From: Rewired Rewired <re_wired@ymail.com>
Sent time: 26/04/2017 06:58:10 PM

In the High Court of Justice
Queen's Bench Division

Royal Courts of Justice
Strand,
London,
WC2A 2ll

Date: 17/04/2017

Between:

	THE QUEEN ON THE APPLICATION OF SIMON CORDELL	CLAIMANT
	- AND -	
	THE COMMISSIONER OF THE POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS	DEFENDANT
	THE COMMISSIONER OF THE POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS	INTERESTED PARTY

SKELETON ARGUMENT INTRODUCTION:
1. This application is to have the following decisions/orders reviewed and reversed in order to prevail in the right to and in justice.
2. A decision/order to make an application for an Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order against the Appellant as named above was agreed in a conference at the Enfield civic centre on the 00/00/2014 alongside their employed staff and members of the Metropolis police.
3. On the 5th November 2014, the Appellant defends in his defence that a guilty verdict was wrongfully decided at Highbury Magistrates Court, this was in order for the Commissioner of the Metropolis Police.
4. The Appellant asks for the case to be reopened and reviewed in its decision that is made by order of the Magistrates Court, so for the verdict to be overturned in his favour to be declared as void making the decision an error in law.
5. The Appellant's human rights have now been breached. And;
6. The Appellant's right to due process has also been breached. This lead to the Appellant's right to a fair trial also being breached.
7. The ongoing of the Asbo case are a clear miscarriage of justice that has been allowed to happen, even once reported.
8. The Appellant's rights in the data protection act 1998 have also been breached in relation towards the ongoings of the Anti Social Behaviour order.
9. The Appellant requests the decision/order that was placed upon his statue of liberty's to make the interim order a full Antisocial Behaviour order on 4th August 2015 by Highbury Corner Magistrates Court, in order for the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis to be revoked.
10. The Appellant asks for the case to be reopened and reviewed in its decision that is made by order of the Magistrates Court, so for the verdict to be overturned in his favour to be declared as void making the decision an error in law.
11. The Appellant's human rights have now been breached. And;
12. The Appellant's right to due process has also been breached. This lead to the Appellant's right to a fair trial also being breached.
13. The ongoing of the Asbo case are a clear miscarriage of justice that has been allowed to happen, even once reported.
14. The Appellant's rights in the data protection act 1998 have also been breached in relation towards the ongoings of the Anti Social Behaviour order.
15. The Appellant 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 dismissed also.
16. The Appellant asks for the case to be reopened and reviewed in its decision that is made by order of the Magistrates Court, so for the verdict to be overturned in his favour to be declared as void making the decision an error in law.
17. The Appellant's human rights have now been breached. And;
18. The Appellant's right to due process has also been breached. This lead to the Appellant's right to a fair trial also being breached.
19. The ongoing of the Asbo case are a clear miscarriage of justice that has been allowed to happen, even once reported.
20. The Appellant's rights in the data protection act 1998 have also been breached in relation towards the ongoings of the Anti Social Behaviour order.
21. It is said that on the on the 12th September 2014 the police attended The Appellant home address of 109 Burncroft, Avenue, Enfield, EN3 7JQ, they knocked on the door, the Appellant was not expecting anyone, the Appellant 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 Appellant opened his front door very slightly then the police officers started to try a force an object into the front door, he soon came to the understanding he was being tricked so for the officers to be able to serve some

documents on him as they would never have been able to fit into any standard letterbox, due to the Appellant's learning difficulties he stated he would not accept anything and closed his door and then continued to state that he was not being rude in doing so.
22. It is a well-known fact on the police's system of government bodies that the Appellant does have learning difficulties andhealth problems.
23. The Appellant 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 stated put it on the floor in front of the door referring to the application.
24. They then put some other pages into the Appellant's letterbox this totalled to four pages. The lady police officer then placed an A4 size folder on the floor outside the Appellant's front door as the male officer had instructed her to do.
25. The Appellant then made a phone call to his mother, who could not attend at the time this was until the following day when she attended the Appellant's home address. On her attendance, she found the folder was left opened on the floor where the police had left it. The Appellant'smother was very shocked when she looked inside the folder and saw the data that was within it.
26. The data that was within side the A4 size folder was personal information and a breach of the data protection act 1998 by leaving such data in a commune area of the block of flats.
27. A letter of complaint was put to the police in the way in which they had left personal information on a doorstep in view of everyone that lived or who came into the block of flats, this was achieved on the 13th September 2014 and was hand delivered to Edmonton Green police station and a receipt was issued from them, at the same time as of when the complaint letter was handed in there was also that of the A4 bundle being referred to as the Asbo application and court summons which was also handed into the front desk of the police station.
28. The complaint has never been addressed and neither has there been that of a professional response concluding any outcome to them issues raised of concern, a total failure of a response from the police, providing any professionalism when dealing with complaints.
29. Please see a letter of the compliant and photos and receipt that was handed to Edmonton police station on 13th September 2014.
30. On 06th October 2014, the Appellant was due to appear in Court on this day, The Appellant had arranged for Michael Carroll and Co Solicitors, to act on his behalf, this included to have legal aid in place.
31. On the day of court legal aid had been applied for, but the legal aid had been refused, the Judge sitting overturned this and granted legal aid in the Applicants favour.
32. The reason for the Judge overturning and granting legal aid was due to the Appellant having known learning difficulties, health problems and due to the complexity of the case.
33. The disclosure was asked for so that the Appellant could stand a fair and speedy trial, but the requested disclosurenever ever did come. The case was relisted for the 22/10/2014, for an interim Antisocial Behaviour Order hearing, all police officers were due to attend for the interim hearing.
34. On the 22nd October 2014, the Appellant was due in Court for the Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order to be heard, due to the Appellant barrister having a burst water pipe and his home being flooded hecould not attend, the applicant still wanted the case to be heard which theJudge would not allow.
35. The Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order hearing was then set for the 05/11/2014.
36. On the 22nd October 2014, all police officers did attend Court for the Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order hearing. The disclosure was asked for on this date.
37.On 05th November 2014, the Appellant was due in Court for the Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order hearing; all police were due to attend but did not. The Appellant's barrister could not attend on this date due to the flooding that taken place at his home address, another barristerturned up to represent the Appellant but had no paperwork for the case only a skeleton argument to strike-out the Antisocial Behaviour Order application.
38. The skeleton argument, submitted on behalf of the Appellant, to strike out the application for the Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order. Arguments advanced in this respect, and those which rely upon the civil procedure rules, are not applicable to these proceedings. The civil procedure rules only apply to proceedings in the county Court, the high Court and the civil division of the Court of Appeal. As a result, the Magistrate's Court has no jurisdiction to consider an application to strike-out application.
39. The Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order hearing went ahead, The Appellant's barrister did not have the correct paperwork for the hearing, and knew very little about the case, no police officers turned up to Court on this day.
40. In the days prior to this hearing, The Appellant was rushed to the hospital due to kidney problems while he was still in hospital he was informed by his solicitor 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. The Appellant then discharged himself from the hospital, because he had no choice. (He was extremely unwell)
41. On this date, the Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order was granted by the District Judge Newham.
42. Upon delivering her judgment, District Judge Newham ruled that it is just to impose an Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order, and that regard had been taken of The Appellant's Article 6 and 8 rights, as well as The Appellants business. District Judge Newham ruled that there are no provisions contained within the (amended) proposed Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order which would prevent The Appellant from conducting legitimate business.
43. On this date, all police officers were due to attend. (They did not attend their reason was they were not told to attend,this was untrue as the application from 22/10/14 should still stand as the case had only been adjourned until this date for the Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order hearing)
44. The applicant's case also relied solely on hearsay, Magistrate's Courts (hearsay evidence in civil proceeding) rules 1999.
45. These are the conditions The Appellant was placed under and are for the whole of the UK:
46. The defendant is prohibited from:
A. Attending a rave as defined by s.63 (1) of the criminal justice and public order act 1994;
B. Being concerned in the organisation of a rave as defined by s.63(1) of the criminal justice and public order act 1994;
C. 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;
D. Entering or remaining in any disused or abandoned building unless invited to do so in writing by a registered charitable organisation;
E. Entering or remaining 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:-
F. Engaging in any licensable activity in any unlicensed premises.
47. For the sake of clarity, nothing in this order prevents the defendant from assisting, preparing for, or engaging in licensed licensable activities.
48. This is untrue as we have since contacted council and police and told he would not be granted a licence to hold any events as long as the Antisocial Behaviour Order was in place other than when applying with Enfield Council. So The Appellant's entertainment business is seriously affected by the Antisocial Behaviour Order that was put in place.
49. Points to address regarding the conditions the Appellant is prohibited from doing.

