

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