. 3. Si Note: In the events of my past occurrences while living on my estate! -- “I can remember making my first ever mistake, while living on my housing estate, what acutely happened on this occasion did take place on a hot sunny day, that then took place in the middle of summer, I was driving back home when I made an error and clipped another car wing mirror, this was unfortunate to happen, I think that I did put a note with my details on their window and that is how we latter chatted about it. The car that got involved, had got parked down my hometown street, I soon later found out the owner of this car was to be a Ms Christine, who is a close friend to Stan Curtis.”   **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 3 / 00/00/2008**   * **2008,**  1. **Debra Andrews** Moved into the Block of flats of 113 Burncroft Avenue in the year of **2008**. 2. The flat Debra moved into is the flat above the Now Claimants. 3. Unknowingly to the Now Claimant and his Family they were the perfect candidates for the local Authorities to move Debra Andrews above due to their reputable good nature when helping people that were in needle of support, as their ambitions in life was to provide a public service such as a festival that would mandatorily provide these services Debra Andrews desperately needed at this time within society so, badly. 4. Deborah Andrews is well known to the North London Authorities since her early adolescence as she raised High-Risk concerns to those alerted to her such as the Police, Social Services, Mental Health Care, and other services. 5. What is Known to be True by the Now Claimant about Debra Andrews is: -  * **Identity:** -  1. Debra Andrews is a mixed-race woman IC3. In the year of **2008**, the Now Claimant thought she was around the same age group as himself but later found out that she was much older by about **10 years.**  * **Description of character: -**  1. Debra Andrews makes it apparent to all that she is an Acholic that is still drinking out of control. 2. Debra Andrews Speech stays slurred in any conversation and her face slops downwards but only on one side as her eyes showed a life of misery. 3. Debra Andrews has a distinctive presence about her that seem as if she is born with a brain deficiency causing her to stay within a well advance 13 years old of an age Group and she also tends to be dribbling down one side of her mouth. 4. Friends and family of alike also find that when they are speaking to Debra that she carries a tendency to suck up her dribble, straight back into her mouth for herself to be able to speak aloud again. 5. It advised that when speaking to Debra Andrews that all persons are to stay contusions and careful of more than just a wind fill and in more than just one aspect as her words trend not to make sense and her breath is as if she has a free ticket to unlimited alcohol. 6. Her stance is lurched but to the eyes of the beholder they will find that no matter how intoxicated Debra gets she does not sway as if in tipsy.   **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 4 / 00/00/2009**   * **2009,**  1. A   **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 5 / 00/00/2010**   * **2010,**  1. Stains Wife Sadly Passed Away!   Stains Neighbours across his road supported him.  Stain Told the Now Claimant that he used to be an Acholic  Stain Told the Now Claimant that he used to be a Lorry Driver  **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 6 / 00/00/2011**   * **2011**  1. Stain and Debra become drinking partners and more, the Now Claimant started to hear his dog bark as someone opened and then entered into the separated corridor of the flats of 109 and 111 Burncroft Avenue and because he carried extremely about his and his fellow neighbour’s welfare | | |
| **2012** | | | |
|  | **Exhibit** **BB1**   * **Responsible Doctors & Enfield Council**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because 2. Enfield Council Case History Deborah Andrews / The 1st Injunction Order: | **12/03/2012** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB1 – 1 / 01/03/2012:**  **From Enfield Councils Databases: - History Forged Against the Now Claimant and Illegally Detained.**   * <https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Original-Files-Folder/All%20Case%20Original%20Court%20Application%20Case%20Files/All%20Case%20Original%20Court%20Application%20Case%20Files/18_01_2019%20FOI%20Folder/FOI%20%20from%20Council%20Split/Attachment%205_105..pdf> * **Page** 7   **--**  **Referral Details**  **23/09/2015**: Organisation making referral Housing Anti-Social Behaviour Response Team  **History**  **23/09/2015**: Agree an Action Plan with the Complainant ACTION PLAN PROVIDED TO THE VICTIM AND A COPY FORWARDED TO HER CPN BOLA QUADRI   1. Dated the **23/09/2015** 2. **“March 12** - 1st contact with MH services following arrest after a: - **“Bad Trip of Taking LSD & Alcohol,**” mental state assessed remained in custody of police - no MH input”   **--**   1. **March 14** - 2nd contact, assessed by team psychiatrist, presented with anxiety & suicidal thoughts in context of social stressors due to pending court case leading to stress. Discharged form MH services, suicidal thoughts are longstanding from early childhood and present at times of high stress, not 'A typical' of other forms of suicide as relates to thoughts as opposed to wish to die, and usually found in context of those presenting with early childhood trauma as a way of expressing emotions. 2. **Nov l4** - Mental Health Act assessment, not detained in hospital, discharged from mental health services.   Presented highly volatile, angry & paranoid about motives of others, presented in context of social stressors due to on-going issues with police & court process –  mother reported he has been targeted by police causing him stress??  He has a medical history of Crohn's disease which may impact on mood stability particularly if not compliant with treatment and monitoring of symptoms.  All assessments completed by mental health services have found no evidence of serious mental illness,  “He appears to be a very angry young man who has had an extremely difficult and traumatic early childhood which is likely to explain his distrust of people in authority **(e.g., police)** and being angry at others and at the world....”  Regards Debbie  --   1. **23/09/2015 Classification:** PROTECT   Good afternoon, Debbie,  Hope you are doing well?  could you kindly advise if the above tenant is known to your service and if he is, does he have a CPN and does he engage?  Thank you for your assistance  Mr Simon Cordell,  109 Burncroft Avenue,  Enfield,  EN3 7JQ  DOB=25 (34 yrs.)  Phone=020 8  Dolly Ogunseye Anti-Social Behaviour Officer Housing Anti-Social Behaviour Team Tenancy Manager  Enfield Council  **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB1 – 2 / 13/08/2012: = March 12** - 1st contact  **HERTFORDSHIRE CONSTABULARY)**   1. Police Came to mine and arrested me “for an accused shop robbery & a separate car case, I got held then bailed for the robbery then while in custody the next day I got re arrested, straight away.   **Arrest**  **Arrest/Summons Ref:**  **Name Charged:** CORDELL, SIMON PAUL.  **Date of Birth:**  **Fingerprint Status:** CONFIRMED 41 ID  **15/08/2012**  NOT TAKEN ARRESTED ON  **13/08/2012**  10:30 41 HQ 13/08/12.  **DNA Status:** COYLE/PC/8  **Process Stage:** 41 (HERTFORDSHIRE CONSTABULARY) CPS (CROWN PROSECUTION SERVICE) 13/09/13.  **Arresting Officer:**  **Report Owner:**  **Prosecuting Agent:** CROWN PROSECUTION SERVICE (CPS.)  **Description:** REMANDED ON POLICE BAIL ON 14/08/12  **At:** 41K1  **To Appear At:** NEXT APPEARING ON 18/09/12 AT 41K1  **Owner:** 41 (HERTFORDSHIRE CONSTABULARY) 14/08/12.  **Condition 1:** NOT TO CONTACT DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY ANY WITNESS CONNECTED TO THIS INVESTIGATION.  **Condition 2:** NOT TO ENTER HERTFORDSHIRE EXCEPT TO ANSWER POLICE BAIL.  **Condition 3:** RES EDMONTON N9.  **Dates Held in the Police Station:** 13/08/**2012**.  **Dates Held in the Police Station:** 14/08/**2012**.  **Bailed to the:** 18/09/**2012**.  **Final Result:** “Case Won by Si”  **Re Arrested on the:** 14/08/**2012** **Transported to:** West Midlands “Birmingham”  Accused Car Case!  **14/08/2012:** “Arrested from; (41 HERTFORDSHIRE CONSTABULARY) the Police Station.”  **15/08/2012:** “Released on Bail”  **Bail till the:** 12/09/**2012**  **Final Result:** “Case Won by Si”  **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB1 – 3 / 13/08/2012: = March 12** - 1st contact  **The Doctor’s Folder / pub Book Issue: five!**  **Stage 5**  **Folder five**  Originator Details: 13 Aug **2012**  Last Amended by Details: 13 Aug **2012**  Mohammad Fohim Nursing  **Page Numbers:**106  **Originator Details:** 13 Aug **2012** 18:58  Mohammad Fohim  **Nursing Originally Entered by Details:** 13 Aug **2012** 19:13  **Mohammad Fohim Last Amended by Details:** 13 Aug **2012** 19:13  **Mohammad Fohim Validated by Details:** 13 Aug **2012** 19:13  **Mohammad Fohim Significant:** No Added to Risk  **History:** No  **Contains Third Party Info:** No Conceal  **From Client:** Not Concealed Enfield AAC   1. Faxed referral received from CFH A&E Dr Smith 2. Reported SC was under police arrest (for? crime related offence) and four police officers brought him to CFH A&E due to: - “**Effects of LSD”** he took over the weekend. He had about 2 x paper LSD last Saturday and ?5mcg liquid LSD on Sunday, also had about one bottle of rum yesterday. 3. Had been partying over the weekend at a festival. Was under care of medics (? had first aid) at the festival. 4. Was agitated on arrival, but calm down later.? hallucinating, seeing assorted colours. 5. No other risk or symptoms identified. Dr Smith reported that these LSD effects might last for about 48hours. 6. Referral triaged and advised that he did not need an emergency mental health assessment at present. 7. Advised for him to see his GP. Likely would be arrested by police. |
| **INFO** | * **Exhibit BB1** we have split into five sections **A**, **B**, **C**, **D**, **E.**   --   1. **The First incident: BB1 – 1 – A/** 2. Is the creation date of the Enfield Councils history against The Now Claimant, dated **23/09/2015.** 3. We will not be explaining this date yet as we are going to be tackling incidents in a chronological order through this tabled document. 4. **The Second Incident: BB1 – 1 – B** 5. Is a wrongful arrest for a robbery backdating over 10 years.  * Evidence: Exhibit BB1 – 2 / 13/08/2012:  1. is a printed-out section of the Now Claimants Criminal record held on the Metropolitans police National Computer Systems named as ACRO. 2. This Proves that the date of the No Further Actioned Incident was transferred between Government systems by employees inaccurately.  * Evidence: Exhibit BB1 – 3 / 13/08/2012:  1. This piece of evidence is a printout of the NHS Computer Systems named as RIO. 2. This also proves the date is wrong and first imputed report 3. The key word of LSD proves that the 4. **00/03/2012** is really the **13/08/2012** 5. The **13/08/2012** is the correct date of the arrest that the Now Claimant was detained by police wrongfully to the hospital and then taken to the police station for Criminal Offences that he did not commit. 6. **Evidence Exhibit**: BB1 – 2 / **13/08/2012** as above proves the police had no evidence to charge the Now Claimant and the case was latter no further actioned. 7. The information held on the Enfield Councils Computer system pursuing this date is wrong in its context as the date is inaccurately wrong by displaying: - “**March 12**.” 8. The **Evidence Exhibit**: BB1 – 1 / **01/03/2012** is information that is held on the Enfield Councils Computer wrongly and also is set out in such a way that the information describes the Now Claimants as a criminal for facts not proved tarnishing his true good character in an unfair way. 9. The purposes of the Enfield Councils staff obtaining this personal data against the Now Claimant was to avoid Justice and clearly would have been a breach of the data act **1998** knowingly to them as official persons. 10. The timeline as opposed to what you are reading now and exhibited as BB clearly shows that the facts mentioned on this day are factual evidence once read.   Police went to the Now Claimants home and arrested him for an offence he did not commit that they said happened 10 years prior to the date of arrest.  Came to mine and arrested me “for an accused shop robbery & a separate car case, I got held then bailed for the robbery then while in custody the next day I got re arrested, straight away.  The police came to my home / front door to arrest me. I explained that I had gotten drunk the nights and days before at an event on acholic drink and it had made me ill by causing me to hallucinate. I said to the attending police officers that I had been lying down since contemplating on calling an ambulance until they had arrived at my home address, and this happened soon after they told me that I was getting arrested for an Armed Robbery. I went to the hospital with the police simply because I believed I had been spiked.   1. **The Third Incident: BB1 – 1 – C** 2. Is the Gazebo Case  * Evidence: Exhibit BB1 – 4 / **02/03/2014**  1. Due to the Bail Conditions getting extended and while the Prosecution team was withholding evidence that proved the Now Claimants innocence. 2. The Now Claimant heard in Court talks of his Mental stability in question by the Prosecution team and Judge trying to get out of trouble for what the Now Claimant and his support network could prove they had done wrong through the Court Case and investigation and decided to get their first. 3. As the Gazebo Case come to an end the Second that the Now Claimant went back out his front door the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police Set him straight away by building a fraudulent Asbo behind his back. 4. We will not be explaining this date yet as we are going to be tackling incidents in a chronological order through this tabled document. 5. **The Fourth Incident: BB1 – 1 – D** 6. **Nov l4** – “Mental Health Act assessment,” **not detained in hospital**. 7. **Discharged** from mental health services. 8. We will not be explaining this date yet as we are going to be tackling incidents in a chronological order through this tabled document. | | |
|  | * **Responsible Burncroft Avenue Street Party**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **03/06/2012** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 1 / 03/06/2012:**  Text, letter  Description automatically generated |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 1 / 03/06/2012:**   * **The Now Claimant Found Himself Taking Part in His Estates Local Street Party: —**  1. In the day, month, and year of **3rd of June 2012**; I started to hire out my entertainment equipment and was still attending the Local civic centre regarding creating my own dreams and making them a reality. 2. By this time in my life my dreams included developing other people’s dreams within my own. 3. Just before the **03rd of June 2012**: I got approached by another resident off Burncroft Avenue, in aid of supporting my estate in a local street party, it was happy that I got invited, for it to get agreed so for me to get involved in supporting my fellow members of neighbour’s, I got the job of supplying entertainment equipment and I done this at a no chargeable rate. 4. To me, and I believe others, the event was a success and to my own recollection the day went down with the tents and their friends very well. 5. There were no other issues of concern between any of the other Burncroft Avenue residents, in me explaining: apart from the already mentioned, this was for the time period of around the first eleven years of my presence, while residing at my home.  * **Debra Andrews 113: --**  1. **03/06/2012:** Debbie Came to my flat asking to borrow money in the sum of £10, when intoxicated with drink and her vocabulary was that off slurred speech, she stayed polite and the money got granted to her that she asked for. 2. At the Time: 09:49 pm | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors & Enfield Council for Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/2012** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 1 / 00/00/2012:**  The Now Claimants Diary |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 1 / 00/00/2012:**   1. O | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/2012** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 1 / 00/00/2012:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 1 / 00/00/2012:**   1. O | | |
|  | * **Responsible Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/2012** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 1 / 00/00/2012:**  A notebook with writing on it  Description automatically generated with low confidence |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 1 / 00/00/2012:**   1. O | | |
|  | * **Responsible Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **11/12/2012** | **Evidence Exhibit:** **BB5 – 1 / 11/12/2012:**  A drawing of a fish  Description automatically generated with low confidenceA piece of paper with writing on it  Description automatically generated |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 1 / 11/12/2012:**   1. O | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/2012** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 1 / 00/00/2012:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 1 / 00/00/2012:**   1. O | | |
| **2013** | | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/2013** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 1 / 00/00/2013:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 1 / 00/00/2013:**   1. O | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/2013** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 1 / 00/00/2013:**  **07/06/2013** Debbie wrote me a letter!  **12/06/2013** I received another letter off Debbie today!  **17/06/2013** Debbie kept on writing me letters!  **20/06/2013** Debbie kept writing me letters!  **22/06/2013** Debbie kept writing me letters!  **24/06/2013** Debbie kept writing me letters I have them all in my position still to date!  **28/06/2013** Another letter wrote to me from Debbie!  **16/07/2013** I then found another letter of Debra Andrews that got posted through my letterbox of my front door! |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 1 / 00/00/2013:**   1. O | | |
|  | * **Responsible Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **11/07/2013** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 1 / 11/07/2013:**   1. Contained in the Now Claimants Diary   **Evidence Exhibit: -** **BB5 – 1 / 00/00/2015:**    **14**  **Stage 5**  **The Enfield Councils History FOI Indexed**  **Stage 5**  Deborah Andrews / Enfield Council Case History  **Page Number:** 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,**14,**15,16,17,18,19,20,21,  **DATE(S).**  G.1.1) 18/01/2016  H.1) 18/01/2016  I.1) 18/01/2016  J.1) 26/01/2016  **Page 14 of 21**  **26/01/2016:** from customer services re Simon Cordell  From: Laura Goodson  Sent: 26 January **2016** 14:10  To: Louise Brown •  Cc: Jackie Gubby  Subject: Simon Cordell 0208 245 7454  109 Burncroft Ave [SEC=PROTECT: INVESTIGATION]  Classification: PROTECT – INVESTIGATION  Hi Louise, Jackie,  Mr Cordell called this afternoon requesting to speak with yourselves in regard to his case against his neighbour.  I am sure you know the details; however, he did say that his neighbour is making noise when he undresses. He did go on to mention an incident that resulted in both himself and his neighbour in an awkward position when he attempted to help her move her bed.  Mr Cordell is expecting a call back this afternoon.  Kind Regards  **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**  **Stage 1**  **Home MHA assessment Recording!**  **Page Number: Update Page Number** 1,  A Home MHA assessment got completed and Simon got assessed as to be not detainable.  This is the wrong date in the report?  On the **02/02/2016** is when they used the section 135 warrant to come to my home with police. On this date I been at home and had no visit of the medical team, as for this was the date when the section 135 of the Mental Health Act  **THIS IS PART OF THE RERCORDING**  **Simon:**Eventually, anyway I broke up with my partner and this woman wrote me letters suddenly, this shows how drunk she was and her mental state of mind in the letters.  **Simon:**She is like dear Simon I thank you for your support through alcoholism.  **Simon:**So, she is admitting that she is always drunk.  **Simon:**I was a where that I knocked on your door and borrowed money approximate £7 around 8 times.  **Simon:** So, you can see that I am always giving her money.  **Simon:**I am always giving her money.  **Katie:**That is because she is asking for it.  **Simon:**Yes, she is knocking on the door.  **Simon:**And then she is like I do not have the way or the means of stalking you.  **Simon:**So, she clearly, understands that she is stalking me and I am saying to her please can you stop what you are doing to me, she keeps writing it when she is drunk, it is my life.  **Simon:**Now because of the case I am spending 24 hours a day in my home, do you know what she does, sir she comes here and she gets the tap in her flat that the manufacture intended it to get built for a purpose and that is not in the way she uses it, what she is doing is sitting there at the tap and I mean she sleeps at the tap " Description of her using the tap" going bang, bang, bang what it was like is someone, had turned the pressure up by the stop cock.  **Doctor:**Can I stop you there please.  **Simon:**What it is I cannot even take my clothes off in my own home as she will stamp and follow me bang, bang, bang, bang on the floor all the way into the bathroom.  **Mother:**He has so many witnesses I been trying to get the council to help with no luck.  **Sam:**Have you raped I mean, surely, the housing officers know that the.  **Mother:**I have been I have been.  **Simon:**the police will do nothing.  **Mother:**I have been trying to deal with it, I have gotten emails upon emails upon emails that I have sent begging the council to deal with lady upstairs.  **Mother:**Even when I am here, she follows me into the bathroom.  **Simon:**There are loads of them here she writes me so many letters so many letters.  **Simon:**Yes, and none of my friends can take their clothes off in this house or nothing `because of what she has been doing.  **Mother:**It feels like she is continuing on top of your banging.  **Simon:**What she does every time she hears a computer keyboard; what she does is she will stand there and she will; (Mr Simon Cordell makes a loud banging sound.)  **Sam:**And it sounds like there is no sound proofing here at all low.  **Mother:**No there is not.  **Simon:**I cannot even work in this house because of her I mean I have been sitting down in this house for the last year still just waiting for her to stop banning and this can cause my sleep pattern to mess up a bit from time to time still.  **Sam:**No, I am fine, I am fine.  **Mother:**And I got emails upon emails asking the council to address it because it is not fair on him, he feels as if he has no privacy in `his own home.  **Simon:**Look Simon, thank you I think I have sorted it and I believe you and would bend over not to make an emissary of your life sorry I cannot see leaving just the wedged headboard.  **Katie:**There are plenty of people who have been here she has done it too me.  **Simon:**This is how drunk she is when she wrote this.  **Katie:**You can hear her.  **Louise Brown:** Do you live in this block too?  **Katie:**No but I am always here I am, here a lot and I am also here a lot when mum is not here, I mean a lot of things have happened.  **Louise Brown:** yes.  **Katie:**So, it is not like he is making things up as it has gotten seen by a lot of other people and no one does anything as it is a council place for him.  **Katie:**I even told him that he should move away from here.  **Louise Brown:** Hmm.  **Simon:**But do you know what she means by the wedged head board yes like I said a Christmas last Christmas I brought her a box of chocolates yes and I gave everyone in the block a present yes times where hard for me as this time because I had not been up too much because I had been on curfew for two years all ready at that stage yes in this house Simon so I brought t them their boxes of chocolates then In a couple of months later in February she did all this banging on the tap on purpose and stamping bang, bang, banging but just before that she knocked on my door one day and asked me to go upstairs into her flat and help move her bed out this was the first time I had been into her flat I have not been in that flat for years since she has lived there but I still went up there as a gentleman I went up there and I went in to her house and the house smelled right it was clean but it did not just smell clean so I felt funny as I am one of them people that as if "She is lazy why is her house not clean" how could she invite me In to her house like that so I quickly moved the bed fast and UN-done it and got it out of the house and got out and got straight back to my own house yes and that is why she wrote that funny bit about the head board .  **Simon:**You are being the best neighbour in the world Debbie and this is the sort off letters she keeps putting into my front door.  **Mother:**Even the council `has turned around and said that she has a fashion-nation with my son, but they’re not doing nothing and it's driving him, he cannot even go into the toilet and have a  bath as she is on top of him banging continued.  **Louise Brown:** Hmm OK.  **Mother:**Even when I am sitting here and I go to the toilet and she does not even know that it is me and she does the same too me, and It makes you feel and the council are really not doing nothing about it what so ever.  **Louise Brown:** Hmm.  **Mother:**He knows that she has got problems.  **Louise Brown:** And this has been going on for how long a long time.  **Mother:**A year.  **Louise Brown:** Oh right.  **Mother:**And I put a complaint in because Dawn Alena is his council officer.  **Louise Brown:** Yes.  **Mother:**I was making phone calls and saying to Dawn Alena, please try to address this you know please it's going to far now.  **Louise Brown:** Yes.  **Mother:**And she wouldn't come out she wouldn't deal with it and wanted Simon to come up and visit her and basically, I put a complaint in and the they said that they’re going to put it over to the anti-social team and they wouldn't do anything then a Louise brown took up the case after months of not doing any think and I am writing emails upon emails and then they come out she did not take one note and he has video tapes recordings and every think and you can hear it and you can hear the taps were she was using the taps and they had the pressure up so high the noise that come into his flat was terrible the noise she was just turning it on and off on and off on and off.  **Mother:**He could not even sleep propel.  **Louise Brown:** How old is she Simon?  **Simon:**She is four years old now.  **Mother:**How old is Debbie.  **Simon:**Oh, she is about 12 years older than me I would say.  **Louise Brown:** 12.  **Katie:**Oh, what the dog.  **Simon:**Oh no the dog is four, four years of age.  **Louise Brown:** Arr.  **"Muttering"** 45:14 till 45:34  **Katie:**She might be older than that.  **Mother:**And like I put a complaint in because the Anti-Social Behaviour team was not dealing with it and they was not taking the issue seriously, and that got put in October of last year and we have not heard a thing, so I keep asking them when are we going to get a response from the formal complaint that got put in because you are not addressing thing correctly.  **Louise Brown:** And nothing.  **Mother:**nothing she phoned because I think she made a mistake, because he phoned Louise, and it now I mean Debbie was going off constant banging and he could not work or any think and it is annoying to him so he phoned Louise up and he always gives out my number so she phoned me by mistake and I turned round and said to Louis I said I said She said is Simon Cordell there I said no who is it she said it Louise Brown.  **Louise Brown:** I am Louise brown.  **Mother:**Oh, so you are Louise brown can you tell me why you have not responded to my formal complaint I sure you have and I know.  **"Muttering"**and I have not deleted them err, yet in another email you will have a response fast and directly, but it is still going on now and it is now February and sill nothing.  **Marry:**No response.  **Louise Brown:** It can take up to four months later.  **Mother:**Yes, I Know.  **Louise Brown:** Any way.  **Mother:**And I have even been up because he has knocked on her door a few times when she was bad and really banging the council has  **"Muttering"**So that you do not hear it so badly, so bad when she is constantly, banging.  **Mother:**I mean, even the other day he had his entire bathroom ceiling flooded, and it knocked his entire electric out and he had to call the Emergency. |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 1 / 11/07/2013:**   * **Debra / Moving Her Bed!**  1. Debbie asked me to go into her bedroom: -- 2. In the days to follow I noticed that outside of my flat, I could hear the wind howling through the streets, as the sun was trying to come out to play, while I was still trying to stay safe inside of my home. 3. By this time Debra’s fire was nearly out, in this instance, Debra Andrews had knocked on my front door but instead of asking the normal question “like can she borrow some money” she had asked the question of whether I can help her by moving her bed out of her flat, I remember having to agree to help her, so I went upstairs to her flat for the first time and only time. 4. When I entered, I noticed that she had been finding life hard, she had not managed to keep her flat to a high level of standard of hygiene and I could smell the odour of cider that she had been consuming, I politely hurried to complete the job that I had agreed to do for her then in hand and quickly made my way back home. 5. After that day, I did always feel like she took an offence for not spending more of my time with her, as she knew I was a single man by then. 6. **Date:** **11/07/2013** 7. **At Time:** 05:30 pm. | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **05/09/2013** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 1 / 05/09/2013:**   1. Contained in the Now Claimants Diary   Text, letter  Description automatically generated |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 1 / 05/09/2013:**   * **I like to be able to explain to everyone that it is a powerful reed, when you write like this: -**  1. Before this Debra had continually attended mine and Ozzie s addresses, she endeavoured us with her so-called love. 2. By this stage she has become an occupier of her premises for about five years, in turn living with us as a resident in Burncroft Avenue. Prior to any problems between us all I and Ozzie had both decided not to allow Debra Andrews access into our own flats, as we could understand she has special needs. We managed to look after her, while treating her like a sister, in a short explanation, as much as she attempted to gain access into our homes, we both discretely presided in both politely declining her entry and stayed adamant in our decision. But to our surprise Debra Andrews had found something that would mean to her that she'd not be bored or lonely again, “Stain.” Thought most of the years that Debra Andrews did live above me, Debra never did knock on Stan’s front door, while stains wife was present with us all. The reason for this to me was because I believe, she knew of Brenda's presence. Debra simply knocked on mine and Ozzy’s front doors. Eventually, my own civil partner also raised a large concern about Debra always knocking on our front door, the reason for this was because of the persistent knocking on the front door, which in turn caused my partner weirdly to question me in regard to my personal relationship with Debbie. Whenever I needed to, I would go to my front door and look through the spy hole, this was whenever I heard a person at the front doors, that is to mean the front doors of my or Stan’s, as his front door is opposite to mine and the other reason was partly as my guard dog always makes me aware of anyone else's presence. Henceforth, as a sense of natural instincts, I will confirm who is there for our safety. Because of security I had noticed Debra had started to knock at the front door of Stan on a daily basis a shot while after his wife had passed away, I would notice that he would always grant her access and that she would be carrying a shopping bag full of alcoholic drinks. I could easily tell what she had in her plastic bags as they would always make the clinging sound that glass and plastic bottles do and or metal cans will make. At around the same time, I asked Stan if he would help me, what I asked him was for him to help me to help everybody by reading a proposal that I had prepared for the community event that I had started to build, to which he did agree to read. In the following days, I approached Stan as agreed for an update, as to any amendments that he may advise me to make within the document, when speaking to him, he explained to me that he was grateful that I had asked him to go over the proposal and that he enjoyed reading it very much so, I can remember that his words made me feel very happy, me being me, I questioned him a little more whether there is anything else’s that he recommends being updated or changed for the better of the event being created, I received a reply of no it is perfect just how it was alongside with the advice of to send it off, even low I still understood that I was not quite ready at this stage! The slowdown and closing of talking to Stan, at this period was just after I said to him that I treat my work seriously, so because of this reason, I will be indoors working hard, so if he ever needs any help of me just tell me and I will be there for him. | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **28/09/2013** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 1 / 28/09/2013:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 1 / 28/09/2013:**   1. **Consequences: --**  * Neighbours Stain – Debra & Co  1. There will be consequences for their actions, thinking this is what made me carry on staying aliv**e:** - 2. I did find myself helping Stan, at his own requests, this got achieved in helping to complete some following: - 3. A Simple task, like pushing the chair that Stan sits down the road for him, into his house. 4. Taking Stan to the doctors, after he had fallen over, when closing his curtains. 5. My mother and I shared with Stan, at his house, our boxing day. 6. I hand delivered Stan and Debra their Christmas presents early and in time, even low I was finding life hard, as of the police bail conditions and the separate Anti-Social Behaviour Order proceedings. 7. Up to date, I have never asked of anything of any other person that lives on my estate, other than respect. 8. Shortly after the trial, I got released to be free from police bail conditions and was then single due to the burglary case. It took me a long time to get better, after being kept on curfew and for what I had suffered wrongly, because of the damage that the court case and other on goings had caused me. | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **17/12/2013** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 1 / 17/12/2013:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 1 / 17/12/2013:**   1. O   **Who stole the Christmas tree?**  Thought, the rest of the months in  2013  off the summer faded away into the winter and the question to ask was, “Who stole the Christmas tree?  While still living in my flat, I remember when stain took his time to place a Christmas tree in the corridor for the entire tenant’s pleasure. But little was he to know that this good deed of his was soon after to get disheartened. In the years prior to stain placing the Christmas tree in the corridor the council had never changed the entrance codes, to the front door of the flats, so in layman terms, the entrance code to the front door had never got updated and because of this, the past users' fingerprints, to the door locks, could get seen. The faded ID could get seen by any person’s naked eyes, this is due to the wear and tear, making the door entrances vulnerable to prowling eyes. Because of this reason people had started to loaf within side the corridors for shelter or other reasons and so forth. On one of the cold winter nights after stain had done his good deed, the tenants of the block must have got occupied with their own responsibilities. I cannot clearly remember what I personally was doing, but I could bet a pound coin that I was working hard on a good project. On awakening one morning, I went outside into my communal corridor, on doing so, I noticed stain and said to him the usual, “hello and how are you doing.” His voice was full of upsets as I heard his reply, he asked me the question of; do I know where his Christmas tree has disappeared too. At first, I took a full glance to see the spot to where he had placed it and continued to notice that it was in fact missing. I had known stain for so long by this time, in my life, so I took it that he personally would already understand the truth and that would be that I never would have been that person what did move the Christmas tree, in sense to any stake, I and my first civil partner already had our own Christmas tree. After talking for some time and doing our own investigation, we never did find out who actually did steal, “the tree.” So, the question still is who stole, The Christmas Tree? | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/2013** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 1 / 00/00/2013:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 1 / 00/00/2013:**   1. O | | |
|  | * **Responsible Stain Curtis**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **29/12/2013** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 1 / 29/12/2013:**  Bank Statement to be Added  Text, letter  Description automatically generated |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 1 / 29/12/2013:**   1. O  * **I had got stain and Debra**   A Christmas present each! | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/2013** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 1 / 00/00/2013:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 1 / 00/00/2013:**   1. O | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/2013** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 1 / 00/00/2013:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 1 / 00/00/2013:**   1. O | | |
| **2014** | | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/2014** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 1 / 00/00/2014:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 1 / 00/00/2014:**   1. O | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/2014** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 1 / 00/00/2014:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 1 / 00/00/2014:**   1. O | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/2014** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 1 / 00/00/2014:**  **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 2 / 00/00/2014:**  **A picture containing text, indoor, different  Description automatically generated**  **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 2 / 00/00/2006:**  **A picture containing text, indoor  Description automatically generated**  **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 2 / 00/00/2014:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 1 / 00/00/2014:**   1. O | | |
