

Sent: 07 April 2014 13:33

To: Lorraine Cordell

Subject: Fwd: Regina v. Simon Cordell for mention at Woolwich Crown Court 8th April 2014

FYI

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **JOSEPHINE WARD** <josephinewardsolicitor@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Apr 7, 2014 at 9:53 AM

Subject: Regina v. Simon Cordell for mention at Woolwich Crown Court 8th April 2014

To: croydonkingston&woolwichcrown@cps.gsi.gov.uk, listing@woolwich.crowncourt.gsi.gov.uk, "J.B. Akin-Olugbade" <j.akin-olugbade@nexuschambers.com>

Dear Sir or Madam

We refer to the above matter.

This case was last mentioned in court on 18th March 2014 and on that occasion the Learned Judge made a number of directions.

Statements and invoices regarding the repair of the wall to be served by 21st March 2014 - not served

Statements from council to be served by 29th March 2014 - not served

We attach a copy of the insurance file that we received from Mr Patel's insurance company and note will no doubt be taken of the dates of the previous break ins and the damage caused on previous dates prior to May 2013. You will also no doubt note that there were no invoices submitted for any repairs during that period of time and also the delay in the Patel's responding to the insurance claim.

It has always been our client's case that the damage caused to the wall and inside the building had already been committed before he hired out his sound system for the private party. Our client has always disputed causing the damage or having any knowledge as to how this damage was caused.

We further raise that other suspects forensically linked to the earlier offences were released with no further action been taken against them. Mr Cordell has always maintained that police officers attended with the noise abatement officers but we are yet to be provided with the officers contact details or indeed the reason for their attendance. Clearly the issue is why did the Police allow a party to go ahead if persons present were damaging a wall and removing property. Mr Cordell feels like he is being singled out and made a scapegoat in this case. He denies involvement in the burglary and this allegation is having an adverse effect not only on his business but also on his mental health. We attach a copy of a letter confirming his medical diagnosis from his GP.