

From: Lorraine Cordell <lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk>
Sent time: 03/07/2017 04:34:44 PM
To: re_wired@ymail.com
Subject: read this
Attachments: Letter to high court CO 2171 2017.pdf

here

In the High Court of Justice
Queen's Bench Division

Royal Courts of Justice
Strand,
London,
WC2A 2ll

Date: 28/06/2017

Ref: C0/2171/2017

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

To Whom It May Concern:

I Miss Lorraine Cordell am writing this letter to say that I do object to pay the sum of £785.70 for preparing the Acknowledgment of Service to be paid by the claimant to the defendant. I confirm that I was also the person who filed the application for the claimant in order to get justice within this case. The judge who stated that there was no merit within the case I believe is wrong. I do understand that when the judge made his decision there was little evidence supplied by us. I am not a lawyer and upon receiving the Metropolitan police response to the application I realised my mistake when filing the application. I did make calls to the High Court to explain the error in the hope that they would be able to help me as they had done before, I stated that I would need more time to submit the evidence to the court that I would have to try and get legal help. The lady I spoke to stated that I could take my time in submitting the evidence, so I did not know I was on a time limit until we'd received the letter from the court.

At this time the skeleton argument I was writing comprises of over 90 pages with regard to the errors that have occurred within this whole case since it started in 2014. This would be many more pages once completed.

The claimant and his family only ever wanted justice and the truth, the UK justice system is supposed to be one of the best within the world but in this case it has failed to see the truth, the police hold information on their systems which proves my son's innocence and when asked to provide this evidence they withheld it though we asked many times since 2014, not one judge has ordered the police to hand over this information, then the appeal judge removing my sons legal representation and stating he can do the case himself, How was a person with mental health problems, learning difficulties, health problems meant to have coped with dealing with the appeal himself, nothing was put in place by the judge to address this, a few days prior to the appeal hearing I managed to find a solicitor willing to take the case on for the appeal, on 17 January 2017 the judge refused to allow the new solicitors a short adjournment which would have enabled the new solicitors to go over all the bundles, speak to the client which they had not done, the judge just dismissed it told them they had to be ready by the next morning if they could not be ready then my son would have to deal with the case himself, how is this justice, there is many other factors in this case that was incorrect and breached human rights.

The claimant as the courts was aware has mental health issues he also has learning difficulties, and other health issues. The claimant receives benefits every two weeks of the sum of £201.30, which is £100.65 per week; this money has to cover all of his bills, water rates, 19.5% council tax shortfall, electric, gas, £5 a week for him to have a phone for emergencies, his food, hygiene items, and any other items to support living. I do not understand how he is meant to pay £785.70, just because a mistake was made in my endeavour to get justice for my son.

Below I will list dates that is within the application, and outline information I have recovered, which will show the police have information which proves my son is innocence. How could this miscarriage of justice been allowed to have happened.

12/01/2013 Canary Wharf:

On this date the claimant is accused of the organisation / or supply of equipment for an illegal rave.

The claimant has always disputed the account that the police stated in their application, he did not organise or was involved in any part of setting this party up or supply, hire or loan any equipment for this party.

The claimant did attend the party on this evening with his ex-girlfriend, they were there for a few hours before a person attacked the claimant at the party, the claimant was rushed to hospital, and the claimant does not know anything from this point in regards to this date as he was at the hospital.

When the hospital released him he returned with his girlfriend and the person that had driven him to the hospital to pick his car up, which had been left at the location, at this time the party had already ended it was around 07:00 hours.

Again this case is outside the six months time limit when the application was submitted to the court, so how has this case been proven by the Judge; any date outside the six months time limit should only be used as reference to show prior history.

On the 12th January 2013 the claimant did not cause any anti social behaviour to any person.

07/04/2013 No Insurance and Section 5 of the Public Order Act:

Within Steve Elsmore statement dated 11/08/2014 public order matter. Although this date is outside of the six months time limit from when the application was submitted to the court, Steve Elsmore still included this within his statement.

The claimant was arrested on this date due to an issue with his insurance not showing up on the MID database, the police stated in the intelligence report the claimant became abusive, hence why he was arrested for a public order matter and no insurance.

The claimant was charged and given a court date to attend court and on this date he attended court to prove his innocence.

The claimant had witnesses that would prove he did not become abusive; there was no need for him to become abusive he had done nothing wrong; the case for the public order offence was withdrawn by the CPS at court and the claimant was found not guilty.

The insurance matter was addressed and proven the claimant did in fact have insurance so his vehicle in fact should never have been seized at a cost to take it out of the police compound of about £190.00 by the claimant that has never been recovered so was a loss to the claimant for no good reason.

There was information on the police's systems due to the claimant being stopped a number of times due to the error on the MID database showing he did not have insurance, which the claimant had tried to get addressed and so did I as to the reason why it was not showing on the MID database when in fact he did have insurance no one could understand why he was showing as not insured.