|  | * **Responsible Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **26/01/2014** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 1 / 26/01/2014:**  A picture containing icon  Description automatically generatedText  Description automatically generated |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 1 / 26/01/2014:**   1. O  * Wrong? INFO +   **1**   * **My birthday - Neighbours: --**   In the flat getting tortured this is the last time I spoke on Facebook to any of my friends because what they stain and Debbie inclusive of the Mathiyalagan!  **1**  **My birthday - Neighbours: --**  I could not get the Woolwich case to get dropped, in accordance to the law and my legal rights re obtained: --  The start of  **2014**  a new year for everyone; it was January and this special day was my birthday. I can reminisce about the day being depressing as I could not get the Woolwich case to get dropped, in accordance to the law and my legal rights re got, which meant that I got bail condition subjected towards my person still, so I found myself stuck in my home, all alone getting attacked by my neighbours. I placed my sound system in my lock up at another address to where I live, earlier in the last year on  **June 2013**  and took a look online at Facebook.  In doing so I noticed that I received a lot of nice birthday messages, which in fact cheered me up, but my smile was not to last for too long, as I realised how far Stain and Debbie and the Mathiyalagan Markandu family members and guests, managed to damaged my life. Typing on the keyboard of my computer doing my work would mean they would hear me and bang above where it would have the worst effect on me, by hitting the floorboards and dropping objects above my head for hours at a time. I kept video diaries and audio recordings so to prove what kept going on. | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **11/03/2014** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 1 / 11/03/2014:**  **From Enfield Councils Databases: - History Forged Against the Now Claimant and Illegally Detained.**   * <https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Original-Files-Folder/All%20Case%20Original%20Court%20Application%20Case%20Files/All%20Case%20Original%20Court%20Application%20Case%20Files/18_01_2019%20FOI%20Folder/FOI%20%20from%20Council%20Split/Attachment%205_105..pdf> * **Page** 7   **--**  **Referral Details**  **23/09/2015**: Organisation making referral Housing Anti-Social Behaviour Response Team  **History**  **23/09/2015**: Agree an Action Plan with the Complainant ACTION PLAN PROVIDED TO THE VICTIM AND A COPY FORWARDED TO HER CPN BOLA QUADRI   1. Dated the **23/09/2015** 2. **March 12** - 1st contact with MH services following arrest after a: - **“Bad Trip of Taking LSD & Alcohol,**” mental state assessed remained in custody of police - no MH input   **--**   1. **“March 14** - 2nd contact, assessed by team psychiatrist, presented with anxiety & suicidal thoughts in context of social stressors due to pending court case leading to stress. Discharged form MH services, suicidal thoughts are longstanding from early childhood and present at times of high stress, not 'A typical' of other forms of suicide as relates to thoughts as opposed to wish to die, and usually found in context of those presenting with early childhood trauma as a way of expressing emotions.”   **--**   1. **Nov l4** - Mental Health Act assessment, not detained in hospital, discharged from mental health services.   Presented highly volatile, angry & paranoid about motives of others, presented in context of social stressors due to on-going issues with police & court process –  mother reported he has been targeted by police causing him stress??  He has a medical history of Crohn's disease which may impact on mood stability particularly if not compliant with treatment and monitoring of symptoms.  All assessments completed by mental health services have found no evidence of serious mental illness,  “He appears to be a very angry young man who has had an extremely difficult and traumatic early childhood which is likely to explain his distrust of people in authority **(e.g., police)** and being angry at others and at the world....”  Regards Debbie  --   1. **23/09/2015 Classification:** PROTECT   Good afternoon, Debbie,  Hope you are doing well?  could you kindly advise if the above tenant is known to your service and if he is, does he have a CPN and does he engage?  Thank you for your assistance  Mr Simon Cordell,  109 Burncroft Avenue,  Enfield,  EN3 7JQ  DOB=25 (34 yrs.)  Phone=020 8  Dolly Ogunseye Anti-Social Behaviour Officer Housing Anti-Social Behaviour Team Tenancy Manager  Enfield Council  **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 1 / 11/03/2014:**  **The Doctor’s Folder / pub Book Issue: 1!**  **Notes From the:** 09/02.**2016**  **Date of initial referral:** 21/01.**2016**  **Date of assessment:** 03/02.**2016**  **Place of assessment: Patient’s Home**  London Borough of Enfield  Approved Mental Health Professional Assessment Form. For use when compulsory powers are being considered  **Assessing AMHP:** Sam Curtis.  Hospital Not applicable Dr Kripalani, Consultant Psychiatrist, Lucas House, 305 - 309 Fore Street, Edmonton, London, N9 OPD Tel 020 8702 3100 GP Nightingale House Surgery, 1 Nightingale Road, N9 8AJ Tel 020 88059997 /cmhn / Goodie Adama, Care Coordinator and Community Mental Health Nurse, Lucas House, cmht 305 - 309 Fore Street, Edmonton, London, N9 OPD Tel 020 8702 3100  **Page Numbers:** 32,33,34,35,36,37  **“**Not Relevant**!”**  **33,**  **“**Not Relevant**!”**  **34,**  **“**Not Relevant**!”**  **35,**  On **11/03/2014** due concerns about suicidal thoughts and anxiety. He was prescribed Sertraline anti-depressant. He was stressed about a pending court case as he was accused of burglary. He described experiencing poor sleep and weight loss.  **36,**  **“**Not Relevant**!”**  **37**  **“**Not Relevant**!”**  **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB1 – 4 / 02/03/2014: = March 14** - 2nd contact, assessed by team psychiatrist  Text, letter  Description automatically generatedText, letter  Description automatically generatedText, letter  Description automatically generated |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB5 – 1 / 11/03/2014:**   1. On the 11/03/2014. I Mr Cordell got assessed by **Dr Jarvis** from the Enfield triage team, this should be on the 02/03/2014 and not the **11/03/2014.** | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/2014** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 1 / 00/00/2014:**  A picture containing text, cat, indoor  Description automatically generatedText, letter  Description automatically generated  **07/06/2013** Debbie wrote me a letter!  **12/06/2013** I received another letter off Debbie today!  **17/06/2013** Debbie kept on writing me letters!  **20/06/2013** Debbie kept writing me letters!  **22/06/2013** Debbie kept writing me letters!  **24/06/2013** Debbie kept writing me letters I have them all in my position still to date!  **28/06/2013** Another letter wrote to me from Debbie!  **16/07/2013** I then found another letter of Debra Andrews that got posted through my letterbox of my front door! |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 1 / 00/00/2014:**   1. O | | |
|  | * **Neighbours**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **30/08/2014** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 30/08/2014:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 30/08/2014:**   1. P | | |
|  | * **Neighbours**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **28/08/2014** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 28/08/2014:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 28/08/2014:**   1. P   My Nan got rushed into hospital! | | |
|  | * **Neighbours**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **30/08/2014** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 30/08/2014:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 30/08/2014:**   1. P   My Nan passed away! | | |
|  | * **Neighbours**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **09/09/2014** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 09/09/2014:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 09/09/2014:**   1. P   117 Burncroft Avenue: The London Borough of Enfield / The 2nd Injunction Order Indexed / Statement of Markandu Mathiyalagan - “**I have been housed to this Property with my family on 9TH September 2014 by Waltham Forest District Council.**  The Property was given to me as a temporary accommodation. | | |
|  | * **Asbo**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **12/09/2014** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 12/09/2014:**  **The Asbo dates**  PC Sophie Theodoulou  Police Officer Who Lied and said that she Served me the First Asbo Folder!  **Page Numbers:**57,58  12/09/2014 |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 12/09/2014:**   1. PC Sophie Theodoulou is already exhibited in 2. **[Exhibit A4] Name list** 3. **[EXHIBIT J8]** Failed Service of Court Order 4. **[EXHIBIT J37]** Caught More Than Three Times Sir Bernard Hogan Howe 5. The Judge wrongfully Granted the **Asbo** needlessly of the true facts of evidence on the **04/08/2015** and the End of Asbo Court Order was the **04/08/2020.** 6. The Forged Asbo conditions placed upon me finished but I could never go out ever again to a party in case I got set up again by the police and the Council! | | |
|  | * **Neighbours**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **13/09/2014** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 13/09/2014:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 13/09/2014:**   1. P   The Asbo folder got left in the hallway! | | |
|  | * **Neighbours**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **06/10/2014** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 06/10/2014:**  The day had turned into the day of the Asbo? |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 06/10/2014:**   1. P   I have heard people say their hair is falling out and now so is mine! | | |
|  | * **Neighbours**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **21/10/2014** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 21/10/2014:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 21/10/2014:**   1. P   The older Nephew or son, the dark secret - “Meeting Mathiyalagan Markandu family including the older Nephew / son, the dark secret | | |
|  | * **Neighbours**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **04/11/2014** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 04/11/2014:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 04/11/2014:**   1. P   I Started to be sick again - “And I was up all night but needed to go to court the next day, so I got out of the Hospital! A different part of a continuation: --  **Also,** Going to the clinic! | | |
|  | * **Neighbours**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **06/11/2014** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 06/11/2014:**  **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**  **Stage 1**  **1x Recording**  **1st POLICE CALL Recording!**  01m. 1st POLICE CALL Recording 06\_11\_**2014**  **Page Number: Update Page Number** 1,  **The first recording between me and**  The Metropolitan Police that I recorded!  **And now this is a true copy of the first recording between me and the Metropolitan Police; --** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 06/11/2014:**   1. P | | |
|  | * **Neighbours**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **07/11/2014** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 07/11/2014:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 07/11/2014:**   1. P   **I noticed an assault of banging at me: --**  I got shocked after coming back home from helping out at the community hall the reason for this is that when I am sitting down in my front room working on establishing a new model constitution for the community hall. Debra Andrews of 113 Burncroft Avenue has started to bang above my head to wherever I sit this continued for over three hours at the time of 9:00 Pm till 12:00Am. | | |
|  | * **Neighbours**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **09/11/2014** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 09/11/2014:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 09/11/2014:**   1. P   Debbie’s front door: -- Also the Mathiyalagan Markandu family’s front door - “I knocked on Debbie’s front door for the first time, then the Mathiyalagan Markandu family’s front door for the first Time! The banging got worse and worse as the families and Stan Curtis banged on the taps and pipes and floorboards so I could not sleep or study while developing my company, their actions towards me made it so that I could not even work on my own website without being assaulted. One day a few months after the occupiers of the flats I complain about in this report had continued to take place in victimizing me, that is to explain in their assault against me on a continual daily basis, with no remorse for their actions. I knocked on Debbie’s door and ask why she was doing this to me, she blames the Mathiyalagan Markandu family, I then headed upstairs and asked the Mathiyalagan family the same question with the reply of them blaming Debbie Andrews 113, I knew it to be both addresses including Stan Curtis, I believe that no person can question me about what I state as being false or misleading in any deceiving way, the reason for this is that I recorded the ongoing on camera and by way of an audio dictator recorder and I also had numerous friends stay over at my home who were also violated by the people living in all of the addresses, who are also willing to be witnesses and victims with their statements of truth.” | | |
|  | * **Neighbours**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **10/11/2014** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 10/11/2014:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 10/11/2014:**   1. P   The banging at me / Handshake 1 - “After going up stairs to Debra and then the Mathiyalagan Markandu family flat after, to speak to the people treating me in such a way: they all blamed each other: -- The first handshake with Mr. Mathiyalagan Markandu was in 2014, the day after when I went upstairs to Deborah’s and the Matthew flats, as them and Stan Curtis started to viciously, attack me, so after a few weeks passed with no change I decided to go upstairs and knock on the Mathiyalagan Markandu family flat front doors to speak with them about my questions to why this was happening to me, and if they would help me make it stop if not for me to do it for their child, I spoke to them about Deborah as they accused her themselves, of doing the banging at me, that I got subjected towards in me believing in the Mathiyalagan Markandu family; as I had only helped them in a nice way in the past and I didn't know them or their names, other than that. We spoke politely, to each other and they maintained that it was Deborah Andrews who was doing the assaults against me, when I spoke with them, I asked Mr. Mathiyalagan Markandu whether he would write a letter in regards about Deborah Andrews negative actions and the concern for him having his new born child in the flat around her because of the continuing loud banging noises that got left to happen 24 hours a day, he agreed to write a letter and hand deliver it to my front door, I then asked him whether he would shake my hand in an agreement given his word, he held his hand out and we shock hands, afterwards we both went along in our own days, ways.” | | |
|  | * **Neighbours**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **11/11/2014** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 11/11/2014:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 11/11/2014:**   1. P   Asking Stain if he would? - “Go upstairs to help me or Debra by taking control in a positive aspect! On this day I asked Stan if he would go upstairs to debris and try to resolve the problems he said: no. When I asked why he explained to me, that one day not so long ago at this time of relevance, he had been in his own back garden when Debra had been upstairs drunk in her flat.” | | |
|  | * **Neighbours**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **12/11/2014** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 12/11/2014:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 12/11/2014:**   1. P   **Do you ever question yourself when you think?**  Because I do and I keep thinking, personally, that I was better of writing all of the documents for a festival than this report: -  Contacting the council and MP’s; - Obviously, the banging never stopped it continued and got much, much, much, worse than ever before. Between the different contacts that I had with the MP’s, Enfield council and the police nothing changed for me the banging continued as I explain and got much, much, much, worse. I asked my mother if she could help me in emailing and or calling Enfield Council, so to get the problems addressed, as towards what was being done to me, by members of my neighbours, which my mother and I both did on a numerous number of different occasions, many emails got sent to the official departments, I even called them by phone on top of sending emails as did my mother. At the first chance I and my mother had we then after continually, sent the correct correspondence addressed to the relevant complaint departments who would have any relevance in these situations and this got done by us with no correct follow up taking place of them sent correspondents thus so far, this is a serious concern to me: - “the victim” and any others it may affect, indirectly. Nothing was being done by the council I told them I got CCTV of what was going on but they never asked to see it, in the one and only meeting I got with them, they did not even ask to see all the evidence that I have, I offered more than once in the meeting to show them, the lady did not even write anything down throughout, I said to her that Debbie even attacked me outside the flat all of this got told to the council.  **Also**  **A Subject access request got made**  To the Local council Enfield: --  A Subject access request got made to the Local council Enfield, chasing up answers, I re-submitted a subject access request in to the local council again, so that I could find out more information as to what was truly, being addressed by them and why and also what was being done about it.  In the request that I sent I asked for some of: -  Any information, as to any complaints made by my neighbours or any other person about me or my personal visiting guests, in any of the times, that they been and visited me, this was to get answers for the time period, of Enfield Council being my landlords; this was to include any anti-social complaints.  The reply that I received back, that was in acceptance off my Subject access request and was an answer of no there has been no complaints that got made to them, regarding myself or any of my other visiting guest, this got agreed for the time of the first eleven years, which I had lived in my home.  **Also**  **Seeing Debra and Stain**  Coming into the Block of Flats from after I asked stain to speak to Debra. | | |
|  | * **Neighbours**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **13/11/2014** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 13/11/2014:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 13/11/2014:**   1. P   **Assaulted with battery and negligence: --**  Every day I get assaulted with battery and negligence towards  my human right Article 2 the right to life and article 13 the right to a private family life this continues with article 5 the right to freedom and security alongside most of my other human rights that have gotten breached now towards me I can feel the damage that Stain, Debra and the Mathiyalagan Markandu do to me, by banging on the floor and walls inclusive of slamming on and off when abusing  the water tap on and off at a compulsive fast rate, they bang so hard and, compulsively, that it causes all the other fixtures in the building to come loose and so that every other close by person within a half mile radios can hear them assaulting me. I believe is easy for others to see that this is having a negative effect on me, I had done nothing wrong to them all and because the two flats above my flats, main water feed runs through my flat, I cannot get away from hearing them while they assault me with tortures acts and endanger my life, while I try to stay strong. Stain, Debra and the Mathiyalagan Markandu’s kept doing the things that I mention about so that other person's children might come into the block and try to also victimise me, while they cause me mental sufferings. On this day this got left to happen to me, by the police and local council once I contacted them about my safety concerns.  **Also**  I Received a Phone Call - “On this day I received a phone call of my new living partner  **Also**  One off the times that I enjoyed - “One off the times, that I enjoyed with my new living partner was w | | |
|  | * **Neighbours**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **14/11/2014** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 14/11/2014:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 14/11/2014:**   1. P   **117 Burncroft Avenue:** He said it was not her fault! - “The Mathiyalagan Markandu family’s nephew or son said.” | | |
|  | * **Neighbours**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **15/11/2014** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 15/11/2014:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 15/11/2014:**   1. P   **The banging at Me Continued: Mathiyalagan Markandu family** - “The Mathiyalagan Markandu family; wife played with her pressure pot release the value on and off for hours at a time with her cooker, while slamming her window opened and closed so that I could hear the banging sound and the sound also from the pressure pot, she placed more pressure on me and my partner who sadly, had a miscarriage because of what them members of neighbours were doing to us, with their wrongful intent of criminal action’s.” | | |
|  | * **Government Issue**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **17/11/2014** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 1 / 17/11/2014:**  Text  Description automatically generated |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 1 / 17/11/2014:**   1. O   My blood test results - “To the hospital: | | |
|  | * **Neighbours**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **18/11/2014** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 18/11/2014:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 18/11/2014:**   1. P   I received a phone call from the Clinic Evergreen - “At the same time, I had already been to the clinic and requested to have my blood test taken | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **19/11/2014** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB1 – 1 / 19/11/2014:**  **From Enfield Councils Databases: - History Forged Against the Now Claimant and Illegally Detained.**   * <https://horrific-corruption-files.webhop.me/Original-Files-Folder/All%20Case%20Original%20Court%20Application%20Case%20Files/All%20Case%20Original%20Court%20Application%20Case%20Files/18_01_2019%20FOI%20Folder/FOI%20%20from%20Council%20Split/Attachment%205_105..pdf> * **Page** 7   **--**  **Referral Details**  **23/09/2015**: Organisation making referral Housing Anti-Social Behaviour Response Team  **History**  **23/09/2015**: Agree an Action Plan with the Complainant ACTION PLAN PROVIDED TO THE VICTIM AND A COPY FORWARDED TO HER CPN BOLA QUADRI   1. Dated the **23/09/2015** 2. **March 12** - 1st contact with MH services following arrest after a: - **“Bad Trip of Taking LSD & Alcohol,**” mental state assessed remained in custody of police - no MH input 3. **March 14** - 2nd contact, assessed by team psychiatrist, presented with anxiety & suicidal thoughts in context of social stressors due to pending court case leading to stress. Discharged form MH services, suicidal thoughts are longstanding from early childhood and present at times of high stress, not 'A typical' of other forms of suicide as relates to thoughts as opposed to wish to die, and usually found in context of those presenting with early childhood trauma as a way of expressing emotions.   **--**   1. **“Nov l4** - Mental Health Act assessment, not detained in hospital, discharged from mental health services.   Presented highly volatile, angry & paranoid about motives of others, presented in context of social stressors due to on-going issues with police & court process –  mother reported he has been targeted by police causing him stress??  He has a medical history of Crohn's disease which may impact on mood stability particularly if not compliant with treatment and monitoring of symptoms.  All assessments completed by mental health services have found no evidence of serious mental illness,  “He appears to be a very angry young man who has had an extremely difficult and traumatic early childhood which is likely to explain his distrust of people in authority **(e.g., police)** and being angry at others and at the world....”  Regards Debbie”   1. **“Classification:** PROTECT   Good afternoon, Debbie,  Hope you are doing well?  could you kindly advise if the above tenant is known to your service and if he is, does he have a CPN and does he engage?  Thank you for your assistance  Mr Simon Cordell,  109 Burncroft Avenue,  Enfield,  EN3 7JQ  DOB=25 (34 yrs.)  Phone=020 8  Dolly Ogunseye Anti-Social Behaviour Officer Housing Anti-Social Behaviour Team Tenancy Manager  Enfield Council”  **Evidence Exhibit:** **1 / 19/11/2014:**   1. Mr Cordell’s mother phoned the hub (triage team) and reported that he was paranoid towards her and towards the police. 2. In response the home treatment visited the same day. 3. When home treatment workers arrived the same day, the police were present and reported that Mr Cordell had been screaming in distress. 4. The police said that they had found Mr Cordell using a gas canister and thought that he was using nitrous oxide. 5. “He was referred for a Mental Health Act assessment.”   **Evidence: Exhibit** **2 / 19/11/2014:**   1. NHS: Colin Clancy Nursing / CRHT / Time 19:12 - “Mother, Lorraine: 020. Father, Ben: 0741. We spoke initially with mother on phone. She reiterated that Simon has suffered years of harassment by the police for past offences. Not all true. She has spoken with him today and he has been extremely angry with her and the father. We stated to mother that we will be tactful and say only that the family were concerned. We attended the flat around 17.30. There were police outside. They had been attempting to enter as they had received complaints from neighbours due to Simon screaming out in distress. We spoke with the officers and explained that we were from the mental health services. They stated that they had not properly spoken with him and observed him to be holding a small gas cannister, possibly sniffing nitrous oxide for recreational purposes. We all jointly spoke with his mother, and she requested that CRHT do not attempt to see him following this as it will antagonise the situation.19.30: Spoke with Lorraine. She stated that a friend is currently with him, and he is calmer. The coincidental timing of the police attending has caused him to blame Lorraine for calling police. He is convinced that she is also conspiring against her. he has stated to her that he is feeling persecuted, he is paranoid and suffering ideas of reference from the TV constantly. “Lorraine explained that he has had an ASBO put on him due to being aggressive when in court, he has been bailed to his own address c/o a burglary accusation in June 2014.” “Lorraine spoke of her own mother who has been treated for BPAD and was prescribed Clozaril with good effect.” Mother is now deceased c/o cancer complications. 2. “Lorraine states that Simon has suffered sexual abuse as part of a paedophile ring when younger.” This is the source of his anger and subsequent treatment under CAMHS. He has refused to talk about it for years and has declined any therapy / counselling for this so far. “Lorraine states that she does not want him to be asked about any sexual abuse.” “I informed mother of the remit of HTT and that he may be potentially prescribed an antipsychotic for his emerging paranoid psychosis.” “She reiterates that he will most likely refuse all medicine interventions.” “He has been prescribed medicine for Crohn's disease.” He does not take. We have mutually agreed to plan CRHT to call mother tomorrow am to negotiate another visit to assess |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 19/11/2014:**   1. On the 19/11/2014 It is said that the now Claimants mother telephoned the Mental Health hub (triage team) in regard to her son a Mr. Simon Paul Cordell not being well and stated to them: - “That He Was Paranoid Towards Her and Towards the Police.” this information is not correct to its statement as this is not what really happened. 2. What did in fact happen is   “Mr Cordell’s mother phoned the hub (triage team) and reported  In response the home treatment visited the same day  Mr Cordell had been screaming in distress.  using a gas canister and thought that he was using nitrous oxide. He was referred for a Mental Health Act assessment.  **Statement Exhibit** **2 / 19/11/2014:**   1. On the 19/11/2014 I Mr Cordell   Doctors say that they spoke initially with mother on phone.  She reiterated that Simon has suffered years of harassment by the police for past offences. Not all true.  She has spoken with him today and he has been extremely angry with her and the father.  We stated to mother that we will be tactful and say only that the family were concerned.  We attended the flat around 17.30.  There were police outside.  They had been attempting to enter as they had received complaints from neighbours due to Simon screaming out in distress.  We spoke with the officers and explained that we were from the mental health services.  They stated that they had not properly spoken with him and observed him to be holding a small gas cannister, “possibly sniffing nitrous oxide for recreational purposes.” | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **21/11/2014** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 21/11/2014:**   1. “The duty AMHP made contact with Mr Cordell’s mother and father.” 2. The duty AMHP was told that Mr Cordell was subject to an anti-social behaviour order and that he is on the police at risk register for suicide. The duty AMHP advised that he broke up with his girlfriend and grandmother died. He had stopped taking his medication for chromes disease four weeks and had been admitted to the North Middlesex Hospital. |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 21/11/2014:**   1. On the 21/11/2014 I Mr Cordell | | |
| **2015** | | | |
|  | * **Housing Disrepair**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **02/03/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 02/03/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue:**  495. Lorraine Cordell \_Re\_ Complaint Simon Cordell  **/ Page Numbers:** 1769,1770,  **From:** Lorraine Cordell [[lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk](http://lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk)]  **Sent:** 02 March **2015** 14:05  **To:** [feedback@enfieldhomes.org](mailto:feedback@enfieldhomes.org)  **Cc:** [housing.repairs@enfieldhomes.org](mailto:housing.repairs@enfieldhomes.org)  **Subject: Re:** Complaint Simon Cordell  To Whom It May Concern:  Complaint.   1. “I am writing this email to many issues with my address of 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, EN3 7JQ, over many years now I have had big issues with damp to my flat, I believe there is a wide area of concern being that.” 2. There are leaks to pipe work in other flats above and beside me. 3. This is causing the conditions I am living in and the flat is very dump. 4. “I have had large amounts of work done to try and stop this to my flat but believe due to other flats having issues this is causing my flat to suffer and this is causing my heath to suffer.” 5. “My flat has been unliveable due to the damp and the issues just being covered up and not repaired in the way in which they should.” 6. Since some major work was carried out in my flat for damp, they had to remove the radiators in my flat also due to leaks in pipe work under the floors. 7. “These were never replaced once the work was completed, so I have had to live for years now with no heating.” 8. “When they come to do a lot of work to my flat, they had to take the flooring up in my bedroom, and bathroom, they had to replace part of it, due to the leaking pipes the floor and joist have very badly bowing and rioting.” 9. “But due to them not fixing the leaks the rest of my floor in my bedroom has now started to sink, so I know the problem has not been fixed, also the smell of damp as soon as you enter the bedroom is very bad and this is also still ruining my belongings, I have already had to replace everything, and I am not willing to keep replacing due to things not being done, correctly.” 10. “I have had around twelve surveyors to my flat each time them saying they would sort heating out for my flat and other things which has never happened therefore I have been living at my flat with no heating since the large amount of work was done.” 11. “I have made many phones calls each time they just say they would send a surveyor again to look what needed doing but how can they keep doing this and not correct the problems, until around **Jan of 2015** all the information was on their system about all the problems this now seems to be missing, I am told people will call me back, but the calls never come.” 12. “The last set of surveyors sent was around **Nov 2014** and all work was planned to be done, the person came to see how much pipe work was needed, but no one has come to do the work, and when I call all, I get told it is being looked into.” 13. “When work was also carried on my flat re doing the electric,” they wired in fire alarms and a Carbon Monoxide alarm, I made many calls to say these had not been fitted correctly, and due to this got carbon monoxide poisoning due to a faulty boiler and the Carbon Monoxide alarm not working. 14. “When they did come out in **Nov 2014** I was left with no boiler for weeks until parts could be ordered, work was also meant to be done to rewire the incorrect rewiring of the alarms this has again not been done and I feel very unsafe.” 15. They also repaired a new dump section to my wall, but due to them not fitting the under-laying problems with other flats this has again come back. 16. “I believe to leaking pipe work. I have told the council many times about the other flats, but nothing has been done and this is causing my heath to suffer badly this is now just not good enough.” 17. They were also meant to repair my back-door window this is not just a back door it has windows each side to it. 18. That has a large hole around the window frame where you can see outside. this was also meant to be fixed and has not been. 19. The other day I got up to a large amount of water on the floor due to the hole around the frame of the window and it had been raining this has happened more than once due to this and the rain and also, the window in my bedroom does not lock and needs a new hinge. 20. Also, where the police kicked of my front door, I give the CAD number to get this address as my front door is not safe nothing again has been done to sort this. 21. Also, the new toilet wish was fitting is not secure I have had this repaired once already but it still is moving around, and I feel unsafe. 22. I just want a home to live in and to be warm and not have all these problems and for them to be addressed but I am getting nowhere, so the only option I have left is to put this complaint in. 23. If I did not pay my rent, you would soon get me out of the flat but when it is repairs that need done nothing gets done. I am paying full rent for a flat I cannot use right; I have to sit there with covers on just to try and keep warm this is no way to live and I had enough of nothing being done. 24. I would like a reply to this complaint within the next 14 days as I feel I have waited long enough for work to be carried out on my flat. could you please reply via this email, and also confirm you have my email?   Regards  Simon Cordell  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue:**  Jo O'Brien MR SIMON CORDELL  **/ Page Numbers:** 1775,1776,  **From:** Jo O'Brien  [Jo.O'Brien@enfieldhomes.org](http://Jo.O'Brien@enfieldhomes.org)  **Sent:** 04 March **2015** 16:20  **To:** Lorraine Cordell  **Subject:** 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ MR SIMON CORDELL [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]  **Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  Good afternoon, Ms Cordell,  Following your e-mail to EH Feedback I have been asked by the Customer Services Manager to raise a repair order to our contractor Wates Living Space for an operative to attend to carry out necessary works to the front door. EH Feedback will be in touch with you shortly in response to your e-mail. An appointment has been booked for a Wates operative to attend on Tuesday 10th March between 8.00am- 10.30am. Order Number 1509056/1. If this appointment is not convenient, please do not hesitate to contact me so that we can agree a mutual appointment.  Many thanks  Jo O'Brien Customer Services Enfield Homes  ★ ★  Direct 0800 40 80 160\* The Edmonton Centre  Fax 020 8375 8016 36-44 South Mall  \* This is a freephone number, so there is no charge if you use a landline.  Edmonton Green N9 0TN  If you  **1776,**  Enfield Council is committed to serving the whole borough fairly, delivering excellent services and building strong communities. Opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual and not necessarily those of the London Borough of Enfield. This email and any attachments or files transmitted with it are strictly confidential and intended solely for the named addressee. It may contain privileged and confidential information and if you are not the intended recipient and receive it in error you must not copy, distribute, or use the communication in any other way. All traffic handled by the Government Connect Secure Extranet may be subject to recording/and or monitoring in accordance with relevant legislation. This email has been scanned for viruses, but we cannot guarantee that it will be free of viruses or malware. The recipient should perform their own virus checks.  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue:**  499. Lorraine Cordell \_Re\_ 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ MR SIMON CORDELL [SEC=UN3  **/ Page Numbers:** 1782,1783,  **From:** Lorraine Cordell [[lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk](http://lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk)]  **Sent:** 04 March **2015** 19:27  **To:** 'Jo O'Brien'  **Subject: RE:** 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ MR SIMON CORDELL [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]  Dear Jo O’Brien  “I am sorry but the 10th or the 11th and maybe the **12th of March 2015** cannot be done due to having appointments already arranged could this please be re booked.”  Regards  Lorraine Cordell  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue: 02**  Jo O'Brien MR SIMON CORDELL  **/ Page Numbers:** 1784,1785,1786,  **1785,**  My Flat Front Door Disrepair Case Enfield Homes!  **From:** Jo O'Brien [[Jo.O'Brien@enfieldhomes.org](http://Jo.O'Brien@enfieldhomes.org)]  **Sent:** 05 March **2015** 10:10  **To:** Lorraine Cordell  **Subject: RE:** 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ MR SIMON CORDELL [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]  **Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  Good morning, Ms Cordell,  Thank you for your response, I have cancelled the appointment for 10th March as requested. A new appointment has been booked with our contractor Wates Living Space for attendance on Friday 13th March between 10.30-2.00pm. Would you be so kind as to advise Mr Cordell that if the front door needs to be renewed, he is responsible to pay for the replacement but we can arrange for him to pay by instalments but if Mr Cordell can provide a Crime Reference Number and not a Cad Number, we can carry out the repair.  Kind regards  Jo O'Brien Customer Services  **From:** Jo O'Brien [[Jo.O'Brien@enfieldhomes.org](http://Jo.O'Brien@enfieldhomes.org)]  **Sent:** 06 March **2015** 09:38  **To:** Lorraine Cordell  **Subject: RE:** 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ MR SIMON CORDELL [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]  **Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  Dear Lorraine,  The police provide a CAD number as a call logging only. When a crime/incident has taken place, they will provide a full crime reference number. Enfield Homes Procedure is that we require this reference number to enables us to carry out repairs/renewals without recharging the tenant.  Kind regards Jo  Jo O'Brien Customer Services  **From:** Lorraine Cordell [**Mail To**:[lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk](http://lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk)]  **Sent:** 06 March **2015** 10:22  **To:** Jo O'Brien  **Subject: RE:** 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ MR SIMON CORDELL [SEC=UNCLASSI FI ED]  Dear Jo O’Brien  Could you please send me the CAD number my son gave you I will call the police station and get the reference number you need.  Regards  Lorraine  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue: 02**  Jo O'Brien MR SIMON CORDELL  **/ Page Numbers:** 1794,1795,1796,1797,1798,1799,  **From:** Jo O'Brien [[Jo.O'Brien@enfieldhomes.org](http://Jo.O'Brien@enfieldhomes.org)]  **Sent:** 06 March **2015** 11:25  **To:** Lorraine Cordell  **Subject: RE:** 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ MR SIMON CORDELL [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]  **Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  Dear Lorraine,  I have checked our records and can confirm your son did not provide us with a CAD number.  Kind regards Jo  Jo O'Brien Customer Services  **From:** Lorraine Cordell [**Mail To**:[lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk](http://lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk)]  **Sent:** 06 March **2015** 00:20  **To:** Jo O'Brien  **Subject: RE:** 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ MR SIMON CORDELL [SEC=UNCLASSI FI ED]  Dear Jo O’Brien  My son has already provided a Crime Reference Number crime ref is called a CAD as this is what gives the police the ref, they need to call up any information the police have on file.  Regards  Lorraine |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 02/03/2015:**   1. M | | |
