

In understanding that Mr Simon Cordell's acting solicitor has explained to him that she can not arrange a barrister till April 2016, due to him being on leave, if granted by the Judge this would in fact set the new appeal date to be two months after the all ready agreed appeal date of Feb 22<sup>nd</sup>, if the court agrees to such a date, contained within the time scale of April 2016 and not any time after, due to the court diary all ready being pre booked.

Mr Simon Paul Cordell is asking for a Former judge to examine the role of police officers, who present the applicant cases of an ASBO order against him self.

Mr S. Cordell is asking for this to be assessed and agreed under the grounds of Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights, the Right to a Fair Trial Act 1998, Legislation.

Which in legal terms, should be the best means of separating the guilty from the innocent and protecting against injustice. Without this right, the rule of law and public faith in the justice system collapse. The Right to a Fair Trial is one of the cornerstones of a just society.

Article 6 the Right to a fair hearing

The right to a fair trial is fundamental to the rule of law and to democracy itself.

The right applies to both criminal and civil cases, although certain specific minimum rights set out in Article 6 apply only in criminal cases.

The right to a fair trial is absolute and cannot be limited. It requires a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law. The procedural requirements of a fair hearing might differ according to the circumstances of the accused.

The right to a fair hearing, which applies to any criminal charge as well as to the determination of civil rights and obligations, contains a number of requirements and I believe the causes below full within them requirements.

An ASBO order has been appealed against after the magistrates court decided a decision of guilt, the decision had been made against Mr Simon Cordell, this was at Highbury Corner, Magistrates Court, on the 4th August 2015 in pursuant to s.1 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 it was agreed to make him subject to an Anti Social behaviour order. This was in pursuit for the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis.

The respondent's case is that Mr Simon Cordell has been accused of being integrally involved in the organisation of illegal raves in Enfield.

Part of the Barrister submissions that represented Simon Cordell, had been that the allegations were that he was involved in the organizing of illegal raves, but the applicant hadn't adduced evidence, of trespass or evidence of breach of the licensing Act 2003 which is a requirement for proving, that an indoor rave was illegal. The Deputy District Judge ruled that the applicant did not need to prove illegality, - all the needed to prove was he had acted in an anti social manner. In the view of the barrister this was a very questionable decision: firstly, the applicant based their case on the illegality of the raves rather than the fact of the raves themselves and secondly, without proof of illegality the presumption of innocence leads to the conclusion that the raves were legal, and thus,