Why then in fact did Steve Elsmore include this within the ASBO application and make it look as if the claimant had been found guilty of it by the court? I thought false information on an application was illegal. Why has this case and the intelligence report been allowed to be used within this case?

So how has this been allowed to stay within this case for the judges to read and the statements are read out in court when the fact it should never have been entered into this case.

All Steve Elsmore statements only act to show bad character towards the claimant within them and multiple errors and facts that are untrue and can be proven to be untrue. But it would be too long within this letter to list them all.

Please see below information regarding these two issues that is on the police's system.

The claimant did not cause any Anti Social Behaviour on the 07th April 2013.

Disposal (Court)

Adjudication Date:	23/07/13
Court Name:	EAST LONDON MAGISTRATES
Name:	CORDELL, SIMON PAUL
Offence Count:	2
Taken into Consideration:	0
Owner:	02 (METROPOLITAN POLICE)
Last Updated:	25/07/13

Offence

Arrest/Summons Ref:	13/01HT/01/1537C
Crime Reference:	01HT/1537/13
Offence Number:	1
Court/Caution/Force Reference:	13/2574/60295A
Court Offence Number:	1
Adjudication:	NOT GUILTY
Plea Description:	NOT KNOWN
Originator:	01 (METROPOLITAN POLICE)
Offence Description:	USE DISORDERLY BEHAVIOUR OR THREATENING / ABUSIVE/INSULTING WORDS LIKELY TO CAUSE HARASSMENT ALARM OR DISTRESS
Offence Date(s):	07/04/13
Location:	ELLESMERE STREET, LONDON E14 (01HT)
Disposal:	23/07/13 AT EAST LONDON MAGISTRATES COURT REF: 13/2574/60295A

1 WITHDRAWN FINAL

Offence

Arrest/Summons Ref:	13/01HT/01/1537C
Crime Reference:	01HT/1537/13
Offence Number:	2
Court/Caution/Force Reference:	13/2574/60295A
Court Offence Number:	2
Adjudication:	NOT GUILTY
Plea Description:	NOT KNOWN

Originator: 01 (METROPOLITAN POLICE)
Offence Description: USING VEHICLE WHILE UNINSURED
Offence Date(s): 07/04/13
Location: ELLESMERE STREET, LONDON E14 (01HT)
Disposal: 23/07/13 AT EAST LONDON MAGISTRATES
COURT REF: 13/2574/60295A

1 WITHDRAWN FINAL

24/05/2013 Old Police Station Ponders End:

On this date it is alleged by the police the claimant was looking for venues in which illegal raves could be held.

This is far from the truth on this date, I was contacted via phone by a person called Joshua, Joshua was homeless and at that time was staying at 204 High Street, Ponders End EN3 4EZ, this building is also known as the old police station, Joshua had contacted me due to being hungry and in need of food, he told him he would come and meet him in order to take him out and get some food as he had no money. As the claimant approached 204 high Road the police stopped him, the claimant consented to being searched and having his car searched due to the police stating there was a strong smell of cannabis, the police did their search and found nothing. The police asked where he was going which he told them, he was going to meet a friend to get some food.

The claimant disputes stating to police that he could attract people to illegal raves and three day events, the claimant does not know what Joshua said to the police so cannot comment on this as he was not with Joshua when the police were questioning Joshua.

This date is also outside of the six months time limit from when the application was submitted to the court, again the judge has proved this case when this case is only meant to be used as reference, and the claimant did not cause any anti social behaviour on the 24th May 2013. Why are these cases being proven/

20/04/2014 Cannabis 420 day:

Within Steve Elsmore statement dated 11/08/2014, it is made to seem that the claimant attended on this date without the knowledge of the organisers of this event and was not hire to be there by the event organiser's norm-co.uk. In fact he was hired by norm-co.uk to attend the event that they had organised the claimant believes this event is legal and happens every year. The claimant was hired on a dry hire basis; the claimant was doing the job on a no profit basis. When norm-co.uk contacted the claimant he was told that the person that they had hired had let them down at the last minute.

The claimant arrived at the location in Hyde Park he was approached by the police, the claimant explained why he was there that he had been hired by the organisers, the police stated to him he had not been hired by the organisers of the event, and that he was not supposed to be there, when the claimant was hired by the organisers norm-co.uk they told him that this was a licensed event. The claimant did not use his

equipment he did try to contact the organisers of the event but was unable to, the claimant left the location as the police had asked him to do and returned home.

Within the claimant's bundle there are emails to prove the above account of what the claimant has stated these emails are from norm-co.uk. The claimant did not cause any anti social behaviour on the 20th April 2014.