|  | * **Responsible Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/2015** |  |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 1 / 00/00/2015:**   1. O | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/2015** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **BB5 – 1 / 00/00/2015:**  Text, letter  Description automatically generatedText, letter  Description automatically generated  **07/06/2013** Debbie wrote me a letter!  **12/06/2013** I received another letter off Debbie today!  **17/06/2013** Debbie kept on writing me letters!  **20/06/2013** Debbie kept writing me letters!  **22/06/2013** Debbie kept writing me letters!  **24/06/2013** Debbie kept writing me letters I have them all in my position still to date!  **28/06/2013** Another letter wrote to me from Debbie!  **16/07/2013** I then found another letter of Debra Andrews that got posted through my letterbox of my front door! |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 1 / 00/00/2012:**   1. O | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **19/03/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 19/03/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue:**  523. Lorraine Cordell \_Re\_ Can you please help  **/ Page Numbers:** 1910,  1x Email Dawn Allen First Email complaint about my Neighbour’s!  **19 March 2015 16:37**  **To**: Dawn Allen  **Subject: RE:** Can you please help  Mr Simon Cordell Burncroft Ave  Enfield  Middlesex  EN3 7JQ  Dear Dawn Allen   1. My son has had an issue with his neighbours who live above him, this has been going on a while and it is making my son's health go downhill he is not sleeping due to what is going on. 2. We would like to put a report into the issue and therefore would it please be possible for you to make a date when you could come to my son's home to do this, if you can let me know via this email with dates this can get done so we can get this issue addressed as soon as possible I would be grateful.   Regards  Mother  Simon Cordell |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 19/03/2015:**   1. On the 19/03/2015 the 1st email got sent by the Now Claimants Mother to Dawn Allan who works or worked for thew Enfield Council. 2. Dawn Alan is or was the Now Claimants Tenancy Manager and based at the Neighbourhood watch department at Edmonton Green. 3. The Emails that got sent to Dawn Allen she never replied to, and this occurred no matter how high their importance and this left the Now Claimant to get attacked by mutable Members of his Neighbours. 4. Logic says that by two people complaining that the same thing is happening that the likelihood of it being the truth is remarkably high. 5. Likelihood also proves that it would be very unlikely that by two different people saying the same thing is happening or happened, as they have both witnessed the incident or both been subjected to the incident would prove that their complaint it is not a Mental Health Issue. 6. Dawn Allen cannot say that she never received the Emails because eventually she answered to the Now Claimant and his mother from the same email address, but Dawn Alan only done this when she thought that she had something negative about the Now Claimant and that it would be him that was in trouble. 7. The Email sent by the Now claimant’s mother raised issues such as: - “ 8. My son has had an issue with his neighbours   **Time Duration:** - “this has been going on a while”  **Inhuman Effect:** - “it is making my son's health go downhill he is not sleeping due to what is going on”  **Breach Of the Procedure:** - “We would like to put a report into the issue.”  **Meeting Arranged:** – “therefore would it please be possible for you to make a date when you could come to my son's home to do this.” “If you can let me know via this email with dates this can get done so we can get this issue addressed as soon as possible”   1. There was no reply to **Evidence Exhibit:** 1 / **19/03/2015:** (RE: Can you please help.) | | |
|  | * **Asbo**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **20/03/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 20/03/2015:**   1. **15 FW RE FOI 06/03/2015 13:42 1008**  * **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue: 02**   FW RE FOI  **/ Page Numbers:** 1800,1801,1802,1803,  **From:** Lorraine Cordell  **To:** "Micheal McKee"  **Cc:** "JOSEPHINE WARD"  **Subject: FW:** RE FOI 11845 [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]  **Date:** 06 March **2015** 13:42:00  **From:** Ned Johnson [**Mail To**: [Ned.Johnson@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Ned.Johnson@enfield.gov.uk)]  **Sent:** 05 March **2015** 16:39  **To:** [lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk](http://lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk)  **Cc:** Esg Complaints  **Subject:** RE FOI 11845 [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]  **Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  Dear Ms Cordell,  **FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000 - INFORMATION REQUEST**  Thank you for your email received on **February 10th, 2015**, where you requested information regarding illegal raves/parties. In response to your questions:  All dates and times and addresses to any illegal rave/parties where the Noise and Nuisance Team attended:  8/6/14, no time recorded, Progress Way, Enfield.  Any paperwork was served to any person/persons and if need known. copies of any paperwork served:  No paperwork served.  All the calls that were made on any dates to the Noise and Nuisance Team to make them aware that illegal rave/parties were taking place: -   * **Progress Way:**  1. **13**/6/14: **1 call** 2. **12**/6/14: **2 calls after event** 3. **09/**6/14: **2 calls after event** 4. 08/6/14: 6 calls 5. 07/6/14: 8 calls  * **Leeside Road:**  1. 15/7/13: 1 call after event  * **46 Crown Road:**  1. 18/5/14: 3 calls after event 2. 19/5/14: 6 calls after event 3. 21/5/14: 1 call after event 4. 31/5/14: 2 calls 5. **01**/6/14: **6 calls** 6. **02**/6/14: **4 calls after event** 7. **04**/6/14: **1 call after event** 8. **06**/6/14: 1 call 9. **08**/6/14: 3 calls 10. 09/6/14: 1 call after event 11. 13/6/14: 2 calls   --  Any noise abatement orders that was put on any addresses where an illegal rave/party was taking place.  This would include any noise abatement that were put in place before an illegal rave/parties took place.  This would include dates and times the noise abatement, orders were served on an address and to whom and to forward copies of any such noise abatement orders within this request: No noise abatement notices served.  Personal names who attended the address and times and dates of any person attending from the Noise and Nuisance Team and any police officer names or IDs that attended with the Noise and Nuisance Team:  **Progress way:** 2 Enforcement Officers attended form the Out of Hours Noise Team, **08/6/2014**, no times noted.  Any reports made up for any of the addresses in full for the dates listed above for any illegal rave/parties. **No reports made.**  If you are dissatisfied with the handling of your request, you have the right to ask for an internal review.  Internal review requests should be submitted within two months of the date of receipt of the response to your original letter and should be addressed to:  **Theresa Dodd**  Correspondence & Complaints Manager  Environment & Street Scene Department  PO Box 52  Civic Centre  Silver Street  Enfield EN1 3XE  020 8379 3540  Email – [theresa.dodd@enfield.gov.uk](http://Theresa.Dodd@enfield.gov.uk)  Please remember to quote the reference number above in any future communications. If you are not content with the outcome of the internal review, you have the right to apply  **1802,1803,**   1. **16 FW RE FOI 06/03/2015 15:36 1008** 2. **17 FW RE FOI 06/03/2015 17:16 1008** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 20/03/2015:**   1. Mother and I were contacting the Enfield Council about the ongoing ASBO case that I was dealing with since the **12/09/2014** that the met police along with Enfield Council had submitted to the court, 2. I had been subjected to an interim order on the **05/11/2014** by the court, which breached my Human Rights and was unlawful. 3. Enfield Council state they were not involved in the ASBO case but if they were not involved why is Enfield Council name on the ASBO files which were in front of the court why are there statements from Enfield Council in the ASBO files which can be proven. 4. There are reasons I was never helped by Enfield Council with the issues with the neighbours the above is one of them.   **46 Crown Road:**   1. 18/5/14: 3 calls after event 2. 19/5/14: 6 calls after event 3. 21/5/14: 1 call after event 4. 31/5/14: 2 calls 5. **01**/6/14: **6 calls** 6. **02**/6/14: **4 calls after event** 7. **04**/6/14: **1 call after event** 8. **06**/6/14: 1 call 9. **08**/6/14: 3 calls 10. 09/6/14: 1 call after event 11. 13/6/14: 2 calls | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **31/03/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 31/03/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue:**  533. Lorraine Cordell \_Re\_ Issue I am having  **/ Page Numbers:** 1958,  **From:** Lorraine Cordell  [lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk](http://lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk)  **Sent:** 31 March **2015** 15:34  **To: Dawn Allen**  **Subject: RE:** Issue I am having  Mr Simon Cordell  109 Burncroft Ave  Enfield  Middlesex  EN3 7JQ  Dear Dawn Allen,   1. I am writing this email due to not having a reply to my email dated **19/03/2015** I am having a great deal of problems with my neighbours who live above me, they are not letting me sleep and this is having an effect on my health I have asked before if someone could come and speak to me to address these problems and no one has. 2. I and my mother have made phone calls about the neighbours above my flat, yet nothing is being done. 3. Please can you get back to me as soon as possible in order to setup a meeting at my home so we can address the issues with the neighbours as soon as possible as I cannot live the way I am any longer. 4. There are also still issues with repairs that have not been addressed.   Regards  Simon Cordell  Lorraine Cordell |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 31/03/2015:**   1. On the **31/03/2015** a second email got sent to Dawn Allan by the Now Claimants mother about flat repairs and neighbours no reply to this email (RE: Issue I am having) Email name. 2. A total of 12 days passed by and without a reply to the Now Claimants and his mother’s request for emergency help of the Enfield Council and their neighbourhood watch teams. Members of the Now Claimants neighbours were left to brutally attacking him due to this failure. | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **11/04/2015**  Till the  **17/04/2015** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **1 / 11/04/2015:**  **I was still being victimised by the already mentioned: --**   1. On the **11th of April**, a 24-hour assault of cruel inhuman treatment took place against me because I was still being victimised by the already mentioned. 2. Stan Curtis and Debra Andrews with the Mathiyalagan family had been left to breach my human rights on a day to day and night to night basis this was while Stain and Debra were always both drunk together, this got done to an extent off an attempted manslaughter charge that would be in accordance to section 18 of that Act and also includes proof of their intent and purpose such as **1.** Cruel Inhuman treatment. **2.** sport and fun. 3. I know this as I had rapidly, told them all involved that I had not been tricked by their evil banging on the floorboards and walls, even with or without foreign objects being used at separate times by them; on numerous instances this contained the use of their feet and hands inclusive of other objects and fixtures. 4. Together they would work in collaboration to maintain a 24-hour assault on myself to get overseen and managed, I continued to defend myself even more and with any extra time of peace that I got given I read into the Anti-Social Behaviour Order Case files I noticed, that these people that created the application were not good police officer’s, they were criminals. 5. I needed to safeguard myself from their actions and after contemplating on what would be the best way forward for me and anyone involved, I called the Metropolitan police 999 call centre again to ask for more advice and security and this is a copy of that conversation that got recorded then transcribed.   **Evidence: Exhibit** **2 / 17/04/2015:**  **Tape recording two Z0000011: --**  **Intro: Welcome to the Metropolitan police introduction: --**   1. **Police Officer:**Hello, police officer, what is the reason for calling us. 2. **Simon:**hello I would like to put a complaint in, and I was just wondering if you could help me do this, please. 3. **Police Officer;**yes, is it a complaint against police? 4. **Simon:**yes, that is correct. 5. **Police Officer:**yes, I can take the complaint. 6. **Simon:**I would like to; can you forward an email to Jane Johnson please? 7. **Police Officer;**Jane Johnson. 8. **Simon;**yes, superintendent for Edmonton police station the commissioner. 9. **Police Officer;**let me just have a look, just one second. 10. **Police Officer;**Jane Johnson yep supper chief superintendent 11. **Simon:**yes, that is correct. 12. **Police Officer:**yes, that is ok, is this complaint that has already got made or is it that you need to make a first one? 13. **Simon:**this is just a fresh email to herself it is more of a request than a complaint at the 14. present time but it may turn into an official complaint depending on how she decides to discipline her officers that she represents. 15. **Police Officer;**ok. 16. **Police Officer:**and that is too Jane Johnson ok go ahead with the continence and I will get the email sent to you. 17. **Simon:**my name is a Mr Simon Paul Cordell. 18. **Police Officer;**Paul Cordell 19. **Police Officer;**Cordell 20. **Simon:**yes, that is correct madam. 21. **Simon;**and. 22. **Police Officer;**and your contact number 0208-245. 23. **Simon:**yes, that is correct. 24. **Police Officer;**right go ahead. 25. **Simon;**and the issue is of concern is that I have her signature at the bottom of an Asbo Order a standalone Asbo Order and there has been a lot of corruption represented in side of it, that she has instructed, a Steve Elsmore too complete an application for an Anti-Social Behaviour Order for the organisation of illegal raves and in that application there are lots of police corruption and foul play where the evidence has gotten manufactured, now I am asking her to oversee her officers that she has instructed to make such an application and then to cheek the time stamps relating to the Cad’s and to check the Urn numbers that run consecutively, over an annual year period when they should not, I am asking her to oversee this and to inform me of my case being manufactured and for this it will get dropped or I am calling her, herself to the court as a witness and I will investigate myself against her also for her actions and decisions. 26. **Police Officer;**OK. 27. **Simon;**to what is allowed to happen, she is basically, the boss of all the police and she is charge of Steve Elsmore, she has told Steve Elsmore to create an application and either she told Steve Elsmore to manufacture the application in such a way and or to falsify information contained within it or she does not know that Steve Elsmore has done that and I would like her to know that Stave has done that and I would like her to decide to whether she is going to suspended him right now and give the case to somebody else to handle or what she will do and I would like her to contact me back at [Re\_wired@ymail.com](http://re_wired@ymail.com) as soon as practically, possible. 28. **Simon:**I know I was going fast, but did you manage to get the full gist of what I am explaining to you, madam. 29. **Police Officer:**yes, I got the jest I made the points for you. 30. **Simon:**so, she will contact me back at [Re\_wired@ymail.com](http://re_wired@ymail.com) as soon as practically, possible regarding how she will represent this case, because at the present time I am being held captive within my own home because she is not doing her job correctly. 31. **Simon;**I have handed in an article six twice now sine this case started in the courts with a complete copy, if she would like to get a copy of the court case she can and contained within this is a copy of the Article six with all the drafted corruption inside it and also, I have handed in three complaints, three official complaints that get issued in the police PNC computer this will also show this information. 32. **Police Officer;**OK. 33. **Simon:**and if she would like to hold a meeting with me, I would be happy to come to the police station and show her the evidence I have. 34. **Simon:**either she is a part of the corruption, or she is separate from the corruption and 35. for her to be separate she must do her job correctly, and this must mean that I am not being held captive in my own home. 36. **Police Officer;**ok. 37. **Simon:**to laws that do not even exist. 38. **Police Officer;**right ok. 39. **Police Officer:**what I will do for you right now Simon is getting this email sent over to her right now, please can you confirm your email address again [Re\_wired@ymail.com](http://re_wired@ymail.com). 40. **Simon;**thank you. 41. **Police Officer;**ok good buy. 42. **Simon:**you have a good day.   **Evidence: Exhibit** **3 / 17/04/2015:**  **The banging Started!**   * Debbie Andrews (responsible) * Stain Curtis (responsible) * Mathiyalagan (Responsible)   **Time:** All-Day and All-Night whenever they knew that I was indoors!   1. I tried to defend myself from them attacking me in a dignified manner with no submission towards justice getting accomplished! 2. The Enfield Council and the Enfield Homes employees aloud the occupiers of 117 and 113 and 111 Continued to victimize me by: -- 3. 117 Burncroft Avenue and 113 keep on continually, reiterating to flushing the toilet when I am in the bathtub! 4. Eavesdropping, / Heedfully aurally perceiving where I am in my abode and then chasing me around into each room as listed, while banging on the floor with objects! 5. 113 and 117 woke me up by assailing me intentionally by stamping and dropping articles above my head in my front room and all other living rooms! 6. Slamming the main, communal ingress door closed! 7. Victimizing me with intent of utilizing the same reiterated items of the building fixtures to have tortures effects on me within my rented habitation is inequitable living circumstances!   **Evidence: Exhibit** **4 / 17/04/2015:**  **Disrepair!**   1. I stay in the freezing conditions within my home because all of the complaints I make get pushed aside after I report them to the Enfield council employed staff!     **Evidence: Exhibit** **5 / 17/04/2015:**  **Time Spent Building.**   1. In the background of everything going I continued creating a new and up to date event Electrical Systems Policy and I continued to Study and finish at the Time Start: 07:00 Am and Time End: 03:30 Pm! 2. My mother also continues to build my company website for me with others at the Time Start: 09:00 and Time End: 14:00!   **Evidence: Exhibit** **6 / 17/04/2015:**  **Working at Home doing Court Case Defence Work!**   1. “I spent time and resources costing expenditure with my mother also building my defence case, against the allegations getting put against me at the Time Start: 12:00 Am and Time End: 06:00 Am!” |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 11/04/2015:**   1. On the 11/04/2015 is an exhibit taken from the Now Claimants diary. 2. The Now Claimant explained to Members of the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police Force that an incident report form that he had been given by them to complete was not designed to manage more than a couple of words and that he had followed their advice due to this fact and continued to document incidents down on a bit of paper but no member of staff would since accept the incident logs or have a meeting with him in regards to the issues raised with it. 3. The **Evidence Exhibit:** 1 / **11/04/2015**: would have clearly show the Official staff the torture the Now Claimant was continually being put through by members of his neighbour’s aloe he did say they were committing an attempted manslaughter charge when he should have said an attempted murder charge. 4. The Now Claimant also explained that his neighbours were taking out Cruel & Inhuman treatment against him while explain that this was done to him by those involved as if it were a sport for them to have fun, but yet the Government authorities refused to act in accordance with the law and even with his mother saying the same. 5. Neighbours of the Now Claimant were left evilly banging on the floorboards and walls, and even with objects at him and no arrests of interviews took place in respect of these matter.   **Statement Exhibit** **2 / 11/04/2015:**   1. On the 17/04/2015   Is a Tape recording to the Metropolitan police Services  **Statement Exhibit** **3 / 11/04/2015:**   1. On the 17/04/2015   Diary Exhibit of the banging at the Now Claimant  **Statement Exhibit** **4 / 11/04/2015:**   1. On the 17/04/2015   Disrepair!  **Statement Exhibit** **5 / 11/04/2015:**   1. On the 17/04/2015   Time Spent Building.  **Statement Exhibit** **6 / 11/04/2015:**   1. On the 17/04/2015   Working at Home doing Court Case Defence Work! | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **17/04/2015** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **1 / 17/04/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue:**  546. x2 Lorraine Cordell \_Fwd.\_ Issue I am having  **/ Page Numbers: 2014**,  **From:** Lorraine Cordell [[lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk](http://lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk)]  **Sent:** 17th April **2015** 17:57  **To: Dawn Allen**  **Subject: FW:** Issue I am having  Dear Dawn Allen   1. “I still have not had a reply to the below email please can you get back to me via this email address my son is really suffering due to what the neighbours are doing.” 2. “A report needs to be made as this is making my son's health go downhill, he is not being able to sleep due to what is going on and other things. Please can you get back to me?”   Regards  Lorraine Cordell |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 17/04/2015:**   1. On the 17/04/2015 The 3rd email got sent to Dawn Allan by my mother about flat repairs and neighbours due to no reply to past emails and the exhibited email as \*\*\*\* also did not get replied to headed as (FW: Issue I am having.)   The First Email sent about Neighbours asking for protection from being victimised was sent on the **19/03/2015** and the Second Email was **31/03/2015.**  = 14 days March  = 17 days April  **Totalling a total of: -**  31 Days  son is really suffering due to what the neighbours are doing.”  A report needs to be made as this is making my son's health go downhill  he is not being able to sleep due to what is going on and other things.  Please can you get back to me?” | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **04/05/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 04/05/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue:**  550. x2 Lorraine Cordell \_Re\_ Issue I am having with neighbours  **/ Page Numbers:** 2031,  **04th May 2015 13:22**  **Sent: To: Dawn Allen**  **Subject: RE:** Issue I am having with neighbours  Mr Simon Cordell  Burncroft Ave  Enfield  Middlesex  EN3 7JQ  Dear Dawn Allen   1. I have been sending you so many emails, yet I am getting no reply nothing is being done, 2. my son is having so many issues with the neighbours he has asked for help, yet nothing is being done. 3. My son went up to the neighbours and asked if they would please stop banging all the time, 4. and about the water issues with the pipes banging, very, badly, in his flat, but they are still doing it and will not stop, 5. people who also have been in my son's flat have also heard what is going on, and they are even saying they do not know how he is coping with this. 6. On the top floor, they have wooden flooring this does not help and can something please get done. 7. lady that lives at 113 is also causing a great deal of problems and she keeps coming to my front door asking for money to buy a drink, she is also banging very, badly, and 8. my son's health is suffering due to this, 9. I do not know why you have not replied to my emails and are just leaving things when we are asking for help, 10. you are the council officer for my son's area please can this get addressed.   Regards |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 04/05/2015:**   1. On the 04/05/2015 The 4th email got sent to Dawn Allan by my mother about flat repairs and neighbours no reply to this email (RE: Issue I am having with neighbours) Email name.   = 14 days March  = 30 days April  = 4 Days May  **Totalling a total of: -**  48 Days | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **28/05/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 28/05/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue: 02**  FW Issue I am having with neighbours  **/ Page Numbers:** 2045,  **28 May 2015 15:16**  **Sent: To: Dawn Allen**  **Subject: FW:** Issue I am having with neighbours.  Dear Dawn Allen   1. “Could you please reply to all my emails as too, what can get done with the issues that is going on, you have not replied to one email, and this is not fair.” 2. “I don’t know what is going on and why my son is being treated like this by Enfield Council is it due to what the police did to him?”   Regards |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 28/05/2015:**   1. On the 28/05/2015 The 5th email got sent to Dawn Allan by my mother about flat repairs and neighbours no reply to this email (FW: Issue I am having with neighbours) Email name.   = 14 days March  = 30 days April  = 28 Days May  **Totalling a total of: -**  72 Days | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **01/06/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 01/06/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue:**  561. Lorraine Cordell \_Fwd.\_ Issue I am having with neighbours\_ (2)  **/ Page Numbers:** 2048,2049,  **From:** Mother [[Mother!32@blueyonder.co.uk](http://Mother!32@blueyonder.co.uk)]  **Sent: 01/06/2015 - 14:38**  **To: Dawn Allen**  **Subject: FW:** Issue I am having with neighbours  Dear Dawn Allen  **Complain**   1. I have sent a number of emails regarding the issues my son is having with his neighbours, which you have failed to reply to and have not addressed the issues which has been ongoing. 2. I have given you enough time to reply and address the issues, yet you have failed to do anything.   **2049,**   1. I would like it looked into why you do not reply to my emails. 2. I would like it looked into why you have done nothing in regard to the issues that having been ongoing for son for some time and have done nothing. 3. I would like it looked into why you have allowed a person to suffer and have not done anything about it. 4. I would like a reply to this co1nplaint and if you cannot deal with this, please pass it over to a person that can. 5. I would like a reply to this co1nplaint and if you cannot deal with this, please pass it over to a person that can.   Mother |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 01/06/2015:**   1. On the 01/06/2015 Issue I am having with neighbours   = 14 days March  = 30 days April  = 31 Days May  = 01 Days June  **Totalling a total of: -**  76 Days | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **10/06/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 01/06/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue: 02**  **RE** Please Can You Help This Cannot Carry On!  **Page Number:** 2063,  **From:** Mother [**Mail To:** [Mother!32@blueyonder.co.uk](http://Mother!32@blueyonder.co.uk)]  **Sent: 10/06/2015 - 21: 13**  **To: Dawn Allen**  **Subject: RE:** Please Can You Help This Cannot Carry On!  Mr Simon Cordell  109 Burncroft Ave  Enfield  Middlesex  EN3 7JQ  Dear Dawn Allen   1. I do not understand why all my phone calls and emails are not getting addressed. 2. I have really tried and so has my son. 3. we have been making calls all the time to try and get something done and I have sent a lot of emails including a complaint email dated **01/07/2015**. 4. I still have had no reply to my son and also, I have tried to talk to the neighbours which have done nothing they still keep on. 5. My son health is st1ffering due to what has been ongoing for a long time. 6. We have tried to get help from the council as if the council speaks to them maybe they will stop what they are doing. 7. I also went to 117 but they were not at home so did not speak to them about the issues. 8. I went to Debbie at 113 to try and talk to her but she just started to shout at me through the door. 9. I did try and say to her through the door could she let me speak but she was just screaming at me so I went back down to my son flat the banging is unbelievably bad and you can clearly hear they are doing this is not just so1neone living their life as no1mal people would. 10. You can even hear her following my son around in his flat banging; he does not even want to take a bath because he can hear her above him banging on the floor. 11. Yet she still keeps coming down to my son door asking him for money to buy drinks my son has told her could she please leave him alone and stop coming to his door and to please stop following him around and banging on the floor and pipes, but this has not helped she just acts like nothing is going on. 12. Debbie has now started to go to my other neighbours at 111 and they are drinking and now 111 is also banging. 13. I do not know if it is due to Debbie liking my son and when he and his partner ended in **Mid-2013.** 14. “She was hoping something would come of this, as this is the time when she started to come to my son flat door a lot more.” 15. when my son was with his partner, she used to co1ne to his door maybe once a week for money but after they ended, she was coming down more and more she even was trying to give my son drink, he does not drink so would not accept it. 16. She was also writing my son letters and putting them through his door, the letters are not really readable. 17. The main problem with Debbie seemed to start when she came to 1ny son's front door and saw a girl in his flat she saw the girl on more than once and this upset her. 18. Since this time things have got worse and worse, and my son's health is really suffering. 19. Please cam something be done as we really do not know what to do any longer, if you cannot do anything about the neighbours in the block can you please see if you can move my son as he cannot take any 1nore, he needs to be able to rest and sleep which at this time it is impossible, this is unfair what is going on to my son's health. Please can you reply to this email as you have not done to any of my other emails or calls or the calls my son has made regarding this issue which I do not understand why.   Regards  Mother |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 10/06/2015:**   1. On the 10/06/2015 RE Please can you help this cannot carry on 2. Demonstrates how the Enfield   = 14 days March  = 30 days April  = 31 Days May  = 10 Days June  **Totalling a total of: -**  85 Days | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **20/06/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 20/06/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue: 02**  FW Issue I am having with neighbours  **/ Page Numbers:** 2067,2068,  **20th June 2015 19:12**  **Sent: To: Dawn Allen**  **Subject: FW:** Issue I am having with neighbours  Dear Dawn Allen   1. “Seeing as you are not addressing the emails that are being sent, I have no option but to take this higher.”   Regards  Mother  **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **2 / 20/06/2015:**  **The banging Started!**   * Debbie Andrews (responsible) * Stain Curtis (responsible) * Mathiyalagan (Responsible)   **Time:** All Morning: -- Mid-Day: -- In the Evening and of the Night!   1. The Enfield Council and the Enfield Homes employees aloud the occupiers of 117 and 113 and 111 Continued to victimize me by: -- 2. 117 Burncroft Avenue and 113 keep on continually, repeating to flushing the toilet when I am in the bathtub! 3. And follow me to the toilet when I am being sick and start banging above my head 4. Debbie bangs when she is drunk with the occupiers of 117 the Mathiyalagan family and also Stain Curtis off 111 Burncroft Avenue and continue to Slam the water tap on and off, causing damage to my health and the buildings fixtures at an unacceptable rate! 5. Stain playing with pots or pans on his kitchen wall like the devil that has surmounted his sole I cannot believe that I had so much love for him, and reverence and he treats me this way in my life and my dotted ones! 6. The occupiers of 117 keep on assailing me and then Slamming their own living room, door closed repentantly! 7. Debra when drunk 113 and Mathiyalagan 117 keep slamming the dihydrogen monoxide tap on and off at an unacceptable rate, while stain 111 additionally joins in from his flats kitchen dihydrogen monoxide supply to daunt me into moving home and this is causing earnest damage to my health, while everyone else on the estate can auricularly discern and does nothing to forfend me from them! |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 20/06/2015:**   1. On the 20/06/2015 The 6th email got sent to Dawn Allan by my mother about flat repairs and neighbours no reply to this email (FW: Issue I am having with neighbours) Email name.   = 14 days March  = 30 days April  = 31 Days May  = 20 Days June  **Totalling a total of: -**  95 Days  **Statement Exhibit** **2 / 20/06/2015:**   1. On the 20/06/2015 The | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **01/07/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 01/07/2015:**  **The funfair being present: --**   1. July **2014** is around the time of the funfair being present in the local park attached to our housing estate, date. 2. I had gotten locked in my flat wrongly, for one year for the gazebo case and an additional six months for the interim order by this stage of my life and thought that time I got assaulted by my neighbours, Stain Debra and the Mathiyalagan Markandu and friends, they together mentioned had been banging so loud at me, that it seemed as if in they were trying to get other involved who live on my estate, by way of making them believe that they were better than me and that I am the worst of society. 3. Luckily, other people than the ones already involved on my estate did not get involved neither did their loved ones, so when the funfair arrived in the local park ajar from our housing estate it seemed as if in, they would bang louder hoping for them to get involved by coming to my home address, I believe that it is lucky that this did not happen, I had prevented any bad misfortunes from happening and brought the welder for my security gate and then reinstated the gate commission of use.   **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **2 / 01/07/2015:**  **1 x Email!**  **Sent: 01 July 2015 14:38**  **To: Dawn Allen**  **Subject: FW:** Issue I am having with neighbours  Dear Dawn Allen  **Complaint: --**   1. I sent a number of emails regarding the issues my son's is having with his neighbours, which you failed to reply to and have not addressed the issues which has been ongoing. 2. I have given you enough time to reply and address the issues, yet you have failed to do anything, 3. I would like it looked into why you do not reply to my emails. 4. I would like it to look into why you done nothing regarding the issues that having been ongoing for some time and have done nothing. 5. I would like it to look into why you allowed a person to suffer and done nothing about it, 6. I would like a reply to this complaint and if you cannot deal with this, please pass it over to a person who can.   Regards Simon’s Mother |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 01/07/2015:**   1. On the 01/07/2015 The 7th email mum got sent to Dawn Allan by my mother about flat repairs and neighbours no reply to this email (FW: Issue I am having with neighbours) Email name.   **Statement Exhibit** **2 / 01/07/2015:**   1. On the 01/07/2015   = 14 days March  = 30 days April  = 31 Days May  = 30 Days June  = 01 Days July  **Totalling a total of: -**  105 Days | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **10/07/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 10/07/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue: 02**  **RE** “Please Can You Help This Cannot Carry On”  **/ Page Numbers:** 2069,  10th July **2015** 21:13  **Sent to: Dawn Allen**  **Subject: RE: “**Please can you help this cannot carry on Mr Simon Cordell”  Burncroft Ave  Enfield Middlesex  EN3 7JQ  Dear Dawn Allen   1. I do not understand why all my phone calls and emails are not getting addressed, I tried and so has my son, we have been making calls all the time to get something done and I have sent a lot of emails including a complaint email dated **01/07/2015** which I still have had no reply to my son and I also tried to talk to the neighbours which have done nothing they still keep on. 2. My son health is suffering due to what has been ongoing for a long time. We tried to get help from the council as if the council speaks to them, maybe they will stop what they are doing, 3. I also attended to 117 but I believe they were not at home so did not speak to them about the issues. 4. I attended to Debbie at 113 to talk to her, but she shouted at me through the door. I tried to say to her through the door could she let me speak, but she was just screaming at me so I went back down to my son flat the banging is terrible and you can clearly hear they are doing this is not just someone living their life as normal people would. 5. You can even hear her following my son around in his flat banging; 6. If he does not even want to take a bath because he can hear her above, him banging on the floor. 7. Yet she still keeps coming down to my son door asking him for money to buy drinks my son has told her could she please leave him alone and stop coming to his door and to please stop following him around and banging on the floor and pipes, but this has not helped she acts like nothing is going on. 8. Debbie has now gone to my other neighbours at 111 and they are drinking and now 111 is also banging. 9. I do not know if it is due to Debbie liking my son and when he and his partner ended in Mid-**2013** she was hoping something would come of this as she came to my son’s flat door a lot more. when my son was with his partner, she used to come to his door maybe once a week for money, but after they ended, she was coming down more and more she even was trying to give my son drink, he does not drink so would not accept it. 10. She was also writing my son letters and putting them through his door, the letters are not readable. 11. The main problem with Debbie seemed to start when she came to my son's front door and saw a girl in his flat, she saw the girl on more than once and this upset her. Since this time things got worse and worse, and my son's health is suffering. 12. Please cam something gets done as we really, do not know what to do any longer, if you can do nothing about the neighbours in the block can you please see if you can move my son as he cannot take any more, he needs to rest and sleep which is impossible, this is unfair what is going on to my son's health. 13. Please can you reply to this email as you have not done to any of my other emails or calls or the calls my son has made regarding this issue which I do not understand why.   Regards |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 10/07/2015:**   1. On the 10/07/2015 The 8th email got sent to Dawn Allan by my mother about flat repairs and neighbours no reply to this email (RE: Please can you help this cannot carry on) email name.   = 14 days March  = 30 days April  = 31 Days May  = 30 Days June  = 10 Days July  **Totalling a total of: -**  114 Days | | |
