to cause anti social behaviour. See schedule forwarded to you on Friday. All the matters alleged you have

already provided instructions and challenges to the allegations. Put as simply as possible you deny organising,

providing sound equipment or sourcing premises for the purposes of holding raves / Parties. You challenged

whether the events in question are illegal raves as trespass is not present. This argument has no bearing on your

case as you deny and have repeatedly denied sourcing premises, providing equipment or organising any of the

events with the exception of Mill Marsh Lane which you accept you were present for a small birthday party

gathering (again no witness statement / witness details provided)

I have advised you that it is my view that regardless of whether Progress Way was a private party (LAPSO

loophole) or a rave the bottom line is that anti social behaviour was caused due to noise nuisance / disorderly conduct.

You seek to use the appeal proceedings to challenge the law by arguing that any person living in a commercial

building under a LAPSO notice can hold moving in parties. They are not holding a rave as trespass is not

present but they are causing anti social behaviour to neighbouring residents when they hold events that cause

extreme noise etc. On no occasion during your instructions did you say that you were living on the premises,

nor did you state that your sound system had been seized.

You are appealing against the Magistrates Court decision that you organised these events, provided sound

equipment or sourced premises.

You wish to introduce topics that have no bearing to the narrow issue which is did you organise or provide

equipment for these events, which if they went ahead would or had the potential of causing anti social

behaviour. I am under no obligation to argue points that are not relevant to your appeal.

I have copied Michael Carroll in in this email and you must now communicate with him as our relationship has irretrievably broken down.

The case is listed again for disclosure if required on Wednesday before