8/6/2017

Print

| Subject: | RE: I sent this to Josie                       |
|----------|--|
| From:    | Lorraine Cordell (lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk) |
| То:      | re_wired@ymail.com;                            |
| Date:    | Friday, 9 September 2016, 9:55                 |

## Simon when i opened the email this is how it come out i could not read it so had to go to your email and save to pdf

## not sure if it will come out to Josey like the below or not.

From: Rewired Rewired [mailto:re\_wired@ymail.com]
Sent: 08 September 2016 23:12
To: Lorraine Cordell
Subject: I sent this to Josie

Dear Josie I do not understand why it is not in my best interests for you to serve the suggested amendments that I made in relation towards the letter that you proposed sending to Ms Sally Gilchrist. The reason I do not understand is because: 1. Mr Morris advice on 4th April 2016 was the same as what I had explained to yourself when the case had started dated 12th September 2014 as received on receipt by yourself and by method of email's and them email's referred to the respondent's application of an Asbo order quoting "That a case should not rely solely on hearsay" as mine seems to do by the police officer's. Most of the hearsay in any case is reported to be third party and therefore carry less weight in any case. 2. I want to show the true facts about the case as I am the one who is suffering because of untrue cut and paste facts that represent the basics of the respondent's case and that singed evidence being off fabricated police statements, as detailed in the amendments towards your letter to Sally Gilchrist, whom is already in receipt of such evidence but refuses to act upon such intelligence in accordance of the law and you advise me to ignore this even low I suffer. 3. I understand that a lot of the matters that should be dealt with at court will be. 4. I still argue for a speedy and fair trial: and feel that when a judge asks the respondent to reply by a set date such as the 1/08/2016 as the judge HHJ PAWLAK has ordered to happen it should. 5. The respondent should do so within the time duration as dated 01/09/2016 and agreed with the judge and then received with the correct response, as has not happened. 6. I have been awaiting the reply since 00/02/2016 from an ongoing civil application that is dated 13th August 2014 so to be able to have a fair trial. 7. After waiting on the 01/-9-2016 with no response I waited till the 2/09/2016 and telephoned the respondent I spoke with a lady called sally gill Hurst, she states that she has served some paperwork to my solicitor's at the beginning of august a month prior, after finishing our conversation I contacted my solicitor she explained to me that she was away on holiday and that I must wait till she gets back on the 6th September 2016. 8. I again put the phone down and called my solicitor firm's office to see if any paperwork had been served to be told no. 9. On the 8TH August I spoke with my mother who explained to me that she had been in contact with my solicitor and that I would

## about:blank