) 25/05/2014 Unit 5 St Georges Ind Est White hart Lane, N17:

In respect to this date the claimant did attend premises where homeless people was treating it as their home, the claimant had attended bringing food for the homeless people living in the premises, when the claimant got to the premises the homeless people was already in the premises living there, there was no music being played while he was present.

The claimant does admit he attended the premises in his van, when the police attended the premises he allowed the police to search his vehicle, in his vehicle there were two speaker boxes with no drivers within them so they were unable to play music, he explained to the police that he used his van as storage, he did ask the police to note this, he did not have any other sound equipment in the vehicle.

Once the police had searched his vehicle which he allowed them to do, he was allowed to leave and he made his way home.

The police did not seize anything within the claimant's van, which if the police believed there was going to be an illegal rave in the premises they would have had the right to do this, but the police saw the speaker that were in the van could not play music. And he never had any other sound equipment in the van, this is why the police allowed him to leave.

At no time while the claimant was at the premises did anyone attend there dressed up stating there was going to be a party at the premises.

If the police had CCTV of people breaking in to the premises why was this not submitted as evidence within this case?

Why was there a need to update the information report on the 19/06/2014?

The claimant did not cause any anti social behaviour on the 25th May 2014.

06/06/2014 to 08/06/2014 Progress way Enfield:

The claimant disputes the facts that are within the application, on the 06th June 2014 he was at his home address with a friend, and also attended my home address Lorraine Cordell. His sister Deon was there, and a friend of the family Jamie Duffy who lived at the family's addresses.

On the 07/06/2014 he attended a leaving party for his cousin Dwayne Edwards who was leaving to go around the world for 12 months, the claimant was there at the leaving party till the early hours on the 08/06/2017, it has already been stated in the

magistrates court there was a mistake in the paperwork and the claimant did not attend until the 08/06/2014 at around 02:00 hours. I also cannot understand why the claimant's brother name has been added to this case as an organiser. As stated in the magistrates court the claimant's brother had a serious life changing accident in April 2014, his brother had a number substantial injuries, after this was stated before the magistrates trial the claimant's brother was never mentioned again, the reason for this the police knew of the RTA accident as they was called and the claimant's brother had to be airlifted to the Royal London Hospital. The police know my sons very well by face they do not even have to do a name check on them. So how this serious mistake could have been made is beyond me.

While the claimant was at the leaving party he had got a call from someone he knew they had stayed at his home address a few weeks earlier and left their locker keys there, due to them being in the area they called the claimant and asked if he could drop the keys off to them, the claimant told them he was at a family party and that once he left he would drop the keys off to them. He asked where they was and they gave the location as progress way, he told them that once he left the family party he would pick the keys up from his home address and drop them off to them, this is how the police saw the claimant coming towards them while they were standing at the gate at progress way on the 08/06/2017 at around 02:00 hours, the claimant had never been in side progress way, but due to the police knowing the claimant they went straight up to him and started to talk to him, the police was with people that worked for Enfield Council, they wanted to serve paperwork on the claimant, the claimant would not accept any paperwork and walked back towards the A10.

The claimant was not involved in organising or supplying any equipment at progress way. The claimant did not act in any anti social behaviour manner on the 06/06/2014, 07/06/2014 and the 08/06/2014.

Within ASBO application most of the data relates to Progress Way which relates to the dates of the 06/06/2014, 07/06/2014 and the 08/06/2014.

The police stated that the information contained within their bundle does not relate to another location and deny that an event was ongoing just down the road from progress way on the same dates as progress way, this was even stated under oath at court. The police denied that there was another event ongoing in Crown Road at the same time that Progress Way was ongoing.

They even confirmed to the judge when the Judge asked if anything related to another location, it was stated to the Judge everything that related to 06/06/2014, 07/06/2014 and the 08/06/2014 within their bundle related to progress way that nothing within the bundle for Progress Way related to another event.

A huge amount of data has been redacted by the police, I could understand if the redacted data only redacted the person's details name and address phone numbers etc that had made the calls to the police. But the redaction goes a lot further than this where there is whole pages redacted within one CAD which really makes the CAD useless being in the bundle, also the grid references why would so many be redacted I can understand the call location being redacted but why would there be a need to redact the Att Loc and Inc Loc. We asked every time we were in court for the CADs

to be un-redacted because we knew a fair amount related to Crown Road, which the police were denying, we also asked for all of the missing CADs, nothing ever came of our requests, none of the judges ordered this to be done.

Crown Road has a lot of history for events they was ongoing in this location from April 2014 till around June 2014, in fact maybe later than June 2014.

I do not really need to bring the intelligence reports and CADs up as the information I will supply later in this letter regarding Progress Way will become very relevant as to what the police are hiding. The reason I'm going to go to some detail here is because I do not feel it is correct that the police are allowed to get away with what they have done within this case towards my son due to how much they dislike him and my family. And I believe it will show how much the police are willing to do in order to put everything onto my son.