50. Clearly, the conditions the Appellant was put under are a breach of the Appellant's human rights, and disproportionate due to the fact it would breach:

A. Article 3 freedom from torture and inhuman or degrading treatment:-
B. Article 5 right to liberty and security:-
C. Article 8 respect for your private and family life, home and correspondence:-
D. Article 23.1 of the universal declaration of human rights states: (1) everyone has the right towork, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment.

51. Condition E states entering or remaining on a non-residential private property on an industrial estate between the hours of 10 pm and 7 am without the written permission from the owner of that land and/or leaseholder of the property.
52. With this condition in place, it makes it so that the Appellants life is left in term while as for it leaves him in a state of confusion as to what he can and can not do as he has been left not equal to others.
53. Any non-residential property the Appellant would like to attend such as where house night club or any friends or families private parties he is not able to attend:
54. 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. 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 should not be justified.
55. 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, the Appellants has spent the last 10 years building his business saving every penny with help from his family.
56. The company he has built is regulated within the entertainment industry and is represented by the licensing Act 2003, heintends to hire equipment out, the Appellants 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 Appellant 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 Applicants bundle are indoor events and are therefore not illegal. When hiring out equipment the appellant does ask what it is going to be used for and also makes sure that he and his clients have that of a professional contract inplace, so for him to be sure he is hiring the equipment in good faith.
57. Sometimes when a person tells you their reason for hiring the equipment out you may find out at a later date that what wasexplained when hiring the equipment out is not always correct and that it was not used for the purpose the person told you. The Appellant 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.
58. 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 wassomething that did not even constitute as being for an illegal rave.
59. These are just two more of the concerns within the conditions that the Appellant is under.
60. Some of our other concerns within the conditions set by the Courts are that the Appellant's Human rights are even further breached, this includes:-

A. Article 6 right to a fair trial:-

61. The Appellant had to go ahead at the hearing without the barrister having any other paperwork other than the application to strike out, which was not allowed.
62. Also on this date, the police officers did not attend when they knew they should.
63. The Appellant 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.
64. The police have it on the police systems who done what they say the Appellant has done and have not disclosed that information when requested.
65. The following directions were made:
66. The parties to exchange any additional evidence on which they seek to rely by 20th January 2015, this is to include any witness statements from any witness, including the defendant himself; and:-
67. The parties are prohibited from relying on any evidence not already served or served in accordance with paragraph 1 of these directions, without the permission of the Court.
68. Although not a formal direction, should any witnesses no longer be required, the Judge requested written confirmation of this to be given to all parties speedily.
69. At present, the following witnesses are required to attend the full hearing:

A. Inspector Douglas Skinner;-
B. Police constable Miles;-
C. Acting police sergeant Edgoose;-
D. Police constable Elsmore:-
E. Sergeant King:-
F. Police constable Ames; and:-
G. Inspector Hamill.

70. The interim order was set to continue until 10th march 2015 when the full hearing was heard this was listed for two full days.
71. The disclosure was asked for this was meant to be given by 20/01/2015 this never happened and no disclosure was given.
72. No disclosure was served on us by the20/01/2015 that was asked for; this has happened throughout this case. Thedisclosure we ask for would prove the Appellant did not do what the police are saying within the application.
73. Before the first hearing was due to take place the Appellant and his mother was constantly requesting by methods such as via phone and emails for the acting solicitors Michael Carrol and co's to obtain the relevant information so for them to have the Applicants best interests at heart regarding a fair trial, thought our requests we understood that things were not being addressed to the correct level of services needed, this included a lack of communication, submission of forms and applications and relevant procedures for a solicitor firm to have the correct correspondents ready for trial, inlaymen terms a complete disregard for their clients, things just was simply not being completed.
74. Since the start of the case meetings was constantly being put off by them self's, we had also asked a number of times could the solicitors please go over the CADs, and intelligence reports thatwere in the Asbo application as we understood there to be serious errors contained within its context, our request was never accomplished, this included the questioning of laws representing the case stating it was an illegal offence to which the Applicant had never been arrested for.
75. Also noticed within the applicant's bundles were other serious breaches of data protection, regulations and codes of conduct, this includes some of the following: - in police officers statements;

76. In what is referred to as a “CFS call” in a short abbreviation a member of the public requesting assistance by way of aphone call for services that in turn has led an investigating officer(s) into using a mg11 form otherwise known as a witness statement, to take a version of events of a person.
78. The issue of relevance being highlighted is in witness statements that were contained within the Asbo applications bundle.Serious errors once again seem to have occurred, that leave serious concerns towards any guilty verdict, as for sure when any official person is filling out such a form as a mg 11 there should be statements of truth that have been complied with as well as many other measurements that should be met that seem to be under serious scrutiny as for they were written by police officers and not the witnesses themselves, to even further the rights to justice the Appellant was not allowed to call any witnesses or any other police officers whose information was within the application's bundle he was only allowed to have the police officers that the application wanted us to have, he simply was denied his rights to have any other witnesses being called.
79. The members of the public's statements that could be proved to be no other than information reports that should be classified as non-disclosed intelligence were allowed to remain within theapplication's bundle as witness statements without being questioned by theacting solicitors, although it was constantly being brought up.
80. On the 10th March 2015, this date was due to be the full Antisocial Behaviour Order hearing but the Court had made a mistake and only listed it for a one-day hearing.
81. District Judge Williams sitting, apologised for the error and said that a part hearing could take place or the full hearing is adjourned to a later date so that the full hearing could be dealt with over two days.
82. The Appellant was upset as he wanted this to be dealt with and only agreed that the case is adjourned until the 03/08/2014 and the 04/08/2014 if district Judge Williams heard the case, she cleared her diary and promised that she would be the Judge that would reside over the case.
83. District Judge Williams also stated that this was the 1st 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.
84. The disclosure was asked for and this was once again never given.
85. On the 2nd August 2015 The Appellant’s mother received a phone call from Miss Ward acting solicitors, regarding a statement she had just found in the emails relating to Antisocial Behaviour Order, The Appellant’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. Similar things were continuously happening throughout the case; the solicitors seemed to only do anything on the case the day before the hearings, or a few days before it was due to take place. Many emails were sent including many phone calls that were made to get the right things done, most of the emails went not replied to for months, phone calls was not picked up, or if they were we were told that things would be addressed when they never were.
86. The Appellant attended Court on the 03rd August 2015 and the 04th August 2015 for the full hearing of the Antisocial Behaviour Order, only to find the stipulation and reasons he had allowed the case to be adjourned to these dates had not been adhered to, the presiding Judge was not District Judge Williams, it fact it was District Judge D Pigot who would beresiding over the full hearing.
87. Non-disclosure was again spoken about but nothing came of this and the case went forward.
88. We understand this is only our opinion but we believe this Judge had already found that she was going to prove the case before it even started for the full Antisocial Behaviour Order in favour of the applicants.
89. Before the hearing started The Appellant’s mother informed the Judge the Appellant was very ill and she did not think he would cope due to health problems. She continued with the case none the less and did not ask the Appellant’s mother to elaborate further. Later within the hearing the judge would notice that there should have been medical recordsadduced for the Applicants response within his bundle and this was missingalong with a lot of other documents that had been requested for his defence, the Appellants bundle was only around 82 pages when it should have been around 300 pages.
90. Continually through cross-examination by the Appellants barrister toward the police officers, District Judge D Pigot 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. The Appellant’s barrister even commented to the Judge Pigot “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.
91. This was certainly not the case and in fact, the Judge allowed the Appellant to be cross-examined extremely harshly evenknowing the Appellant had health problems.
92. On the date of trial the Appellants solicitor had not even prepared a copy of the bundle so for the Appellant to have his own bundle, he was never told by the acting solicitors that he should of had his own copy and there was also the issue of there being a lot of documents missing from the Appellant’s bundle.
93. On the day of trial when the Appellant took the stand, the Judge did ask where the Appellants bundle was, he stated he had never been given one, and did not know he needed one, the Judge did ask ifthere was a spare bundle that the Appellant could use which there was not. the Judge carried on by allowing the Appellant to be cross-examined clearly anyone could see the Appellant was unwell, from time to time the Judge passed theAppellant her own bundle.
94. Thought the trial the Appellant because the appellant did not understand what he was being asked, the problem with this is how is someone with learning difficulties is meant to be able to read what is contained within the bundle.
95. The Appellant feels that if he had had been solicited correctly then for sure he would have been better prepared, as for this would have left him with access to his own bundle so for him and his barrister to have been able to defend the Applicant correctly, therefore efficiently. Prior to the hearing this would have been the right point of time of opportunity for any of the support network the Applicant has or may need in place to have complied with what would have been in the Applicants best interest, so for that group of people working together as a collective of people, to have been able to off overseen this case, we all now feel this was totally inappropriate for Mr Simon Cordell to have been apposed to such behaviour and therefore challenge the rightfulness of what was allowed by the Judge to have happened.
96. To the best of the Appellants barrister abilities he questioned the legitimacy of many issues of our concern that we have raised in may of the correspondents to the relevant persons of interest, relating towards this case, one of them concerns that we continually have raised is in relation towards the CAD’s that are being used in the Asbo application, such problems referring to the cads are in reference towards the case that is linked to Progress Way on 6th 7th 8th June 2014, this line of interrogation, such as what has been taken on by members of the police lead to a line of questioning such as:- if there was an illegal rave taking place at the sametime on Crown Road.
97. The Appellants barrister was asked to make this line of questioning, the reason being, after reading the local news papers and making other inquires we new for sure this was a true fact, that there was another party at Crown road on the same dates.
98. It was latter revelled that the acting solicitors had not gone over the CADs before the trial, although they was asked too many times and this should have been a standard fair practice for them.
99. If asked by any official person involved in the on goings of the Anti-Social Behaviour Order, the defendant can and is happy to provide a list of correspondents that have been requested by way of mobile texts and electronic emails by him and his per network. In them

