

had no idea what was going on but proceeded to follow him outside the Court room, it was at this point of time when Mr Locke turned around and said quite curtly “I do not want you to speak anymore”, as we got closer to him he also informed the Appellant it was not good to shout out, “in open Court,” to which the Appellant had to agree with, but the Appellant felt so let down as it seemed his barrister did not even want to talk to him, since the Appellant had last seen him in 2014 and this is another part of the reasons that the Appellant wanted to speak with him, as so much had already gone wrong with this case and the Appellant felt very nervous as he did not know what was going on, or what would be said as he had not spoken to his barrister.

The Appellants mother, who had witnessed all of this, did try to explain to the Appellants barrister, what the Appellant wanted to say, in reference to the receipt of the requested Non-disclosure and asked Mr Locke to explain what the schedule is about before we all went back into court.

The Appellant also asked about the two article 6’s that had been issued by the court, which had never been addressed:- “by the Court,” which pertains to The Appellants Human Rights and importantly his rights to a fair and speedy trial, to what had not happened. The Article 6 the right to a fair and speedy trial had been handed to the Court at earlier hearings, as The Appellants knew Mr Locke knew nothing about this and other information that had happened, so he felt it important to explain this to him at the time. Mr Locke explained that the schedule was what the Judge had asked for on the 04/04/2016, my mother replied this was not all the Judge had asked for,