Let me give you some CADs Numbers I will not go over everyone as there is a great deal of them and some have got so much redaction we can only wonder why.

CAD 2410:08/06/2014 all grid references are redacted, most of the second and third pages are redacted, but what gives this away as being Crown Road is what has been written by the call handler on page 4.

“illegal rave going on opposite A&J Cars approx 200 people1 drugs being openly sold and taken caller noticed them whilst on his way home, they're all over the Street.”

“Linked to cads 1646 & 1768 08June”

Any police officer would know that A&J Cars is right by Crown Road, right opposite the Old Mann Building where the events was ongoing for months, and no where near Progress Way.

The CAD numbers 1646 and 1768 08 June are missing we were never allowed to have these.

CAD 3319:08/06/2014, Grid Reference below,

Att Locn	:SOUTHBURY RD/CROWN ROAD
Map	:Page 082, Grid Reference 534960,196240
GPA	:YP [Division: YE:JC]
Inc Locn	:SOUTHBURY Rd/CROWN ROAD
Map	:Page 082, Grid Reference 534960,196240
GPA	:YP [Division: YE:JC]
Call Locn	:93,BROADLANDS AVENUE,ENFIELD
Map	:Page 082, Grid Reference 534981,196790
GPA	:YF [Division: YE:SX]

As we can see all the Grid Reference have been left in this one by mistake I believe, once again any police officer would know 93,BROADLANDS AVENUE,ENFIELD is behind Crown Road, so in fact this CAD can not belong to Progress Way.

But this CAD tells us even more as there is a safety risk with it regarding a fragile roof, and subsequently gives details in regards to door numbers along Southbury Road and Crown Road. This also links to CAD number 3319. There is no mistaking this CAD links to the event that was ongoing at Crown Road. The police deny this they state no event was ongoing, yet it is a known fact the building was along Crown road/Southbury Road have fragile roofs, the old mann building has partly a glass roof.

These are just a few CADs that prove there was an ongoing event at Crown Road, it is also proven in the FOI request I put into Enfield Council, there is also a substantial amount of information within the intelligence reports that do not correspond in the way in which they should do, there is also errors within the timeline of some of the CADs, I do not see why the police have mislead the courts, the only reason is most of the information the police had related to Progress Way.

Also the witness statements that was taken by police are meant to be written in the words of the witness signed and dated by the witness, all but one witness statement has been written and signed by police officers, not one witness statement identifies the claimant or a description, under the law I witness statement should be completed and signed and dated by the witness.

Now as said before I have done a lot of research, and I now put it to the police they knew full well my son had not done what they said he had done in this case. And that the police was hiding information.

Progress Way Event was relocated to Progress Way; the Metropolitan police know this already, but yet blame my son.

The location that this was meant to have happened In Essex a very senior police officer was being updated in regard to this event, due to the Essex police monitoring the event page on social media for some time, due to the brief location on the event page on social media, the very senior police officer was concerned due to it being very close with the border to the Metropolitan police area.

The very senior police officer due to being concerned contacted the Metropolitan police, information was given to the Metropolitan police in regards to the concerns with this event and area, there was information given so that the Metropolitan police could monitor the event page on social media, the senior officer asked for information of a senior officer within the Metropolitan police that would be on duty the full weekend the event was due to take place so that contact could be made regarding this.

On the 06th June 2014 the Very senior police officer sent police to look for the location within the border of Essex, the police found the location this event was going to be taking place. Once the very senior police officer got the location he went in a police helicopter and went to the location and landed in the field.

He had his file with all the information in it which included pictures of the known organiser, he went up to the known organiser who was white north European, after speaking to him the very senior police officer asked him to leave the land and served him a notice under S63 CJOPOA and a notice not to set up within 24 hours. The very senior police officer gave the known organiser 3 hours to pack up everything and leave the land and gave him an explanation of the offence he was liable to commit if he failed to comply with the direction.

The organiser then relocated to progress way. Police are well aware organisers relocate if the police close an event down.

The claimant was nowhere near Essex on this day; he was not involved in the organisation or supply of equipment which the police are well aware of. Yet the police want to blame him and they was not going to stop until they got the ASBO on him and did not care what they covered up in the process of the information they had, I believe this is also why there is nothing really for the 06th June within the bundle for the ASBO application. And why when asked over and over why we were never allowed to see the police officers packet note books, for any of the dates in there application.

20/06/2014 1 Falcon Park Neasden Lane NW10:

The claimant's is alleged to have been involved in the organisation and or supplied equipment for an illegal rave, the claimant disputes what the police have said, on this date the claimant had been contacted and asked if he would hire a sound system for a gentleman's birthday party. The claimant agreed to do so; the sound system and van were collected from the claimant's home. The claimant's terms and conditions were agreed and invoice signed and a deposit was given to him.