messages he had asked his acting solicitor firm at the time to make sure of any reductions of wrongful accusations that has now been proven not to be correct, part of the reason why is because there is still CADs within the bundle that had nothing to do with the Appellant, what has already beenclearly proven and should not stand as any part of a case against his person.
100. As can be seen in a copy of the Magistrates transcripts of the trial a police officer gave wrongful information while under oath, he stated that every CAD contained in the Asbo application on the dates of the 6th 7th 8th June 2014 is in fact related to Progress Way and there was not an illegal rave taking place on Crown Road on them same dates, he done this to help himself in aid of gaining a guilty verdict against the Appellant, what he stated to the district judge under cross-examination is not the truth as can be proven by a copy of a freedom of information request that was sent in receipt's to Enfield Council and ourselves, to further this the Judge then asked the same question was every CAD linked to the case of the application, and was given the exact same answer yes.
101. Attached is a copy of the freedom of information act which was obtained from Enfield Council.
102. In point of the facts there are multiple inconsistencies pertained within the CADs within the application, timestamps also do not match up within the CADs, there is also all the missing CADs. Some of the intelligence reports also have been updated with no reason as to why. There are also the breaches of data protection within the Appellants PNC record which are incorrect which also can be proven and should have never been contained without the right application granted by a judge, also containedwithin the police officer statements there are errors which can be proven as untrue and are therefore a breach of the data protection act.
103. We know the police knew about the illegal rave at Crown Road because police were deployed there. This can clearly be seen within the CADs which are within the application's bundle, but there is so much reduction within the CADs we believe there is a lot more that pertain to Crown Road, and we can not see due to the reductions.
Part of the Appellant's barrister submission had been that the allegations were that the Appellant was involved in the organising of illegal raves, but the applicant hadn't adduced evidence of trespass which is a requirement for proving that an indoor rave was illegal.
104. The district Judge ruled that the applicant did not need to prove illegality - all that needed to prove was the Appellant had acted in an Antisocial Manner.
105. In the Appellants barrister view this is a very questionable decision: firstly, the applicant based their case on theillegality 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 rave's were legal, and thus the applicant being prohibited from engaging in an ostensibly lawful activity requires more careful consideration on issues of proportionality.
The barrister continued to state that the Applicant could go to judicial review in regards to the case, but gave hislegal advice that he did not think this decision was in the Appellants bestinterest as he believed there is little merit in doing so, the reason he gave was because the Appellant 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.
To summarise the Judge stated she did not need to prove illegality, but she proved the Appellant had acted in an Antisocial Manner, how the district Judge came to this conclusion we do not understand, not one police officer had stated the Appellant had acted in an AntisocialManner towards them, is also a fact that any application for an Antisocial Behaviour Order has to be bought within six months of the dates, there were cases going back prior to the six months which should have only been used for reference, but the District Judge also included these cases to be proven.
Since this case started we knew the police and thepublic order investigation unit held information on the police systems thatproved the Appellant was not the organiser of these illegal raves. Infact, the police knowingly went around to the known organiser's homes and also spoke with them on the telephone. This proves they have the information we were asking for in disclosure. (This was found out via social media and Google by the Appellant's mother) the Appellant's mother even called the public order investigation unit and spoke to DS Chapman, and Val Turner.
The Appellant had not been coping throughout this case and walked out of the Court, the Appellant's 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 that the Appellant was not well. But continued to ask the clerk to get the Appellant back in Court and she also informed that if appellant re-entered the Courtroom and was disruptive shewould hold him in contempt of Court. The Appellants mother would not let the Appellant re-entered the Courtroom, as she knew the Appellant was so unwell and not coming and did not want him to be held in contempt of Court due to hishealth.
Because of this, the Appellant was not there to have the Antisocial Behaviour Order served on him, and the Antisocial Behaviour Order was served to the Appellant's mother on his behalf.
Upon proving the case District Judge Pigot granted all the applicants conditions. The applicants wanted to make this a lifetime Antisocial Behaviour Order, which district Judge Pigot did not allow and granted it for five years within the whole of the UK. With the stipulation that it could be reapplied for when the five years were concluded. She started the five years from the 04/08/2015; she did not count the time the Appellant had been on the Interim Antisocial Behaviour Order.
The Appellant's mother and the Appellant's barrister then asked the Judge if the conditions of the Antisocial Behaviour Order could be defined as there were many points of concern. the Judge wasasked if the Appellant went to a Tesco or Tesco petrol station between thehours of 10 pm and 7 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". I am guessing the same could be said for food and any other non-residential buildings, this would include hospitals, police stations, restaurants, cinemas etc. on hearing the Appellant's mother and barrister questioned this and said "so you think this is in accordance with the law,?" she replied to this "the conditions are precise and plain.
District Judge Pigot then left the Courtroom with her clerk to get the memorandum of an entry, so for them to be made up as soon as possible, this was due to the lateness of the day and the department whodealt with this kind of request would be closed, on her return the DistrictJudge asked why the Appellants barrister was not in Court, the Appellants mother said that he had left because he was not told that he needed to stay, she handed the memorandum of an entry to the Appellants mother and a copy was then sent to the applicants barrister, on reviewing this the applicants barrister said there were multiple spelling mistakes and that the dates from 2013 should not be entered and needed to be removed. She said this would beamended and a new copy would be sent in the post, and until this day this has never happened even though the Appellants mother contacted the Court via emails in regards to them issues, the spelling mistakes were corrected but not thedates.
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, but this map would have just shown the whole of the UK, 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.
The Appellant's mother asked the Court for the transcripts, but was told at the Magistrate's Court does not record hearings, that the only notes that were kept were the clerks Court notes, the clerksCourt notes were requested and the fee paid to obtain these. Upon looking at the clerk's notes there is a substantial amount is not included within them for the full two-day hearing for the Antisocial Behaviour Order hearing.

