

incorrect as only he had arrived to visit a friend, and this was his first time at the location and for the true facts of the matter to be that of Tyrone Benjamin being in hospital.

As A/Insp Hamill 01566 states; "at 0200hrs on Sunday the 8th June 2014, Mr Simon Cordell did in fact arrive."

A/Insp Hamill 01566 Could not be sure of the fact of the person that he is stating was at the gate did in fact bring Mr Simon Cordell back to the gate, he does not state that she or he came back with Mr Cordell, who would have told A/ Insp Hamill that Mr Simon Cordell was in fact the person she had gone to collect and asked to assist in speaking to police as the event organiser, neither did he take any name(s) or personal details of the gate assistances. He also states that Mr Simon Cordell would not in fact speak to him, so if this was true then why would Mr Simon Cordell have approached him to speak to him as the event organiser and not speak, as for fact he was just arriving.

No police officers did in fact see Mr Simon Cordell, on the 6th 7th Jun 2014

Mr Simon Cordell will state that he did not talk to any police or council as he felt intimidated.

Mr Cordell will state that he was not given any noise abating order from the local council as confirmed on page 34 by A/Insp Hamill 01566 as he was not in fact the organiser.

(On page 33) A Insp Hamill 201566 states that he see Mr Simon Cordell, at the gates but believed that Mr Simon Cordell was coming from inside the premises, Mr Simon Cordell will state due to the large number of people at the location and due to other reasons and believes of the inspectors own that he is mistaken, Mr Simon Cordell states that he remembers clearly, that of the police approaching him, as he was walking towards the gates, when he was arriving from the Great Cambridge road, and that of the police asking him questions in regards to illegal raves. A Inspector Hamill states that he ask Mr Simon Cordell his name and that he gave him a reply, such as to the answer of "yes" verbally and then A Inspector Hamill states that he asked Mr Cordell the same question again but Mr Cordell would not reply, (chapter one of A Inspector Hamill statement page 33 the 5th line down;) he then states the 3rd time when Mr Simon Cordell was asked again, but this time by the council officers with inspector Hamill present his name, that he would not reply again, Mr Simon Cordell will state that he did not speak to any body, he just listened to what was being said to him and complied when he was asked to walk back to were he had just parked his vehicle. The police officer is incorrect in saying that Mr Cordell was the person that the gate assistant went and collected, as the event organiser, as Mr Simon Cordell was in fact approaching the occupied building and was visiting his friend. He did state this in his first statement dated (24th/02/2015.) Mr Simon Cordell will State that, as he was approaching the ally way were tops tiles is before the entrance gate for progress way as stated by A/Insp Hamill 201566 on (page 33 2nd line up from the last sentence.) Simon remembers it being dark and a lot of people being present in the ally way. Mr Simon Cordell will state that he saw, who he now knows to be A/ Insp Hamill for the first time, at around 2:00 am on the 8th June 2014 as he was arriving and had not seen a police officer on the date in question, till that point of time, when he had seen A Inspector Hamill talking too other people at the gate than him self as he was approaching, Mr Cordell will state he does remember the police trying to speak to him and that he felt that the police was accusing him of being an organiser, to which he was not, so he choose not to say any think, with out a solicitor being present.

The Police and council let Mr Cordell go and he walked across the road to the petrol station, while waiting for his friend to turn up, which he had to give a set of keys back too.

Crown Road == There was no Licensable events or private parties on the 2nd apart from Crown Road that is contained within the applicants bundle, a council freedom of information act has been provided, from local council as proof of this statement. (Exhibit)

(Cad 3151 8th June 2014 page 278) clearly states that the rave / private party was at crown road not progress way relating to cad 3151 8th June 2014 and that members of the public were using Southbury train station, to get to this location, which is across the road from Crown Road the old man building which is grid reference; X (Easting) 534960 Y (Northing) 196240

Under oath to the Dj A/Insp concealed the truth true facts of evidence. Please read court train scrip off A Inspector Hamill below;

(This also proofs that all the cads are linked together and corrupt)

Witness 1 - inspector Hamill -R.O - 11.15am

Statement contained in tab 9-lead

DEF XEX

Intel would be by open source, checked by an officer but was not done by me.

The rave was taking place indoors.

I have not personal spoken to the owners of the venue.

I only see the D on the Saturday on the evening of the 7th Saturday.

I did not go inside, the gates were closed.

I did not see any vehicles.

D'S Van reg is known to the police but I would not personally know.

There were vehicles parked but I did not notice whether defendants van was there.

He was not aware of people squatting in that building at that time.

(Hearsay of officers continues D @ venue but (unreadable text) Officer (unreadable text) Not present here today.)

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.)**

Phone calls received were not relating to Crown Rd Rave on that day.

On the day in question phone calls related to this particular rave. (Progress Way)

Cad 3319 8th June 14 page 283 is also related to

Southbury train STN /Crown RD

(cad 11822 8th June 14 page 302)

Southbury STN cad 2410 8th Jun 14 page 276. Also blocked out so no person can see, apart from the makers of the bundle themselves, when creating their application towards Mr Simon Cordell, What evidence there is to support this claim is the mistake of A and J cars Enfield not being blocked out, as listed above in this document. As the same as many of the other cad numbers relating to this ASBO case, to which if it was not for this error A and J cars, being not blocked out like the rest of cad 2410 8th Jun