|  | * **Asbo**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **03/08/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 03/08/2015:**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **7 Out of 20 of 20 court dates the 7of 7 appearance towards the 1st Asbo got held at Highbury Court and the judges was** | | | **Date:** | 03/08/2015 & 04/08/2015 | | **Defendants Name:** | Mr Simon Cordell | | **Case Handler:** | Ms Sally Gilchrist Legal Executive Director Met Police and she was Present! | | **Court House:** | Highbury Corner Magistrates | | **Reason:** | Mention Hearing | | **Case Number:** | 1402490741 | | **Judges Name:** | Defendant Judge Pigot | | **Contra’s Name:** | Robert Talalay | | **My Barrister Name:** | Mr. Andrew Locke | | **Note 1:** | (Full Hearing) | | **Note 2:** |  | |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 03/08/2015:**   1. On the 03/08/2015 This is the Day at Court for the trial of the Anti-Social Behaviour Order Case and the Verdict got made Guilty against me on the 04/08/2015, Spelling Mistakes. 2. On the **03** & **04/08/2015** at the Highbury Corner Court the Asbo trial case, got said to be part proven on the 04th 08/**2015**. 3. On this date of trial, I never got found guilty in my opinion, and others, such as my mother and barrister under true and fair Acts of law under the grounds of the application that the prosecution had brought into motion, but somehow, I seemed to have received a punishment, so I travelled home and looked into the case files even more than I had beforehand as I knew that I had not committed the crimes that I was being accused of. 4. I noticed the following to be wrong and in clear error: - 5. They got all the law’s and do not use them right: - 6. I had noticed the governing officials as explained thought growing up, but this finally, became a growing concern when reading the Anti-Social Behaviour Order application that got said to get served on me under the law, to which I disputed from the start of the proceedings, at first, in the Anti-Social Behaviour Order case I had not noticed a lot of fraudulent inconsistencies contained, in its folder, right until I had noticed the time stamps were in error and this was because I understood that I had never committed the crimes or public offence I was being questioned and accused of on the days that the police brought proceedings in motion towards. | | |
|  | * **Asbo**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **04/08/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **3 / 04/08/2015:**  **The 1st Injunction Order / Lemmy / pub Book Issue: one!**  **D + E + F + G:** Lemmy Statement 1st Injunction order **/**  **Page Numbers:** 105,106,107,108,109,110,111,112,113,114  **105,**   |  | | --- | | **Simon Cordell’s**  **The 1st Injunction Order Dated: 00/00/2014**  **INDEX** | | **“**Not Relevant**!”** |   **106,**   |  | | --- | | **Simon Cordell’s**  **The 1st Injunction Order Dated: 00/00/2014**  **INDEX** | | **5.** The Defendant was I previously known to the Claimant and an **anti-social behaviour order** was made on  **G.**  **04 August 2015**  by the Magistrates Court to prevent him from knowingly using or supplying property personal or otherwise, for the use in a rave as defined in s.63(1) o: f the Criminal Justice Order Act 1994. The order· was made for a duration of 5 years. A copy of the Order is at page 27 of the  exhibit bundle. |   **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **4 / 04/08/2015:**  **LEMMYS, Index I received on the 25/06/2018**  Claim form, application for an injunction and statements / New 2 Injunction / Indexed  **/ Page Numbers:**  196,197,198,199,200,201,202,203,204,205,  206,207,208,209,210,211,212,213,214,215,  216,217,218,**219,220,221,222,223,224,225,**  **226,227,228,**229,230,231,232,233,234,235,  236,237,238,239,240,241,242,243,244,245,  246,247,248,249,250,251,252,253,254,255,  256,257,258,259,260.261,262,263,264,265,  266,267,268,269,270,271,272,273,274,275,  276,277,278,279,280,281,282,283,284,285,  286,287,288,289,290,291,292,293,294,295,  296,297,298,299,300,301,302.  --  **219**  07th day of August 2017   |  | | --- | | **CLAIM NUMBER: D02EDO73**  **IN THE EDMONTON COUNTY COURT**  **BETWEEN:**  **{CLAIMANT}**  **THE MAYOR AND BURGESSES OF THE LONDON BOROUGH OF ENFIELD**  **-AND-**  **(DEFENDANT)**  **MR SIMON CORDELL**  **DIRECTIONS ORDER** | | Dated this**07th day of August 2017** |   **220**  Dated **07th August 2017**  I have held this employment since **August 2016**   |  | | --- | | **CLAIM NUMBER: D02EDO73**  **IN THE EDMONTON COUNTY COURT**  **BETWEEN:**  **{CLAIMANT}**  **THE MAYOR AND BURGESSES OF THE LONDON BOROUGH OF ENFIELD**  **-AND-**  **(DEFENDANT)**  **MR SIMON CORDELL**  **DIRECTIONS ORDER** | | 1. Made on behalf of the Claimant 2. Witness Statement of Lemmy Nwabuisi 3. Statement No. 1 4. Exhibit No LN1 5. Dated **7 August 2017**   **IN THE EDMONTON COUNTY COURT**  **CLAIM, NO:**  **BETWEEN:**  **THE MAYOR AND BURGESSES OF THE LONDON BOROUGH OF ENFIELD**  **Claimant**  **-and-**  **MR SIMON CORDELL**  **Defendant**  **WITNESS STATEMENT OF MR LEMMY NWABUISI**  I, Mr Lemmy Nwabuisi, of PO BOX 50, Civic Centre, Enfield, EN1 3XA make this statement believing it to be true and understand that it may be placed before court.  As far as the content of this witness statement is within my own personal knowledge it is true and insofar as it is not within my personal knowledge it is true to the best of my knowledge.  **I WILL SAY AS FOLLOWS**   1. I am employed by the London Borough of Enfield as an Anti-Social Behaviour Coordinator in the Community Safety Unit.   **I have held this employment since August 2016.** My role as an Anti-Social Coordinator consists of investigating and dealing with reports of anti-social behaviour involving council and non-council tenants. My involvement with the Defendant was due to allegations of verbal abuse, threats, harassment, and intimidation made against him by some of his neighbours. |   **221**  14th August 2006  October 2016  05th October 2016  17th November 2016  04th August 2015   |  | | --- | | **CLAIM NUMBER: D02EDO73**  **IN THE EDMONTON COUNTY COURT**  **BETWEEN:**  **{CLAIMANT}**  **THE MAYOR AND BURGESSES OF THE LONDON BOROUGH OF ENFIELD**  **-AND-**  **(DEFENDANT)**  **MR SIMON CORDELL**  **DIRECTIONS ORDER** | | The Defendant was previously known to the Claimant and an anti-social behaviour order was made on **4 August 2015** by the Magistrates Court to prevent him from knowingly using or supplying property, **personal** or **otherwise,** for the use **in a rave as defined in s.63(1)** of the **Criminal Justice Order Act 1994**. The order was made for a duration of 5 years. A copy of the Order is at page 27 of the exhibit bundle. |   **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **5 / 04/08/2015:**  **LEMMYS, Index I received on the 25/06/2018**  Claim form, application for an injunction and statements / New 2 Injunction / Indexed  **/ Page Numbers:**  196,197,198,199,200,201,202,203,204,205,206,  207,208,209,210,211,212,213,214,215,216,217,  218,219,220,221,222,223,224,225,226,227,228,  229,230,231,232,233,234,235,236,237,238,239,  240,241,242,243,244,245,246,247,248,249,250,  251,252,253,254,255,**256,257,258,**259,260.261,  262,263,264,265,266,267,268,269,270,271,272,  273,274,275,276,277,278,279,280,281,282,283,  284,285,286,287,288,289,290,291,292,293,294,  295,296,297,298,299,300,301,302  **256**  07th October 2016  05th October 2016  17/11/2016   |  | | --- | | **CLAIM NUMBER: D02EDO73**  **IN THE EDMONTON COUNTY COURT**  **BETWEEN:**  **{CLAIMANT}**  **THE MAYOR AND BURGESSES OF THE LONDON BOROUGH OF ENFIELD**  **-AND-**  **(DEFENDANT)**  **MR SIMON CORDELL**  **DIRECTIONS ORDER** | | **CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM**  **Prosecution Team**  Witness Care Unit Holborn **10 Lambs Conduit Street Holborn Police Station**  London WC1N3NR  0208 247 7530 10am - 2pm Mon-Fri  **7th October 2016**  Dear Mr \*\*\*\*  **Case Against Simon Cordell**  **Unique Reference Number 01YE0355816:**  I am writing to confirm that you are required to attend court to give your evidence.  At the hearing on **5th October 2016** at Highbury Comer Magistrates Court, Simon Corded pleaded “not guilty" to the following offences:   1. Use threatening / abusive / insulting words / behaviour with intent to cause fear to of / provoke unlawful violence 2. Criminal damage-to property valued under £5000   The defendant Is on ball with the following conditions: not to contact you or attend your address and to reside at a designated address known to police. If you witness the defendant breaking these conditions, call 101 or in an emergency, 999 immediately.  A trial has been arranged to take place at HIGHBURY CORNER MAGISTRATES COURT at 13:30 p.m. on **17/11/2016.**  On arrival, please make your way to WITNESS SERVICE and you wait in their suite which is separate from the public and read your statement. Please collect a blue victim form to claim any expenses of loss of earnings.  If you do not attend a WITNESS SUMMONS may be issued to enforce your attendance.  EN3 7JQ  i1venue |   **257**  17/11/2016   |  | | --- | | **CLAIM NUMBER: D02EDO73**  **IN THE EDMONTON COUNTY COURT**  **BETWEEN:**  **{CLAIMANT}**  **THE MAYOR AND BURGESSES OF THE LONDON BOROUGH OF ENFIELD**  **-AND-**  **(DEFENDANT)**  **MR SIMON CORDELL**  **DIRECTIONS ORDER** | | Please confirm if you wish for your contact details to be passed onto the Witness Service. They offer support to victims; and witnesses, on the day you attend court, and they can arrange for you to visit the court, before the day of the trial, so that you can have a look around. If you would like to visit the court, please contact the Witness Service ·on 0300 332 1000  “Thank you for your assistance as a witness, as giving evidence is very important and your help is greatly appreciated.”  Yours sincerely  Thomas Jones  Witness Care Officer.   * Please call WITNESS CARE to confirm that you will be attending. * Please attend **HIGHBURY CORNER MAGISTRATES** court at 13:30 p.m. on **17/11/2016** * For further information about being a witness, visit: [http://www.iustice.QOV.uk/victims-and-witnesses/workinQ-with-victims- witnesses](http://www.iustice.QOV.uk/victims-and-witnesses/workinQ-with-victims-witnesses) |   **258**  Date: **04th August 2015**  Date: **04th August 2015**   |  | | --- | | **CLAIM NUMBER: D02EDO73**  **IN THE EDMONTON COUNTY COURT**  **BETWEEN:**  **{CLAIMANT}**  **THE MAYOR AND BURGESSES OF THE LONDON BOROUGH OF ENFIELD**  **-AND-**  **(DEFENDANT)**  **MR SIMON CORDELL**  **DIRECTIONS ORDER** | | **Highbury Corner Magistrates' Court**  **Code 2572**  **North London Admin Centre POBOX52 N7 1AF**  **Telephone** 020 7506 310  **Fax** 0870 739 5768  Mr Simon CORDELL 109 Bancroft Avenue Enfield Middlesex EN37JQ  **Case number:** 011402490741  Bom:  **Anti-social behaviour order on application**  **Order**  **You must not**   1. Attended a rave as defined by s.63(1) of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994. 2. Be concerned in the organisation of a rave as defined by s.63(1) of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 3. Knowingly using or supplying property, personal or otherwise, for the use in a rave as defined in s.63(1) of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994. 4. Enter or remain in any **dis/us/ed** or abandoned building unless invited to do so in writing by a registered charitable organisation or Local Authority 5. Enter or **re man** on non-residential private property on an industrial estate between the hours of 10pm and 7am Without written permission from the owner and/or leaseholder of the property; and 6. Engage in any licensable activity in an unlicensed premise 7. For the sake of clarity, nothing in this order prevents the Defendant from assisting, preparing for or engaging in licensed licensable activities 8. This order lasts for 5 years.   **Warning**   1. If you do not obey any part of this order, you will commit an offence and may be fined or sent to prison for up to five years. 2. **J. Vantyghem** 3. **Date: 4 August 2015** 4. Justices' Clerk 5. Mr Simon CORDELL 6. **04 August 2015**/ASBOJ6\_0/1584095/1 |   **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **6 / 04/08/2015:**  **Stage 4**  **The Enfield Councils History FOI Indexed**  **Stage 4**  **Please reply to:** Geoffrey Mann  Geoffrey Mann Neighbourhood Manager  **Page Number:** 27,28,29,30,  **22/12/2016**  **27,**  22nd December 2016  24th November 2016  24th November 2016  05th December 2016  08th December 2016  **04th August 2015**  18th November 2016  25th November 2016  29th November 2016   |  | | --- | | **The Enfield Councils History**  **FOI Indexed** | | **ENFIELD**  **Connected**  **Please reply to** Geoffrey Mann  Ms Lorraine Cordell Sent via Email  **E-mail:** [geoffrey.mann@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:geoffrey.mann@enfield.gov.uk)  **My Ref:** COM 1885  Your Ref:  **Date:** **22nd December 2016**  Dear Ms Cordell,  **Re:** Mr Simon Cordell -109 Burncroft Avenue - COM 1885.  I write with reference to your letters of complaint dated **24th November 2016** copies of which were received via email on **24th November 2016**, **5th December 2016,** and **8th December 2016.**  I will respond to the issues you raised as follows.  **1.** Anti-Social Behaviour Order  We are aware that the police applied for an Anti-Social Behaviour Order (ASBO) which was granted on **04th August 2015** against your son in relation to activities that cations away from Burncroft Avenue. We are aware that your son is appealing against the ASBO, and we are therefore unable to comment further.  EQUALITY  Environment  Enfield Council  Civic Centre, Silver Street  FRAMEWORK FOR LOCAL  GOVERNMENT  Enfield EN13XY  EXCELLENT  Website: [www.enfield.gov.uk](http://www.enfield.gov.uk) |   **28,**  04th August 2015  20th August 2015  26th January 2016  04th August 2015  04th October 2016  14th August 2016   |  | | --- | | **The Enfield Councils History**  **FOI Indexed** | | concerns a breach of tenancy conditions and will be addressed separately from this complaint.  **3. Allegations of Anti-Social Behaviour**  You referred to alleged issues that your son was having with his neighbours; however, you' did not specify which neighbours and or provide a specific time frame when these complaints were made. We have checked our records since **4h August 2015** and found two records of telephone complaints received from your son. |   **29,**  29th November 2016  21st November 2016  November 2016   |  | | --- | | **The Enfield Councils History**  **FOI Indexed** | |  |   **30,**  03rd January 2017   |  | | --- | | **The Enfield Councils History**  **FOI Indexed** | | Yours Sincerely  **Geoffrey Mann Neighbourhood Manager** | |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 04/08/2015:**   1. Asbo Court Date   **Statement Exhibit** **2 / 18/01/2016**.  This shows  Anti-social Behaviour order on application, Threats Made out of my Asbo Condition’s in page 18 2nd Asbo Folder by Police! Page Numbers: eighteen  10/03/2015  **Mother**  Called the typo spelling mistakes!  Highbury Corner Magistrates' Court  North London Admin Centre  Case number: 011402490741   1. Enter or remaining any disused or abandoned building unless invited to do so in writing by a 2. registered charitable organisation or Local Authority - 3. Enter or remain on non-residential private property or on an industrial estate between the hours of   **Date:** 4 August **2015**  Mr. Simon CORDELL  Justices' Clerk  04 August **2015**  ASB0\_sixteen\_0/1584095/1  **J. V an ty g hem**  **Statement Exhibit** **3 / 18/01/2016**.  Lemmy Statement 1st Injunction order  “*The Defendant was I previously known to the Claimant and an anti-social behaviour order was made on 04 August 2015 by the Magistrates Court to prevent him from knowingly using or supplying property personal or otherwise, for the use in a rave as defined in s.63(1) o: f the Criminal Justice Order Act 1994. The order· was made for a duration of 5 years. A copy of the Order is at page 27 of the exhibit bundle.*”   1. On the 04/08/2015. This Information about the Asbo is also in Lemmy’s 1st Injunction Order for the Enfield Council dated 09 January 2018 which means that Lemmy and the Enfield Council had a copy of the Asbo files all the way through the proceedings that were given to them by Sally Gilcrest or her legal team. Page 256 or 254 2. This is also in Lemmy’s 1st Injunction Order for the Enfield Council **Page 256 or 254** Which means that Lemmy and the Enfield Council had a copy of the files all the way through the proceedings given to them by Sally Gilcrest or her legal team.   **Statement Exhibit** **4 / 18/01/2016**.  “Same as above”  **Statement Exhibit** **5 / 18/01/2016**.   1. **Section One of The Document Lemmy’s, Index I Received on the 25/06/2018** George & Endfield Council Case Against Simon Cordell**.** Prosecution Team Witness Care Unit Holborn 10 Lambs Conduit Street Holborn Police Station 2. **Section one of the document Highbury Corner Magistrates' Court** 3. Enter or remain in any **dis/us/ed** or abandoned building unless invited to do so in writing by a registered charitable organisation or Local Authority 4. Enter or **re man** on non-residential private property on an industrial estate between the hours of 10pm and 7am Without written permission from the owner and/or leaseholder of the property; and   **Statement Exhibit** **6 / 18/01/2016**.   1. Geoffrey Mann in reference to mothers’ complaint dated **24th November 2016** 2. When Geoffrey Mann responded to some of the issues raised, he mentions about the Asbo and what he states is that the Enfield Council and Neighbourhood team 3. **Anti-Social Behaviour Order** We are aware that the police applied for an Anti-Social Behaviour Order (ASBO) which was granted on **4th August 2015** against your son in relation to activities that cations away from Burncroft Avenue. We are aware that your son is appealing against the ASBO, and we are therefore unable to comment further. 4. **Allegations of Anti-Social Behaviour** You referred to alleged issues that your son was having with his neighbours; however, you' did not specify which neighbours and or provide a specific time frame when these complaints were made. We have checked our records since **4h August 2015** and found two records of telephone complaints received from your son. | | |
|  | * **Asbo**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **14/08/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 14/08/2015:**  **The Asbo’s wrong Verdict**   1. Got advertised in the News Papers While I awaited my appeal! 2. The newspapers. 3. Mutable Newspaper Articles were published with wrongful claims that I got given an Asbo under the applicant's case, stating Man given ASBO for organising illegal raves (From Enfield Independent.) Do you hate things in life? 4. In any analogous way, to what I do? 5. When do people refuse to say sorry? 6. In return for this happening to me, I ended up feeling like a leprechaun which had got robbed and was therefore without his pot of gold. 7. While looking into the court case paperwork, when at my home address one day, trying to study, so that I could defend myself, I remember a different occasion, when I was looking at the local newspaper, while trying to get my head around all the banging that I got induced towards from members of my neighbours. 8. When reading the paper, I noticed a copy of an article that got contained in my local newspaper. 9. What I read was about my person and was unjustified to get printed as a true and fair description of the truth events. 10. In fact, it got worse than unjustified as it was incorrect information that slandered my character. 11. The published articles in the newspapers that had gotten copied from the metropolitan police website and were in regard to the Anti-Social Behaviour Order application that the police had been pursuing in court against me, they stated that I got given an Anti-Social Behaviour Order for organizing illegal raves. 12. The case against me for the Anti-Social Behaviour Order regarding “the organization of illegal raves” never got proven, correctly, and this is because the judge could not find any illegal accept, that I the defendant was guilty of, as the application claimed to be for, but somehow, some way even low wrong in law the district judge sitting the court found me guilty of acting in an antisocial way. 13. In the newspapers it stated the following also: — “Cordell is well-known for organizing illegal raves in Enfield and across London.” 14. I have never got arrested for anything that nature mentioned, so find this to be untrue and in other words, this would be a lie inclusive as since I had never arrested, I got so upset that my address got put into the metropolitan police website as I had requested and received a copy of the court transcripts of the day of the trail which prove that I am right, so had set the wheels in motion for the appeal proceedings. 15. This led to the real problems I had to get worse and get out of control; I understood that members of my neighbours and members of the police made me suffer towards. 16. My life got turned upside down as a figure of speech, by my name getting darkened and put into all the local newspapers stating that I had got found guilty of illegal raves when the judge clearly stated that no illegality got proved. 17. A full assault took place against me by members of my neighbours, and I was looking for a solution to the problems. 18. The stress that has accumulated because of the problems in this document that I highlighted in any readers' vision are Unfair to have taken place against me and the problems being of such an important level of importance is of even further relevance to how this case should not have got dealt with. |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 14/08/2015:**   1. On the 14/08/2015 The Asbo’s wrong verdict got advertised in the newspapers while I awaited my appeal. | | |
|  | * **Asbo**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **16/08/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 16/08/2015:**  **The Newspaper articles: --**   1. After the Newspaper articles got wrongly, published I noticed that Debbie’s attitude and Stains had really, changed against me for the worst, and this includes the Mati lagan family and this reminded me of the stories I had heard before of wild tales of evil witches and evil sources, but I never felt as if they were true till the adults around me turned evil towards me, the weird thing is that I had just met people who made them characters seem so real to me and it was them named neighbours. 2. Soon after the Anti-Social Behaviour Order case; got said to have got proven against me at court; I noticed after the newspaper articles that had got published about me and from the letters that I had received from Debbie that her attitude and Stains had changed in a negative factor towards me. 3. Other neighbour’s had now also at this moment in time banged on the floor board and walls with Stan and Debra to my further surprise at my person, this was now happening, they were using the floor as if it was an offence weapon or a belt being wrongfully; used to hit a person, this is Clear tortious acts of crime that no one should ever have to go through, this happened to me, in every room I walk into in my own home, “I could not go anywhere and be safe” I found that any place I stand in my flat she or others was above me, taking furious assaults upon me. 4. I could always notice the other family above her flat joining in I could not even get in the bath or take my close off, I felt as if I was Debbie's children that have got taken away from her by social services, I was being abused in a sense of a clear insight, like she had gone mad hitting me, this could happen over 70 times a day and continued on for over a 1000 days, this still happens up to date were the Mathiyalagan family, who still live above me, who are not secure tenants as I am would not see reason to the issues and still to date have not changed their characters, as they always continue with the same actions and mind frame of making me a victim to their actions, together them mentioned neighbour’s all achieved this by way of using the floorboards and other house fixtures as weapons, they continued to find ways to have a negative effect on my life.     **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **2 / 16/08/2015:**  **The banging!**   * Debbie Andrews (responsible) * Stain Curtis (responsible) * Mathiyalagan (Responsible)   **Time:** All-Day and All-Night!   1. The Enfield Homes and the Enfield Council staff aloud the tenants of 117 and 113 and 111 Continued to victimize me by: -- 2. Banging with objects onto the internal main buildings walls and floors, so to intimidate surely me and maybe others living close by whom may be present to an extent only worthwhile for the perpetrators selfless glory, In them perpetrators knowing that their behaviour would only leave all those getting victimized towards getting left by their wrongful actions as to being put into a state of a mental health patient and not rightfully with this occurring within mine and their rented or paid for homes! 3. I am Keen to get these problems rectified in my flat, but nothing gets rectified on the Enfield council's and the Enfield homes behalf. 4. Ever Email I send to the complaint department that never got addressed fairly and in a timely manner makes my sole understands the failures for humanity and puts diversity down! 5. The Enfield Council employees managed a Breach of duty towards me! 6. These problems not getting addressed causes me Disturbance to my personal relationship with my partner!     **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **3 / 16/08/2015:**  **Summary!**   1. My Heart has really started to hurt me every day, I am having an early aged mild heart attacks because of what the Mathiyalagan family stain and Debra with the police and local council members are getting away with each day holding me hostage with no first hand witness and the estate members flushing the toilet attacking me when I am in the bathtub and getting undressed all so playing with the water taps and banging above my head damaging my work studies and private family life and making me a Vulnerable person! 2. I have also had a lot of problems with eating because of what they keep all doing to me! 3. My dog has eaten its paws because of what 113 – 117 and 111 are getting away with I have taken pictures of the damage this is doing to us in this flat!     **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **4 / 16/08/2015:**  **Disrepair!**   1. It must be forbidden for the Enfield Council's tents to suffer for the Enfield homes staff’s mistakes or similar mistakes of neglect by their team leaders, as I do!     **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **5 / 16/08/2015:**  **Time Spent Building.**   1. In the background of everything going I continued working on Creating a new and up to date event Traffic Management policy and I continued to Study and finish at the Time Start: 00:00 and Time End: 00:00 and this included creating a new and up to date event On Site Road Traffic Plan policy! 2. My mother also continues to work on building my company website for me with others at the Time Start: 09:00 and Time End: 14:00!   **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **6 / 16/08/2015:**  **Working at Home doing Court Case Defense Work!**   1. I spent time and resources costing expenditure with my mother also building my defense case, against the allegations getting put against me at the Time Start: 12:00 Am and Time End: 06:00 Am! |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 16/08/2015:**   1. On the 16/08/2015   Newspaper articles Asbo starting Neighbours of at me.  **Statement Exhibit** **2 / 16/08/2015:**   1. On the 16/08/2015   The banging  **Statement Exhibit** **3 / 16/08/2015:**   1. On the 16/08/2015   Summary  **Statement Exhibit** **4 / 16/08/2015:**   1. On the 16/08/2015   Disrepair!  **Statement Exhibit** **5 / 16/08/2015:**   1. On the 16/08/2015   Time Spent Building my company  **Statement Exhibit** **6 / 16/08/2015:**   1. On the 16/08/2015   Working at Home doing Court Case Défense Work | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **18/08/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 18/08/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue: 02**  Mother FW Please can you help this cannot carry on  **/ Page Numbers:** 2086,2087,  **18 August 2015 11:19**  **Sent: To: Dawn Allen**  **Subject:** Forward: Please can you help this cannot carry on?  Dear Dawn Allen   1. Can you please give me a person name and email address that can address this issue, as you seem to not want to reply I can call and checked? 2. I am sending these emails to the correct email address which I am [Dawn.Allen@Enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Dawn.Allen@Enfield.gov.uk)   Regards  Simon’s Mother |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 18/08/2015:**   1. On the 18/08/2015 The 9th email mum sent to Dawn Allan about flat repairs and neighbours no reply to this email (FW: Please can you help this cannot carry on) email name.   = 14 Days March  = 30 Days April  = 31 Days May  = 30 Days June  = 31 Days July  = 18 Days August  **Totalling a total of: -**  153 Days | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **20/08/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 20/08/2015:**  **The Enfield Councils History FOI Indexed**  **Stage 4**  **Please reply to:** Geoffrey Mann  Geoffrey Mann Neighbourhood Manager  **Page Number:** 27,28,29,30,  **22/12/2016**  **27,**  22nd December 2016  24th November 2016  24th November 2016  05th December 2016  08th December 2016  04th August 2015  18th November 2016  25th November 2016  29th November 2016   |  | | --- | | **The Enfield Councils History**  **FOI Indexed** | | **ENFIELD**  **Connected**  **Please reply to** Geoffrey Mann  Ms Lorraine Cordell Sent via Email  E-mail: [geoffrey.mann@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:geoffrey.mann@enfield.gov.uk)  My Ref: COM 1885  Your Ref:  **Date:** **22nd December 2016**  Dear Ms Cordell,  **Re:** Mr Simon Cordell -109 Burncroft Avenue - COM 1885.  I write with reference to your letters of complaint dated **24th November 2016** copies of which were received via email on **24th November 2016**, **5th December 2016,** and **8th December 2016.**  I will respond to the issues you raised as follows. |   **28,**  04th August 2015  **20th August 2015**  26th January 2016  04th August 2015  04th October 2016  14th August 2016   |  | | --- | | **The Enfield Councils History**  **FOI Indexed** | | **3. Allegations of Anti-Social Behaviour**  You referred to alleged issues that your son was having with his neighbours; however, you' did not specify which neighbours and or provide a specific time frame when these complaints were made.  We have checked our records since **04th August 2015** and found two records of telephone complaints received from your son.  One on **20th August 2015** and again on **26th January 2016** which related to noise and the issues he was having with a neighbour. These concerns were dealt with at the time by relevant officers. |   **29,**  29th November 2016  21st November 2016  November 2016   |  | | --- | | **The Enfield Councils History**  **FOI Indexed** | |  |   **30,**  03rd January 2017   |  | | --- | | **The Enfield Councils History**  **FOI Indexed** | | www.homeswapper.co.uk.  [https://www.enfield.Gov.uk/forms/form/203/fresh start scheme.](https://www.enfield.Gov.uk/forms/form/203/fresh%20start%20scheme.)  Yours Sincerely  **Geoffrey Mann Neighbourhood Manager** |   **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **2 / 20/08/2015:**  **The banging Started!**   * Debbie Andrews (responsible) * Stain Curtis (responsible) * Mathiyalagan (Responsible)   **Time:** All-Day and All-Night whenever they knew that I was indoors!   1. The occupiers of 117 and 113 and 111 Continued to victimize me by: -- 2. Continually, repeating to flushing the toilet when I am in the bathroom being sick in my toilet because they made me ill! 3. Victimizing me by Banging above the Barth to which I get into, once they understand that I have stopped running the water for my bath to be ready, this is after they wait for any other tail, tail signs that I have gotten undressed and soaked within the water, creating a brutal attack against my person in their wrongful self-gains! 4. The continual intimidation of the kitchen draw being slammed shut or opened either way it got effectually, closed, to then soon after hearing the sharpening of the kitchen utilities knifes to an unrealistic extent to make a constructive sense of logic and reason, visible for explanation of any good character of themselves with the time need to look after an Adelson in today’s word safely! 5. 117 Slamming the main, communal entrance door closed! |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 20/08/2015:**   1. On the 20/08/2015 Geoffrey Mann Neighbourhood Manager said that they had checked their records since **04th August 2015** and found two records of telephone complaints received from Mr. Simon Cordell. One on **20th August 2015** and again on **26th January 2016** which related to noise and the issues he was having with a neighbour. Geoffrey Mann said that these concerns were dealt with at the time by relevant officers, but Mr. Cordell was never informed of any outcome.   **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 20/08/2015:**   1. On the 20/08/2015 | | |