Please see Clerk Notes:-
I know that a judicial review in regards to the Magistrates hearing is being submitted to the Court out of time, but when the Appellants mother contacted the high Court to make enquiries in regards to a judicial review and explained the situation that had occurred throughout this case she was told to submit the application for judicial review for the Magistrates hearing's and that under exceptional circumstances the time limit could be overturned, the reason that this has been submitted to the Court out of time is due to the Appellant taking his barristers opinion that he would be better to go for the Appeal at the Crown Court and this is what the Appellant did. The Appeal hearing was not concluded until 19 January 2017.
On the 13 August 2015, the Metropolitan Police Service posted on their website, this lead to all the local newspapers printing thestory about the Appellant.
Please see attached:-
But how could the police have printed this as illegality had not been proven?
This lead to the Appellant having stones thrown at his windows, and a gun being pulled out on him, which it then took the police six days to come out to take a report, 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 Appellant, and his family this has been ongoing for over 23 years.
The Appellant's mother contacted many solicitors to try and get a new solicitor to take over the case, each time she was told that solicitors will not take a case on at Appeal stage due to how much legal aid paid for Appeal hearing, legal aid believed the solicitors that acted for the hearing would be dealing with the Appeal hearing so there was a set amount that would be paid for Appeal hearings which would not cover a new solicitor going over the complete case. The Appellant's mother believed it was best to keep the old solicitors on record as it was better to have a solicitor thenhaving none due to the Appellant's health which had deteriorated throughout this case.
The Appeal was listed for the 26 October 2015 but only listed for 1-hour hearing the case was put off, due to the case needed to be set for three days as to the Appeal hearing.
The acting solicitors had seemed to have lost the Appellant's bundle it had been removed from the office due to the office being audited in the October 2015, no one seemed to be able to find the Appellant's bundle, and all the missing documents that was meant to have been within the bundle which was for the case and full hearing.
On the 9th November 2015 the case was listed for a mention hearing, all bundles were due to be at the Crown Court by the 23December 2015. The case was listed for a three-day Appeal to start on 22 February 2016. Discloser had been requested again.
In the December 2015 arrangements was made for the acting solicitors to attend the Appellants mother's home to go over the case bundles, at this point the Appellants 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 Appellant's bundle and the Appellant's bundle was remade as it was due to be handed into Wood Green Crown Court on the 23 December 2015. Emails were also sent by the solicitor to the police.
The Appellants mother agreed to print of multiple documents including all maps needed to be done in colour, just prior to theChristmas holiday all printing was done and contact was made with the solicitors in order to get the Appellant's bundle Paginated and indexed, on 22 December 2015 multiple texts and calls was made to the solicitor due to thefact the bundle needed to be to the Court by the 23 December 2015.
The acting solicitor firm's replies were not being made in efficient time. On one occasion out of many the acting solicitor did not reply until much later, when she finally did reply she stated, that shecould hand in the 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 Applicants case load.
Effectually a text was sent to the solicitor stating that this was going to have an effect on families Christmas and NewYear due to the Appellant knowing that the Court had ordered the bundle to be submitted to the Court by a certain date and this time limit given by a judge not being merited, a text was received back from the solicitors, this stated the following:- "to be at the office by 18:00 PM" The Appellants mother attended and two bundles was Paginated and indexed which took until around01:30 AM. Miss Ward was not happy due to the time that had to be spent dealing with this as she was due to fly out in the early hours to Ireland. The bundles were left with the Appellants mother, this was achieved so that one mastered copy could behand-delivered to the Court in the morning on the 23 December 2015 and theother bundle was recorded delivered via the Post Office to the police.
Miss Ward stated after the Christmas and New Year holidays she would get the Appellant's bundle ready so it could be given to him. The Appellant had not seen the new bundle as the solicitor did not want to meet him, and due to the lateness in which the bundle was made to get into the court and the police, there was not the time for the Appellant to see the new bundle.
One of the texts that were sent to the Appellants mother please see below. Stated: that on the 22/12/2015, "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." Upon receiving the text the Appellants mother wasupset, it was the Court who had set the day for the bundle to be within theCourt, not the Appellant.
The solicitors should have dealt with the case in a timely manner and made sure that things were not left to the last minute.
All that the Appellant ever wanted was for the solicitors to do what was right and needed for the Applicant their client, to which never happened.
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 Appellants to his disappointment, in turn,causing wrongful suffering and loss, this seems to continue to leave the Appellant being in receipt of getting the blame, when he should not.
It was also upsetting because it seemed as if: - the Appellant paid for the solicitor's services then things would have been addressed a lot differently. I feel it should make no difference between paying privately or having legal aid put in place, a solicitor's job is to represent their client to the best of their ability seek justice for their client thebest they possibly can, this was not the case throughout this case.
After the Christmas and the New Year's holidays, we had to keep asking for the Appellant's bundle, we managed to get this in the beginning of February 2016, not long before the trial was due to start, itwould also seem the solicitors was having problems getting a barrister for the Appellant still had not seen a barrister, this was at the time of the fullhearing at the Magistrate's Court, the original barrister that represented the Appellant at the Magistrate's hearings, was on sabbatical leave. It is also noted that the acting solicitors, did not want a meeting with the Appellant and was mostly dealing with the Appellants mother.
On the 19th February 2016 the acting Solicitors put into the Court for a mention hearing, the Appellant believed this was due to non-disclosure, but the solicitors had also put an application into Break Fixture this was dismissed by His Honour Judge Morrison, this was three days before the three-day Appeal hearing was due to start.
"The Court will not and does not accede to any application for The Appellants."
Solicitor's 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 February 2016. It was also said that 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."
This information is very important due to what occurred on the 21/09/2016 when HHJ-PAWLAK removed the solicitors from therecord, as this was done without the Appellant or a Senior Partner of Michael Carroll & Co being present in Court. ("See date 21/09/2016 as more