At around 01:00 hours the claimant received a phone call from the person he had hired the sound system to; the person stated that the sound system and van was being seized by the police.

The claimant was very upset and could not at this stage understand why the police was seizing his equipment and van.

The claimant asked the location and took down the address, he had to get up and get dressed and leave his home it took him around an hour to reach the location, upon approaching the address he had been given he saw there was a lot of police around, he parked his car up got out and went up to the police to speak to them to find out what was going on, he showed the police the terms and conditions of hirer, and the invoice.

The police at this point allowed the claimant into the building where he continued to speak to the police, the sound system had not been put away and the police allowed the claimant to start packing it away into his van, but the police stated they were confiscating it until they had looked into the matter.

The claimant gave the police all his contact information, and also took down the police officer information. About a week later the police contacted the claimant and told him he was allowed to come and pick his van and equipment up from the police station.

The claimant did not knowingly supply equipment for an illegal rave; he believed the hire was for a birthday party and it was all above board.

The claimant did not cause any antisocial behaviour on the 20th June 2014.

19/07/2014 Carpet right A10 Enfield:

As stated previously by the claimant he was not involved in the organisation or supplied equipment on this date. And the claimant totally disagrees in regards to what the police have said in their application. The claimant on this day was driving down A10 he was heading towards McDonald's, as he was passing carpet right he saw the police outside and he believed he saw a friend who he knew had been homeless, he was on the wrong side of the road so went down towards Southbury Road where he knew he could turn his car around. He parked his vehicle and walked

to the location, upon arriving there he saw there was a lot of police, as soon as he got there he was standing on the pavement and the police arrested him to stop a believed breach of the peace, the claimant never entered the building, he was arrested outside.

Within the CADs it clearly states there was around 20 people males and females all white approximate age 20. The claimant is mixed raced, The CADs start from 20:51 hours, the claimant was not arrested until 22:50 hours, some two hours after the police arrived at the premises.

There is a statement from Mr Moses Howe who states he was hired by Mr Anthony Harvey, he states Mr Anthony Harvey was arrested by the police inside the premises but later de-arrested, the police have never disputed this.

As stated before I have done a lot of research I will deal with this research into this date below.

Officer in Charge Steve Elsmore states in his statement dated 11/08/2014 about a rave that happened in Croydon where a poor boy lost his life, and in fact has made it seem as if the claimant was part of this rave.

Officer in Charge Steve Elsmore did an updated statement dated 26/06/15 in this statement he stated about operation blue iris which relates to the Croydon rave, the Croydon rave I believe was called rum and base.

Officer in Charge Steve Elsmore states in this updated statement that he spoke with A/DS Tanner who works for the public order investigation unit at Scotland Yard, A/DS Tanner confirmed she had spoken to Miss Lorraine Cordell to Steven Elsmore. Blue iris was the operational name that related to the investigation into the Croydon rave.

My investigation has led to the information regarding Anthony Harvey being listed by Scotland Yard and all TV media as wanted regarding the Croydon rave his picture was published in the media a long with a lot of others that was also wanted regarding the Croydon rave, on the 30th June 2014 Anthony Harvey handed himself into Ilford police station, Scotland Yard attended Ilford police station and took Anthony Harvey back to Scotland Yard for questioning, Anthony Harvey was questioned by 4 police officers at Scotland Yard, he was charged with violent disorder and some other things, he was released on bail with bail conditions. He spent around six hours in a cell.

The claimant had nothing to do with the Croydon rave, he was not present and I believe this is confirmed in the updated statement of Officer in charge Steve Elsmore. The claimant did not organise or supply equipment in Croydon rave. Once again why has this been put in the application and worded as if my son had organised this, when clearly the police have information that he had nothing to do with this. The only reason i can see is that this was a high profile case where someone unfortunately lost there life. And tainting my son with this event will make any Judge believe my son is such a bad person, i believe this amounts to slander and or defamation of character.

The claimant did not cause any anti social behaviour at Croydon rave as he was not there and had nothing to do with it.

It seems Anthony Harvey was very unhappy in regards to how Scotland Yard was treating him they would not leave him alone, but he was still advertising the events he was putting on. One was for the 19th July 2014 called The Raving Family That Rave In The Woods, Anthony Harvey even had special T-shirts made up with the wording The Raving Family on them, Anthony Harvey even put a request for anyone that had strong bolties he could use.

It would seem that Anthony Harvey first location for the 19th July 2014 was in Barking, Anthony Harvey then relocated to Enfield carpet right, he states that he begged the police to allow this to carry on but they would not, and states fuck to Scotland Yard, a person that knows Anthony Harvey states they was all waiting at Southbury Road.

As stated before Anthony Harvey was on bail I believe one of those bail conditions was not to attend an illegal rave, as he states he is allowed to attend legal events only.