|  | * **Responsible the Police & Council**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **28/08/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 28/08/2015:**  **I put a police complaint in, and it got cancelled: --**   1. I put a police complaint in, and it got cancelled. 2. I have the letter to prove this I then revived a letter dated the **30th of August 2015** stating the complaint was being addressed again as it should have been with no further contact after. |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 28/08/2015:**   1. On the 28/08/2015 I put a police complaint in, and it got cancelled. I then revived a letter dated the 30th of August 2015 stating the complaint was being addressed again. | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **29/08/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 29/08/2015:** E |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 29/08/2015:**   1. On the 29/08/2015 The Police attended my address Six days after I phoned them about my life being in danger because of their wrong actions, I have a video of their wrong doings. I have a police video regards an Emergency 999 call I made when I fell victim to the police advertising wrongful claims on their website about the forged Asbo and printed their gain from the guilty conviction for the Asbo into the newspapers. I got attacked with a gun outside of my flat because their forged Intel. Police pulled the Asbo information about me out of their website shortly afterwards. | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **30/08/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 30/08/2015:** E |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 30/08/2015:**   1. On the 30/08/2015 I Received a letter of the police regarding a complaint that I had made to the Police on the 28/8/2015 about the Asbo the police said it will get investigated. 2. Information gained from a data subject access requested of my personal information from Enfield Councils Computer systems. Dated 04/01/2017 On the 18/09/2015 Doctors went to Debra Andrews flat 113 Burncroft Avenue 3. Is what Debra Andrews History should start with but on stead it starts with the 23/09/2015 4. The reason for this that on the 18/09/2021 the doctors that look after Debra Andres alongside Enfield Council at attended her home of 113 Burncroft Avenue and she would not let them in her front door on stead she just talked to them through her letter box, and she had been acting this way for some time, so the doctors contacted Dawn Allen 5. The 23/09/2016 was put in first to cover up this fact. Because my mother had also been contacting Dawn Allen for months prior and without any reply back or update in Debra Andrews Mental Health Records or Enfield Council History even aloe, she was considerable risk and had her children taken away from her. 6. Debra Andrews who lived in the flat above mine as a secure Enfield Council Tenant made a complaint regarding myself, while she and other neighbours were attacking me. 7. I and my mother had complained about them for months prior and without any fair investigation taking place by the police and council inclusive of the Enfield Mental Health Teams. 8. After months of no emergency contact when requested of the Enfield Council and Neighbourhood watch team. 9. In fact, I got my claims disbelieved and so did that of my family and friends who are also witness and some made into victims due to what we got forced to undergo. 10. The Enfield Council and that of their sub partner company the neighbourhood watch team of the Enfield Borough. 11. and it gets addressed right away with you going to her home and switching the blame. 12. By this date I and others had made umpteen complaints about the neighbours spanning backwards in the last 6 months which you can see from the emails, this is not including the numerous amounts of phone calls being made still up to date 17/04/2022 13. (Which were made and noted in emails sent) 14. Why does the involved government authority’s feel it lawful to ignore me and not address my issues? 15. And when a neighbour of mine has an issue with me, 16. The speed and number of times the government officers have acted within is wrong and done in such a way that it is obvious that staff willingly disadvantage me 17. The government official’s behaviours who delt with my ongoings was more than an unmoral and unfair. The staff’s actions were to help themselves only and endangered my life while tarnishing any future prospects of a fair standard of life. 18. This disregard shows a lack of responsibility for stationary duty’s and shows you wanted to victimise me and make me suffer the way I have been for all this time. Also, this shows a complete lack of due care towards Mr Cordell. 19. Why is it that Enfield Council received in their words lots of complaints from Debra Andrews but when we received the SAR, they only start on the **23/09/2021**? | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **18/09/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 18/09/2015:**   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Weblink** | | <https://serverone.hopto.org/Index%2011/> | | | | **Name** | | Debra Andrews | | | | **Address** | | 113 Burncroft Avenue Enfield London EN3 | | | | **Dates of living in residence** | |  | | | | **Page Number and Title** | | **Page Numbers:** 53,54,55,56,57,58 | | | | **Date** | **Incident Logs** | | **Facts** | **Si Note:** | | **E.**  **18/09/2015** | **E.**  **From:** Mark.Tilley2@met.pnn.police.uk **mailto:**Mark.Tilley2@met.pnn.police.uk  **Sent: 18 September 2015** 17:23  **To:** Dolly Ogunseye  **Subject:** 113 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ Ms Debra Andrew [SEC=PROTECT]  Hi **Dolly,**  **Nick** and I attended while ago and spoke to the lady a while ago when she originally called Police.  “At the time she did not want us to speak to her neighbour as things had got better.  “The lady handed us a letter about what had happened but none of it made any sense.”  “We believe she was suffering from mental health issues.”  “On another occasion we popped round to see her, and she would not come and speak to us so instead she spoke through her letterbox to us.”  The male at 109 - Simon Cordell who is causing the problems is very well known to Police and is also very anti Police.  I know some Officers went around and spoke to him and things seemed to get better  “After that we have had no further calls from the lady.”  We will try and get around to see her when were back on duty on Monday.  Kind Regards  **Classification:** PROTECT  Good afternoon, Mark,  Could you kindly assist with this query please.  “Following reports of ASB by the above tenant, my colleague and I visited her this morning and were alarmed by the nature of her complaints.”    “She has in the past few months being constantly harassed, intimidated, bullied, stalked, and threatened to be kill by her neighbour at 109.”  As a result of his behaviour, she has become too scared to leave her flat for fear of what may happen to her.  She is a vulnerable tenant who requires support from services.  However, the unsettling behaviour exhibited by number 109, has hindered her from attending her appointments and exacerbated her condition.  At the moment, she feels very disorientated / agitated and will like the harassment to stop.  She advised that she had reported this to the police a few times but, was not taken seriously.  I will appreciate if you could stop over at to reassure her that the matter is being dealt with and to stop by 109 and advise him that you are aware of what is going on and the repercussions should it continue.  Thank you for your support and assistance  Doliy Ogunseye Anti-Social Behaviour Officer  **58,**  In light of the above, h a s been identified as one of many cases involved in this process. You will shortly hear from an office with the community Safety Unit advising you of the name of the officer that will be dealing with case.  Page 6 of 32  Housing Anti-Social Behaviour Team Tenancy Management Enfield Council  **Referral Details:** | |  | This was the real first date that was known about Debra to the Enfield Council and their Neighbourhood watch team. | |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 18/09/2015:**   1. The **18/09/2015** is a date that is contained inside of a copy of an SRA that my mother requested from the Enfield Council and received on the **24/02/2017** 2. My neighbour makes a complaint regarding my neighbours attacking me on this and without any fair investigation taking place in fact I got my claims disbelieved and so did that of my family and friends who are also witness and some victims to what I was forced to undergo. 3. The Enfield Council and that of their sub partner company the neighbourhood watch team of the Enfield Borough. 4. Date and it gets addressed right away with you going to her home and switching the blame. 5. By this date I and others had made umpteen complaints about the neighbours spanning backwards in the last 6 months which you can see from the emails, this is not including the numerous amounts of phone calls being made. (Which were made and noted in emails sent) 6. Why does the involved government authority’s feel it lawful to ignore me and not address my issues? 7. And when a neighbour of mine has an issue with me, 8. The speed and number of times the government officers have acted within is wrong and done in such a way that it is obvious that staff willingly disadvantage me 9. The government official’s behaviours who delt with my ongoings was more than an unmoral and unfair. The staff’s actions were to help themselves only and endangered my life while tarnishing any future prospects of a fair standard of life. 10. This disregard shows a lack of responsibility for stationary duty’s and shows you wanted to victimise me and make me suffer the way I have been for all this time. Also, this shows a complete lack of due care towards Mr Cordell. 11. Why is it that Enfield Council received in their words lots of complaints from Debra Andrews but when we received the SAR, they only start on the **23/09/2021?** | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **21/09/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 21/09/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue: 02**  Re Complaint /  **Neighbours**  **Page Numbers:** 2137,  **From:** Lorraine Cordell [[lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk](http://lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk)]  **Sent:** 21st September **2015** 13:59  **To:** '[dawn.allen@enfield.gov.uk](http://dawn.allen@enfield.gov.uk)'  **Subject: Re:** Complaint  Mr Simon Cordell  109 Burncroft Ave  Enfield  Middlesex  EN3 7JQ  Dear Dawn Allen,   1. “I am writing this email after phone calls and emails have been sent to Enfield council about my neighbour who lives above me.” 2. “I have made calls myself and my mother Ms Lorraine Cordell has also sent emails and made phone calls.” 3. “No one has been to my address to see me, and I am asking for you to come out to see me and take a full report of what has been going on as my heath is being made worse by nothing being done.” 4. “There is also still repair issues I would like to talk about that has not been done.” 5. “Could you please email this email address a date and time when you can come out to see me to take a report?”   Regards  Mr Simon Cordell  **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **2 / 21/09/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue: 02**  Dawn Allen RE Complaint /  **Neighbours**  **Page Numbers:** 2138,2139,  **From: Dawn Allen** [[DAWN.ALLEN@Enfield.gov.uk](http://dawn.allen@enfield.gov.uk)]  **Sent:** 21 September **2015** 14:17  **To:** Lorraine Cordell  **Cc:** Feedback Council Housing  **Subject: RE:** Complaint [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]  **Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  Dear Mr Cordell   1. In terms of your neighbour, you will need to attend this office for us to discuss the neighbour concerns face to face in a neutral environment. 2. For repairs, please speak to customer services on 0208 3791327 for any outstanding issues you have. 3. Our office is open Monday to Friday 08.30 am – 05.00 PM where you can attend this office to speak to us directly.   Regards  Dawn Allen  Tenancy Management Officer  Council Housing  The Edmonton Centre  3644  South Mall  Edmonton  N9 0TN  Email: [Dawn.allen@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Dawn.allen@enfield.gov.uk)  Freephone 0800 40 80 160  "*Enfield Council is committed to serving the whole borough fairly, delivering excellent services and building strong communities*".  **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **3 / 21/09/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue: 02**  RE Complaint /  **Neighbours**  **Page Numbers:** 2141,2142,  **From:** Lorraine Cordell [[lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk](http://lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk)]  **Sent:** 21 September **2015** 15:35  **To:** 'Dawn Allen'  **Subject: RE:** Complaint [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]  Dear Dawn Allen   1. I no longer go out of my home due to my heath that is why I cannot come to the office. 2. “Also, why would it need to be a in a neutral environment you would have to come to my flat at some point to hear for yourself what is going on as you can clearly hear it and see what the neighbour is doing.” 3. “I have also put in reports also about the repairs this has been going on for years and things still have not been done.” 4. You are my housing officers can you please tell me what your job description is? 5. “I am asking for help and have been for some time and you do not seem to be willing to give me any help.” 6. Is there a problem with you coming to my flat? 7. My Mother will be there with me, and you can be someone with you if you feel there is a need to. 8. “I have on going issues which does need to be addressed by someone and you are my housing office and I have been told you would need to address these issues.”   Regards  Simon Cordell  **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **4 / 21/09/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue: 02**  Dawn Allen RE Complaint /  **Neighbours**  **Page Numbers:** 2143,2144,2145,  **From: Dawn Allen** [[DAWN.ALLEN@Enfield.gov.uk](http://dawn.allen@enfield.gov.uk)]  **Sent:** 21 September **2015** 15:43  **To:** Lorraine Cordell  **Subject: RE:** Complaint [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]  **Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  Dear Mr Cordell   1. “Can you be a bit more specific about your repairs so I can forward to the correct person.” 2. “The Nuisance complaint will be forwarded to the Antisocial Behaviour Team for them to contact you it is likely log sheets may be issued.” 3. “If you can answer the first question it would be greatly appreciated.”   Kind regards  Dawn Allen  Tenancy Management Officer  Council Housing  The Edmonton Centre  3644  South Mall  Edmonton  N9 0TN  Email  [dawn.allen@enfield.gov.uk](http://dawn.allen@enfield.gov.uk)  Freephone 0800 40 80 160  "*Enfield Council is committed to serving the whole borough fairly, delivering excellent services and building strong communities*".  **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **5 / 21/09/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue: 02**  Mother RE Complaint /  **Neighbours**  **Page Numbers:** 2146,2147,2148,  **From:** Lorraine Cordell [[lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk](http://lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk)]  **Sent:** 21 September **2015** 16:14  **To:** 'Dawn Allen'  **Subject: RE:** Complaint [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]  Dear Dawn Allen   1. My Mother has sent emails in of complaints about the repairs more than once and made lots of phone calls. 2. There does seem to be an issue of things not being logged on the system and reports going missing. 3. But I sure if you looked you could find them. 4. But I am tired of getting the run about and waiting for years for things to be done. 5. And a call was made to the Antisocial Behaviour Team today and they again gave me your details, so once again it seems nothing will get done about the neighbour. 6. My mother has now made a call to the Assistant Director Community Housing Services and they have taken a lot of notes, and your name and I should be getting a call back and she has now booked to see the MP and will being all the information that has been gathered along to the MP to see what they can do.   Regards  **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **6 / 21/09/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue: 02**  Dawn Allen RE\_ Complaint /  **Neighbours**  **Page Numbers:** 2149,2150,2151,2152,  **From: Dawn Allen** [[DAWN.ALLEN@Enfield.gov.uk](http://dawn.allen@enfield.gov.uk)]  **Sent:** 21 September **2015** 16:29  **To:** Lorraine Cordell  **Cc:** Dolly Ogunseye  **Subject: RE:** Complaint [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]  **Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  Dear Mr Cordell   1. Thank you for the update but unless you are specific with the repair, I cannot refer you to the correct person. 2. In terms of the complaint with your neighbour the Anti ‐ Social Team will be in touch with you at home.   Regards  Dawn Allen  Tenancy Management Officer  Council Housing  The Edmonton Centre  3644  South Mall  Edmonton  N9 0TN  Email  [Dawn.allen@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Dawn.allen@enfield.gov.uk)  Freephone 0800 40 80 160  "*Enfield Council is committed to serving the whole borough fairly, delivering excellent services and building strong communities*".  **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **7 / 21/09/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue: 02**  Mother RE Complaint /  **Neighbours**  **Page Numbers:** 2153,2154,2155,2156,2157,  **From:** Lorraine Cordell [[lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk](http://lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk)]  **Sent:** 21 September **2015** 17:03  **To:** 'Dawn Allen'  **Subject: RE:** Complaint [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]  Dear Dawn Allen   1. Was meant to be sending a surveyor out to see how the pipes have been laid for my heating system, this has not been done. 2. When work was carried on my flat re doing the electric, they wired in fire alarms and a Carbon Monoxide alarm, I made many calls to say these had not been fitted correctly, and due to this got carbon monoxide poisoning and ended up in hospital due to a faulty boiler and the Carbon Monoxide alarm not working. when they did come out in Nov **2014** I was left with no boiler for weeks until parts could be ordered as they had to cap the boiler off, work was also meant to be done to rewired the incorrect rewiring of the alarms this has not been done and I feel very unsafe as I feel if my boiler went wrong again the Carbon Monoxide alarm would not go off. 3. Window in my bedroom does not lock and needs a new hinge. 4. The new toilet wish was fitting is not secure I have had this repaired once already but it still is moving around, and I feel unsafe. 5. The Sink has come away from the wall in bathroom. 6. After major works being done to my flat for damp the smell of damp as soon as you enter the bedroom is awfully bad. 7. They fixed damp in my front room, and this is still not died out due to them not fixing the reason for the damp. 8. I was told that the guttering was causing the damp in my flat and needed doing someone came around months ago and told me the works was due to be done this has never been done. 9. The pipes bang in the flat really bad I was told it was the main stop cock that needed replacing the pipes are still banging badly so this cannot have been done. When the man came out to do my heating the council had told them I had removed all the pipes from my home, the man was stocked to see them all still in place and could not understand why he had been told this. 10. I have had so many surveyors come to my flat and say work is going to be done but it never is this is most of the list that still needs to be done.   Regards  **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **8 / 21/09/2015:**  **The banging Started!**   * Debbie Andrews (responsible) * Stain Curtis (responsible) * Mathiyalagan (Responsible)   **Time:** All-Day and All-Night!   1. The Enfield Homes and the Enfield Council staff aloud the tenants of 117 and 113 and 111 Continued to victimize me by: -- 2. 117 and 113 Continually, repeating to flushing the toilet when I am in the bathroom being sick in my toilet because they make me ill by Victimizing me with intent of using the same repeated items of the building fixtures to have tortures effects on me within my rented home is unfair living circumstances! 3. 117 Slamming their own living room, door closed! 4. 117 Slamming their own bedroom, door closed! 5. 111 Banging on the kitchen wall! 6. Whenever I contact the complaints departments, they made my issues of concern invisible! 7. A Drastic turn around in the decision that the Enfield council and the Enfield Homes came to since the start of the announcement when I put them into receipt of my Disrepair issues needs to get addressed and then fixed needs to get reanalysed, so in an effect I do not suffer any longer! |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 21/09/2015:**   1. Mother contacted Dawn Allen on the **21/09/2015 about Debra Andrews and other neighbors.** 2. This time Dawn Allen did reply to mothers’ emails and there were emails sent back and forth.  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **31** | Re Complaint | 21/09/2015 | 13:59 | | **32** | Dawn Allen RE Complaint | 21/09/2015 | 14:17 | | **33** | RE Complaint | 21/09/2015 | 15:35 | | **34** | Dawn Allen RE Complaint | 21/09/2015 | 15:43 | | **35** | Mother RE Complaint | 21/09/2015 | 16:14 | | **36** | Dawn Allen RE\_ Complaint | 21/09/2015 | 16:29 | | **37** | Mother RE Complaint | 21/09/2015 | 17:03 |  1. By the **21/09/2015** my mother had contacted the Enfield Council more than thirty times regarding what my neighbours were doing to me by attacking me in my home illegally, as shown below up to 30  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **15** | FW RE FOI | 06/03/2015 | 13:42 | | **16** | FW RE FOI | 06/03/2015 | 15:36 | | **17** | FW RE FOI | 06/03/2015 | 17:16 | | **18** | RE FW RE FOI | 06/03/2015 | 17:14 | | **19** | Read acknowledgement | 06/03/2015 | 17:19 | | **20** | Read acknowledgement | 09/03/2015 | 16:21 | | **21** | FW RE FOI | 20/03/2015 | 15:33 | | **22** | FW Issue I am having | 17/04/2015 | 17:57 | | **23** | RE Issue I am having with neighbours | 04/05/2015 | 13:22 | | **24** | RE Can you please help | 19/05/2015 | 16:37 | | **25** | FW Issue I am having with neighbours | 28/05/2015 | 15:16 | | **26** | RE Issue I am having | 31/05/2015 | 15:34 | | **27** | FW Issue I am having with neighbours | 01/06/2015 | 14:38 | | **28** | RE Please can you help this cannot carry on! | 10/06/2015 | 21:13 | | **29** | FW Issue I am having with neighbours | 20/06/2015 | 19:12 | | **30** | Mother FW Please can you help this cannot carry on | 18/08/2015 |  |  * Some dates above are wrong because when I first started putting the emails together, I made the above as an index but due to” OCR-Ing” the emails from images to text a few dates were wrong. I used the index to quickly put this document together and then realised. I have updated everything since. If I remember right, it was the months that went wrong.  1. On the 21/09/2015 My mother contacted Dawn Allen again about Debra Andrews and other neighbour’s illegal actions against Mr. Simon Paul Cordell. 2. On this day Dawn Allen did actually reply to mothers’ emails for the first time. 3. After this day emails got sent back and forth. 4. The Emails prove that by the 21/09/2015 my mother had contacted the Enfield Council more than thirty times regarding what my neighbours were doing to me by attacking me in my home illegally.   = 14 Days March  = 30 Days April  = 31 Days May  = 30 Days June  = 31 Days July  = 31 Days August  = 21 Days September  **Totalling a total of: -**  188 Days  **Statement Exhibit** **2 / 21/09/2015:**   1. On the 21/09/2015   **Statement Exhibit** **3 / 21/09/2015:**   1. On the 21/09/2015   **Statement Exhibit** **4 / 21/09/2015:**   1. On the 21/09/2015   **Statement Exhibit** **5 / 21/09/2015:**   1. On the 21/09/2015   **Statement Exhibit** **6 / 21/09/2015:**   1. On the 21/09/2015 | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **23/09/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 23/09/2015:**   1. Home visit to flat. Attended? Dawn Allen TMO and CRN Sola Quadri. Home visit to advised that her neighbour at number 109 has for the past few months harassed, intimidated, stalked her, and made a life a complete misery. He continuously plays loud music, bangs on her ceiling and door alleging that she is monitoring his movements in his flat. She feels petrified by his presence and as a result refused to leave her flat for fear bumping into him on her way out. She has missed a few appointments with her social worker as a result, she has now been subjected to making home appointments pending the time this matter is resolved. She explained that they use to be acquaintances. Ms also recalled an incident when the perp spat in her face. It has been one issue after the other she advised.   **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 23/09/2015:**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Weblink** | <https://serverone.hopto.org/Index%2011/> | | | | **Name** | Debra Andrews | | | | **Address** | 113 Burncroft Avenue Enfield London EN3 | | | | **Dates of living in residence** |  | | | | **Page Number and Title** | Page Numbers: 53,54,55,56,57,58 | | | | **Date** | **Incident Logs** | **Facts** | **Si Note:** | | 05/10/2016  Debra Andrews  Council History    **53,**  N/a **24/01/2017**  **54,**  **A.    03/09/2015 +**  A1. 23 September 2015 15:07   **23/09/2015**  **B.**<https://ecaseworks.net/ENFIELD/ViewSelected.asp7sViewData-747403.750084.747>... **08/08/2017**  **55,**  A2. 23/09/2015  A3. 23/09/2015  A4. 23/09/2015  A5. 23/09/2015  **C.**<https://ecaseworks.net/ENFIELD/ViewSelected.asp7sViewData-747403.750084.747>... **08/08/2017**  **56,**  A6. 23/09/2015  **D.**<https://ecaseworks.net/ENFIELD/ViewSelected.asp7sViewData-747403.750084.747>... **08/08/2017**  **57,**  **E.**18 September 2015   **18/09/2015**  **F.**<https://ecaseworks.net/ENFIELD/ViewSelected.asp7sViewData-747403.750084.747>... **08/08/2017**  **58**  A7. 23/09/2015  A8. 23/09/2015  A9. 23/09/2015  A10. 23/09/2015  A11. 23/09/2015  A12. 23/09/2015  A13. 23/09/2015  A14. 23/09/2015  A15. 23/09/2015  **G.    24/09/2015**  **H.**28th September 2015   **28/09/2015**  **I.**[https://ecaseworks.net/ENFIELD/ViewSelected.asp7sViewData—747403.750084.747](https://ecaseworks.net/ENFIELD/ViewSelected.asp7sViewData%E2%80%94747403.750084.747)... **08/08/2017** | | | |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Weblink** | <https://serverone.hopto.org/Index%2011/> | | | | **Name** | Debra Andrews | | | | **Address** | 113 Burncroft Avenue Enfield London EN3 | | | | **Dates of living in residence** |  | | | | **Page Number and Title** | Page Numbers: 53,54,55,56,57,58 | | | | **Date** | **Incident Logs** | **Facts** | **Si Note:** | | **24/01/2017** |  |  | Out of Com  Mothers FOI | | **03/09/2015**  **+**  **A1.**  **23/09/2015** | **A.**  **03/09/2015:**  **Sent:**  **A1.**  **23 September 2015**15:07  **To:**Carmel Naessens; Loretta Walsh  **Cc:** Charles Elkington; Dawn Allen  **Subject:**Bancroft Annum Importance: High  **Classification:** PROTECT New case  **VICTIM:** Ms  Bancroft Avenue ENFIELD EN3 7JQ  297 07/ 1973  02083500628  **Perpetrator Simone Cordell**  109 Burncroft Avenue ENFIELD EN3 7JQ  Home visit to flat. Attended? Dawn Allen TMO and CRN Sola Quadri  Home visit to advised that her neighbour at number 109 has for the past few months harassed, intimidated, stalked her, and made a life a complete misery. He continuously plays loud music, bangs on her ceiling and door alleging that she is monitoring his movements in his flat. She feels petrified by his presence and as a result refused to leave her flat for fear bumping into him on her way out. She has missed a few appointments with her social worker as a result, she has now been subjected to making home appointments pending the time this matter is resolved.  **She explained** that they use to be acquaintances before the relationship went sour.  She believes the whole problem started when he claimed the decoration in his flat was damaged as a result of a leak coming from her flat. She confirmed that she had a leak from her overflow a few months, ago which has since been repaired but, the damage alleged had occurred.  “Ms also recalled an incident when the perp spat in her face. “  It has been one issue after the other she advised  **55,**  “The recent event which took placea week ago. “  “She was on her way out to attend her appointment with her CRN when he apprehended her and threatened to kill her. She was pretty shaken from the incident that instead of attending her appointment, returned home immediately. She advised that she contacted the police but, was not taken seriously as they assumed, she was drunk at the time of the call.”  She advised that she was not in the list drunk but, just the way she spoke due to her condition. She still was not taken seriously and had to abandon the call.  She found this very frustrating and advised that it was not the first time this would happen to her. Her GPN also confirmed her statement and expressed her dissatisfaction at the way she was treated.  I felt completely let down by the police and became frightful for her safety especially, as she knows the perpetrators has shells in his flat.  I observed in her flat that her floors were very creaky, I was made aware by Dawn that most of the flats in the block are like that. Unfortunately, the creakiness exacerbates the noise level in the fiats and cause more problems than usual.  “I advised that I contact the police to make further enquiries. I will also contact MHT to enquire if Mr Cordell is known to them.  “At some point the perpetrator will need to be interviewed and a warning letter issued on him.”  “I will contact the repairs team and try to arrange a surveyor to visit her flat and see what assistance can be offered  “I further advised that her case will be investigated, and an officer will get back to her to discuss further with her. “Her CPN and TMO will be kept informed of updates”  Bola Quadri has already put in place a safeguard alert.” |  |  |   **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **3 / 23/09/2015:** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 23/09/2015:**   1. This is said in the Enfield Councils History as the first incident dated **23/09/2015**   *The recent event which took place a week ago.*  *She was on her way out to attend her appointment with her* ***CRN when he apprehended her and threatened to kill her****. She was pretty shaken from the incident that instead of attending her appointment, returned home immediately. She advised that she contacted the police but, was not taken seriously as they assumed, she was drunk at the time of the call.*   1. For a fact this would not have been able to have occurred due to the simple fact that the accused incident had not happened until the **30/09/2015** / **28/09/2015** and 100% means that the council history was created after this date, to cover up what had really happened and was allowed to continue. 2. On the **30/09/2015** / **28/09/2015** my mother and I both sent an email to Dawn Allen explain what had really happened on this date and this was never added to the Enfield Councils History due to information providing a fair account of the true ongoing that situated on the **28/09/2015** that proved my innocence. 3. On the **22/12/2016** Debra Andrews made up information was explained in brief to I and my mother by Geoffrey Mann but not in full as he understood that he was Dawn Allen’s Team Leader and he held an obligation of responsibility for what he had allowed to continue to proceed to myself and the way that the Official paperwork had been fabricated behind mine and my mother’s back while we were making Official complaints in respect of the ongoings at the same time. 4. Debra Andrews at this stage was a Super bad acholic who had been diagnosed as a Mental Health High Risk Patient suffer, she had also had children in her past and the Government had taken custody and visiting rights away from her. 5. I am not too sure of the reasons to why this had happened to her but in the years that I had gotten to know her before she had no intention of ever seeing them again and she just would not give up drinking acholic drinks to get them back 6. No Council History was built for Debra Andrews that contained the emails my mother and I had both been sending to the Enfield Council. 7. The Enfield Council responded to my mother for the first time 00/00/201   **Perpetrator Simone Cordell**   1. Dawn Allen and her team labelled me a perpetrator without no fair investigating even when the doctors warned her of Debra Andrews behaviour on the **18/09/2015** while my mother was also sending complaints about her and others copying her cruel behaviour towards myself 2. Dawn Allen and her careers were not honest when being complacent with Debra’s past Mental Health history and acholic dependences and not to forget the fact that she had her own light skin children taken away from her for their own safety 3. Dawn Allen and none of the Government teams had ever met me or spoken to myself. | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **24/09/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 24/09/2015:**  **The 1st Injunction Order / Lemmy / pub Book Issue: one!**  Added Information Council History Debra Andrews/  **Page Numbers:** 53,54,55,56,57,**58**  **58,**  **G.**  **24/09/2015:** Email - sent,  RE SOVA Alert - D.A - 1009639  **Classification:** PROTECT  Dear Susan,   1. Thank you for your email. Please note that as from Monday **28th September 2015,**all high-level cases of antisocial behaviour will be **transferred** to the Council’s Community Safety Unit. 2. In light of the above, Ms Andrews case has been identified as one of many cases involved in this process. You will shortly hear from an officer within the Community Safety Unit advising you of the name of the officer that will be dealing with Ms Andrews case.   Kind regards  Dolly Ogunseye = Anti-Social Behaviour Officer Housing Anti-Social Behaviour Team Tenancy Management Enfield Council  **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **2 / 24/09/2015:**  **Stage 5**  **The Enfield Councils History FOI Indexed**  **Stage 5**  Deborah Andrews / Enfield Council Case History  **Page Number:**  1,2,3,4,5,**6,**7,8,9,10,  11,12,13,14,15,16,  17,18,19,20,21,  --  **06**  **24/09/2015:** Email- sent  RE SOVA Alert - D.A -1009639 **Classification:** PROTECT  Dear Susan,   1. Thank you for your email. 2. Please note that as from Monday **28th September 2015**, all high-level cases of anti-social behaviour will be transferred to the **Council's Community Safety Unit.** 3. In light of the above, Ms Andrews case has been identified as one of many cases involved in this process. You will shortly hear from an officer within the **Community Safety Unit** advising you of the name of the officer that will be dealing with **Ms Andrews case.**   Kind regards  Dolly Ogunseye = Anti-Social Behaviour Officer Housing Anti-Social Behaviour Team Tenancy Management Enfield Council  **28/09/2015:** “Note from above”  **24/09/2015:** Letter – sent; TRANSFER TO CSU LETTER MS DEBORAH ANDREWS  **24/09/2015:**Email- sent  **Classification:** PROTECT   1. Good morning, Debbie, Glad you are doing well. 2. Thank you for being ever so helpful. 3. I know, “we are busy bees" 4. I appreciate the **detailed information** **you have provided** 5. It will assist us in deciding a way forward. 6. Have a peaceful weakened 7. Warm regard   Dolly Ogunseye Anti-Social Behaviour Officer Housing Anti-Social Behaviour Team Tenancy Management Enfield Council  Hi Dolly,   1. I am well thanks; I see your department is busy as ever... 2. **Re:** **SC, he is not open to MH services and does not have a MH worker.** 3. **01/03/2012: March 12-** 1st contact with MH services following arrest after a bad trip of taking LSD & alcohol, mental state assessed remained in custody of police - **no MH input** 4. **02/03/2014: March 14** - 2nd contact, assessed by team psychiatrist, presented with anxiety & suicidal thoughts in context of social stressors due to pending court case leading to stress. 5. Discharged form MH services, suicidal thoughts are longstanding from early childhood and present at times of high stress, not 'A typical' of other forms of suicide as relates to thoughts as opposed to wish to die, and usually found in context of those presenting with early childhood trauma as a way of expressing emotions. 6. **00/11/2014: Nov 14 -** Mental Health Act assessment, not detained in hospital, discharged from mental health services. 7. “Presented highly volatile, angry & paranoid about motives of others, presented in context of social stressors due to on-going issues with police & court process - mother reported he has been targeted by police causing him stress?” 8. He has a medical history of Crohn's disease which may impact on mood stability particularly if not compliant with treatment and monitoring of symptoms. 9. All assessments completed by mental health services have found no evidence of serious mental illness, he appears to be a very angry young man who has had an extremely difficult and traumatic early childhood which is likely to explain his distrust of people in authority (e.g., police) and being angry at others and at the world....   Regards,  **Debbie**  **Classification:** PROTECT   1. Good afternoon, Debbie, 2. Hope you are doing well? could you kindly advise if the above tenant is known to your service and if he is, does he have a CPN and does he engage? 3. Thank you for your assistance 4. Mr Simon Cordell,109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, EN3 7JQ 5. DOB=26/01/19 (34 yrs.) 6. Phone=020 8245 7. Dolly Ogunseye Anti-Social Behaviour Officer Housing Anti-Social Behaviour Team Tenancy Management Enfield Council |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 24/09/2015:**   1. On the 24/09/2015   **Statement Exhibit** **2 / 24/09/2015:**   1. On the 24/09/2015 Dawn Allen went to the Mental Health Teams and asked them to check my personal data without my legal consent for any history of any mental health issues about myself rather than doing a fair investigation into what me my mother and the (Doctors **18/09/2015**) had said to her about Debra’s Mental Health state. They provided her with my personal data   “*Re: SC, he is not open to MH services and doesn't have a MH worker.*”  and told Dawn Allan and team that there was no Mental Health History on me.   1. Also, Debra’s Enfield Council History had not been made against me by this date. 2. As it got built by Dawn Allen and her team after the date of 30/09/2015. 3. An RE SOVA Alert got sent out by way of email stating that as from Monday **28th September 2015**, all high-level cases of anti-social behaviour will be transferred to the **Enfield Council's Community Safety Unit,** who forged the Asbo against me and allowed members of my neighbours to attack me and all while not investigating mine or my mother’s claims fairly, in an aid as a cover up for what their team had illegal forged in an official court order set out against myself to deprive me of my way of life and then life itself as the cover up. 4. **Si Note** “CSU Meaning” = <https://medical-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/CSU> | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **28/09/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 28/09/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue:**  597. Lorraine Cordell-RE-109 Burncroft Av  **/ Page Numbers:** 2168,  Debbie screamed: --  **Date: 30 September 2015 14:23:00**  **To:**[jackie.gubby@enfield.gov.uk](http://jackie.gubby@enfield.gov.uk)  **Subject: Re:** Burncroft Ave  Dear Jackie Gubby   1. Thank you for taking the time to talk to me, on the phone today and explaining why you could not come to the meeting on the **28/09/2014 at 14:30!** As said on the phone the surveyors took all the details of repairs and said they will deal with them. I am happy, you will get keep updated as too, what is going on with the repairs and keep me updated. 2. As also said to you on the phone we did not hear from the ASB team as yet, and today my son heard the main door keep banging so he walked out to the front and saw no one there so walked out further than he was to see if he could spot anyone else around the flats. 3. When he walked back to the main door Debbie, his neighbour was by the bin door and when she turned around and saw my son, she hit him with her shopping bags, there was a lady that was with her, but not standing with her and saw what was going on and run over and told Debbie to stop, my son asked for the lady's name and the lady would not give him it or who she worked for. 4. But my son had time to talk to the lady and tell her what Debbie had been doing, Debbie got upset, and kept shouting and telling the lady not to talk to him the lady had to tell Debbie to stop that she wanted to hear what my son was saying and told Debbie to wait. 5. She spoke to my son for a little while but said to my son that she was sorry, but she was busy and had to go and she left, and my son goes back into his flat. 6. He called me and told me what had happened and asked me to call you to update you as too, what had gone on.   Regards  **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **2 / 28/09/2015:**   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Weblink** | | <https://serverone.hopto.org/Index%2011/> | | | | **Name** | | Debra Andrews | | | | **Address** | | 113 Burncroft Avenue Enfield London EN3 | | | | **Dates of living in residence** | |  | | | | **Page Number and Title** | | Page Numbers: 53,54,55,56,57,58 | | | | **Date** | **Incident Logs** | | **Facts** | **Si Note:** | | **H.**  **28/09/2015** | **H.**  **“28th September 2015,** all high-level cases of antisocial behaviour will be transferred to the Council’s Community Safety Unit.” | |  |  | |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 28/09/2015:**   1. On the 28/09/2015 meeting at my home Jackie Gubby turned up and Dawn Allan and Louise Brown Never.   **Statement Exhibit** **2 / 28/09/2015:**   1. On the 28/09/2015 Debra Andrews History was made on or after this date! | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **30/09/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 30/09/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue:**  597. Lorraine Cordell \_RE\_ 109 Burncroft Av  **/ Page Numbers:** 2168,  Debbie screamed: --  **Date:** 30 September **2015** 14:23:00  **To:**[jackie.gubby@enfield.gov.uk](http://jackie.gubby@enfield.gov.uk)  **Subject: Re:** Burncroft Ave  Dear Jackie Gubby   1. Thank you for taking the time to talk to me, on the phone today and explaining why you could not come to the meeting on the **28/09/2014** at 14:30! 2. As said on the phone the surveyors took all the details of repairs and said they will deal with them. 3. I am happy, you will get keep updated as too, what is going on with the repairs and keep me updated. 