notes")
His Honour Judge Morrison listed for the case to be heard on the 22/02/2016 in front of HHJ-PAWLAK, this was due to issues that were raised once again regarding nondisclosure and he felt he was not the best Judge to answer these issues.
The reason the solicitors gave to come off the record so close to the Appeal hearing was a breakdown in communication and they also could not get a barrister to deal with this case, this is in part misleading, the actual reason for them wanting to come off the record was due to the lack of work done by solicitors acting for the Appellant, in point of fact the case was not ready for the Appeal hearing, They could also not get a Barrister, and did not want to meet with their client.
His Honour Judge Morrison had never heard off solicitors that could not get a barrister and ordered that a Public Defender took over the case to act for the Appellant.
A three-day Appeal hearing was listed for 22/02/2016, 23/02/2016 and 24/02/2016.
Mr Morris acting Public Defender attended Court on this day to act for the Appellant; the Appellant had not met Mr Morris before this date. Mr Morris had only had the case since the 19/02/2016 and was not ready for the three-day Appeal hearing. He wanted time to be able to go over all the large case bundles and be able to sit down and talk to the Appellant, so asked for an adjournment.
HHJ-PAWLAK was very unsympathetic and said he had the weekend to get ready for this case and that the Appeal would go ahead.
Considering this was the Public Defender that His Honour JudgeMorrison had allocated to the case only three days beforehand it seemed that the Appellant was the one being penalised for the incompetence of his acting solicitors Michael Carroll & Co.
The Appellant's health had deteriorated considerably due to all of what was happening within this case and other issues, the mental health team had obtained a section 135 warrant under themental health act and it was only because of the disdain towards the Appellant from the ASBO proceedings, the Appellants Mother felt that she had to hand this information to his acting barrister, so for them to give a copy of the letter handed to them to the Judge, knowing this would cause a huge rift between the Appellant and his mother. But she had no option as the Judge was going to force the Appeal hearing to go ahead when the Appellant mother knew the Appellantwould not cope.
This information was also posted to the judge, in knowing that the barrister had only just got the case handed to him and hehimself was not ready to take the case on, as he had not even met with theAppellant at this point in time.
Upon Mr Morris handing the documents to the Judge the Judge then unwilling adjourned the Appeal hearing until the 26/09/2016 for a three-day hearing.
The Judge listed the case for a mention hearing also on the 04/04/2016.
After this Court hearing, HHJ-PAWLAK wrote a letter to the acting solicitors Michael Carroll and co that had to be replied to by the 04/04/2016.
See Attached letter from Judge:-
See attached response from Solicitors dated 03/04/2016:-
In the letter that the Judge wrote to The Appellant's solicitors on the 22/02/2016, he asked Miss Ward who was dealing with this case for the Appellant at Michael Carroll & Co, if she knew that the response had to be completed by the 04/04/2016 for when the case was next listed in Court.
Miss Ward did not start working on the response to the Judge's letter until the 03/04/2016 and an email was sent to the Appellant with what Miss Ward wanted to reply in response to the Judge's letter alsostating any amendments that needed to be complied with, as soon as practically possible.
Because the Appellant knew that Miss Ward had sat on the letter from the Judge, in turn, she and the company that she represented, had done nothing about what the judge had requested, this wassince the date of February 2016 and then Miss Ward had rushed a response to be ready on the 03/04/2016, when she had been asked repeatedly to address theletter in a timely manner from the Judge and ourselves. In doing this she had not given the Appellant any time to go over the response she had written.
The Appellant amended Miss Wards Letter to include multiple points that had been missed out and sent it back to Miss Ward viaemail within a few hours of getting it. The Appellant was upset that he had to rushed into things, this was due to the learning problems he has and the delay in getting the letter from the solicitors meant the Appellant had hardly any time.
Please see attached:-
Upon attending Court on the 04/04/2016 it was seen that Mr Morris had also drafted a response to the Judge letter this response was almost identical to Miss Ward's Letter except that it included one crucial section regarding the hearsay rule that had not been included in Miss Ward's letter.
The Appellant agreed on the point about the hearsay rule as he had been explaining this to Miss ward since the start of the ongoings of the case, which he felt did need to be included. But the Applicant was adamant it was going to be his letter that was going to be handed to the Judge with the oral addition of the hearsay. (This was the oral addition)
"The Magistrates Court hearsay rules 1999 do not apply to the Crown Court.
The defence does not accept that the Respondent has relied on the correct legislation to apply under the hearsay rules. In any event, the Appellant requests that the Respondent calls the witnesses who made CAD entries for cross-examination.
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.
The Appellant submits that questioning the credibility of one's own witnesses would not be permitted by the Court.
The Respondent has put forward no good reason for why these witnesses cannot be called. As to say it is not in the interests of justice to do so."
HHJ-PAWLAK granted the hearsay application could be submitted, although opposed orally by Mr Morris. HHJ-PAWLAK informed that Mr Morris opposition to hearsay was contained in Mr Morris legal document, forwhich the Appellant did not allow Mr Morris to hand up.
HHJ-PAWLAK was informed that client wished to hand up his own document to HHJ-PAWLAK against Mr Morris advice. Document read by all sides.
Please see The Appellant document:-
Considering point five of the Judge's letter to the Appellants Acting solicitors, it raises the question of how was this allowed, the Judge allowed Mr Morris to make an oral submission in regards to hearsay in the Court, yet then said they were not allowed and then granted the hearsay application as allowed.
Michael Carroll and Co had also not done or prepared a skeleton argument for the Appellant's bundle, the Judge stated that the letter that had then been handed in could be used as the Appellant's skeleton argument.
Miss Ward was sitting in the back of the Court taking notes of what was being asked by the Judge and what was being said.
A meeting was meant to be arranged with the Appellant and the Public defender Mr Morris, this was not done.
On the 12/07/2016: Informed by solicitor viaemail:-
"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. I am in the process of confirming a conferencedate with Mr Locke, hopefully within the next two weeks. I have notified Mr Morris from the Public Defender Service that Mr Locke is your preferredchoice 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 myself. Please confirm any dates that you are not available so that this conference can be arranged.
The meeting was never arranged with Mr Locke, the Appellant's agreed barrister, until just before the Appeal date hearing, even though we kept asking for this to be arranged.
I would like to say that no option was given to us about a preferred barrister and if any person was to notice the date of theemail then they would also notice that in a period of time it was once upon a time three whole months that had escalated since the said:- "mention hearing" referring to the date of the 04/04/2016, this is even through multiple emails were continually being sent to Miss Ward, asking for things to be addressed and dealt with in this case.
Emails were going unanswered for months by the acting solicitor firm, in fact since the start of time in this case, whichstarted in 2014.
As for the list of police officer the Appellant wanted to call Miss Ward had been told over and over the officer's names required to be listed in the Asbo application case, this list of names contained officers from the Public Order Investigation unit at Scotland Yard and maybe another officer such as Superintendent Specialist Operations Adrian Coombs.
On the 14th August 2016 the Appellant was sectioned under section 2 of the mental health act, he was then released later in August 2016, after a tribunal hearing and this was also due to agreeing that he would work with the mental health doctors and teams, that was put in place, he stated he would be willing to stay in hospital voluntarily, but due to bed shortages, he was discharged home a day later, with a support team put into place, the acting solicitors were made aware of this, and so was the Court in the September 2016, when the Appellant was due to attend.
On 16 September 2016 the case was listed for a mention hearing for Non-Disclosure, and also a meeting with Mr Locke the Appellant Barrister as he had not seen any barrister since the 04/08/2015 hearing at the Magistrate's Court when the Antisocial Behaviour Order was granted by the Judge with nolegality found.
The Appellant was told by his acting solicitors to be at Court by 09:30 hours, but later this was changed to 09:00 hours, this was so he could have a meeting with his barrister, which he did agreed to do.
On the agreed court date the Appellant arrived at Court for 09:00, his barrister did not arrive until around 09:40, disappointingly.
On arrival The Appellants barrister and him himself inclusive of his mother all went together into a side room for a pre talk. Before any desiccations in relation to the case could be discussed, Mr Locke said he was sorry he was not feeling very well and that he also had some emails from Ms Ward, that he had to read first, on trying to open the emails he realized he could not and subsequently went out of the room to call Ms Ward.
At around 10:00 hours the Appellant was called into Court, Mr Locke came back into the room from after making his phone call to Miss Ward, so for himself to be able to have collected his things and he then hurried andstarted to walk back out of the room we all was supposed to have a meeting but on stead he hurried in towards the Court room. The Appellant tried to stop him, so to have explained to him, what his concerns were. ("As we had not yet at this point in time had a moment to talk") and the Appellant was also concerned about the disclosure that was going to be asked for.
The Appellant asked Mr Locke if he could ask the Judge to adjourn the case for five or ten minutes, so that we all could speak with each other, which he replied "no that the hearing was only for disclosure about the schedule", The Appellant said that:- "He knew this was not correct and this was one of the reasons that he wanted to speak with him about." The Appellant again asked: - "if the barrister would ask the Judge to postpone for ten minutes again" he yet again said "no", at which point the Appellant asked "why Mr Locke did not want to speak to him, and should he act for himself "?
The Barrister Mr Locke had no time to talk to The Appellant at the time and spent around four minutes talking to Ms Ward on the phone, beforeending his call, he asked the Appellant if he the Appellant was dismissing his solicitors, to which the Appellant replied:- "No", Mr Locke then started to walk towards the Courtroom, we followed the barrister into Court and on entering the Court in a raised voice, The Appellant said to Mr Locke:- ("who was ahead of him") so am I acting for myself then.? Mr Locke never replied to the Appellant and just proceeded to talk to the Judge and then he walked toward the courtroom door and ushered out. At this point the Appellant had no ideawhat was going on but proceeded to follow him outside the Court room, it was at this point of time when Mr Locke turned around and said quite curtly "I do not want you to speak anymore", as we got closer to him he also informed the Appellant it was not good to shout out, "in open Court," to which the Appellant had to agree with, but the Appellant felt so let down as it seemed his barrister did not even want to talk to him, since the Appellant had last seen him in 2014 and this is another part of the reasons that the Appellant wanted to speak with him, as so much had already gone wrong with this case and theAppellant felt very nervous as he did not know what was going on, or what would be said as he had not spoken to his barrister.
The Appellants mother, who had witnessed all of this, did try to explain to the Appellants barrister, what the Appellant wanted to say, in reference to the receipt of the requested Non-disclosure and asked Mr Locke to explain what the schedule is about before we all went back into court.
The Appellant also asked about the two article 6's that had been issued by the court, which had never been addressed:- "by the Court," which pertains to The Appellants Human Rights and importantly his rights to a fair and speedy trial, to what had not happened. The Article 6 the right to a fair and speedy trial had been handed to the Court at earlier hearings, as The Appellants knew Mr Locke knew nothing about this and other information that had happened, so he felt it important to explain this to him at the time. Mr Locke explained that the schedule was what the Judge had asked for on the 04/04/2016, my mother replied this was not all the Judge had asked for, without replying Mr Locke walked towards the Courtroom and we all followed, it was at this point The Appellant said to the barrister I feel I should represent myself because he felt he was not being heard.
All that the Appellant wanted was to be able to speak to his barrister, so that he knew what had been said at the earlier hearing of the04/04/2016, and show him the document that was handed to the Judge, on thatdate.
On entering the Court the Appellant barrister Mr Locke addressed the Judge and said the Appellant did not want him to act for him, but this was not fully the case the Appellant only wanted to be able to speak to his barrister.
The Judge informed the Appellants barrister to remain in the Courtroom, the Judge asked what the case was listed for and the prosecutingbarrister addressed the Court, answering the questions, he then also handed the schedule to the Applicants barrister, they also said to the Judge that theAppellant had been sending letters to the Court and the prosecution himself, which stated: - "I Simon Cordell throughout the document." This is not the case and the Appellant did not understand their comment or what document the prosecuting barrister was talking about. The Judge then addressed the Appellant and asked the Appellant did the Appellant still want the barrister to act for the Appellant, the Appellant replied "Yes" to the Judge that he did want the barrister to act for him; the Appellant stated that he only wanted time tospeak to his barrister, as he had not spoken to a barrister since the Magistrate's hearing.
The Judge then addressed the Appellant barrister he said that the Appellant still wanted the barrister to act for the Appellant, the Appellant barrister agreed to this. The Judge also stated he felt he was not the bestperson to be hearing this case and passed it back over to the Judge that was hearing the Appeal.
On leaving the Courtroom the Appellant and his mother proceeded to go into a side room to talk with the Appellant barrister, we explained that a letter had been handed to the Judge on the 04/04/2016, the barrister said he knew nothing of this letter, so we handed him a copy for him to read. Once he read this he said he knew nothing about this and had only seen one documentthat kept saying I Simon Cordell, ("The Appellant has no idea of what this I Simon Cordell letter is.")

