

76. In what is referred to as a "CFS call" in a short abbreviation a member of the public requesting assistance by way of a phone call for services that in turn has led an investigating officer(s) into using a mg11 form otherwise known as a witness statement, to take a version of events of a person.

78. The issue of relevance being highlighted is in witness statements that were contained within the Asbo applications bundle. Serious errors once again seem to have occurred, that leave serious concerns towards any guilty verdict, as for sure when any official person is filling out such a form as a mg 11 there should be statements of truth that have been complied with as well as many other measurements that should be met that seem to be under serious scrutiny as for they were written by police officers and not the witnesses themselves, to even further the rights to justice the Appellant was not allowed to call any witnesses or any other police officers whose information was within the application's bundle he was only allowed to have the police officers that the application wanted us to have, he simply was denied his rights to have any other witnesses being called.

79. The members of the public's statements that could be proved to be no other than information reports that should be classified as non-disclosed intelligence were allowed to remain within the application's bundle as witness statements without being questioned by the acting solicitors, although it was constantly being brought up.

80. On the 10th March 2015, this date was due to be the full Antisocial Behaviour Order hearing but the Court had made a mistake and only listed it for a one-day hearing.

81. District Judge Williams sitting, apologised for the error and said that a part hearing could take place or the full hearing is adjourned to a later date so that the full hearing could be dealt with over two days.

82. The Appellant was upset as he wanted this to be dealt with and only agreed that the case is adjourned until the 03/08/2014 and the 04/08/2014 if district Judge Williams heard the case, she cleared her diary and promised that she would be the Judge that would reside over the case.

83. District Judge Williams also stated that this was the 1st time she had ever seen a case in which the commissioner of the metropolitan police had brought an Antisocial Behaviour Order in front of her in this way in a civil capacity.

84. The disclosure was asked for and this was once again never given.

85. On the 2nd August 2015 The Appellant's mother received a phone call from Miss Ward acting solicitors, regarding a statement she had just found in the emails relating to Antisocial Behaviour Order, The Appellant's mother asked if this could be sent over via email to her, in knowing it was too late to do anything about it because the full hearing started the next day. Similar things were continuously happening throughout the case; the solicitors seemed to only do anything on the case the day before the hearings, or a few days before it was due to take place. Many emails were sent including many phone calls that were made to get the right things done, most of the emails went not replied to for months, phone calls was not picked up, or if they were we were told that things would be addressed when they never were.

86. The Appellant attended Court on the 03rd August 2015 and the 04th August 2015 for the full hearing of the Antisocial Behaviour Order, only to find the stipulation and reasons he had allowed the case to be adjourned to these dates had not been adhered to, the presiding Judge was not District Judge Williams, it fact it was District Judge D Pigot who would be presiding over the full hearing.

87. Non-disclosure was again spoken about but nothing came of this and the case went forward.

88. We understand this is only our opinion but we believe this Judge had already found that she was going to prove the case before it even started for the full Antisocial Behaviour Order in favour of the applicants.

89. Before the hearing started The Appellant's mother informed the Judge the Appellant was very ill and she did not think he would cope due to health problems. She continued with the case none the less and did not ask the Appellant's mother to elaborate further. Later within the hearing the judge would notice that there should have been medical records added for the Applicants response within his bundle and this was missing along with a lot of other documents that had been requested for his defence, the Appellants bundle was only around 82 pages when it should have been around 300 pages.

90. Continually through cross-examination by the Appellants barrister toward the police officers, District Judge D Pigot kept interrupting and telling the barrister he could not ask the questions he was asking even though what he was asking corresponded with what the police had put in their own statements. The Appellant's barrister even commented to the Judge Pigot "I am only asking questions pertaining to what the police have put in their statements" also he said to the Judge "I hope you are not going to have as much due-diligence with my client on cross-examination as you have with me" to which the Judge replied she would.

91. This was certainly not the case and in fact, the Judge allowed the Appellant to be cross-examined extremely harshly even knowing the Appellant had health problems.

92. On the date of trial the Appellants solicitor had not even prepared a copy of the bundle so for the Appellant to have his own bundle, he was never told by the acting solicitors that he should of had his own copy and there was also the issue of there being a lot of documents missing from the Appellant's bundle.

93. On the day of trial when the Appellant took the stand, the Judge did ask where the Appellants bundle was, he stated he had never been given one, and did not know he needed one, the Judge did ask if there was a spare bundle that the Appellant could use which there was not. the Judge carried on by allowing the Appellant to be cross-examined clearly anyone could see the Appellant was unwell, from time to time the Judge passed the Appellant her own bundle.

94. Thought the trial the Appellant because the appellant did not understand what he was being asked, the problem with this is how is someone with learning difficulties is meant to be able to read what is contained within the bundle.

95. The Appellant feels that if he had had been solicited correctly then for sure he would have been better prepared, as for this would have left him with access to his own bundle so for him and his barrister to have been able to defend the Applicant correctly, therefore efficiently. Prior to the hearing this would have been the right point of time of opportunity for any of the support network the Applicant has or may need in place to have complied with what would have been in the Applicants best interest, so for that group of people working together as a collective of people, to have been able to off oversee this case, we all now feel this was totally inappropriate for Mr Simon Cordell to have been apposed to such behaviour and therefore challenge the rightfulness of what was allowed by the Judge to have happened.

96. To the best of the Appellants barrister abilities he questioned the legitimacy of many issues of our concern that we have raised in may of the correspondents to the relevant persons of interest, relating towards this case, one of them concerns that we continually have raised is in relation towards the CAD's that are being used in the Asbo application, such problems referring to the cads are in reference towards the case that is linked to Progress Way on 6th 7th 8th June 2014, this line of interrogation, such as what has been taken on by members of the police lead to a line of questioning such as:- if there was an illegal rave taking place at the same time on Crown Road.

97. The Appellants barrister was asked to make this line of questioning, the reason being, after reading the local news papers and making other inquires we new for sure this was a true fact, that there was another party at Crown road on the same dates.

98. It was latter revealed that the acting solicitors had not gone over the CADs before the trial, although they was asked too many times and this should have been a standard fair practice for them.

99. If asked by any official person involved in the on goings of the Anti-Social Behaviour Order, the defendant can and is happy to provide a list of correspondents that have been requested by way of mobile texts and electronic emails by him and his per network. In them