I believe that when Steve Elsmore spoke to A/DS Tanner, A/DS Tanner explained a lot more about Anthony Harvey then Steve Elsmore states in his updated statement. Even about the event at Barking which was due to me relocated.

“A/DS Tanner states that she had inputted a crimint regarding a rave that was due to take place on 19th July 2014 in Barking. This rave was due to be at one location but was due to be moved to another location which had not disclosed.”

Why did Steve Elsmore state in the lower court he had deleted emails to and from A/DS Tanner, why did Steve Elsmore not ask A/DS Tanner to do a statement, why did he feel it necessary to write what he says A/DS Tanner said to him. I know the public order investigation unit was told by Sir Bernard Hogan Howe to monitor all raves keep intelligence on them and try to put stop to them A/DS Tanner told me this on the phone when I spoke to her. And when I spoke to DS Chapman from the public order investigation unit he confirmed they was looking into all raves, he also did a check on the claimant's name and stated within all the information they had they only had the claimant's name on their systems once, and that was to prevent a breach of the peace on the 19th July 2014.

The claimant did not organise or supply equipment; the claimant did not cause any anti social behaviour on this date.

24/07/2014 Admitted to police he setups raves:

On this date the claimant was driving down the Road after just leaving my home, he was on his way home via Alma Road, as he passed King Edwards Road he saw the police in an unmarked police car the claimant knew it was the police as the police had stopped him before while on active duty, they were at this time indicating to do a right-hand turn out of King Edward Road onto Alma Road. But when they saw the claimant passed King Edward Road they changed direction and turned left onto Alma Road to follow him after a short time the police put their blue lights on, and pulled him over to the side of the road opposite the BMW repair centre along Alma Road, the male officer who was in the passenger side of the police car got out and started to approach the claimant's car, the claimant opened his window a little and asked why

he had been pulled over. The police officer said he was not sure why but his colleague had instructed him to do this, his colleague was the police officer that the claimant knew. The police officer walked back to the unmarked police car then re-approached the claimant's car with his colleague the driver of the unmarked police car. I asked again what had been pulled over for, and the driver of the unmarked police car pulled out his truncheon and said the claimant had to get out of his car, and that if I declined his windows would be smashed. The claimant got out of his car as he had done nothing wrong and had nothing to hide, the claimant had not committed any offence whatsoever, the police stated to the claimant he had been pulled over because he was driving too close to the car in front of him, the driver who was in the car in front of the claimant never stopped, and was not stopped by police. The claimant was then accused of having drugs, the claimant allowed police to search him and his vehicle nothing was found. The police then asked the claimant what he was up to, the claimant said that he was setting up his catalogue that he had been building with a friend, and that the website that was being built was nearly completed. The claimant said that he was trying to achieve positive effects within today's society with his business that he had been building. Once the police had completed all their checks they needed, they shook hands and went on our way.

At no time did the claimant act in an anti social manner towards the police.

It seems the police stated other things in their report that are very untrue, please see below

“On Thursday 24th July 2014 at around 1625 hours, plain clothes officers from YE Gangs Unit had cause to stop the following male on ALMA ROAD EN3. Simon CORDELL. He was driving a silver Ford Focus vrm MA57LDY on which he is insured, but is not the registered keeper. He was stopped as he was driving about 1" from the bumper of the car in front of him and his driving was erratic. He claimed to know the other driver; this male however approached officers saying he had been driving like that behind him since YR.

CORDELL was obstructive as usual, refusing to get out of his vehicle etc. He stated that his solicitor has a big case going where all his criminal records will be wiped as Police have unlawfully picked on him for years etc. Of interest he stated that he has 4 brand new speaker systems at home which he is happy to loan people for raves etc and that he is inundated with requests to run raves. He stated that he has 20,000 followers on one social media network and 70,000 in another. He says that he could organize a rave and get 20,000 people at it without any problems what so ever, and that he gets lots of requests from anarchist type groups etc to run raves for them. Of note he claims Occupy London, Black Block and other anarchist groups have been asking him to organize one for Notting Hill Carnival so that they can "Cause carnage and mayhem".

The claimant is continuously being pulled up by the police for no reason this has been ongoing for the past at least 23 years, I believe the above comments within the police report shows this when it states CORDELL was obstructive as usual refusing to get out of his vehicle etc.

The claimant did not get out of his vehicle right away he did not know why he was being pulled again, so waited in his car to ask the police why he had been stopped. it is not a crime to sit in your car until the police approach.

The police state in their report he was driving about 1” from the bumper of the car in front of him and the claimant driving was erratic.