The Appellants mother proceeded to explain this is why the Appellant wanted to talk to Mr Locke before going into Court, as this is part of the Non-disclosure being requested.
The barrister explained he only knew about the schedule, to which the Appellant mother replied, the schedule had been asked for by the Judge in addition to the letter that had been handed in and this was also when the Judge said it could be used as the Appellants skeleton argument and that this hadhappened when Miss Ward was in the Court on the date of the 04/04/2016 when she was also taking notes, so Miss Ward knew exactly what the Judge had asked for.
The Appellants mother had made a call to the Appellants solicitor and enquired as to what the Judge had asked for on the 04/04/2016 in regards to the disclosure, Ms Ward stated she could not remember, the Appellant motherbeing dumbfounded by this said in reply to her:- “you was sitting in the back of the Courtroom taking notes,” and continued to explain that only last week from the date in mention, will have everything that the Judge had asked for in his original disclosure, plus what was asked for in the Appellants letter, that was handed to the judge and Miss Ward also explained that the Judge had made other addictions in addition to the mentioned.
At no point did Ms Ward ever make the Appellants mother feel she did not know what was due to be disclosed, before and while still on the phone, if she had ever done this the Appellant and the Appellant mother would haveasked her to relist the case to the Court and asked for this to be clarified, as the disclosure that we was asking for was very important to the ongoings of the Appeal.
The Appellant mother then handed the Appellant the phone the Appellant asked Ms Ward about the letter he was supposed to have sent to the Court and the prosecuting barrister, the Appellant was still thinking she was talking about the letter handed to the Judge on the 04/04/2016 when Miss Ward was not.
Also in Court on this date, it was said the Appellant had written this letter himself, which was not the case.
In truth The Appellant agreed for a letter that Miss Ward had written in reply to the Judge’s letter for the Appellant to be amended, he had amended it himself and it was to be handed into the court, the Appellant solicitor was at Court so she knew the Appellant had amended the letter, this is to be inclusive of it being sent to her by email, as she was in the court on this date to.
On this date when Miss Ward was a court she said to the judge that the Appellant had drafted the letter when the Appellant had only amended it, Miss Ward continued to say, that she did not draft the Letter and that theAppellant wrote it, this is not true, at this the Appellant did call Miss ward a lair as the Appellant knew Miss Ward had drafted the letter herself at first.
The Appellant later explained to Miss Ward on the phone that he could prove the truth and said I have the emails you sent to me and my mother of the letter we talk about and me amending it, in return for you. It was also explained to all that we have kept copies of all other correspondence between our persons and this is to include (Since the start of the Court proceedings.
The Appellant mother has checked the dates for when this letter was drafted by The Appellant solicitor and then returned to her, the date was on the 03/04/2016 please see attached email and letter (marked 03/04/2016 Ms Ward).
The Appellant barrister was listening to the phone call and after the Appellant ended the barrister got up and said I will need to think about still representing you as you called your solicitors a lair, the Appellantstated that he can prove that Miss Ward wrote the letter and she’s denying as to doing so and further expressed himself in question the line of investigation by saying:- “how would anyone body else’s feel, if she had lied about them,” the Appellant barrister then replied that if he was still going to represent the Appellant then there would need to be a meeting at the Appellant barrister chambers, at this point the meeting concluded, with nothing else really spoke of about the Appellant Appeal yet again, this was days before the Appeal hearing was due to start once again.
Up to here for now:-
A while after the Solicitor wrote a letter and sent it to the Appellant and the Appellants mother, the date of this received email is dated 20/09/2016 and a copy had also been sent to the Court, this application was put in so for the acting solicitor to once again attempt to be removed from therecord this was done to our surprise and was listed in Court to be heard on the 21/09/2016.
There were large sections of this letter that were incorrect and did not happen so therefore are not true; this can also be proven by the Court transcripts from the 16/09/2016.
On the 21/01/2016 we were on our way to Court and got caught in traffic, we contacted the Court to get a message to the Judge to say that we were going to be five to ten minutes late, “I know the Judge got the message.”
When we got to the Court, there was a barrister that Michael Carroll and Co had sent to the Court to deal with the application; this was so for them to be removed from the record for the second attempt.
The Barrister informed us she did not want to leave the Court before explaining what had happened it seemed the Judge had called this into Court without us being present and removed the solicitors from the record.
We question how could this have happened? Considering, the Appellant was not present at Court? And there was not a senior Partner fromMichael Carroll and Co?; “this question is due to what had been previously said by His Honour Judge Morrison on 19/02/2016 in regards to this not being allowed to happen.”
The Barrister said the Judge wanted to see us and we would need to wait in Court until we were called, as the Judge was dealing with a trial and we would be called in after it.
Around 16:00 hours we were called into Court, the Respondent did make the Judge aware at this point that what had been said by His Honour Judge Morrison on the 19/02/2016 stating that a Senior Partner was not present atCourt, the Judge replied that he could not force a solicitor to carry on with a case they clearly did not want to and that the Appellant could represent himself, he continued to state; that the case was in a much better order now, but as is known the Appellant has learning difficulties and health problemswhich the Court are also well aware of, there were only a few days until the Appeal hearing was due to start once again, how could a Judge believe that a person with learning difficulties and health problems could be ready and cope with dealing with a three-day Appeal hearing on his own?.
We did try to get the Judge to adjourn the Appeal hearing so we could try and get representation put in place due to knowing the Appellantcould not cope or handle this case on his own, which was due to start on the 26/09/2016 for a three-day hearing, the Judge said he would not allow this and that the Appeal hearing would go ahead no matter what. It seems againthat the Appellant was being blamed for what was ongoing in this case, when the Appellant and the Appellant mother had done all they could, so for them to have this case ready to be heard.
How can a Judge expect someone that is known to be ill and have learning difficulties to be able to handle this case on their own?, considering there were only four days until the three-day Appeal hearing was due to start. Nothing was put in place by the Judge to help the Appellant in any way. TheAppellant was just meant to get on with the case all on his own under themcircumstances.
Once again the solicitors had done nothing for this case and the Judge had allowed them to walk away when this was said to not be allowed and it seems as if everything was being blamed on the Appellant.
It was also noted while we had been waiting outside the Court that the bundles we had been working from was the very first set of the application bundles and since that time everything had been updated, without us being informed, this included more statements from the police officer in charge of the case, there were lots of documents missing from within the first bundle due to the update, so until he was given the updated bundles, the Appellant hadnever seen them additional documents.
It was stated by the respondent they had sent new bundles to the acting solicitors Michael Carroll and co three times since the being of January 2016, we had never been given a set of new bundles since this case had started in 2014, we had never been told about new bundles been sent and never given a new copy of any bundle. This meant that bundle we had would have had all wrong page numbers

