

I feel as my solicitor you should have my best interest at heart and if you know a police officer to be caught for being corrupt for, the evidence that they have supported so that your client faced a wrongful conviction of any sort you should not encourage them to not stand up for what is correct and right, so I do not understand why you would ask me to reconsider whether the attached document should be served on the Respondent.

The amendments I made have all ready been served on the 22/02/2016 and the Judge ask for the respondent to answer them questions from the 01/02/2016 and the respondent refuse to do so.

I do insist for the challenges to be answered as it is my life that has been tarnished for civil proceedings so I do confirm this on writing.

I feel that the meeting has been left by yourself to the last minute I have been requesting this in a multitude of emails to be achieved well in advance to the date that you have now sited a few days before the appeal, when I know that you have had ample amounts of time, so if this is the earliest time I will take it and I look forward to meeting Mr Andy Locke, thank you.

I do not see how the case will not get re listed due to lack of disclosure to be quite frank.

I do not understand why any solicitor would encourage me to go to trial or appeal and not draft out the police corruption that you can clearly see in turn making me accept the clearly fabricated evidence and wrongful conditions that I know have been imposed on myself under section 63 with no trespass taking place, this being said as for any of the incidents contained in the Asbo and with you knowing the true facts of them incidents being contained in private air.

There is also that of the clearly fabricated evidence I am standing against as forsure any solicitor works in Co Hurst towards the understanding of noun precedent in relation to the weight of any evidence put towards a client.

I am concerned about the case, relying sole on hearsay by police.

Is this correct in procedure? However I do understand and take note, that all resident parties contained within the respondents bundle, were held on single occasions and in places of residence and were not held as a running commercial business by myself or by any other to my knowledge.

I have also read that any person is entitled to have a house or resident party in private air under the licensing act 2003 or where they reside.

To my understanding, each accused incident in the respondents bundle is a place of residence and were in fact different people holding their own private parties at their places of residence.