If the claimant had been driving 1” from the bumper of the car in front of him, which I believe is impossible, and his driving was erratic, then surely the police would have arrested him for dangerous driving, the police always try and find a way to arrest the claimant for any reason they can, and I am hundred percent sure if the claimant was driving like this he would have been in the police station under arrest for it. The driver in the car that was in front of the claimant did not stop and speak to the police, if he had done this why have the police not given the drivers details.

The claimant did not speak to the police in regards to loaning out his equipment for raves. The numbers that the police have stated that the claimant said he had in 2 accounts on social media is impossible, and is unbelievable that the police have stated such information. The police have also stated that the claimant spoke of links to Occupy London, Black Block and other anarchist groups, the claimant has never been involved in any activist groups, and is highly insulted that the police could say the name Black Block came out of his mouth, Black Block is a known NF group, so please why would the claimant have said such things when he is mixed race.

There is also concern with the date of this report, it was filed on the police’s system, it would seem police were together when the reports was made for 2 dates in the application, when they must have already knew the police wanted to bring this application against the claimant. If you look at the below and look at the two URN numbers you will see this.

Information Report			Officer Safety
URN	YERT00376229	GPMS	RESTRICTED
Event Date 24/07/2014	Created 27/07/2014	Last Updated 31/07/2014	

Information Report			Officer Safety
URN	YERT00376227	GPMS	RESTRICTED
Event Date 27/07/2014	Created 27/07/2014	Last Updated 27/07/2014	

27/07/2014 Millmarsh Lane Enfield:

On this date the claimant is alleged to have organised a rave and/or supplied equipment, the claimant disputes this, there was some homeless people living in premises at Millmarsh Lane, I had been invited to attend a 20th birthday party the claimant did not know about any rave only that a homeless person was having their 20th birthday party, there was only a few people there and they was the homeless people living there. The claimant did not have any equipment there, did not load any equipment or hiring the equipment.

The claimant did not act in any anti social manner on this date.

Within the police report it states the police had been given intelligence that a rave was due to take place, why is this intelligence not within the application.

The police report also states there was a large stack of speakers being powered by the claimant's van, I do not understand how this is possible the voltage for a sound system would be 240 V the voltage on a van is only 12 V this would make it impossible for a van to power a sound system.

It would also be of concern that when police was writing these reports they were together (please see URN above). At this point the police would have known the antisocial behaviour order application was going to be submitted and anything that was being added would go well with there case (True or untrue).

09/08/2014 to 10/08/2014 Millmarsh Lane Enfield:

On this date the claimant is being accused of organising and or supplying equipment at Millmarsh Lane Enfield, the claimant disputes this, the claimant was not involved in the organisation of any rave and did not supply equipment, police state this event was run by Every Decibel Matters, the claimant can confirm that he is not an employee of this organisation or a shareholder or a director and he has no controlling interest in the company. Information was supplied within the application by the director of Every Decibel Matters that confirms this.

On this date I had gone to see the people that was homeless that was living in Millmarsh Lane Enfield, the police was well aware that homeless people was living in this location in premises from weeks earlier.

As stated before I have done a lot of research, it seems every decibel matters had police turn up at their addresses stating they would be arrested if they carried on with this event, the event location was meant to have been in Harrow, every decibel matters state on the date of the event they were in Harrow and police sent helicopters all day looking for them, they had no option but to relocate I believe this is when they relocated to Millmarsh Lane, the claimant had no knowledge of this and was never in Harrow, and knew nothing regarding this being relocated to Millmarsh Lane.

The officer in charge of the application Steve Elsmore has stated in one of his updated statements that the claimant knew Mr Moses Howe, and that he has been stopped by police with Mr Moses Howe once in the claimant's vehicle 2011.

The claimant does not dispute he does have knowledge of Mr Moses Howe, Mr Moses Howe is a sound engineer, in 2011 the claimant had been offered the management position at Club Juice in Green Street Enfield, the claimant would as part of his job role be organising events for Club Juice this would have included the claimant's sound system being within the venue. Due to the claimant in 2011 not having much knowledge of all the complicated knowledge needed setting up the sound system he asked people he knew if they knew a sound engineer, Mr Moses Howe name was given, the claimant and Mr Moses Howe agreed to meet and go to the venue check what would be needed in regards to equipment, and it was agreed that if it took off Mr Moses Howe would be the sound engineer for club juice. When the police pulled the claimant and Mr Moses Howe was in the vehicle they were on their way to Club Juice, they was due to set the sound system up in order to allow testing

and make sure everything was in order. Within the weeks that followed they had set up one event that was due to take place at club juice, but due to how the police was with the claimant they kept pulling him up outside of Club Juice strip searching him and would not leave him alone, the claimant got so distressed and embarrassed that he told the owner of Club Juice he could no longer carry on, and left the position. Since this time the claimant has had no knowledge of what Mr Moses Howe has been doing, Mr Moses Howe is the director with Sean O'Connor of every decibel matters, as shown within the documents within the claimant's bundle.