and been paginated totally different from the bundles that were being used by the prosecution barrister and Courts.
When we were in Court we did say this to the Judge about the bundles, the Judge ordered the clerk of the Court to contact Michael Carroll and Co solicitors and order the solicitors to bring the bundles to Court. The solicitors informed the clerk that the bundles were at Nexus Chambers, theJudge was shocked that the solicitors did not have a copy of the bundles attheir office. The Appellant's uncle who was also at Court said to the Judge he was willing to go to Nexus Chambers and pick the bundles up.
The Judge listed this for the 22/09/2016 after 14:00 hours to make sure we were all working from them same set of bundles.
Upon The Appellant's uncle getting home it was seen that the bundle he had collected was not the full set of bundles and only had part of the applications Skeleton Bundle.
On the 22 September 2016 we attended Court to inform the Judge we 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 wasgoing on within the bundles, the Judge was very upset that we still did not have the bundles for the case, the Judge asked for the bundles to be brought toCourt before 4 PM, The Appellant's mother stated that it would be easier and faster for her to pick the bundles up from the solicitors on the way home from Court, the Judge asked if she was sure that he could get them brought to Court she stated that it be faster for her to pick the bundles up from the solicitors on my way home.
When we left Court due to the time and the circumstances we had been placed in The Appellant mother called Michael Carroll's office to say what time we would be there by, The Appellant mother was told that the office would be closed by the time we got there so The Appellant mother agreed to pick the bundles up first thing in the morning on 23 September 2016.
On 23-09-2016 The Appellant mother left home early in the morning to go to Michael Carroll's office and collect the bundles with her brother, Mr A Cordell they went into the office together to get the bundles, when the solicitor came down the stairs he had a piece of paper that The Appellant mother needed to sign, stating that the bundles had been collected from theoffice.
Upon getting home and looking at the bundles, The Appellant mother noticed there is now at least 13 additional statements that The Appellant and The Appellant mother had never seen before from the Respondent bundle, this is a clear error as we knew that in the first bundle there were only 4 publicwitness statements and there now seems to be 16, 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 4 contained in the folder minus one, this also highlighted that each member of the public's statements arepolice officers only and have each put there signatures on two different statements each, in a pretence of portraying to own two houses each in Edmonton xxx Gardens and other surrounding roads in an around Progress way, the police officers are claiming to be victims of this case while on active duty.
So in understanding this, the Applicant contacted Edmonton police stations lost property room, so too for him to arrange collection of the original bundle, that was neverserved to him in accordance with the law. To his further upset and disappointment of justice he was to be told by another police officer deployed at the lost property room as the manager, that the bundle that the Appellant wanted to claim had been misplaced or stolen, this file clearly shows thatthere was only ever four potential members of the publics witness statements attached within side of the original Asbo application.
Some of the statements added are all dated prior to the Magistrates Court trial. Upon looking at The Appellant's bundles it seemed this had not been updated or indexed since 2015, so all the new documents that had been submitted to be added to The Appellant's bundle was not in their as they should have been.
Over the days leading up to this, The Appellant 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 was always problems at court due to this not being completed correctly.
Though the case history multiple documents had been handed to the Court and those documents did not get patronised correctly or indexed into The Appellant's bundles, this includes the court and the Respondent bundles that they were using also.
A whole weekend was spent trying to add missing documents to the Appellant's bundle and making copies so that on the Court date of the 26-09-2016; any missing files could be added to the Respondent bundle and the three Judge's bundles. The Appellant health had become very unstable due to him knowing that he was going to have to be dealing with this himself.
The Appellant mother also spent part of the weekend also writing a letter to the Judge in regards to what had gone on with the breaches in TheAppellant'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 was always being raised when at Court and the reason as to whylegal aid had been granted:-

- Due to the complexity of the case:-
- Due to The Appellant's learning difficulties:-
- Due to the concerns of The Appellant health.

This letter was emailed to the Court and asked to be passed to the Judge.
Please see letter that was emailed to the judge:-
The 26 September 2016 the three-day Appeal hearing was due to start, The Appellant was so unwell that there was no way he could attend Court, Mr A Cordell and Miss L Cordell attended Court to speak to the Judge, when the Judge entered the Courtroom he stated that he had received a letter that had to be addressed, he stated that he felt this would go to judicial review, he stated he had three options:
Carry on with the Appeal in the hope that The Appellant would turn up the following day.

- To Dismiss the Appeal:-
- Adjourn the Appeal to a new date.

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.
The Judge decided to adjourn the case until the 16/01/2017; this was later changed for the Appeal to start on the 17/01/2017. The Respondent had tried to object to the Appeal being adjourned. The Judge stated that we should try to find a new solicitor to take on the Appeal and that he would help and also make sure that legal aid was in place.
The Judge asked why The Appellant was not in Court. The Appellant mother stated The Appellant had become so unwell due to what was going on in this case and that he was not coping. Information was passed to the Judge that showed The Appellant was unwell.
Mentioned in court; was also the missing documents that was missing from The Appellant's bundle, and that there were no statements within the bundle, my mother stated to the Judge that she had spent a lot of the weekend trying to update The Appellant's bundle and make sure that it was indexed correctly. The Appellant handed the documents in to the court that The Appellant mother was able to get ready with the new indexing, the Appellant mother also stated that she knew there was still documents missing from The Appellant's bundle, which she was not sure about neither had she been given time in which to add them. The Appellant mother also stated that there was around thirteen statements that had never been seen and that were now contained within theRespondent bundle that was dated prior to the Magistrate's trial.
The Judge was very unhappy and passed the Applicants mother his own bundle for her to check by seeing if the Courts bundles had been updated, upon looking into the Judge's bundle, she noticed that his bundle had also not been updated since 2015, the Appellant motherpassed the Judge's bundle back up the judge while explaining to him that his folder had not been updated. At this the Respondent stated they would make new copies of the bundles and have copies sent to us and the Judge.

The Judge was very unhappy and said he was not going to allow this to be dropped and 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 regards to the missing documents.
I stated I would try and add as many missing documents as I could but was unsure of what documents were missing, the reason being; as so much had been handed to the court and solicitors.
The Appellant mother asked the Judge if the Appellant would need to attend Court on the 14/10/2016, as the hearing was due to only be regards to the missing documents, The Appellant mother felt TheAppellant did not need to be there the Judge agreed to this.
On the 14 October 2016 Mr A Cordell and the Appellant's mother attended Court on this date, the solicitors did not turn up, The Appellant mother had a list of documents that she had made up and indexed that needed to be added to The Appellant's bundle's, which she passed to the Judge. She stated to the Judge that she could not be sure if there were still documents missing. She also stated that she had tried to call Miss Ward and had no reply. The Judge was very upset that the solicitors had not turned up; the Judge again got the clerk of the Court to email Michael Carroll and co to tell them that they had to be in Court on the 19/10/2016.
The Appellant 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, 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.
Again The Appellant mother asked the Judge if The Appellant needed to attend Court on the next date, to which the Judge replied no.
On the 19/10/2016 again Mr A Cordell and the Appellants mother attended Court, to find out that once again the solicitors was not in attendance, the Judge had received a letter from Michael Carroll co,stating that Miss Ward no longer worked for the company, the Judge was veryupset 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.
The Appellants mother again stated to the Judge that she had made many phone calls to other solicitors to try and get them to take over the Appeal, and due to the case being Appeal stage no one was willing to take the Appeal on due to the cost they would not get under legal aid and that it was a set amount agreed for all cases, as legal aid believed that the solicitors dealing with the Appeal would be the same solicitors that dealt with the original trial, so should not incur this additional cost as Appeals are set at a standard rate, so any solicitor taking on a case would not get paid to go over the complete bundles because this had all ready been paid to the pastsolicitor firm before hand and this would include to take updated instructions from any client.
When the Appellant mother got home she again tried to call Miss Ward, this was with no reply she done this by texting her with no receipt of reply.
On the 25/10/2016 again Mr A Cordell and I attended Court, once again the solicitors was not in attendance, the Judge was very upset and done an Internet search under Miss Ward's name to find out if she was working under a new solicitor, he found the new solicitors and sent an email demanding that Miss Ward attended Court on the 11/11/2016.
Again The Appellant mother stated to the Judge that she had made many phone calls to other solicitors and due to the casebeing Appeal stage no one was willing to take the Appeal on and this was due to the cost they would get under legal aid.
When The Appellants mother got home from Court at 15:48 she received a phone call from Miss Ward, she stated that she knew nothing about, what had happened meaning that she did not no the Judge hadasked her to attend Court further to the explained that Michael Carroll and Co had not informed her in regards to any emails sent from the Court.
The Appellant mother said to Miss Ward while on the telephone that she herself had previously tried to call her, this was to include the sent textmessages that she had spent inclusively but Miss Ward had not replied or picked the phone up.
Miss Ward stated 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 Appellants and his family members.
The Appellant mother and Miss Ward arranged to a meeting on the 27/10/2016, to go over The Appellant's bundle "case load" to check for any missing documents.
On the 27/10/2016 The Appellant mother meet with Miss Ward to go over The Appellant's bundle, upon looking at the bundle and the documents that The Appellant mother had added and indexed Miss Ward stated she believed there were no missing files, as time has gone on I have found other documents that should have been in The Appellant's bundle that were missing. These have never been added as The Appellant mother did not want to have to go back to the Judge and say there were more documents that were missing.
Miss Ward stated she had to attend Court but gave a different date that the Judge had ordered her to be there, The Appellantmother stated to her that the Judge had given the date of the 11/11/2016 when we was in Court, Miss Ward stated that this was not what was put into the email that was sent to the company Miss Ward now worked for. The Appellant motherstated she would send an email over to the Court to tell the Court that they had met up and checked the Appellant's bundle and they believed there were no more documents missing at that point.
On the 01/11/2016 The Appellant mother wrote an email to the Judge to state that there had been a meeting with Miss Ward and they had gone over The Appellant's bundle and believed there were no documents missing now. The Appellant 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 this be confirmed via email.
On the 02/11/2016 The Appellant mother received a reply from Wood Green Crown Court from the Judge stating that we did not need to attend on the 11/11/2016 and the date would be vacated.
On the 19/12/2016 The Appellant mother sent an email to the Judge this was in regards to still not finding a solicitor, that was willing to take the Appeal on, The Appellant mother asked the Judge to help in regards to getting a solicitor to act for The Appellant regarding the Appeal as time was becoming short for the Appeal hearing.
On the 21/12/2016 The Appellant mother received a reply in her email from the Judge; this explained that the Judge could not help with a solicitor. The Appellant mother and Appellant still did not give up, they both carried on trying to find one that was willing to take the Appeal on for The Appellant, the Appellant and his mother was upset 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 that time was short for when the Appeal hearing was to take place, as this was due to start soon after. The Appellant and his mother did not wait till the last minute to ask the Judge for help and was then told by the Judge that he could not help.
On the 12/01/2016 late in the day The Appellant mother was given a number form a solicitor's of a solicitor's called MK-Law, that maybe could help and take the Appeal on, The Appellants mother called them as they were the first solicitor's in the list she was given.
The entire of the solicitor's firms that had been contacted prior to September 2016 had simply refused to act in the case; the reason given was because the case was at an Appeal stage. 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 notthink the Judge will agree to this as in September 2016 the Judge had stated he would not adjourn it again.
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 ameeting with The Appellant and