4. As also said to you on the phone we did not hear from the ASB team as yet, and today my son heard the main door keep banging so he walked out to the front and saw no one there so walked out further than he was to see if he could spot anyone else around the flats. 5. When he walked back to the main door Debbie, his neighbour was by the bin door and when she turned around and saw my son, she hit him with her shopping bags, there was a lady that was with her, but not standing with her and saw what was going on and run over and told Debbie to stop, my son asked for the lady's name and the lady would not give him it or who she worked for. 6. But my son had time to talk to the lady and tell her what Debbie had been doing, Debbie got upset, and kept shouting and telling the lady not to talk to him the lady had to tell Debbie to stop that she wanted to hear what my son was saying and told Debbie to wait. 7. She spoke to my son for a little while but said to my son that she was sorry, but she was busy and had to go and she left, and my son goes back into his flat. 8. He called me and told me what had happened and asked me to call you to update you as too, what had gone on.   Regards |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 30/09/2015:**   1. A complaint got sent by my mother and I to Dawn Allen from the Enfield Homes Teams and this is also, the day that Debra Andrews Screamed! | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **01/10/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 30/09/2015:**  **Stage 5**  **The Enfield Councils History FOI Indexed**  **Stage 5**  Deborah Andrews / Enfield Council Case History  **Page Number:** 1,2,3,4,5,6,**7,**8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,  **DATE(S).**  X) 24/01/2017  Y) 01/03/2012  Z) 02/03/2014  A.1) 00/11/2014  **B.1) 01/10/2015**  **C.1) 01/10/2015**  **Page 7 of 21**  **B.1**  **01/10/2015:** History; Email - sent  **Classification:** PROTECT   1. Good afternoon, Mark, 2. “Just received some disturbing news about am incident that took place today.” 3. I was made aware that Simon Cordell attempted to strangle the tenant of 113 Burncroft Avenue. 4. She managed to escape his grip but extremely shaken by the whole episode. 5. She is petrified at the moment and refuses to leave her flat. 6. Would it be possible to contact / visit her today ASAP please? 7. Thank you 8. Dolly Ogunseye Anti-Social Behaviour Officer Housing Anti-Social Behaviour Team Tenancy Management Enfield Council   **C.1**  **01/10/2015:** History; Email - sent  Dear Bola,  **Page 7 of 21**  **“Missing Page”** |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 30/09/2015:**   1. When the Anti-Social Behaviour team authored an email to mark saying that | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **06/10/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 06/10/2015:** E |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 06/10/2015:**   1. Around this date 06/10/2015 is when Debra Andrews got moved into a Hotel by the Council until the date of the 08/12/2015 as this is when she got moved back into the flat to attack me again. | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **13/10/2015** | **Evidence: Exhibit** **1 / 13/10/2016:**  **Stage 5**  **The Enfield Councils History FOI Indexed**  **Stage 5**  Deborah Andrews / Enfield Council Case History  **Page Number:** 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,**12,**13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,  **DATE(S).**  D.1) 24/01/2017  **E.1) 13/10/2015**  **Page 12 of 21**  **E.1**  **13/10/2015:** History; Email-sent from:  Dolly Ogunseye  **Sent: 13 October 2015 14:19**  **To:** Louise Brown (nee Wainwright)  **Subject: RE:** HUB case 16175 Deborah Andrews [SEC=PROTECT]  **Importance:** High  **Classification:** PROTECT   1. Also forgot to mention that we are still in the process of locating a suitable TA for Ms Andrew pending the time her case is resolved   Dolly Ogunseye Anti-Social Behaviour Officer Housing Anti-Social Behaviour Team Tenancy Management Enfield Council  **From:** Dolly Ogunseye  **Sent:** **13 October 2015 14:14**  **To:** Louise Brown (nee Wainwright)  **Subject: RE:** HUB case 16175 Deborah Andrews [SEC=PROTECT]  **Importance:** High  **Classification:** PROTECT  Good afternoon, Louise,   1. Sorry I missed your call; I was at a meeting at the time. Called and left a message on your voice mail. 2. “Ms Andrews suffers from a history of mental health; she is currently being supported by Bola Quadri Care-coordinator / CPN / Nurse Prescriber Psychosis Service Line” 3. Barnet, Enfield & Haringey Mental Health NHS Trust / 58-60 Silver Street, Enfield EN1 3EP 4. She made complains about her neighbour at number 109, harassing, verbally abusing her, intimidating, shouting threatening to kill her. 5. “The mean concern here is that the perpetrator in question also suffers from mental health and is known to be very aggressive, violent, and anti-police.” 6. “He has on a few occasions threatened to kill her and petrified the life out of her.” 7. “It was on this basis that a decision was made to move her out immediately.” 8. Hope the above information is useful.   Thank you  Dolly Ogunseye Anti-Social Behaviour Officer Housing Anti-Social Behaviour Team Tenancy Management Enfield Council  **Classification:** PROTECT Dolly,  **Page 13 of 21**   1. Please can you contact me regarding this case as I would like an update and the full reasons as to her vulnerability and why we have put her up in the hotel?   Thanks, you  Louise Brown  Anti-Social Behaviour officer  Community Safety Unit  Regeneration & Environment Department  London Borough of Enfield  020 8379 4467  [louise.brown2@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:louise.brown2@enfield.gov.uk) |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 13/10/2016:**   1. When Dolly Ogunseye Anti-Social Behaviour Officer Housing Anti-Social Behaviour Team Tenancy Management for Enfield Council messaged a Louise Brown Neighbourhood Watch Team, they | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **15/10/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 15/10/2015:**   1. Louise Brown attended my flat with two police officers. |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 15/10/2015:**   1. A Formal Complaint about Louise Brown got made on the **16/10/2015**. 2. The complaint dated the **15/10/2015**, was about when Louise Brown: attended my flat with two police officers. 3. Debra got moved into a Hotel by the Council, I got told this day! 4. And in the time that Debra had got moved into the hotel is when | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **16/10/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 16/10/2015:**   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **38** | Dear Louise Brown, | 16/10/2015 | N/a | 1233 | | **39** | Louise Brown Jackie Gubby | 16/10/2015 | N/a | 1233 |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **42** | Mother RE Simon Cordell Complaint | 16/10/2016 | 16:49 | 1325 |   **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **2 / 16/10/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue:**  Mother Re Simon Cordell /  **Page Numbers:** 2209,  **Sent: 16 October 2015 15:30**  [jackie.gubby@enfield.gov.uk](http://jackie.gubby@enfield.gov.uk)  **Subject: Re:** Simon Cordell  Dear Louise Brown and Jackie Gubby   1. Could you please read the attached letter and please reply so I know you have this email? 2. Regards 3. Mother Simon Cordell   **Formal Complaint**   1. Dear Louise Brown: 2. You are the person dealing with the complaints put in due to the behaviour of Debbie who lives at number 113 Burncroft Av EN3 7 JQ. 3. My son Simon Cordell is the person who lives at 109 Burncroft Av EN3 7 JQ. 4. Yesterday the **15/10/2015** you attended my son Simon Cordell flat with two police officers. 5. Why would you turn up at someone flat with two police officers and not even ask or set up a meeting to do this? 6. Could I please ask why a meeting was not set up to see him, and you just turned up at his flat with the police? 7. I am the person looking after my son and have been in contract with the council and was meant to have been there at the meeting, so this was meant to have been arranged not that you just turn up with police. 8. You said you was in the area and had the case file for this so just attended, when was you given the case file for you to address on what date? As it was some time ago, yet we have had no contact from you. 9. You asked my son what had been going on, yet you took no notes or a report of anything my son was saying. 10. How is this addressing the issue when you did not even take notes at what was meant to be called a meeting, may I ask what was the point of this meeting? 11. You did not want to look at any of the videos that my son had recorded re what had been going on and what Debbie had been doing. 12. You did not want to look at any of the evidence my son had, the letters Debbie was putting in my son's door in one letter she even put £20 in there which was posted back in her door as my son did not want her money, the videos my son had recorded, nothing so how are you doing your job. 13. You did not want to hear about the attack on my son, when Debbie was at the bins and my son walked be hide her to the main door and when she turned around and saw my son she started screaming and attacking my son. 14. You said to my son Debbie had not been in her address for the last 2 weeks that she had been in a hotel. 15. And asked my son if he knew this how is my son meant to know this? 16. You told him this because he said the things had been better the last few weeks, but there were still problems. 17. Which if you had looked at the Videos you would have seen things from the last 2 weeks, but you did not do this did you. 18. When you left you made my son give his word, he would not hurt Debbie, like Debbie is the victim here and not my son. 19. My son has never hurt Debbie so why would you make him give his word he would not hurt her? 20. Debbie is the person who attacked my son not the other way around here. 21. Which was reported? 22. You have given Debbie support moved her to a hotel like she is the victim yet failed to support my son in any way here, yet he is the victim of what Debbie is doing. 23. Not took a report does not ask anyone what has been going on, as there is witness as to what Debbie is doing. 24. My son's friends and I have heard what is going on and what Debbie is doing. 25. I even went up to Debbie's door to try and speak with her, she asked who was at the door and I said I was Simon’s mum and would like to speak to her to try and sort the issue out what was going on, that if we spoke maybe we could sort this out, she just started shouting so many things at me and sounded drunk, I left and went down to my son flat and said she would not speak to me, 26. I was there around 3 hours after that and Debbie did not bang once or doing anything, yet the 2 hours I was there before going up to her flat to speak to her the banging was ongoing and was making my son so upset, we could not do the work I was there for that is why I went up to speak to her. 27. I believe my son has been to her door 2 times and ask her to stop well he begged her to stop She just started shouting and then called the police, one of these times my son friend Katie was there, and heard what Debbie was doing and spoke to the police when they came to my son door. 28. Katie goes to my son's flat a lot along with a friend called Nash and a few other people each of these people have heard what Debbie is doing. 29. Debbie has been to my son's door more than once when Katie has been at my son's flat offering my son cans of alcohol which my son refused as he does not drink and asking my son for money and other things. 30. So please do not make this out as if it is my son that is causing the problem here as that is how you made him feel yesterday. 31. We are the ones who put the reports in from around a year ago, yet you have done nothing to support my son the first time you even went to see him was the **15/10/15** yet you been out to see Debbie and seem to have given her support. 32. Yet each time I told the council how ill this is making my son, where is his support? 33. Am I of the understand you said to my son that you believe Debbie has feelings for my son and this is the reason you believe Debbie is acting the way in which she is? 34. My son has never acted in a way to make Debbie think my son had any interest in her, he has only every helped his neighbours, which is the type of person my son is. 35. Has Debbie said she has feeling for my son? 36. And as Debbie has already attacked my son unprovoked is, he in any harm from a next attack? 37. This is making my son ill, but you do not care about how ill this is making my son do you or you would have addressed the issue when contact was made with the council about this issue. 38. You have said you are moving Debbie back in, but what has been done to the so-called feelings you think Debbie has got for my son have they just gone away? We know Debbie has mental health issues and she is an alcoholic, and that she needs help, but I am sorry this is making my son ill, and something does need to be done as it has been going on to long now and you have done nothing. 39. My son has lived in his flat even before Debbie moved there, and he has never caused a problem. 40. In fact, he has only ever tried to help his neighbours. 41. I would like to know what has been done to address this and what is being done to help my son. 42. I do not think you have addressed this in the correct manner, and I feel that you feel Debbie needs more support due to her being vulnerable, but have you asked if my son is vulnerable what heath conditions, he has nope you have not and I feel it is due to him being a male and Debbie a female, I feel as if you think males can’t be vulnerable.   Regards  Mother  Simon Cordell |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 16/10/2015:**   1. A Big complaint “See Archived Files” got sent to Dawn Allen from the Enfield Homes Teams that raised high priority issues of concern. | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **21/10/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 21/10/2015:**  **Debra got moved**   1. Into a Hotel by the Council!   **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **2 / 21/10/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue:**  Me to Mother Case Defence Asbo /  **Page Numbers:** 2220,  **Subject: Re: Re:** Simon Cordell  **From:** Rewired ([re\_wired@ymail.com](http://re_wired@ymail.com))  **To:** [lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk](http://lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk);  **Date:** Wednesday, 21 October **2015**, 13:21   1. Thanks   On **Wednesday, 21 October 2015, 12:55,** Lorraine Cordell <[lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk](http://lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk)>  **wrote:**   1. read attached |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 21/10/2015:**   1. On the 21/10/2015 my mother showed me a copy of her wrote complaint for the first time.   **Statement Exhibit** **2 / 21/10/2015:**   1. On the 21/10/2015 | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **26/10/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 26/10/2015:** E |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 26/10/2015:**   1. On the 26/10/2015 The 1st hearing for the Asbo was at Wood Green Crown Court, to see if the court case was ready for the appeal date. | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **02/11/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 26/10/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue:**  Re Simon Cordell Complaint /  **Page Numbers:** 2230,  **Sent:** 02 November **2015** 17:38  **To: Louise Brown; Jackie Gubby**  **Subject: Re:** Simon Cordell Complaint  Dear Louise Brown and Jackie Gubby   1. It has been over 10 days since I sent the complaint in due to how my son has gotten treated. 2. I have not had one reply not even a reply to say you got my email. 3. It has also got left voice messages on Louise Brown phone yet had no calls back. 4. I spoke to Jackie Gubby and got told I should hear within 10 days about my complaint but have heard nothing: also, 5. I would like to take the time to say to Jackie Gubby that jobs are still outstanding on my son's flat.   Regards  Mother Simon Cordell  **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **2 / 26/10/2015:**  **The banging Started!**   * Debbie Andrews (responsible) * Stain Curtis (responsible) * Mathiyalagan (Responsible)   **Time:** In the Morning: -- Mid-Day: -- And in the Evening and of the Night!   1. The tenants of 117 and 111 Continued to victimize me by: -- 2. The flats conditions are making it so that I am unable to sleep and continue to make me ill! 3. 117 Burncroft Avenue kept continually, repeating to flushing the toilet when I am in the bathroom being sick in my toilet because they initially made me ill then they were Jumping up and down on the floorboards above wherever they can tell that I am present below! 4. Stain 111 Burncroft Avenue on my life also attacked me by hitting the kitchen wall with metal objects I can tell they are metal because of the noise it makes when he does it to have the negative effect he desires to create and I keep on washing all of my clothes so that they do not smell of the damp but the smell continues to linger on and become noticeable on all of my garments! |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 26/10/2015:**   1. On the 02/11/2015 About the Big complaint “See Archived Files” got sent to Dawn Allen from the Enfield Homes Teams! | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **03/11/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 03/11/2015:**   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **40** | Louise Brown RE Simon Cordell | 03/11/2015 | 11:16 | 1251 | | **41** | Jackie Gubby RE Simon Cordell | 03/11/2015 | 13:03 | 1251 |   **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **2 / 03/11/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue:**  Louise Brown RE Simon Cordell /  **Page Numbers:** 2232,2233,  **From:** Jackie Gubby [[Jackie.Gubby@enfield.gov.uk](http://jackie.gubby@enfield.gov.uk)]  **Sent:** 03 November **2015** 13:03  **To:** Louise Brown.  Lorraine Cordell  **Subject: RE:** Simon Cordell Complaint [SEC=PROTECT]  **Classification: PROTECT**  Dear Ms Cordell   1. I am not aware of any outstanding repairs to your son’s property. 2. The surveyors who attended the inspection reported back that the heating was fully operational, and the detectors are also working. 3. Mr Cordell can report any new repairs to telephone 0800 40 80 160 - option one   Yours sincerely  **Jackie Gubby Housing Manager**  Tenancy Management the Edmonton Centre 36-44 South Mall Edmonton Green N9 0TN  **Tel:** 0800 40 80 160\*  **Fax:** 020 8375 8016  **e-mail:** [jackie.gubby@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:jackie.gubby@enfield.gov.uk)  \* This is a free phone number, so there is no charge if you use a landline. If you are using a mobile, you may find it cheaper to call our landline number 020 8379 1327  "*Enfield Council is committed to serving the whole borough fairly, delivering excellent services and building strong communities.*"  **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **3 / 03/11/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue:**  609. x2 Louise Brown \_RE\_ Simon Cordell Complaint [SEC=PROTECT]  **/ Page Numbers:** 2236,2237,  **From:** Louise Brown [[Louise.Brown2@Enfield.gov.uk](http://louise.brown2@enfield.gov.uk)]  **Sent:** 03 November **2015** 11:16  **To:** Lorraine Cordell; Jackie Gubby  **Subject: RE:** Simon Cordell Complaint [SEC=PROTECT]  **Classification:** PROTECT  Dear Ms Cordell,   1. Thank you for your email and enquiry regarding your son Simon Cordell tenancy 2. A full response clearly outlining actions to‐date will be sent to your son Simon Cordell.   Yours sincerely  Louise Brown  Anti-Social Behaviour officer  Community Safety Unit  Regeneration & Environment Department  London Borough of Enfield  020 8379 4467  **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **4 / 03/11/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue:**  611. Lorraine Cordell \_Re\_ Simon Cordell Complaint [SEC=PROTECT] \_ (3)  **/ Page Numbers:** 2240,2241,2242  **From:** Lorraine Cordell [[lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk](http://lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk)]  **Sent:** 03 November **2015** 14:39  **To:** 'Jackie Gubby'  **Subject: RE:** Simon Cordell Complaint [SEC=PROTECT]  Dear Jackie Gubby   1. When the surveyors came around there was a list of jobs that they said needed to be done. 2. The electrics needed sorting and the detectors (this has now been done they sent someone out nearly right away after the surveyors came and done the report) 3. Bathroom sink (repaired now) 4. Bathroom toilet (repaired now) 5. Heating pipes not been covered that are running all round the walls and down the walls. (Now it is winter my son has his heating on but has burned himself more than once walking past the pipes as they are so hot, this is bad being left like this as it is a danger due to how hot the pipes get. (Not done) 6. Bedroom floor (not done) 7. Bedroom window (not done) 8. Front room window/door frame (surveyors said that the water was still coming in due to the outside step and this needed to be sorted) (Not 9. done) 10. Pipes banging all the time (the surveyors saw this when they came out) (Not done) 11. Wall still wet in front room (we have been told this is due to the guttering needs to be renewed which was meant to be done, 12. 111 has guttering in his back garden that has fallen off the roof some time ago, but now what also has been noticed is that in the main hallway water is dripping down the walls leaving puddles of water on the stairway which people have to walk up and down this is a danger for people they could have an accident, believe this is due to the guttering needs to be replaced or the roof. (Not Done) 13. I am sure there was also some other jobs that needed to be done the surveyors that came the day you were meant to have come took a full list and wrote everything down. 14. So how is none of these jobs on the system that have not been done? It seems once again things have not been put on the system. 15. Why should we have to keep calling for jobs to be done when they were already meant to have been done, and surveyors and inspectors have been out more than once over the years why are they not on the system, as it seems someone is not doing their job.   Regards  Lorraine Cordell  Simon Cordell |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 03/11/2015:**   1. On the 03/11/2015   **Statement Exhibit** **2 / 03/11/2015:**   1. On the 03/11/2015 Regarding Simon Cordell tenancy. “Disrepair & Neighbours.” 2. *I am not aware of any outstanding repairs to your son’s property.* 3. *The surveyors who attended the inspection reported back that the heating was fully operational, and the detectors are also working.* 4. *Mr Cordell can report any new repairs to telephone 0800 40 80 160 - option one*   **Statement Exhibit** **3 / 03/11/2015:**   1. On the 03/11/2015   **Statement Exhibit** **4 / 03/11/2015:**   1. On the 03/11/2015 | | |
|  | * **Asbo**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **05/11/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 05/11/2015:**  **INTERIM CONDITIONS GOT GRANTED on the 05/11/2014.**  **Date:** 5 November **2014**  **Defendant:** Simon Cordell  **DOB:** two  **Address:** 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ  **ON THE COMPLAINT**  **of PC Steve Elsmore**  **on behalf of the**  **Commissioner**  **of**  **Police of the Metropolis.**  **THE REASONS for making the Order are that it is said:**   1. That the defendant has acted on dates between **01ST January 2013** to date in the London Borough of Enfield and elsewhere in an anti-social manner, that is to say, in a manner that caused or was likely to cause harassment, alarm, or distress to one or more persons not of the same household as himself; and 2. That an anti-social behaviour order is necessary to protect persons in the 3. London Borough of Enfield local government area and elsewhere in which the harassment, alarm or distress was caused, or was likely to be caused from further anti-social acts by him. |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 05/11/2015:**   1. On the 05/11/2015 The Asbo interim conditions got granted against my person with forged paperwork for the Enfield Council, Neighbourhood watch team and Met police force. | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **12/11/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 12/11/2015:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue:**  612. Lorraine Cordell \_Re\_ Simon Cordell Complaint [SEC=PROTECT] \_ (2)  **/ Page Numbers:** 2283,2284,2285,  **From:** Lorraine Cordell [[lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk](http://lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk)]  **Sent:** 12 November **2015** 12:07  **To:** 'Jackie Gubby'  **Subject: RE:** Simon Cordell Complaint [SEC=PROTECT]  Dear Jackie Gubby   1. “I still have had no reply to the below email and to what is going on.” 2. “Are we expected to again contact the repairs again and again put these jobs in again is that what you are telling us to do?”   Regards  Lorraine Cordell  Simon Cordell |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 12/11/2015:**   1. On 12/11/2015 Complaint about disrepair. | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **24/11/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 24/11/2015:**   1. Mr Cordell was assessed under the MHA act, but he was not detained. Record of interview with patient (Include where it was conducted who was present and use of police if required during process) Mr Cordell was assessed under the Mental Health Act at around 10:40hrs |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 24/11/2015:**   1. On the 24/11/2015 | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **27/11/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 27/11/2015:**   1. She reported that Mr Cordell was not eating, not sleeping and that he was experiencing persecutory ideas, thinking that people are laughing at him and talking about him. His mother said that Mr Cordell believed that the government were advertising information about him, and that the television was talking about him or to him. She stated that Mr Cordell was smoking significant amounts of cannabis and he was not taking the anti-depressant medication that as prescribed in March 2014. |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 27/11/2015:**   1. On the 27/11/2015 Reports that my mother contacted the Enfield HUB, mental health referral centre. | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **01/12/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 01/12/2015:**   1. Mr Cordell’s mother again contacted the Enfield assessment mental health team and reported that Mr Cordell had locked himself in his room and believed that his television was talking to him. She reported that Mr Cordell was eating but not as regularly as previously. She said that Mr Cordell sometimes believes that his mother’s body language is sending him messages. She reported that he had not had any recent contact with his friends but does go out on a scramble bike and had injured his hands. a worker from the Enfield assessment team phoned Dawn Allan, estate officer, who reported that he had threatened to strangle his neighbour who had been moved as a result. Mr Cordell had accused his neighbour of deliberately causing noise disturbance. An assessment team worker phoned Mr Cordell and reported that she had received text messages from Mr Cordell saying that he will commit suicide once a court case is finished. Mr Cordell was assessed by Dr Cushion, psychiatrist based at the Home Treatment Team. |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 01/12/2015:**   1. On the 01/12/2015 Reports that my mother contacted the Enfield HUB, mental health referral centre. | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **08/12/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 05/11/2015:** **Sam Curtis**   1. There were no concerns identified concerning his personal care. 2. He said that he has not gone out for months and his mother does all the shopping. 3. He spoke about a conspiracy to destroy his good name and send subliminal messages to him via the television. 4. Mr Cordell said that the woman in the flat upstairs had been “stalking him” he elaborated and said that she stamps on the floor when she hears him moving around his flat or taking off his clothes. 5. He spoke about his plans to start a global business for children. 6. He said that he had about having thoughts of killing himself when he eventually clears his name. 7. He did not accept that he had a mental disorder during the assessment.   **Diagnosis:**   1. Within the Mental Health doctors’ notes made after my assessment on the 08/12/2015 a letter got sent by a Practitioner named as Dr Jane Cushion who is or was a Consultant Psychiatrist who worked for Barnet, Enfield and Haringey NHS Mental Health that got addressed to my GP doctor stating that I had a First Episode of Psychosis with some paranoid and grandiose symptoms, that was based on evidence from history of several months and I had just passed a random mental health assessment at my home. 2. She also, left a comment to my doctor labelled as “FH” followed by “major mental illness” at the end of her letter.   **Rio Notes**   1. Joint assessment conducted together with Dr Cushion from the Enfield Assessment Services at patients’ home. 2. We could not gain entry to his flat and therefore we had to make a telephone call to his mother who we asked to give us a code for access to communal door of the property. 3. Same given as 0123. 4. His mother is called Lorraine and her phone number is 02082457454. 5. Upon knocking on the door to his flat there was fierce barking of his dog from the flat. 6. He was suspicious of people knocking on the door and asked, Dr Cushion Who are you? 7. We calmly introduced ourselves and called out purpose for our attendance. 8. We then asked him to put his dog away and let us in. 9. He complied without any issues. 10. The front door was secured with a heavy-duty metal door and as soon as he opened the door, he instantly bombarded us with volumes of information, about who he is, he talked about what the police have done to him, explained what his neighbour is doing to him (following him about) and what he is doing to clear his name regarding his assumed criminal or police records. 11. This pattern continued even when we sat down to interview him. 12. He would not allow continuous flow of conversation; he had rapid speech; he was disruptive and jumping topics. 13. He had many volumes of files to refer to and try to prove his points and assumed mistreatment by the police and misdiagnosis by the medical professionals. 14. However, he could be interrupted without him becoming angry. 15. He could not facilitate conclusive dialog or interview no matter what method of interviewing we employed. 16. We kept going around the circle without end. 17. He appeared to be mentally disordered and without understanding of his illness (not insightful). 18. We advised and offered him support for his mental disorders which he declined saying that he is not ill and will not take medication. 19. His mother reported family history of mental illness. 20. His grandmother suffered from schizophrenia. 21. This could be the start of his schizophrenia acerbated by drug use. 22. Finally, we had to summarise purpose of our home visit. 23. We told him that we had attended in order to address his medical as well as social issues:   **Medical:**   1. We told him that after the interview, we felt that he needed support/treatment for his mental disorders. 2. We explained and offered him home treatment which he declined. 3. I do not think that he would engage with the HTT. 4. If he continues to take drugs he will continue to deteriorate in mental state and being paranoid about harm to him from others including the police and neighbours   **Social issues:**   1. A 34-year male of mixed race, white, black (mother is white, and father is Black). 2. He was known to CAMHS as a child. 3. He accessed mental health services in **2008, 2012**, **2013**, **2014** and this year with no records of previous admission. 4. He admits to using skunk cannabis daily supplied by people. 5. He pays for drug supply with his benefit money and support from his mother. 6. A well-known person to police.   **Relationships:**   1. Isolated for more than two years, he said. According to Simon, he is not allowed to go out to certain areas by the police and in particular industrial places. 2. He said that he has no friends. 3. However, his mother has regular contact with him. 4. She does his shopping for him. 5. Activity of daily living. 6. He told me that he can cook for himself. 7. I checked that his kitchen was clean and there was some activity of previous cooking. 8. There was food in the fridge. 9. Although his flat is full of equipment, computers, industrial printers, speakers, and others, his flat is reasonably clean and orderly. 10. His bedroom is not too bad either, has makeshift wall robe he made by himself, and I could see that an attempt had been made to make the bed after night use.   <https://rio.beh-mht.cse.thirdparty.nhs.uk/rio/Reports/RiOReports.asp> **29/01/2019**   1. Being appropriately clothed. 2. Mr Cordell was casually dressed in a truck suit. 3. He was cleanly shaven with no signs of self-neglect   **Accommodation.**   1. Lives in a one bedroomed flat provided by the council and paid through housing benefits. 2. Denied any rent arrears.   **Finance/employment.**   1. Unemployed, explained that he is not allowed to venture out by police and hence he cannot go out to look for work. 2. He said that he is in receipt of state benefits. 3. He told me that he earns around A£70 per week EAS and receives housing benefits on top. 4. Mother supports him with money too.   **Social inclusion.**   1. He does not want to work or go for training. 2. Said that his grandparents left a lot of money for the family. 3. He said, "lam alright" 4. Factors having significant impact on Mr Cordell’s wellbeing.   **Mental health and emotional wellbeing.**   1. he continues to deteriorate in mental state as currently not under treatment and using skunk cannabis   **Conclusion/impression:**   1. Mr Cordell is not accepting that he is ill. 2. He would not engage with the HTT. 3. Mr Cordell need to be referred to the EIS as showing early signs of psychosis. 4. A referral for MHA assessment to admit him in hospital for further assessments and treatment would help reduce risk of further deterioration in mental state but Mr Cordell is not deterrable in his current mental state. 5. No immediate social work role for now. 6. The interview did not determine, and Mr Cordell could not identify social issues having signification impact on his wellbeing.   **Plan**   1. We gave him our 24-hour contact number to phone mental health services if in emergency (02087023800).   **Dr Jane Cushion**   1. A Letter got sent by **Dr Jane Cushion** to my GP for my GP to see only. 2. Mother has crisis number and is in regular contact with Simon. 3. She confirmed that he has deteriorated gradually in last year, with no self-harm in last year she is aware of and no known harm to others 4. She gave history that that large metal gate has gone up again recently: and that in her view Simon has been deteriorating for the past year. 5. Mother is very keen that Simon does not know she made the referral to mental health services. 6. Since his father called the HUB, they have had no contact. 7. She is Simon's main support at the moment and has concerns that Simon knowing of her involvement would damage this relationship and negatively impact on him. 8. EAS Joint HV with me and Jameson Simwanza SW after sending out letter From RIO notes 9. Disrupted childhood: CSE in paedophile ring, violent father, adolescence in care, under CAMHS 10. **2012** – diagnosed with anxiety related to court case for burglary 11. **2014**- had MHAA - found not to have major mental illness 12. **2015**- 05-year ASBO for organising illegal raves- not allowed to enter industrial or disused premises between 10pm and 7 am 13. **2015**- November - mother made referral via HUB- she reports gradual deterioration in mental health over the last year. 14. Simon was angry when his father made contact with the HUB in **2014** and does not want it known she instigated the referral. 15. Today 16. Simon consented to be seen and let us in. 17. He was clean, well nourished, well kempt and dressed casually. 18. He put the dog in the back garden. 19. One bed council flat 20. There was a massive heavy-duty metal door like that of a prison cell (over seven feet tall) behind his own front door, which Simon said he has made and installed recently. 21. There were tools lying about on the floor and he has worked in construction in the past. 22. He did not give us a reason for making the door. 23. He has not gone out for months- mother does all shopping   **History from Mr Cordell**   1. Chaotic historian, jumping about topic to topic, but happy to talk especially about his grievances chiefly with the police and the woman upstairs. 2. He said there is a widespread conspiracy to destroy his good name and possibly ultimately to kill him. 3. This is organised by the police with a police officer in Essex called Big Bad (unheard) as its source, in league with "Storm" a global agency who manage the UK’s 999 calls. 4. The police are putting things about him all over the internet (there has been local reporting of his ASBO) and are putting subliminal messages about him through his own TV and other people's. 5. As part of this, he says they have falsified all his records - the proof of which he gave as a list of CADS (relating to one of the illegal raves he had arranged) which as they were not written down in sequence of their numbers, could not be a true record and thus in his view proof of a conspiracy. 6. He said he has evidence on tape of the police talking about him and plotting against him, which he offered to show us, although in fact there were no such sound files on his computer. 7. He could not really explain how he had heard this material. 8. He was keen to show us other written "evidence "from the police, which were all notes Simon had made in files on his computer. 9. Simon said the woman in the flat above has been stalking him, is aware of all his movements around the flat, and when he is in the bath, takes off his clothes or on the loo, begins stamping on the floorboards. 10. The history we have is that he made threats to her, and she was moved for her own safety: he still feels she is upstairs. 11. Said he had CCTV footage from cameras in his flat of her stalking him - he could not show us any cameras. 12. Simon got out several boxes of papers which he said related to the conspiracy together with his plan for his own business and his plans for a global charity for children. 13. The flat was full of equipment for printing and other things. 14. Simon said he had spent" a quarter of a million" on his businesses including 20 000 on each of two printers. 15. Has thoughts of killing himself "when I eventually clear my name." 16. FH of Bipolar Disorder /Schizophrenia- grandmother PPH   **From previous notes**   1. Tried to hang himself at the age of sixteen when in a young offender’s institution and needed to be resuscitated. 2. He was moved to a high security hospital and kept in seclusion on several occasions. He says he was seen regularly by a psychiatrist called Dr Caplin from "the safe project" (probably CAMHS. 