If the claimant had a great deal of contact with Mr Moses Howe I am sure the police would have a lot more than one date on the police's system that the claimant had been with Mr Moses Howe, the claimant as said above is pulled a great deal by the police and I believe that this would have been shown on the police's system. And not just one date in 2011.

CAD 9717 seems to have intelligence that was received by police on 09th August 2014, this CAD was never included in the applications bundle, I believe this intelligence would have been very helpful to the claimant and this is why it was never added to the application bundle. As we believe it would prove the police had no information on my son.

It seems throughout this case there has been a lot of CADs and intelligence reports that have not been included in the applications bundle; I believe the reason for this is that it would show that what has been stated within the application is very misleading. I believe also that is why we was never allowed to see them. I believe also that the police officers notebook's which we was also never allowed to see would also show how misleading the application was towards the claimant.

There is a lot more information I have gained due to research I have done, there is also a lot more points within the application that are misleading and incorrect, there is a list of breaches under the data protection of information that is totally incorrect which can be proven. At this time there is a case ongoing with the ICO in regards to breaches that the police have stated in their application and also incorrect information on the claimant's PNC record, all of this information and a lot more was being bought up each time we attended court at the Magistrate's Court and the Crown Court. There has been so many breaches of human rights throughout this case I cannot understand how it has been allowed to have happened, there is a total miscarriage of justice and many other issues regarding his legal representation within this case.

At this time the claimant does not leave his home he has not done since 2014 due to knowing the police are going to say he has done something that breaches the conditions and arrest him and put him in prison, Steve Elsmore has already done in updated statements, which in fact implies my son had breached his conditions in Nov 2014 by being on an industrial estate, which was totally incorrect.

The conditions the claimant is under breaches his human rights, it seems as though the barrister that was representing the police in this matter feels that it is acceptable to breach someone human rights knowingly.

You can see this on page 28 of the appeal transcript which the administrative court sent, they also only seen to be concerned in regards to the claimant going to a shop or

petrol station. But the implications of the conditions go a lot wider and no one has taken this into consideration. Please see below a list of information which is only a small list which the claimant cannot do.

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 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 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 an unlicensed premises.

For the sake of clarity, nothing in this order prevents the defendant from assisting, preparing for, engaging in licensed licensable activities,

This order expires on the 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 occasion during each separate nine hour period between 22:00 and 07:00 daily.

With this condition in place any non-residential property The Appellant would not be able to attend only for 30 minutes on one occasion during a separate nine hour period:

This would include hospitals, police stations, 24-hour supermarkets, petrol stations, cinemas, restaurants, bars, night clubs and any other public place open to the public between these times that is non-residential The Appellant would only have a 30 minute window to be able to enter any non-residential building, however is not feasible that within 30 minutes The Appellant could be seen in a hospital within 30 minutes, how would it be feasible if The Appellant went to dinner at a restaurant they would be completed within 30 minutes, how would it be feasible if The Appellant wanted to go to a nightclub or late-night bar as it would only have 30 minutes, places that are open to the public should not be restricted to The Appellant how is The Appellant meant to have a normal family life. The Appellant cannot go to without written permission which would be degrading for The Appellant to have to ask each time he wanted to go somewhere and explain why he needed it to be confirmed in writing by the owner and/or leaseholder of the property, how

this condition could be applied by any Judge and state it is not a breach of someone human rights is beyond me.

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 ask what it is going to be used for, and you do have a contract that is in place, but what the person tells you their reason for hiring the equipment out is not always the correct reason and is not used for the purpose the person told you The Appellant would be in breach of these conditions. Also if The Appellant loaned someone any personal belongings and that person ended up at an illegal rave then The Appellant would again be in breach of his conditions, even if the item was something 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 in place, The Appellant would not be able to offer his services also due to the restriction that he has only 30 minutes within a non-residential building, most events go to the late hours in the morning so even if there was a licensed premises and someone wanted to hire the services of The Appellant The Appellant would not be able to do this. 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 because condition 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 which would be degrading for The Appellant to have to ask each time he wanted to go somewhere or had a contact and had to explain why he needed it to be confirmed in writing by the owner and/or leaseholder of the property,

These are 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.

How this case could have been proven is beyond me, I have only done a brief account of information within this letter. there is a lot of information i have not included due to trying to keep this letter as short as I could.

I only wanted Justice for my son, but due to a mistake I done it seems there will be no Justice and the true facts will never been known. And my son will suffer for something he did not do. I did call the High Court then I realised I had made a mistake and told them I was going to be late submitting documents due to trying to get help from a legal person. And as for the beaches of my son's human rights do they not matter.

There is so much wrong with this case, and the way the courts addressed it was not correct since 2014.

Best Regards

Written by Miss Lorraine Cordell on behalf of Mr Simon Cordell