

D's evidence is also not merit able and neither his witness statements.

D's Mothers evidence – totally irrelevant – her evidence is based on conspiracy police have against her family.

7th June Witness Inspector Hamill and Sos .Miles and witness Cordell (D) Inspector Hamill (**unreadable text**) miles points to D being the organiser.

Disruption and concern Rave caused outlined by Cad Reports and officers statements.

19th July Inspector Skinner describes a rave and Cordell being organiser, another statement as far as D is concerned, which is totally wrong,

Crimits reports show D as organiser of large raves according to officer's statements.

Test mode out of submissions above.

Consistent Patten of behaviour as by of D concerned.

1) Test of (**unreadable text**) Nuisance (**unreadable text**) does not (**unreadable text**) delaminates (**unreadable text**) of fact, but from Cad Re: alarm distress etc. Shows this has happened.

The impact this has on police resources looking @ noise levels and potentially speculating out of control. – Disorder due to shutting events down.

2) Pc Elsmore: Description levels other D was subject to order has reduced – only 3 – when D was active was significant more.

3) The order is necessary and attention drawn to carefully word interim order.

Def Closing subs

1) Test to be passed can the allegations be proved? Deceived that alleged it may be illegal, it does not need to cause Alarm or Distress.

Page 2 and 3

Hearsay from Steve Elsmore is a copy and paste job.

Pc Parcel not correct to file evidence, of Crimits, which contained incorrect evidence that can't be backed up, of D known for class A drugs and or supply – info is widely inaccurate.

Totality of evidence is hearsay as well as reports at Cannery Wharf.

No proof this was an illegal rave, as S.63 CJO 1994, No proof of Tres Pass – determination not proved to Criminal Legal Standards.

I did xex Officer of @ no time did he indicate where info had come from.

24/05/2014

2nd Allegations – App relies on Hearsay again and (Crimits.) Pages 104 – 107 noted from evidence.

2nd Could hearsay from Josher Holyfield who allegedly confessed that was looking to set up raves (Crimits.) steward not her again.

Page 98-100 – hearsay – from a Pc again – all in 3rd person, no indication that Pc attended himself.

No evidence that it was illegal rave.

??Show determination in view of illegal rave and no proof has been submitted or covers witness as victim.

No allegations where app. Produced 1st hand evidence.

The particular (**unreadable text**) of allegations states illegal rave and no proof of required standards has been submitted, nothing adduced.

It may be unlikely for presumption that given but it's possible.

In XEX. App ?del failed to Enfield Council who did not pursue.

Does it show the organiser or just some one getting involved in things he shouldn't.

Hearsay be (**unreadable text**) grounds are not here.

No evidence police confirmed D to be organiser.

D spoke to police – he gives reasonable Intel calming he can't keep his mouth shut.

A man was states his someone else's lawyer.

This is a rave said to have lasted 3 days but evidence is weak.

Tyrone's presence was untrue due to life threatening injuries – No competent evidence.

Police had Intel Re: Every Decibel Matters of with no further line of investigation.

Additional hearsay, only evidence of van of equipment of hired equipment for free.

19/07/2014

Carpet Right – Inspector Skinners evidence – indoor test of legality is proof of trespass and nothing adducted.

Mystery why no statement taken from owner of keys (**unreadable text**) And whether or not consultations had been given to access the premises.

R V CORDELL

-5-

On another occasion: Mr Cordell gave explanations to his presents.

24/07/14

“D accepted he organised”, Pc Edgoose Page 50 – statement said he “did organise illegal raves” Admissions alleged from evidence, Entirely of conversations of others, not clear.

27/07/14

Same as Millmarsh Lane, hearsay evidence of number of Pc's called and gave evidence.

Interesting that some one other than D (**unreadable text**) led a (**unreadable text**)

Evidence of people living and potentially other's on the land treating it as home.

Further evidence inaccurate Shoplifters.

9/10 August

Evidence of Pc officers does not match up with allegations in application – on his duties odd their being squatters, also did not try to contact owner while on duty suggesting D there at private party – due to lack of suitable equipment, evidence D was attending a private party.

Councillor: (unreadable text)