3. He says there was a second occasion where he tried to hang himself when in a cell after he was sentenced Said attended NMUH A and E **2014** after drinking liquid nitrous oxide with intent to die   **Forensic history**   1. Long history police contact from juvenile, mostly connected with driving, theft-? in prison on remand in past Smokes 1-2 spliffs most days, no other drugs, alcohol, or tobacco SH 2. One bed council flat, no debts, ESA, food in fridge, flat cluttered but clean MSE 3. Clean, open manner, engaged well, incongruently cheerful, very polite 4. Appeared euthymic- did not appear particularly elated: idea of harming self "when name is eventually cleared" but currently has no thoughts of self-harm or harming anyone else 5. Pressure of speech but able to repeatedly interrupt without irritability   **Thought disordered:**   1. Tangential, circumstantial, preoccupied 2. Paranoid delusions relating mainly to police and woman upstairs: delusions of reference 3. His comments about hearing having police talking about him on tapes may be elaboration of auditory hallucinations No evidence commands or passivity   **Insight: articulate:**   1. does not think he has a mental health problem: Said he had had all these problems for the last year, especially in the last few months, but felt they were getting worse. 2. He has withdrawn from all social contact except with his mother. 3. Impression 4. FEP, possibly with mood element history at least several months   **Strengths:**   1. Significant part of personality intact at present, was willing to engage with us today Maternal support   **Risks:**   1. isolation, self-neglect if mother withdraws support, potential risk harm to self but trigger factors not clear (past self-harm attempts as teenager appear to have related to court appearances)   **Plan**   1. Declined medication and engagement with CRHTT (as he did not want to give his story again) 2. We talked about referral to EIS and my view that he would find seeing someone regularly helpful: he said if I made the referral he would engage- saying he would be too polite to refuse. 3. He seemed to find our conversation today a relief and thanked us for coming. 4. I did not feel he would meet criteria for detention today under the MHA and that I would refer for assertive approach from EIS as a more proportionate response. 5. Referral via email to **Simon Clark** 6. **Mr. Jameson Simwanza Social Worker** 7. Joint assessment conducted together with Dr Cushion from the Enfield Assessment Services at patients’ home. 8. We could not gain entry to his flat and therefore we had to make a telephone call to his mother who we asked to give us a code for access to communal door of the property. 9. Same given as 0123. 10. His mother is called Lorraine and her phone number is 02082457454. 11. Upon knocking on the door to his flat there was fierce barking of his dog from the flat. 12. He was suspicious of people knocking on the door and asked, Dr Cushion Who are you? 13. We calmly introduced ourselves and called out purpose for our attendance. 14. We then asked him to put his dog away and let us in. 15. He complied without any issues. 16. The front door was secured with a heavy-duty metal door and as soon as he opened the door, he instantly bombarded us with volumes of information, about who he is, he talked about what the police have done to him, explained what his neighbour is doing to him (following him about) and what he is doing to clear his name regarding his assumed criminal or police records. 17. This pattern continued even when we sat down to interview him. 18. He would not allow continuous flow of conversation; he had rapid speech; he was disruptive and jumping topics. 19. He had many volumes of files to refer to and try to prove his points and assumed mistreatment by the police and misdiagnosis by the medical professionals. 20. However, he could be interrupted without him becoming angry. 21. He could not facilitate conclusive dialog or interview no matter what method of interviewing we employed. 22. We kept going around the circle without end. 23. He appeared to be mentally disordered and without understanding of his illness (not insightful). 24. We advised and offered him support for his mental disorders which he declined saying that he is not ill and will not take medication. 25. His mother reported family history of mental illness. 26. His grandmother suffered from schizophrenia. 27. This could be the start of his schizophrenia acerbated by drug use. 28. Finally, we had to summarise purpose of our home visit. 29. We told him that we had attended in order to address his medical as well as social issues:   **Medical:**   1. We told him that after the interview, we felt that he needed support/treatment for his mental disorders. 2. We explained and offered him home treatment which he declined. 3. I do not think that he would engage with the HTT. 4. If he continues to take drugs he will continue to deteriorate in mental state and being paranoid about harm to him from others including the police and neighbours   **Social issues:**   1. A 34-year male of mixed race, white, black (mother is white, and father is Black). 2. He was known to CAMHS as a child. 3. He accessed mental health services in **2008, 2012**, **2013**, **2014** and this year with no records of previous admission. 4. He admits to using skunk cannabis daily supplied by people. 5. He pays for drug supply with his benefit money and support from his mother. 6. A well-known person to police.   **Relationships:**   1. Isolated for more than two years, he said. According to Simon, he is not allowed to go out to certain areas by the police and in particular industrial places. 2. He said that he has no friends. 3. However, his mother has regular contact with him. 4. She does his shopping for him. 5. Activity of daily living. 6. He told me that he can cook for himself. 7. I checked that his kitchen was clean and there was some activity of previous cooking. 8. There was food in the fridge. 9. Although his flat is full of equipment, computers, industrial printers, speakers, and others, his flat is reasonably clean and orderly. 10. His bedroom is not too bad either, has makeshift wall robe he made by himself, and I could see that an attempt had been made to make the bed after night use. 11. **Samantha Bernard Administrative** 12. 24hour notification letter emailed to GP on behalf of Dr Cushion: |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 05/11/2015:**   1. On the **08/12/2015** Debra Came Back Around Here and started again and the doctors done a section 135 on my home address so that they could assess me for Mental Health reasons. 2. In respect of **point three** of Sam Curtis Report: - “*He spoke about a conspiracy to destroy his good name and send subliminal messages to him via the television.*” 3. In respect of **point four** of Sam Curtis Report: - “*Mr Cordell said that the woman in the flat upstairs had been “stalking him” he elaborated and said that she stamps on the floor when she hears him moving around his flat or taking off his clothes.*” | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **10/12/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 10/12/2015:**   1. Mr Cordell was contacted by Goodie Adama, early intervention team worker. He said that he was not interested in meeting with mental health services. He spoke about being victimised by the police on **02nd October 2009** and there was no evidence thought disorder or psychotic symptoms on the telephone. He said that he did not feel safe leaving the flat which appeared to be due concerns about police harassment. He said that complaint that he had made about a police officer had led to that police officer being arrested. |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 10/12/2015:**   1. On the 10/12/2015 | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **24/12/2015** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 24/12/2015:** E |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 24/12/2015:**   1. On the 24/12/2015 Debra Andrews Came Back around here and started again while Stain Curtis went away! | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **01/01/2016** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 01/01/2016:**  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue: 04**  **Page Numbers:**  **Sent:** 01 February 2016 14:36  **To: Bola Quadri; George Benyure (**[george.benyure@beh-mht.nhs.uk](mailto:george.benyure@beh-mht.nhs.uk)**)**  Craig Susan  **Subject:** FW: Debra Andrews [SEC=PROTECT|  **Sensitivity:** Confidential  **Classification:** PROTECT  Dear **George & Bola,**  Thank you for your email,   1. I have only copied you both as there is other information on Mr Cordell that urgently needs to be considered. 2. I received an email informing me that a mental health warrant had been granted for Mr Cordell. |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 01/01/2016:**   1. On the 01/01/2016 | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **05/01/2016** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 05/01/2016:** Stain Curtis Came Back!  **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **2 / 05/01/2016:**   1. Goodie Adama Nursing said he was my care coordinator. Originator Details: 05 Jan 2016, Last Amended by Details: 08 Jan 2016. EIS case & referral meeting: I gave feedback on Simon. I reported that he still remained adamant that he did not require mental health services. However, he is happy to speak with me. Team discussed possible actions - cc to speak with GP and find out if they had any concerns. cc to continue telephone contact with Simon. discuss Simon again at next meeting. |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 05/01/2016:**   1. In reference to **Exhibit** **1 / 05/01/2016**; - Stain Curtis came back   **Statement Exhibit** **2 / 05/01/2016:**   1. In reference to **Exhibit** **2 / 05/01/2016**; - Goodie Adama Nursing | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **07/01/2016** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 07/01/2016:**  **Additional Email Attachments & Emails / Issue:**  2. 1. 2  LBE Right to buy -07-01-2016 03-00  07/01/2016  / **Page Numbers:** 2,3,4  --  **2,**    **3,**    **4,**    **END**    **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **2 / 07/01/2016:**  **The banging Started!**   1. Debbie Andrews (responsible) 2. Stain Curtis (responsible) 3. Mathiyalagan (Responsible)   **Time:** All-Day and All-Night whenever they knew that I was indoors!   1. They forced me to suffer when I provided the correct evidence, as they wanted me to go through tortures act of criminal intent caused by them self the staff and members of my neighbours for their own self gain with no compliance to legislation! 2. The Enfield Homes and the Enfield Council staff aloud the occupiers of 117 and 113 and 111 Continued to victimize me by 3. Loud and truculent banging in the bathroom got worse and this got achieved by slamming objects on to the floor with evil intent of malefactor actions! 4. Then victimizing me with intent of using the same repeated items of the building fixtures to have tortures effects on me within my rented home is unfair living circumstances! 5. Jumping up and down on the floor above wherever they can tell that I am present below! 6. Banging with objects onto the internal main buildings walls and floors, so to intimidate surely me and maybe others living close by whom may be present to an extent only worthwhile for the perpetrators selfless glory, In them perpetrators knowing that their behaviour would only leave all those getting victimized towards getting left by their wrongful actions as to being put into a state of a mental health patient and not rightfully with this occurring within mine and their rented or paid for homes!   **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **3 / 07/01/2016:**  **Disrepair!**   1. All of the Emails I send to the complaints departments do not get processed with the right outcome leaving me to suffer every day of my life!     **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **4 / 07/01/2016:**  **Time Spent Building.**   1. In the background of everything going I continued working on creating a new and up to date Event Incident Control Centre plan and I continued to Study and finish at the Time Start: 07:00Am and Time End: 03:30 Pm! 2. My mother also continues to work on building my company website for me with others at the Time Start: 09:00 and Time End: 14:00!   **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **5 / 07/01/2016:**  **Working at Home doing Court Case Defense Work!**   1. I spent time and resources costing expenditure with my mother also building my defence case, against the allegations getting put against me at the Time Start: 12:00 Am and Time End: 06:00 Am! |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 07/01/2016:**   1. On the 07/01/2016 LBE sent me a letter to the Right to buy my rented property which means as I am a council secure tenant, I have the right to a discount when buying my rented flat. My issue is that by the Council and the police allowing my neighbours to bang on the walls at me through the years they have it damaged the reputation to this flat as it showed the vulnerabilities in the property.   **Statement Exhibit** **2 / 07/01/2016:**   1. On the 07/01/2016   **Statement Exhibit** **3 / 07/01/2016:**   1. On the 07/01/2016   **Statement Exhibit** **4 / 07/01/2016:**   1. On the 07/01/2016   **Statement Exhibit** **5 / 07/01/2016:**   1. On the 07/01/2016 | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **08/01/2016** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 08/01/2016:**   1. Goodie received a telephone call from Mr Cordell’s mother. She said that she was concerned about Mr Cordell and said that she had been concerned about him for over a year but would not specify what her concerns were. Goodie phoned Mr Cordell the same day he spoke about conspiracies involving the police and appeared thought disordered and thought about conspiracies. |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 08/01/2016:**   1. On 08/01/2016 | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **11/01/2016** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 11/01/2016**.  **My 1st Asbo Response Bundle/ pub Book Issue: one! / Date+++**  UPDATED FREEDOM OF INFORMATION RESULTS FROM ENFIELD COUNCIL**/**  **Page Numbers:** 288,289,290,291,292,293,294,295,296  **From:** Lorraine Cordell  **To:** "Ned Johnson"  **Subject: RE:** RE FOI 11845 [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]  Date: **11 January 2016** 15:25:00  Dear Ned Johnson,   1. Thank you for the reply email and the update. I have other information due to investigations I have done and due to speaking to people within the area. That it was not just the one date in April 2014 there were events at Crown Road. The dates I have been given that events took place at Crown Road are. **A.** 12th / 13th April 2014 **B.** 19th / 20th April 2014 (confirmed) **C.** 26th / 27th April 2014 **D.** 03rd / 04th May 2014 **E.** 17th / 18th May 2014 (confirmed) **F.** 31st / 01st May and June 2014 (confirmed) **G.** 06th 07th 08th June 2014 (confirmed) **H.** 13th / 14th June 2014 (confirmed) Some of these dates have already been given that events took place within the FOI I requested. Also, you say you did not serve a Noise Abatement Notice on the squatters / occupiers, as it would have had no benefit to do so as you would not have been able to take anyone to court, and I do understand that the council was working with the owners of the building to deal with this problem. But I am sure if you had served a Noise Abatement Notice to the squatters / occupiers / Building, it would have covered not just to take someone to court. It would have covered the council to have seized sound equipment and due to this stopped the events far sooner with a Noise Abatement Notice in place on the building then not having served one at all. That is the reason a Noise Abatement Notice can be served on occupiers / Buildings under Environmental Protection Act 1990 section 80   **Evidence: Exhibit** **2 / 11/01/2016**.  **My 1st Asbo Response Bundle/ pub Book Issue: one! / Date+++**  UPDATED FREEDOM OF INFORMATION RESULTS FROM ENFIELD COUNCIL**/**  **Page Numbers:** 288,289,290,291,292,293,294,295,296  **From:** Ned Johnson  [mail**to:**Ned.Johnson@enfield.gov.uk](mailto:Ned.Johnson@enfield.gov.uk)  **Sent:** 11 January **2016** 12:17  **To:** Lorraine Cordell  **Cc:** Andy Higham; Robert Oles.  Theresa Dodd  **Subject: RE:** RE FOI 11845 [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]  **Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  Dear Ms. Cordell,   1. Thank you for your email. I have rechecked our database and indeed, I did make a mistake and missed one complaint which was received by our Residential Noise Team on 20/04/14, it was the only complaint received by the Council prior to the ones listed in the FOI response sent to you. The officer who received the complaint tried to contact the customer who made it on several occasions but was unable to do so and as such we were unable to verify the complaint. The next complaint received was then on 18/05/14 as stated in my original response. We did not receive any further complaints after June 2014 in regard to the Man Building and therefore as far as we were aware the matter had been resolved. A Noise Abatement Notice was not served on the squatters as we would not have been able to verify any names given, if indeed they would have given a name and it would have been unenforceable as it is extremely unlikely that we would have been able to take anybody to court who was squatting. The line taken was to pursue the owners of the building who then needed to evict the squatters and secure the premises, which they did; serving a Noise Abatement Notice would have had no effect on the owners as they were already taking the necessary steps to stop the problem. |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 11/01/2016**.   1. In reference to **Exhibit** **1 / 11/01/2016**; - Ned to Mother / This date is about the Asbo application brought wrongfully in motion, it is a request of freedom of information that I and my mother had requested to help in proving my innocence. 2. The Enfield Council is one of the two companies that took part in building the Asbo application   **Statement Exhibit** **2 / 11/01/2016**.   1. In reference to **Exhibit** **2 / 11/01/2016**; - Ned to Mother / Enfield Council gave a reply on this date about the request of data and this information clearly shows that | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **13/01/2016** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 13/01/2016**.   1. Goodie spoke to Mr Cordell to see if he would agree to a home visit that day but said that it was not a convenient time, but he was prepared to have a visit at another time. |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 13/01/2016**.   1. On 13/01/2016 | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **15/01/2016** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 15/01/2016**.   1. He agreed to have home visit during a further telephone conversation with Goodie. |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 15/01/2016**.   1. On 15/01/2016 | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **18/01/2016** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 18/01/2016**.  **Stage 5**  **The Enfield Councils History FOI Indexed**  **Stage 5**  Deborah Andrews / Enfield Council Case History  **Page Number:** 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,**13,**14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,  **DATE(S).**  F.1) 24/01/2017  G.1) 18/01/2016  15/01/2016  **Page 13 of 21**  **From:** [James.Flesher@met.pnn.police.uk](mailto:James.Flesher@met.pnn.police.uk), **Sent:** 18 January **2016** 08:35. **To:** Louise Brown. **Subject:** Cordell.   1. “Hi Louise, I hope you are well. Since **15/01/2016** we have had further calls from Debra Andrew relating to the issues she has been having with Simon Cordell. Given the nature of the calls, we visited Debra yesterday for a reassurance visit. She said that there has been a leak in the building causing 'flooding' in both her flat and Cordell's flat, and Cordell has been making accusations relating to it. She said that she believes Cordell is leaving his flat in two weeks, which I had not heard, but said I would look into it - do you know if that is true by any chance? Debra said that if Cordell does not leave, she wants to leave her flat and move somewhere else herself. While at the address we also noticed that Cordell has now installed a CCTV camera which is placed at the top of the internal communal door leading to flats 109 and 111, facing towards the main door of the block. I am unsure as to whether he is allowed to do this and shall look into it, but just wanted to let you know! Best wishes, James **PC James Flesher 337YE** | Dedicated Ward Officer for Enfield Highway | North Cluster NPT Team B | Enfield Borough OCU | [James.flesher@met.police.uk](mailto:%20James.flesher@met.police.uk%20) | Ward Mobile Number: 020 8721 2903 Follow @MPS Enfield for updates of what we're doing across the borough! |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 18/01/2016**.   1. The 18/01/2016 is an email that proves PC James Flesher 337YE is a police officer who is also in the Asbo proceedings and that a conflict of interest | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors’ Involvement & Enfield Council.**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **19/01/2016** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 19/01/2016**.   1. He was visited at home by Goodie and Sandra Muschett, senior practitioner. 2. He was noted to be paranoid, grandiose, and not eating well. He denied any suicidal thoughts.   **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **2 / 19/01/2016**.  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue:**  620. Lorraine Cordell \_Re\_ Simon Cordell Repair ref\_ 1633429  **/ Page Numbers:** 2321,2322,2323,  **From:** Lorraine Cordell [[lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk](http://lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk)]  **Sent:** 19 January **2016** 14:43  **To:** 'Jackie Gubby'  **Subject: RE:** Simon Cordell Repair ref: 1633429   1. Dear Jackie Gubby, would it please be possible for you to give me a call on 0208? Yesterday I got a call from the repair team in regard to a leak my son had in his flat from the flat above. 2. They had to have a repair team out and shut my son lighting of in his bathroom due to the water leaking into the electrics and blowing out all my son's electrics. Today I got a call from the council saying they believe the leak is coming from the flat above 113 which would be 117 which is privacy owned and someone would be coming to see my son today from 117. 3. The people from 117 have been to see my son today and have had someone check there flat and they are 100% the leak is not coming from there flat and that they believe it is coming from 113 which is Debbie's flat the person my son has been having trouble with for over a year now and the council have done nothing about this. 4. The people from 117 have tried to speak to 113 but she will not open the door to them to see where the problem is coming from. Just a little while ago my son saw Debbie care worker and he spoke to them and told them again what has been going on and he cannot take it any longer, the care worker told my son that Debbie will not even let them into the flat anymore. Something has to be done as this has caused my son heath to go downhill badly and this cannot go on anymore. 5. I am getting no replies to any complaints that have gone in and the ASB team are doing nothing. 6. I have booked a date to see my son’s local MP also now as this is having a huge effect on my son's heath, and due to the council doing nothing I do not know where else to turn any longer. 7. I have just called the repair team and spoke to a lady Linda, who has tried to call 113 Debbie and could not take to her, so she is sending a letter out to113 Debbie, Regards   Lorraine Cordell. |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 19/01/2016**.   1. The 19/01/2016 was   **Statement Exhibit** **2 / 19/01/2016**.   1. The 19/01/2016 could | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **21/01/2016** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 21/01/2016**.   1. Sandra Muschet had a telephone conversation with Mr Cordell’s mother. She said that Mr Cordell had been harassed by the police for a number of years and that his preoccupation with the police was based on reality. She reported that Mr Cordell is not eating, not going out and has poor self-care. |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 21/01/2016**.   1. On 21/01/2016 a Sandra Muschet | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **22/01/2016** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 22/01/2016**.   1. An attempt was made to assess Mr Cordell under the Mental Health Act. Mr Cordell was angry that he had an unannounced assessment. He spoke about feeling targeted by the police. He spoke about being arrested numerous times and had a curfew from the police. He refused to give the assessing team access. He initially spoke rapidly but more slowly as the meeting went on. Mr Cordell phoned Amal Pomphrey, early intervention worker covering for Goodie, and said that he had felt threatened by the Mental Health Act assessment that had taken place. He spoke about being arrested over a thousand times by the police and being subject to a curfew. |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 18/01/2016**.   1. On 22/01/2016 | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors’ Involvement & Enfield Council.**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **26/01/2016** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 26/01/2016**.   1. My Birthday   **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **2 / 26/01/2016**.   1. Mr Cordell phoned Amal Pomphrey, early intervention worker. He said that he had been contacted by a housing officer who had “threatened to get the mental health team out to see him.”   **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **3 / 26/01/2016**.  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue: 04**  **Page Numbers:** 624,625   1. To whom it may concern: I am writing this letter to confirm I do give my mother Ms Mother my authority to speak, write, and email, Enfield Council this would include any department within Enfield Council on my behalf. |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 26/01/2016**.   1. On 26/01/2016 My Birthday   **Statement Exhibit** **2 / 26/01/2016**.   1. On 26/01/2016   **Statement Exhibit** **3 / 26/01/2016**.   1. On 26/01/2016 | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Asbo**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **27/01/2016** | **Evidence:** **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 27/01/2016**.  **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue: 04**  **Page Numbers:** 626,627,628  **From:** Mother [lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk]  **Sent: 27/01/2016 - 18:20**  **To:** 'Nicholas.Foster@Enfield.gov.uk.'  **Subject: Re:** Enfield Council Subject Access Request Simon Cordell.  **Attachments:** **one**. Simon\_Cordell\_authority\_Letter\_26-01-2016.doc. **2.** Data-Protection-Request.doc.  To Whom It May Concern:   1. Please see attached letters in regard to my Subject Access Request under the Data Protection Act 1998 Regards Mr Simon Cordell Miss Mother. |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 27/01/2016**.   1. On 27/01/2016 | | |
|  | * **Responsible Stain Curtis**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **31/01/2016** | **Evidence Exhibit** **BB5: – 1 / 31/01/2016:**  A piece of paper with writing on it  Description automatically generated |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **BB0 – 1 / 31/01/2016:**   1. O | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About Debra Andrews**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **01/02/2016** | **Evidence:** **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 01/02/2016**.  **Stage 5**  **The Enfield Councils History FOI Indexed**  **Stage 5**  Deborah Andrews / Enfield Council Case History  **Page Number:**  1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,  12,13,14,15,16,17,**18,**19,  20,21,  --  **18**  **01/02/2016**: communication between **CSU & Bola Quadri CPN**  **From:** Louise Brown  **Sent:**01 February 2016 14:36  **To:** bola Quadri; George Benyure ([george.benyure@beh-mht.nhs.uk](mailto:george.benyure@beh-mht.nhs.uk))  Craig Susan  **Subject:** FW: Debra Andrews [SEC=PROTECT|  **Sensitivity:** Confidential  **Classification:** PROTECT  Dear **George & Bola,**   1. Thank you for your email, I have only copied you both as there is other information on Mr Cordell that urgently needs to be considered. 2. I received an email informing me that a mental health warrant had been granted for Mr Cordell. 3. This will cause a greater issue especially if he is released back into the community. 4. My fear is that this will indirectly cause further distress for Deborah. 5. A plan needs to be put in place with full considerations. 6. Please can an urgent mental health strategy meeting be held regarding Deborah Andrews, given the above information and the urgent need for full consideration in this case due to the complex needs and issues with both clients, who are known to your services and tenants of Enfield Council. 7. Deborah is contacting me if not daily every other day these calls are coming through at all different days and times. 8. She is informing me that she is not coping with everything and wants to go back into supported accommodation, she feels extremely frightened and vulnerable. 9. I must confirm that its Deborah stating that she is not coping as I am not in a position to make these decisions. 10. When I speak with Deborah asking if she is attending her appointments, she states that" it is a quick jab, in and out no one speaks with you. 11. With regards to the management transfer this is still being prepared and waiting to be heard by panel, I am waiting to hear the next available date for this. 12. It was explained when I suggested this action may be a route forward that this is not a quick process, and all elements need to be considered. 13. It is not necessary for Ms Andrews to currently go into emergency accommodation either. 14. This case will be assisted by moving Ms Andrews; however, this may not resolve all of the concerns or the overall future welfare of Ms Andrews. 15. Transferring Ms Andrews into another independent accommodation without fully assessing her current needs and the full support required should be considered before this happens. 16. As moving her may not solve all of Deborah Andrews concerns. 17. She is only going out when SJOG are visiting, however they are only allocated 3 hours per week. 18. More recommendations need to be put forward to provide a comprehensive package to support. |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 01/02/2016**.   1. On the 01/02/2016: A communication between **CSU & Bola Quadri CPN** took place | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors’**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **02/02/2016** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 02/02/2016**.   1. Mr Cordell phoned Amal Pomphrey and advised that he had been told that a warrant had been granted. He was clearly aware of the planned Mental Health Act assessment. |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 02/02/2016**.   1. On 02/02/2016 | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors’**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **03/02/2016** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 03/02/2016**.  **1.** Dr Al-Allaq (independents 12 Doctor), **2.** Dr Albazaz (independent s12 Doctor), 3**.** CJ and Nellie (Home Treatment Team workers), **4.** Amal Pomphrey (Community Mental Health Nurse based at Enfield Early Intervention Team) **5.** All attended. A s135(1) warrant was obtained but not executed as Mr Cordell gave access. **6.** A lock smith was present, but their services were not required as Mr Cordell opened the door.**7.** The police were present but remained outside the property.**8.** Mr Cordell’s home was somewhat cluttered with a large printer by the door. **9.** However, it was clean and organised. **10.** He had food in the kitchen.**11.** His mother and a female friend were present. **12.** Mr Cordell was expecting the assessment to take place. **13.** He was appropriately groomed and dressed. **14.** He had put his dog in the garden. **15.** Mr Cordell expressed his unhappiness about the warrant being obtained. **16.** He said that if he had been sent an appointment letter, he would give professionals access.**17.** He mentioned on going issues with the police and that he had a court case in February. **18.** His speech was somewhat rapid at the start of the interview, but this appeared to be due to anxiety rather than thought disorder. **19.** His speech slowed as the interview went on. **20.** Mr Cordell did change topic of conversation a number of times as there was particular information that he wanted to share with the team. **21.** He spoke a project to start a community internet site and showed those present a business plan that was on his computer. **22.** He showed us documents which he said were related to his court case. **23.** He pointed out a line in the document that said that all the suspects were white and said that this was part of his legal challenge to his Anti-Social Behaviour Order. **24.** He denied any symptoms of mental illness when asked about a variety of psychotic symptoms. **25.** He denied suicidal ideation. **26.** He spoke about difficulties he had with his upstairs neighbour relating to noise disturbance. **27.** He showed us some letters which said that his neighbour had written to him. **28.** He said that his neighbour has an alcohol problem and a learning disability. **29.** There was no evidence of distraction, confusion or that he was responding to internal stimuli. **30.** It is my view that Mr Cordell’s detention was not in the interests of his health as I did not identify evidence of mental disorder during the visit. **31.** I did not believe that Mr Cordell’s detention was necessary for his safety, Mr Cordell denied experiencing any suicidal ideation and could I not identify other risks to safety apart from possible substance misuse which could not be used as the basis of detention without clear evidence of a mental disorder associated with the substance misuse issues. **32.** I also did not think that the threshold for detention on the basis of safety was met, he was having conflict with neighbour this conflict did not appear to be driven by any mental disorder. **33.** I identified Mr Cordell’s Nearest Relative as his mother Lorraine Cordell. **34.** Mr Cordell lives alone and is single. **35.** As far as I could ascertain he did not have any children and was not in relationship. **36.** His father was the older of his parents but when I phoned his mother. **37.** she informed me that he was in regular contact with Mr Cordell and did his shopping for him. **38.** I therefore formed the view that she provided care and was the Nearest Relative. **39.** I phoned Lorraine at around 09:30hrs |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 03/02/2016**.   1. In pursuit of the 03/02/2016 **1.** Dr Al-Allaq (independents 12 Doctor), **2.** Dr Albazaz (independent s12 Doctor), 3**.** CJ and Nellie (Home Treatment Team workers), **4.** Amal Pomphrey (Community Mental Health Nurse based at Enfield Early Intervention Team) who all obtained a Mental Health Warrant to assess Mr S. P. Cordell.   **1.1 – point 5** a  **1.2 – point 6** a | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors’**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **09/02/2016** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 09/02/2016**; -  **1.** Sam Curtis Report Dated 09/02/2016 - **2.** Contact details: North London Forensic Service, Camlet 1, Chase Farm Hospital, The Ridgeway, London EN2 8JL.**9.** I phoned Lorraine at around 09:30hrs on the 09/02/2016 and she advised that in her view use of a warrant and the Mental Health Act assessment were unnecessary as he would give professionals access if he had received an appointment letter. **10.** She said that he had a court case in February but would not elaborate on this. **11.** Lorraine said that she thought that the involvement of mental health services was unnecessary as Mr Cordell was not in her view experiencing any mental health difficulties and had not experienced any mental health difficulties for a number of months. **12.** I was surprised that Lorraine stated that she did not think that Mr Cordell as the recent referral to mental health services had been triggered by a referral that she had made. **Consultation with Assessing Doctors: 14.** Both assessing Doctors declined to make medical recommendations and were in agreement that there was no clear evidence of any mental disorder during the assessing.**15.** 7 Views of others consulted. **16.** Prior to the assessment the police present advised me that were aware of conflict between Mr Cordell and his neighbour. **17.** They advised that the soundproofing between the two properties was poor. **18.** The police officers advised me that they were aware that on one occasion Mr Cordell had threatened to strangle his neighbour. **Mental Capacity Act 2005 - 20.** No Capacity Act issues identified during the assessment. **21.** Reason for decision to make the application (including choice of Section) **22.** “Given that Mr Cordell’s diagnosis and treatment plan were not clear at the time of the assessment the assessment was for possible detention on section 2.” **23.** It was my view that Mr Cordell did not meet the statutory criteria for detention. **24.** It was not clear that he was suffering from a mental disorder of a nature because at the time of the assessment it was unclear if whether or not he had a mental disorder. **25.** “He did not meet the criteria for degree as there was no clear evidence that he was experiencing symptoms of mental disorder.” **26.** Relevant social and medical history. **27.** Information obtained from reports from Mr Cordell and his family to mental health services. **28.** Not independently verified. **Social: 30.** Mr Cordell was the victim of abuse by a paedophile ring, and this led to him having contact with CAMHS Safe project for a number of years, he has not spoken about the abuse for many years. **31.** Mr Cordell’s father was violent towards him. **32.** “He was placed in care as a teenager.” **33.** He separated from his girlfriend in 2014.v**34.** Mr Cordell’s mother has regular contact with and helps with shopping. **35.** Mr Cordell’s grandmother was diagnosed with bipolar affective disorder and schizophrenia; she was treated with Schizophrenia. **36.** She died from cancer in August 2014.**37.** In 2014 he was bailed for burglary. **38.** In 2015 he was made subject to a 5-year Anti-Social Behaviour Order for organising illegal raves. **39.** He not allowed to enter industrial or disused premises between 10pm and 7 am. **40.** He has reported that he has a long history police contact since he was juvenile. **41.** His contact with the police mostly related to theft and driving offences.**42.** He lives in a one-bedroom council flat and is in receipt of Employment Support. **Psychiatric History: 44.** Mr Cordell tried to hang himself at the age of 16 when in a young offender’s institution and needed to be resuscitated. **45.** He was moved to a secure hospital and kept in seclusion on a number of occasions. **46.** He has reported that he was regularly by a psychiatrist called Dr Caplin from CAMHS "the safe project". **47.** Mr Cordell reports there was a second occasion where he tried to hang himself when in a cell after he was sentenced. **48.** He attended the Accident and Emergency Department at the North Middlesex Hospital after drinking liquid nitrous oxide with an intent to die 03 October 2009 hallucinating after taking LSD. **49.