

witness statements and the veracity of what they say in those statements is in question as it was they who assaulted Simon with a metal pole, not what they claim in the statements.

24. At this point in time, on 25 April 2018, I have changed the SAR to the police of 14 February 2018 to a request under Section 35, Data Protection Act 1998, requesting full details of the service of the interim order (including CCTV footage of the cell in which Andy Philippou claims he served the interim order and accompanying documents on Simon personally) and full information regarding the assault on Simon has been requested. I have also sent emails to the officer in charge of the case and am awaiting a reply. I refer the court to the emails to the police and emails specifically dealing with the request under Section 35, Data Protection Act 1998.
25. The reason the court has not been contacted sooner regarding the requests for data is that I am awaiting notification as to whether the request in time for the hearing on 30 May 2018 and if the request did not arrive by the beginning of May 2018, to seek an order from the court to require the police to release the requested data to me. The request under Section 35, Data Protection Act 1998 was submitted to the police on 25 April 2018 when I received the documents for the application for committal proceedings dated 24 April 2018. The police have confirmed, by email, they are processing the request.
26. It is averred that the information from the police will confirm the veracity and reliability of what Mr and Mrs Mathiyalagan say in their witness statements is in question and, accordingly, should not be admitted into evidence.
27. I have also asked, in my email to the police officer in charge of the assault case, to make time so the police can study the witness statements Mr and Mrs Mathiyalagan have made in support of the application for committal proceedings, dated 24 April 2018 and laid before the court. It is averred the veracity and reliability of the claims made by Mr and Mrs Mathiyalagan in their witness statements that Simon breached the interim order is in question and, accordingly, no credence or weight should be placed on their claims.
28. It is averred the Claimant's applications for the interim order and committal proceedings are both vexatious and totally without merit. The Claimant has failed to properly investigate and address Simon's concerns, if at all, knowing he is a vulnerable adult and has been informed by Simon of the abuse he is being subjected to by his neighbours on many occasions, but has chosen to accept the unsubstantiated and questionable claims of Simon's neighbours to the exclusion of Simon's right to have his concerns heard and addressed.
29. The conditions of the interim order are draconian by their very nature and any reasonable person in possession of all relevant information would consider them to be not only totally lacking in any logic and fairness whatsoever, but a direct attack on Simon's human rights under the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and the Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA).
30. It is averred Simon's Convention rights have been breached as follows:-
 - a. Article 3 – Prohibition of Torture, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment