

STATEMENT OF WITNESS

(C.J. Act 1967, S2,9.M.C. Rules 1968 R58)

STATEMENT OF: Simon Cordell

AGE OF WITNESS (if over 21): 35

OCCUPATION OF WITNESS: Unemployed

ADDRESS: 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield, Middlesex, EN3 7JQ

This statement consisting of 23 page(s) each signed by me, is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false or do not believe to be true.

Dated the 24th day of February 2015

S gned.....

Signature Witnessed by

This is an updated statement further to the statement of Mr Simon Cordell Dated 24th day of February.

In reference to the 12th Jan 2013 Canary Wharf

- This date in question has been add to the applicants bundle as a reference as to the Limitation Act 1980. Which states a case must be applied six months prior from the date of the incident. Please take note to Mr Simon Cordell's last statement dated the 24/02/2015; he was in fact taken to The Royal London Hospital.
-

In reference to the 07th April 2013, Blakey's House

07/04/2013 = In Steve Elsmore Statement dated 11/08/2014
In regards to 07/04/2013 = Please read Mr Simon Cordell's last statement dated the 24/02/2015, he states that he did not attended any premises on this date to rave, Mr Cordell did not involve him self in the organization of any illegal rave this was his friends housing estate and was on a Sunday, nor did he supply equipment on said date.

Mr Simon Cordell will State; "that he was not rude to police, but he did feel like he could not even go out for the day with some of his friends, without getting stopped and searched by members of the police.
It is also noted that the caller was very clear that they saw a flat screen TV being put into Mr Cordell's van, which is confusing to why when the police searched the van they found no TV, but did in fact find two of his off road motor bikes, which is not included in Steve Elsmore statement. The police did checks on Mr Simon Cordell's Off Road Motor Bikes but this is also not stated, but should show's up on the seizer notice, as Mr Simon Cordell did asked the police office to take careful note of the two off road motor bikes, as due to the high value of them.

Mr Simon Cordell will state; "that he did get a bit upset when the police said they were going to seize his van, as he did have insurance in place to be able to drive the van in question, but there was an error on the MID database. Miss Cordell had been trying to help her son resolve the issue concerning his insurance policy not showing on the mid data base along side with members of their local police force and his insurance company KGM too, together they had tried to work out why Mr Simon Cordell was showing as uninsured. There was information noted as intelligence on the police National Computer stating this I had asked the police to check on there systems due to this, but they would not they just wanted to seize Mr Simon Cordell's van without checking, so he new he was being wrongfully accused at this point, as he had done nothing wrong and he did have insurance to be driving and had paid a lot of money for his insurance. He states he did not get upset in the manner that the police have said he did and that he does not mean to come across as rude to police. In this case he was just trying to explain the error on the system.

In addition, the prosecution offered no evidence in respect of the charges that were brought even though they were reliant on police witnesses. Mr Simon Cordell had been wrongfully arrested for not having insurance when he was insured to drive. He also did not cause any Anti Social Behaviour on this date in question.

There are no CAD's for this date, but yet they was meant to be, a CAD referring to the pacific details that should be relating to a person stating, that they believed a burglary was in progress and of the 999 caller stating that they had seen a person who was putting a flat screen TV into Mr Simon Cordell's van.