** He was not followed up by mental health services.**50.** He was assessed by Dr Jarvis from the Enfield triage team. |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 09/02/2016**   1. The 09/02/2016 is the date the doctor updated his report after the 135 Mental Health assessment at my home. Below is a list of inaccurate comments; left in the report made on this date.   **1.1 – point 2** a  **1.2 – point 4** a | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Lemmy Backdated Before He Worked for The Council + Dawn Allen & Co About Stain Curtis**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because 2. Enfield Council Lemmy Backdated Before He Worked for The Council + Dawn Allen & Co About Stain Curtis | **06/07/2016** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 06/07/2016**; Stain Curtis Enfield Council History |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit** **1 / 06/07/2016**.   1. On the 06/07/2016 Stain Curtis Council History 2. While I and my mother were complaining for months to the Enfield council about the Asbo, housing repairs and Neighbours attacking me I got treated with negligence by the named companies. 3. I and my mother got left without any response to our complaints and this meant that I continued to get assaulted and forced to suffer on top of the probations in accordance with the Asbo. 4. The involved companies used their media departments to make my personal information go viral and, in an effect, misleading the public into 5. Dawn Alain 6. Geoffrey Oman 7. Loise Brown 8. Jacky Gubby, 9. Alongside other team members who all worked in the same department as Steve Elesmore who is the developer of the Forged Asbo application. These staff all clearly knew Steven Elesmore and Co, as they talk about him and Pat in the Enfield Councils History.   **Stain Curtis Council History starts with Debra Andrews Council History as the first date.**   1. Debra Andrews personal data of History held on the Enfield Councils computer systems got vexatiously forged as the 1st illegal cover up by dawn Alan’s and her team the neighbourhood watch rather than getting the true perpetrators persecuted that they had allowed to violate my human rights by banging on my walls and so forth at me and/or getting any of their past or then present team members held liable for the fraud they created that is contained in the Asbo 2. All of the dates in Stain Curtis Council history and every other person’s council history all got made at the same time and in a rush because of the need for a cover-up of what had been integrated and allowed to continue against my person illegally and also because of mine and my mother Subject Data Access request 3. 111 Burncroft Avenue Enfield En3 7jq - Stain Curtis - 4. 113 Burncroft Avenue Enfield En3 7jq 5. 115 Burncroft Avenue Enfield En3 7jq 6. 117 Burncroft Avenue Enfield En3 7jq 7. Lemmy used Dawn Alans information about Debra Andrews on the **11/01/2016** after he met George Quinton for the 1st time and after George had lost the Bike case dated the **04/10/2016** against me on the **17/11/2016** or their after but before my mother’s FOI had to get served to her and me for my personal data held on Enfield Councils computer systems, that had to be given to us on the date of the **24/01/2016.** 8. Lemmy Used Dawn Alans forged work in his own forgery against me and this is how the information got used for a second time as an illegal cover up.   **What Lemmy done was!**   1. After Debra Andrews Council History got created in 2015 2. Lemmy started work for the Enfield Council on the 01/10/2016 and was given the George bike case to manage by his line manager Kanichiwa who had also just started work for the same company on the date of the 00/00/2016   **Stains dates after Debra Andrews Date**   1. I was not living inside of my rented flat 109 Burncroft Avenue for any of the dates in Stain Curtis Council History as I was on bail conditions to reside at my mothers and did as my bail conditions required. 2. All Stain Curtis could remember when questioned was an alleged incident that happened in **September 2016,** Stain Could not remember any dates or the true events that occurred around the days and months of 2016 and this I important for more reasons than one but just as an example I will list 1. 3. I f no date was give on the first contact and there on afterwards as noted in the Enfield Council history just a month and year then how does the date of the 06th exist. 4. The reason for the date of the 06th is because a date was needed to create a history in the Enfield Council computer system against me and the 06th was given to something in July. The first time any person could see the date of the 06th is in the first Injunction Order dated 00/00/20   **--**   1. On the **31/10/2016** This was the day that Stain became known to the Enfield Council it was not him personal who spoke to the Council bout that of one of his friends. 2. His friend tried to explain an incident but could not say any precise dates as Stain could not remember to give anyone that information. 3. A new employee of Enfield Councils staff took the telephone call who is named as Kaunchita Maudhub, who is an Anti-Social Behaviour - Team Leader attached to the Community Safety Unit and who was Lemmy’s Line Manager who did work for the Enfield Council.” 4. The Reason that I had to stay at my mother on bail conditions was for the following reasons. 5. The Christian Carron Case 6. The Georges Bike Case   **These two-case got me put on bail conditions**   1. An End decision from the CPS was no further action on the **17/11/2016.** 2. **Bail Dates 05/10/2016** till the **17/11/2016** but I did not go back home until the **04/12/2016** 3. **03/11/2016** Jean Barton Called Stain Curtis by telephone, she also spoke to Kaunchita Maudhub by email **-** ASB Victim Support. Jean. Barton @enfield.qov.uk 4. **04/11/2016** Lemmy went to stains house to see if it could help him, and his team get away with the Asbo ongoings that Pat and Steve made. They released that I had not been arrested for Stain but for Christine and Caron setting me up for Stain to help him get away with what me and my mother had been complaining about. Lemmy asked stain about the incidents that had been called in on the **31/10/2016** and stain said he could not remember much and that he could not remember the dates. Stain gave sometime in June and or in September! 5. **11/11/2016** Sarah flexure went to Stains house to see if she could make things worse by making stain remember some dates. 6. Stain still said the same and that he could not remember much about the days and that he could not remember the dates. Stain gave sometime in June and or in September again! 7. This is also the day she backdated claims to help the Mathiyalagan’s and her colleagues get away from complaints I and my mother dad mad about them. 8. When Lemmy and the Enfield Council team made my neighbours councils History’s on and after the **11/01/2017** after meeting George for the first time.   Lemmy added the day of the  06th  **And after meeting the**  **Mathiyalagan’s**  **John Irving**  **George Quinton**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Weblink** | <https://serverone.hopto.org/Index%2011/> | | | **Name** | Stain Curtis / Fisher | | | **Address** | 111 Burncroft Avenue Enfield London EN3 | | | **Dates of living in residence** |  | | | **Page Number and Title** | Page Numbers: 46,47,48,49,50,51,52 | | | **Date** | **Incident Logs** | **Si Note:** | | **47,**  **C.**  **06/07/2016**  **C1.**  **06/07/2016** | **C.**  **06/07/2016:**Making threats,  Date reported:  **C1.**  **06/07/2016**  Making threats Elderly  The defendant using threatening/abusive/insulting words and behaviour with intent to cause fear -provoke unlawful violence - directed at the victim. |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Weblink** | <https://serverone.hopto.org/Index%2011/> | | | **Name** | Stain Curtis / Fisher | | | **Address** | 111 Burncroft Avenue Enfield London EN3 | | | **Dates of living in residence** |  | | | **Page Number and Title** | Page Numbers: 46,47,48,49,50,51,52 | | | **Date** | **Incident Logs** | **Si Note:** | | **D.**  **31/10/2016**  **D1.**  **31/10/2016** | **D.**  **31/10/2016:**  **From:** John Duncan [mail**to:**johnboy0070@virginmedia.com]  **Sent:**  **D1.**  **31 October 2016**18:09  **To:**Kaunchita Maudhub  **Subject:** Contact phone number for Mr Stanley Curtis  Hi Kaunchita,  This is the contact phone number for Stanley Curtis.  0787-0655010  As stated, he is partially deaf so may not hear the phone sometimes.  If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to call me.  Thanks for your help.  Regards,  John Bates |  |  1. Took a telephone call in her notes of a person call John Baits or John Duncan 2. But Lemmy said in his first 12 allegations sent to my mother on the 10/02/2017 that Complainant C   **The Enfield Gov / Email’s Issue: ten**  **Sent: 10/02/2017 - 16:01**  Lemmy Nwabuisi FW Anti-Social Behavior Allegations against Mr. Simon Cordell  **/ Page Numbers: 2901**,2902,2903,2904,2905,  **Lemmy’s Incident Number is listed as: 03**  **2901,**   1. *On* ***31/10/2016*** *a telephone call got received from another resident on behalf of Complainant C.* ***He*** *alleged that Complainant C's neighbour, Simon was using threatening, abusive, and insulting words towards Complainant C. He stated that he witnessed an incident that happened in* ***September 2016 outside the block when Simon shouted abuse at Complainant C and made threats towards him.*** 2. **Christine** | | |
|  | * **Doctors’ Involvement**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **04/08/2016** | **Evidence:** **Exhibit** **1 / 04/08/2016**; E |
| **INFO** | **Statement Exhibit 1 / 04/08/2016.**  On the 04/08/2016 A Mental Health Risk Assessment took place against me again in targeted malice. Doctors abused their powers against me. | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Lemmy Backdated Before He Worked for The Council + Dawn Allen & Co About the Mathiyalagan Family**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **05/08/2016** | **The Neighbours**   * Page 0 |
| **INFO** | **S** | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Lemmy Backdated Before He Worked for The Council + Dawn Allen & Co About the Mathiyalagan Family**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **06/08/2016** | **The Neighbours**   * Page 0 |
| **INFO** | **S** | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Lemmy Backdated Before He Worked for The Council + Dawn Allen & Co About Stain Curtis**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **14/08/2016** | **The Neighbours**   * Page 0 |
| **INFO** | **S** | | |
|  | * **Enfield Council Dawn Allen & Co About My Formal Complaint**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **24/08/2016** | **The Neighbours**   * Page 0 |
| **INFO** | **S** | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors’**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **27/08/2016** | **The Neighbours**   * Page 0 |
| **INFO** | **S** | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors’**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **28/08/2016** | **The Neighbours**   * Page 0 |
| **INFO** | **S** | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors’**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **29/08/2016** | **The Neighbours**   * Page 0 |
| **INFO** | **S** | | |
|  | * **R**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/0000** | **The Neighbours**   * Page 0 |
| **INFO** | **S** | | |
|  | * **R**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/0000** | **The Neighbours**   * Page 0 |
| **INFO** | **S** | | |
|  | * **R**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/0000** | **The Neighbours**   * Page 0 |
| **INFO** | **S** | | |
|  | * **R**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/0000** | **The Neighbours**   * Page 0 |
| **INFO** | **S** | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors’**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/0000** | **The Neighbours**   * Page 0 |
| **INFO** | **S** | | |
|  | * **R**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/0000** | **The Neighbours**   * Page 0 |
| **INFO** | **S** | | |
|  | * **R**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/0000** | **The Neighbours**   * Page 0 |
| **INFO** | **S** | | |
|  | * **R**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/0000** | **The Neighbours**   * Page 0 |
| **INFO** | **S** | | |
|  | * **R**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/0000** | **The Neighbours**   * Page 0 |
| **INFO** | **S** | | |
|  | * **R**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/0000** | **The Neighbours**   * Page 0 |
| **INFO** | **S** | | |
|  | * **R**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/0000** | **The Neighbours**   * Page 0 |
| **INFO** | **S** | | |
|  | * **Responsible Doctors’**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/0000** | **The Neighbours**   * Page 0 |
| **INFO** | **S** | | |
|  | * **R**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/0000** | **The Neighbours**   * Page 0 |
| **INFO** | **S** | | |
|  | * **R**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/0000** | **The Neighbours**   * Page 0 |
| **INFO** | **S** | | |
|  | * **R**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/0000** | **The Neighbours**   * Page 0 |
| **INFO** | **S** | | |
|  | * **R**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/0000** | **The Neighbours**   * Page 0 |
| **INFO** | **S** | | |
|  | * **R**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/0000** | **The Neighbours**   * Page 0 |
| **INFO** | **S** | | |
|  | * **R**  1. The reason that we have adduced this exhibit into these proceedings is because | **00/00/0000** | **The Neighbours**   * Page 0 |
| **INFO** | **S** | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **In Ruff,**  **The 1st Possession Order**  **Exhibit** \*\*\*\*\*.” |
| The text below is in short and beats around the points made; -  The Now Claimant asked a Lemmy Nwabusi in **Exhibit** \*\*\* what was the first recording between themselves   1. If he was a Solicitor trained to educed legal documents that he had tried to order as served.   A Kanichiwa \*\*\*\* is or was Lemmy Nwabusi line manager and they both stand for the Enfield Council alongside with others who worked or work in the Enfield Civic Centre.  The Enfield Council Hired an external Solicitor from \*\*\*\*\* whose name was Ms Lumina \*\*\*\* from a Solicitor firm next to pizza hut in Enfield Town. “I have the recording of me speaking to them about the fraud she allowed to continue and played a fatal role in upkeeping & more”  Vicarious liability  infanticide  Mandate  When exposing  **Got hold of the wrong end of the stick**  **Maladministration.**  **Put one's foot in it**  **Erred**  **Misjudgement**  **Blunder** |

|  |
| --- |
| **In Ruff,**  **The 1st Injunction Order**  **Exhibit** \*\*\*\*\*.” |
| **\*\*\*\*\***  **Exasperate** |

|  |
| --- |
| **In Ruff,**  **The 2nd Injunction Order**  **Exhibit \*\*\*\*\*** |
| **After winning the firstpossession order and first injunction order**  I called Lemmy as to complain in polite about what had occurred.  Lemmy told me that I was a dead man down the phone and my mother was dead as well. After our recorded conversation had finished, he called the police and said I had said similar things to him when I did not as I had just won the frauded cases put illegally against me and knew I was going to win the Asbo case next.  “I now can prove he had attended Court every day almost trying to get the cases reopened against me in the same case number that the Judge had stuck out and was refused on more than one occasion.” The police came to my rented home straight after our conversation on the phone and arrested me.  While I was in the police station Lemmy went to Court and refiled for a 2nd Injunction Order for himself and all other Enfield Council Staff.  They used the company credit card and refilled with a new case number.  While in the Police Cell the police allowed a man into my cell who tried to serve me the Court order, but I refused to accept Knowlagent of service.  The Enfield Council posted a letter into my front door of service, but my mother attended my home and picked up the letter and left with it before I got home.  Luckily for me I have a camera in my hallway facing my front door that recorded me not able to receive any documentation of service.  The Now Claimant was in police custody while a Process Server posted the order in his letter box and then afterwards taken out of my house by mother.  “I will upload a video link latter.”  Also, my past Solicitor who acted for me for the first time in the 1st Injunction Order had a copy of service served of Lemmy’s new 2nd Injunction Order for himself to his upset: I never used the same Solicitor firm again after that”  Lemmy then allowed the Mathiyalagans family to attend the Court and do a declaration of facts of past events that had got stuck out prior and gave them on top of his claims in the 2nd Injunction order.  I complained to the Judge, and he Ordered for the folder to get Indexed.  I won the case in the End but before this happened the Judge ordered for another Mental Health assessment to take place not under his request but by the Enfield Councils request this is all on recording as well.  The assessment said that there was no mental illness on my behalf and the Judge ruled that Lemmy and the Enfield Council inclusive of Lumina rehouse me for a like to like Two Bedroom house as an Emergency transferer and I can have who I like to live with me a support network.  Lemmy tried to argue in Court by the Judge made it his final order putting Lemmy and Lumina in their places.  Just type transfer in the Diary Years.  The Enfield Council agreed to do this once my mother filled out the forms which she done straight away, The Enfield Council staff treated the Now Claimant evilly by the Council and told that the Emergency transfer will go before the board meeting at the end of the month the same happened for three months afterwards with no meeting taking place.  the Enfield Councils staff told The Claimant and his mother that they could not attend and all while the Now Claimant Neighbours brutally attacked him in his home and to prove this fact, he collected evidence on mp4 & Mp3.  By the second month that an emergency board room meeting should have taken place my mother had informed the MPS of what was going on with the fraud and housing transfer and that the issues have not been prioritised as an Emergency, the MPS said that they had wrote to the Enfield Council and was waiting for a reply.  “I did not think this was fair as the Council continued to allow people to attack me while in my home and had a chance to cover up as much as possible rather than an official investigation taking place.  “This is in Audio & Emails”  The Enfield Council and Neighbourhood team lied to the MPS and said that my mother was lying about the housing transfer and The Enfield Council told a lie by saying the Judge said for the housing transfer to take place the Now Claimant needs to accept the Doctors to be in his life and a care worker to live with him, or he will not be moved.  “This was a clear lie as you can tell by reading the first couple of emails about the housing transfer as to what the Jude really ordered to happen because all parties involved agreed in those emails then afterwards the Enfield Council requested for a new Solicitor to deal with the case from Harringay Council named as Michel.  “There is also Audio of this me speaking to Michael”  Michael sent an email straight after taking the case on and said that Enfield Council has Ordered for him to start new Possession proceedings and also called my mother a liar in the emails. |

|  |
| --- |
| **In Ruff,**  **A Breach of a Court Order**  **To Make an Emergency Housing Transfer**  **on the Now Claimants behalf**  **Exhibit** \*\*\*\*\*.” |
| **\*\*\*\*\***  **Discovery**  **The Enfield Council turned their backs on one.**  **Judgement**  **Ban**  **Unwillingness**  **Disapproved** |

|  |
| --- |
| **In Ruff,**  **The 2nd Possession Order** |
| **Proceedings for the 2nd Possession Order never started straight away.**  The claimant continued to violently be under assault by members of his Neighbours.  Most times my mother authored an email to the Enfield Council, they referred me to the Doctors for no obvious reason.  Also, in my Diary under the **25/10/2015** you can see Dawn Allen “Enfield Councils Neighbourhood Team” request of the NHS if there is any Data held on me by them as she had been blacking my mother’s request to protect me for moths prior.  The reply was no and the next days she agreed that they are going to build a history for myself.  Shortly afterwards she sent the Doctors to my house to do an assessment on me without ever meeting me she tells them to brig bite back spray for my dog and more.  Lemmy started work on the 10/10/2016 and read her notes and continued to victims me and build a history for me.  This is all just in a concise summary and there is more to account for were the Government bodies failed me.  Back to the point of this text. “**A Conflict of Interest”**  I received a letter of harassment hand delivered into my letter box by police.  While making my report.  I went outside to the police explaining this was out of order.  Police arrested the claimant and put into Chase Farm Hospital, due to the Enfield Council fabricating more frauded evidence against him  Even more illegal activities took place around this time that I will explain latter when I type up everything.  **25/10/2019**  Doctor green side was not available to do the 24-hour assessment for detention and no other person would do it until he got back from holiday.  People tried to give me meds without any reason or doctor prescribing them  When doctor Greenside did come back from being away, we had our first meeting my mother and uncle were present  My family explained that the Doctors were wrong in detain me  The reason Doctor greenside thought the claimant was getting Heald was for the arrest of spitting at the police when it was not.  After release from the hospital and with no Mental Health Diagnosis my m  I made a phone call to Luminas Solicitor firm based next to pizza hut in Enfield Town who had hired her out to the Enfield Council to take the Now Claimants case load on and explained what I could prove, she wrote to my past Solicitor and the police and took place in the creation of forged documents used in Court orders against me.  which there and the Judge Ordered that  In **2019** I received letters of Jeremy Chambers who then worked for the Civic Centre as Director of Law and Governance.  At this time, the Council and Neighbours had lost all of the falsified cases they had built against me and had never taken anything I had explained fairly.  The letters I received of Jeremy Chambers barred me from calling the Civic Centre and or attending the building in an attempt of themselves stopping me from displaying the true events that took place and in turn making a start towards cleaning my name.  All the conditions apposed in the letters are the same as in past forged applications that I have prior won and in a knock-on effect allowed for me to get attacked day in and night out without any justice.  I requested the right to appeal the decision in Jeremys and Ian Davis letters but due to the past Telephone conversations and other relevant documentation Jeremy Chambers and Co understood they could not allow for this to happen as I have the evidence to prove my innocents and so, he and others just refused to acknowledge my legal rights even further than what had already taken place and continues to happen by way of blanking me.  Jeremy and Ian Davis as signed on the documentation blocked my mobile phone so I can no longer call the civic centre, and this took place from around the year of 2016.  Another point is that the first point of contact given was Deion Grant who had been messaging my mother in the email’s months beforehand and I as well as mother was not happy with the way in which she managed the situation. Deion Grant's recordings are now, listed below.   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   Stage 1  1x Recording  01m. Jeremy passed to Deion grant 11/12.2019 time 09:42  Page Number:  Update Page Number 1,  ​  There are other emails made to the Civic centre and telephone calls relating to the specifics of Deion grant due to being the only point of contact that the Now Claimant can contact in the Enfield Council and its subsidiary companies without facing Prosecution.  ​  The second point of contact will not answer to emails or a request for a call back to myself up until date 10/01/2021.  I refused to have the second Possession Order dropped under the grounds offered and due to knowing that I could prove what had really happened and to win in Court. If you look in audio around the dates of these letters and find me talking to my Solicitor, which I will join / link up latter while still working hard, you can listen to what I was saying!  ​   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   Stage 1  1x Recording  01m. my Solicitor Ronad Ahmhed 20\_09\_2019  Page Number:  Update Page Number 1,  Update   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   Stage 1  1x Recording  01m. My Solicitor (2) 24/10/2019  Page Number:  Update Page Number 1,  Update  Page 4 is the number in document above that I was calling the Enfield Council's Whistle Blowing line in regard to their employed staff and other's criminal activities over the years list below.  ​   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   Stage 1  1x Recording  Civic centre 28/12/​2017  Page Number:  Update Page Number 1,  ​   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   Stage 1  1x Recording  Chief Heather littler!  1st Recording  01m. 1. 1st Chief 29/12/2017D  Page Number:  Update Page Number 1,  ​   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   Stage 1  1x Recording  01m. 3. 29/12/2017 Chief Heather littler! 2nd Recording call back after Christmas Chief Heather 1 of 3  Page Number:  Update Page Number 1,  ​   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   Stage 1  1x Recording  Chief Heather littler!  2nd Recording  01m. 4. 01/01/2018 chief Heather 2 of 3  Page Number:  Update Page Number 1,  ​   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   Stage 1  1x Recording  Chief Heather littler!  3rd Recording  Next week someone will get back to me  01m. 5. 02\_01\_2018 chief Heat 3 of 3  Page Number:  Update Page Number 1,  ​   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   Stage 1  1x Recording  Chief Heather littler!  4th Recording  Page Number:  Update Page Number 1,  08/01/2018   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   Stage 1  1x Recording  Chief Heather littler!  5th Recording  Page Number:  Update Page Number 1,  08/01/2018  ​   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   Stage 1  1x Recording  01m. 31. Enfield whistle rec12/01/2018  Page Number:  Update Page Number 1,  Update   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   Stage 1  Chief Heather littler!  6th Recording  01m. 6. 15/01/2018 Arrested again - Heather littler  Page Number:  Update Page Number 1,  ​   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   Stage 1  1x Recording  01m. 7. 25\_01\_2018 (m)   Heather Littler555  Page Number:  Update Page Number 1,  ​   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   Stage 1Heather littler  1x Recording  01m. My Solicitor (2) 24/10/2019  Page Number:  Update Page Number 1,  ​  Then Jeremy took Control of it as below pdf page 2.  over the years of 2013 to 2019 the Now Claimant and his mother sent mutable emails to the Enfield Council who are also my landlord’s, by the year of 2019 the Enfield Council had allowed for me to get tortured by my Neighbours for years to cover up an Asbo Order that got made in joint enterprise / Joint circler by themselves and other government bodies. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Ruff Notes**  **Whistle Blowing Officers** |
| * **24/11/2016,** **28/12/2017,** 29**/12/2017, 01/01/2018, 02/01/2018, 08/01/2018, 15/01/2018, 25/01/2018, 03/10/2018, 05/12/2018, 06/12/2018, 03/03/2019, 04/03/2019, 28/12/2019, ++++**   **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**  **Stage 1**  **1x Recording**  **Z0000007(m)**  01m. Z0000007(m) Enfield Council reception looking for Steven x 2 Asbo 24/12/2014  **Page Number:  Update Page Number**1,  [01m. Z0000007 Enfield Council reception](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20Z0000007%20Enfield%20Council%20reception%20looking%20for%20Steven%20x%202%20Asbo%2024_12_2014.docx)   1. [looking for Steven x 2 Asbo 24\_12\_2014.docx](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20Z0000007%20Enfield%20Council%20reception%20looking%20for%20Steven%20x%202%20Asbo%2024_12_2014.docx) 2. [01m. Z0000007 Enfield Council reception](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20Z0000007%20Enfield%20Council%20reception%20looking%20for%20Steven%20x%202%20Asbo%2024_12_2014.htm) 3. [looking for Steven x 2 Asbo 24\_12\_2014.htm](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20Z0000007%20Enfield%20Council%20reception%20looking%20for%20Steven%20x%202%20Asbo%2024_12_2014.htm) 4. [01m. Z0000007 Enfield Council reception](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20Z0000007%20Enfield%20Council%20reception%20looking%20for%20Steven%20x%202%20Asbo%2024_12_2014.mp3) 5. [looking for Steven x 2 Asbo 24\_12\_2014.mp3](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20Z0000007%20Enfield%20Council%20reception%20looking%20for%20Steven%20x%202%20Asbo%2024_12_2014.mp3)  * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   **Stage 1**  **1x Recording**  01m. 01 LEMMY 19\_06\_2017  **Page Number: Update Page Number** 1,  **19/06/2017**  [01m. 01 LEMMY 19\_06\_2017.docx](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%2001%20LEMMY%2019_06_2017.docx)  [01m. 01 LEMMY 19\_06\_2017.htm](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%2001%20LEMMY%2019_06_2017.htm)  [01m. 01 LEMMY 19\_06\_2017.mp3](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%2001%20LEMMY%2019_06_2017.mp3)  **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**  **Stage 1**  **1x Recording**  **Lemmy**  2nd Recording!  01m. Lemmy 2 – Enfield Council – 20-06-2017  **Page Number: Update Page Number** 1,  [01m. Lemmy 2 – Enfield Council – 20-06-2017.docx](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20Lemmy%202%20%E2%80%93%20Enfield%20Council%20%E2%80%93%2020-06-2017.docx)  [01m. Lemmy 2 – Enfield Council – 20-06-2017.htm](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20Lemmy%202%20%E2%80%93%20Enfield%20Council%20%E2%80%93%2020-06-2017.htm)  [01m. Lemmy 2 – Enfield Council – 20-06-2017.mp3](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20Lemmy%202%20%E2%80%93%20Enfield%20Council%20%E2%80%93%2020-06-2017.mp3)   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   **Stage 1**  **1x Recording**  **Lemmy**  3rd Recording!  01m. LEMMY 3\_\_21/06/2017  **Page Number: Update Page Number** 1,  [01m. Lemmy 3 - 21\_06\_2017.docx](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20LEMMY%203%20__21_06_2017.docx) [01m. Lemmy 3 - 21\_06\_2017.htm](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20LEMMY%203%20__21_06_2017.htm) [01m. Lemmy 3 - 21\_06\_2017.mp3](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20LEMMY%203__21_06_2017.mp3)   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   **Stage 1**  **1x Recording**  01m. Z0000023 (m) Enfield civic centre 06/07/2017  **Page Number: Update Page Number** 1,  [01m. Z0000023 (m) Enfield civic centre  06\_07\_2017 nnnn.mp3](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20Z0000023%20(m)%20enfield%20civic%20centre%2006_07_2017%20nnnn.mp3)  Update   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   **Stage 1**  **1x Recording**  **Lemmy 4th Recording**  01m. LEMMY 4\_\_26/07/2017  **Page Number: Update Page Number** 1,  [01m. LEMMY 4\_\_26\_07\_2017.docx](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20LEMMY%204__26_07_2017.docx) [01m. LEMMY 4\_\_26\_07\_2017.htm](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20LEMMY%204__26_07_2017.htm) [01m. LEMMY 4\_\_26\_07\_2017.mp3](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20LEMMY%204__26_07_2017.mp3)   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   **Stage 1**  **1x Recording**  01m. Z0000034 (m) 27/07/2017 Asbo Protect me four hundred emails Enfield Council  **Page Number: Update Page Number** 1,  [01m. Z0000034 (m) 27/07/2017 Asbo  Protect me four hundred emails Enfield Council.mp3](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20Z0000034%20(m)%2027_07_2017%20Asbo%20Protect%20me%20400%20emails%20Enfield%20Council.mp3)  Update   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   **Stage 1**  Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed  **1x Recording**  01m. Lemmy 5\_01/08/2017  **Page Number: Update Page Number** 1,  [01m. Lemmy 5\_01\_08\_2017.docx](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20Lemmy%205_01_08_2017.docx) [01m. Lemmy 5\_01\_08\_2017.htm](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20Lemmy%205_01_08_2017.htm) [01m. Lemmy 5\_01\_08\_2017.mp3](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20Lemmy%205_01_08_2017.mp3)   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   **Stage 1**  **1x Recording**  01m. 2. Lemmy Line Manager (m) 10/08/2017  **Page Number: Update Page Number** 1,  [01m. 2. Lemmy Line Manager (m) 10\_08\_2017.mp3](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%202.%20Lemmy%20Line%20Manager%20(m)%2010_08_2017.mp3)  Update   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   **Stage 1**  **1x Recording**  Of Enfield Council Coming into mine!  01m. 01 01 Track 1 (2) 11/08/2017D  **Page Number: Update Page Number** 1,  [01m. 01 01 Track 1 (2) 11/08/2017 D yep to fix.doc](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%2001%2001%20Track%201%20(2)%2011_08_2017D%20yep%20to%20fix.doc)  [01m. 01 01 Track 1 (2) 11/08/2017 D yep to fix.htm](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%2001%2001%20Track%201%20(2)%2011_08_2017D%20yep%20to%20fix.htm)  [01m. 01 01 Track 1 (2) 11/08/2017 D yep to fix.mp3](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%2001%2001%20Track%201%20(2)%2011_08_2017D%20yep%20to%20fix.mp3)   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   **Stage 1**  **1x Recording**  01m. Lemmy House Inspection 16/08/2017  **Page Number: Update Page Number** 1,  [01m. Lemmy House Inspection 16/08/2017.WMA](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20Lemmy%20House%20Inspection%2016_08_2017.WMA)  Update   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   **Stage 1**  **1x Recording**  01m. Z0000007 Enfield Council reception 22/08/2017  **Page Number: Update Page Number** 1,  [01m. Z0000007 Enfield Council reception 22/08/2017.mp3](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20Z0000007%20Enfield%20Council%20reception%2022_08_2017.mp3)  Update   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   **Stage 1**  **1x Recording**  01m. Z0000009 Enfield Council Customer services 23/08/2017  **Page Number: Update Page Number** 1,  [01m. Z0000009 Enfield Council Customer services 23/08/2017.mp3](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20Z0000009%20Enfield%20Council%20Customer%20services%2023_08_2017.mp3)  Update   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   **Stage 1**  **1x Recording**  01m. Z0000023 Enfield civic centre 28/08/2017  **Page Number: Update Page Number** 1,  [01m. Z0000023 Enfield civic centre 28/08/2017 nnn.mp3](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20Z0000023%20enfield%20civic%20centre%2028_08_2017%20%20nnn.mp3)  Update   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   **Stage 1**  **1x Recording**  01m. Z0000034 Enfield Council 04/09/2017  **Page Number: Update Page Number** 1,  [01m. Z0000034 Enfield Council 04/09/2017.mp3](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20Z0000034%20Enfield%20Council%2004_09_2017.mp3)  Update   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   **Stage 1**  **1x Recording**  01m. Enfield Council (2) Looking for Jeremy – 06/09/2017  **Page Number: Update Page Number** 1,  [01m. Enfield Council (2) Looking for Jeremy -](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20Enfield%20Council%20(2)%20Looking%20for%20Jeremy%20-%2006_09_2017.WMA)  [06\_09\_2017.WMA](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20Enfield%20Council%20(2)%20Looking%20for%20Jeremy%20-%2006_09_2017.WMA)  Update   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   **Stage 1**  **1x Recording**  01m. 77. Geoffrey Man Enfield Council 22/11/2017  **Page Number: Update Page Number** 1,  [01m. 77. Jeffrey Man Enfield Council - 22\_11\_2017.mp3](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%2077.%20Jeffrey%20Man%20Enfield%20Council%20-%2022_11_2017.mp3)  Update   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   **Stage 1**  **1x Recording**  **Civic centre 28/12/2017**  Recording!  01m. 49. Chief Heather littler 28/12/2017  **Page Number: Update Page Number** 1,  [01m. 49. Chief Heather littler 28/12/2017](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%2049.%20Chief%20Heather%20littler%2028_12_2017%20NEEDS%20FIXING.docx)  [NEEDS FIXING.docx](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%2049.%20Chief%20Heather%20littler%2028_12_2017%20NEEDS%20FIXING.docx)  [01m. 49. Chief Heather littler 28/12/2017](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%2049.%20Chief%20Heather%20littler%2028_12_2017%20NEEDS%20FIXING.htm)  [NEEDS FIXING.htm](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%2049.%20Chief%20Heather%20littler%2028_12_2017%20NEEDS%20FIXING.htm)  [01m. 49. Chief Heather littler 28/12/2017.mp3](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%2049.%20Chief%20Heather%20littler%2028_12_2017.mp3)   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   **Stage 1**  **1x Recording**  **Civic centre 28/12/2017**  01m. Diary civic centre 28/12/2017  **Page Number: Update Page Number** 1,  [01m. Diary civic centre 28\_12\_2017.mp3](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20Diary%20civic%20centre%2028_12_2017.mp3)  Update   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   **Stage 1**  **1x Recording**  **Civic centre 28/12/2017**  01m. civic centre 28/12/2017  **Page Number: Update Page Number** 1,  [01m. civic centre 28/12/2017 - 20018.mp3](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%20civic%20centre%2028_12_2017%20_20018.mp3)  Update   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   **Stage 1**  **1x Recording**  **Chief Heather littler!**  1st Recording  01m. 1. First – Chief 29/12/2017D  **Page Number: Update Page Number** 1,  [01m. 1. First - Cheif\_29\_12\_2017D.mp3](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%201.%20%20%201st%20-%20Cheif_29_12_2017D.mp3)  Update  Sixty-seven in the index   * **Simon Cordell’s MP3’S Indexed**   **Stage 1**  **1x Recording**  01m. 3. 29/12/2017 Chief Heather littler! 2nd Recording call back after Christmas Chief Heather 1 of 3  **Page Number: Update Page Number** 1,  [01m. 3. 29/12/2017 Chief Heather littler!](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%203.%2029_12_2017%20Chief%20Heather%20littler!%202nd%20Recording%20call%20back%20after%20Christmas%20Chief%20Heather%201%20of%203.mp3)  [2nd Recording call back after Christmas Chief Heather](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%203.%2029_12_2017%20Chief%20Heather%20littler!%202nd%20Recording%20call%20back%20after%20Christmas%20Chief%20Heather%201%20of%203.mp3)  [1 of 3.mp3](https://serverone.hopto.org/Audio%20Files%20Link/01m.%203.%2029_12_2017%20Chief%20Heather%20littler!%202nd%20Recording%20call%20back%20after%20Christmas%20Chief%20Heather%201%20of%203.mp3)  Update |