take instructions due to the weekend.
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.
The Appellant's health had deteriorated, when The Appellant's mother told The Appellant 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 andmeet the barrister that the new solicitors was sending, the problem was that this person could change at any time.
The Appellant does not leave his home which he treats as his prison cell due to the Asbo case and prudery the police havecommitted and no disciplinarily action, punishment, being brought into motion for there wrongful actions.
On the 17 January 2016, the Appellant and his mother attended the Court, the new barrister was there also for The Appellant, so was the Appellants uncle, we all went into a side room and the barrister spoke to The Appellant, 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 Appellant, The Appellant 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 anadjournment would be needed for the new solicitors to act in a professionalmanner 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.
We were called into Court and the barrister spoke to the Judge, explained the situation and that he was asking for an adjournment, he spoke to the Judge in regards to the legal aid, and having the appeal ready for there new client and having time to be able to deal with it in a professional manner for there client. 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. Calls was also made to MichaelCarroll and Co who stated that when they was removed from the record that the legal aid that was in place at the time had been revoked.
The case was called back into Court and the barrister explained that the legal aid department could not say whether or not the legal aid had been revoked, but when a call was placed to the old solicitors Michael Carroll and co they had said that the legal aid that was in place had been revoked. The Judge handed the barrister a certificate of legal aid, the barrister stated that the certificate was not proof that the legal aid had not been revoked.
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.
At this the Judge stated, well if you cannot be ready by tomorrow, then The Appellant will have to act for himself, we will not adjourn the Appeal again.
It seems again The Appellant was being put at blame for the delay in the Appeal, but it was not due to The Appellant, TheAppellant only wanted a fair hearing and Appeal from when this started in 2014 and from what was going on this clearly had not been.
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 was imposed by the Magistrates Court, 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. This was not the first time the Judge had mentioned the conditions that TheAppellant was under, but this time the Judge went further to include what sections he thought were disproportional, to the people in the Court The Appellant, Mr A Cordell, Miss L Cordell, and The Appellants 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. But this was before the Appeal had even been heard, why a Judge would state this without even hearing theAppeal.
The Judge would not allow an adjournment and stated The Appellant could represent himself if the barrister could not beready by 10 0'clock the next morning, the Judge raised and left the Courtroom.
The Appellant 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 Judgeremoved his old solicitors, he felt very let down and just wanted to go home.
The barrister called us into a side room and had to ask The Appellant due to what the Judge has said, if they were to change the conditions to something appropriate would The Appellant accept it. This put further stress on The Appellant, The Appellant knew he had done nothing wrong and had not done what the police was saying he had done and The Appellant knew that if the disclosure had been given it would have proven this. The police have been unwilling to give any disclosure since this case started.
The Appellant was not willing to accept having the conditions changed and accepting the Antisocial Behaviour Order as this would have said he was guilty; The Appellant was not willing to accept something he knew he was not guilty of.
The Appellant was so distressed all the way home, he felt he would never get justice.
Later that day The Appellant'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. The Appellant's and his mother could totally understand this.
A vulnerable person should not be forced into a position where they have to act on their own behalf, in the opinion of manypractitioners, detrimental to the administration of justice. But this is exactly what had happened, The Appellant and The Appellant mothers and others cannot understand or see any reason why the Judge did not allow for a shortadjournment so that The Appellant had proper representation in place, especially when there was a solicitors company willing to take on the Appeal hearing, in turn to allow a fair Appeal hearing.
The Appellant'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 Appellant was entitled to legal aid, if The Appellant or his family could have afforded to pay privately for a solicitors company to act for The Appellantthis would have been done a long time ago. Justice is meant to be fair but in the case of The Appellant Asbo this is not the case.
On 18th January 2017 The Appellant was so unwell he did not attend Court on this day, nor did Mr A Cordell, or Miss L Cordell, Miss 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 regards to what had gone on.

The Judge decided to go ahead in the absence of The Appellant with the Appeal; he heard the witness statements from police on this date.
On 19 January 2017 again The Appellant and his family did not attend Court this case has made The Appellant so unwell, at the end of this day the Judge dismissed the Appeal against conviction, but he changed a few of the conditions that The Appellant was under, the conditions are still a breach of The Appellant's human rights. Schedule of prohibitions are listed below.
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 and are intended to be individual) or an industrial estate between the hours of 22:00 and 07:00 without written permissions from the owner and an leaseholder of such property. If you candemonstrate that the purpose of your entry of such property is to purchasegoods 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. Provide any service in respect of any licensable activity in any unlicensed premises.
For the sake of clarity, nothing in this order prevents the defendant from assisting, preparing for, engaging in licensedlicensable activities,
This order expires on the 3 August 2020:-
This order and its requirements amends' a previous order imposed by Highbury Corner Magistrates Court.
Condition 4 states:-
Enter any non-residential private property (by which words buildings and an open enclosed and are intended to be individual) or an industrial estate between the hours of 22:00 and 07:00 without written permissions from the owner and an leaseholder of such property. If you can demonstrate that the purpose of your entry of such property is to purchase 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 occaision during each separate nine hour period between 22:00 and 07:00 daily.
With this condition in place, it would mean that any non-residential property The Appellant would not be able to attend unless it was for no less than 30 minutes on any 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 isnon-residential, The Appellant would only have a 30 minute window to be able to enter any non-residential building, however is not feasible within that 30minutes to:-
1. The Appellant could not be seen in a hospital within 30 minutes,
2. How would it be feasible if The Appellant went to dinner at a restaurant they would be completed within 30 minutes?
3. How would it be feasible if The Appellantwanted to go to a nightclub or late-night bar as it would only have 30 minutes?
4. Places that are open to the public should not be restricted to The Appellant how is The Appellant meant to have a normalfamily life?
5. 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 theproperty, how this condition could be applied by any Judge and state it is not a beach of someone human rights must be wrong.
6. jiojiojioj
Conditions 2 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 hires 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 persontells 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 anypersonal 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 wassomething that did not even constitute as being for an illegal rave.
Conditions 5 states provide 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 licence that has already been clarified by the police and councils due to the Antisocial Behaviour Order that is inplace, 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 so even if there was a licensedpremises and someone wanted to hire the services of The Appellant The Appellant would not be able to do this. The Appellant was also offered contracts within two nightclubs to be the manager if The Appellant was 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 5 has been imposed becausecondition 4 conflicts with condition 5 in certain parts. And who would want to hire or take on The Appellant if he had to ask for written permission whichwould 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 just a few 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 many complaints has had to be put into the police regarding how the police have treated
The Appellant over many 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 there 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. It is also noticed that some of the police in this application who have done statements in this ASBO have complaint 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 there 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.
Still not completed I still got sections to add about ASBO application and no discloser and some other sections. And some laws.
This is how a JR has to be written up. They will have all the ASBO application bundles sent to the high court also so will be able to see the whole case as I need to also point out that we can not addeverything in this due to allowing the police to have the full extent as towhat is wrong within the application for the ASBO that should have been able to use at the appeal hearing. As we don't want the police to be able to try and correct the things that are wrong.
If you want to edit any of this then please do so really carefully and in a next colour and you have to keep this format don't change it as it has to be sent to the high court in this formation, I know you are not going to like some of what I have written but if you want to win this case at JR you have to put things you don't like to hear or feel you don't have a problem. The judges have to see your human rights have been fully fuked over from start to end of these court cases. And showing things you don't like will help that.
you can at your own write up as well