

From: Lorraine Cordell <lorraine32@blueyonder.co.uk>
Sent time: 09/09/2016 09:55:14 AM
To: Rewired Rewired <re_wired@ymail.com>
Subject: RE: I sent this to Josie

Simon when i opened the email this is how it come out i could not read it so had to go to your email and save to pdf

not sure if it will come out to Josey like the below or not.

From: Rewired Rewired [mailto:re_wired@ymail.com]
Sent: 08 September 2016 23:12
To: Lorraine Cordell
Subject: I sent this to Josie

Dear Josie I do not understand why it is not in my best interests for you to serve the suggested amendments that I made in relation towards the letter that you proposed sending to Ms Sally Gilchrist. The reason I do not understand is because: 1. Mr Morris advice on 4th April 2016 was the same as what I had explained to yourself when the case had started dated 12th September 2014 as received on receipt by yourself and by method of email's and them email's referred to the respondent's application of an Asbo order quoting "That a case should not rely solely on hearsay" as mine seems to do by the police officer's. Most of the hearsay in any case is reported to be third party and therefore carry less weight in any case. 2. I want to show the true facts about the case as I am the one who is suffering because of untrue cut and paste facts that represent the basics of the respondent's case and that singed evidence being off fabricated police statements, as detailed in the amendments towards your letter to Sally Gilchrist, whom is already in receipt of such evidence but refuses to act upon such intelligence in accordance of the law and you advise me to ignore this even low I suffer. 3. I understand that a lot of the matters that should be dealt with at court will be. 4. I still argue for a speedy and fair trial: and feel that when a judge asks the respondent to reply by a set date such as the 1/08/2016 as the judge HHJ PAWLAK has ordered to happen it should. 5. The respondent should do so within the time duration as dated 01/09/2016 and agreed with the judge and then received with the correct response, as has not happened. 6. I have been awaiting the reply since 00/02/2016 from an ongoing civil application that is dated 13th August 2014 so to be able to have a fair trial. 7. After waiting on the 01/-9-2016 with no response I waited till the 2/09/2016 and telephoned the respondent I spoke with a lady called sally gill Hurst, she states that she has served some paperwork to my solicitor's at the beginning of august a month prior, after finishing our conversation I contacted my solicitor she explained to me that she was away on holiday and that I must wait till she gets back on the 6th September 2016. 8. I again put the phonedown and called my solicitor firm's office to see if any paperwork had been served to be told no. 9. On the 8TH August I spoke with my mother who explained to me that she had been in contact with my solicitor and that I would be reviving a letter to sign to be sent to Sally Gill Hurst. On receiving this letter it raised the following concerns. 1. The paperwork has not been served in time. 2. In a preliminary hearing, so to be ready for the appeal the judge ordered this to be achieved. 3. The respondent has had another 6 months sine 22/02/2016 from the start of the on goings as dated 13/08/2014 4. We are now at 08/09/2016 the appeal is on the 26/09/2016 this leads me to the concerns of once again the case being postponed, as it has already been ten times before. 5. I have handed to article Six the right to a speedy and fair trial in regard to some of my human rights being breached because of the on goings in the ASBO proceedings drafting clear corruption and fabricated evidence asking for the case to be investigated our the correct paperwork to be served in accordance to my response to HHJ PAWLAK.

6. Yes, my instructions are clear, I did not organised any illegal raves or provide any equipment with an intention of holding an illegal rave and surely did not cause any Anti Social behavior on the dates sighted, this is also to include Mill Marsh Lane with no exception. 7. Yes in some I am visiting my friends who are or were homeless at the time. 8. The legal technicality you state that I refer to i.e. absence of trespass that does not prevent parties from being held in accordance of the law, may lead to a stand alone anti social behavior order if a person commits a public order offence, to which I did not cause as I was not organizer neither did I take part in the organisation of the party or did I commit any civil or criminal offence. 9. In any one un-regular occasion over the

duration of the weekend I can understand the noise nuisance and distress to neighbors this can cause if the allegations were to be true and not fabricated by police as I can prove. I was not the organizer of the event. The case is based on what the respondent based it upon and in my case this is the organisation of illegal raves not the organisation of raves:- 1. I proved that indoor parties are not illegal unless there is a breach of the licensing act 2003 as this is the law for entertainment. 2. That the word rave can not be used in a building as section 63 requires as a key element unless trespass has taken place. 3. I proved that I was not the organizer of the events as I was not. 4. That I never took part in any anti social behavior or intended or encouraged any other person to neither. 5. Anti social behavior was not clearly caused as a result of the Progress

Way by myself or my actions as I was only a visitor who never caused any offence. I feel as my solicitor you should have my best interest at heart and if you know a police officer to be caught for being corrupt for, the evidence that they have supported so that your client faced a wrongful conviction of any sort you should not encourage them to not stand up for what is correct and right, so I do not understand why you would ask me to reconsider whether the attached document should be served on the Respondent. The amendments I made have all ready been served on the 22/02/2016 and the Judge ask for the

respondent to answer them questions from the 01/02/2016 and the respondent refuse to do so. I do insist for the challenges to be answered as it is my life that has been tarnished for civil proceedings so I do confirm this on writing. I feel that the meeting has been left by yourself to the last minute I have been requesting this in a multitude of emails to be achieved well in advance to the date that you have now sited a few days before the appeal, when I know that you have had ample amounts of time, so if this is the earliest time I will take it and I look forward to meeting Mr Andy Locke, thank you. I do not see how the case will not get re listed due to lack of disclosure to be quite frank. I do not understand why any solicitor would encourage me to go to trial or appeal and not draft out the police corruption that you can clearly see in turn making me accept the clearly fabricated evidence and wrongful conditions that I know have been imposed on myself under section 63 with no trespass taking place, this being said as for any of the incidents contained in the Asbo and with you

knowing the true facts of them incidents being contained in private air. There is also that of the clearly fabricated evidence I am standing against as for sure any solicitor works in Co Hurst towards the understanding of noun precedent in relation to the weight of any evidence put towards a client. I am concerned about the case, relying solely on hearsay by police. Is this correct in procedure? However I do understand and take note, that all resident parties contained within the respondents bundle, were held on single occasions and in places of residence and were not held as a running commercial business by myself or by any other to my knowledge. I have also read that any person is entitled to have a house or resident party in private air under the licensing act 2003 or where they reside. To my understanding, each accused incident in the respondents bundle is a place of residence and was in fact different people holding their own private parties at their places of residence. Also there may have been complaints in regards to issues of concern about them house parties I was not the occupier of any of the accused locations; neither was I the hire of equipment and surely not the organizer. I was establishing a hire company around the dates of the accused events and have provided evidence of the work I had been committing myself to. I was not trading at the time and whenever hiring out equipment I do with due care and responsibility, however I do not accept responsibility for other people's actions when hiring out such equipment in good faith. I do take legal action for any persons when breaking my terms and conditions. I do not hire out equipment to any person

without being
in the constraints of the law and in good business practice or without the correct ID. On one occasion I did hire out a sound system in good faith on a pro Bono basis, this being of the understanding that no laws were being broken and as a Ltd company acting responsible. I know that I should not be liable for them persons actions when hiring out equipment and having the correct protocols in place as I clearly do. I do not feel that it is right for the respondent to obtain criminal punishments such as section 63 of the crime and disorder act 1994 and for that section to be then imposed against my freedom of movement and many other Human Right that have been breached by being pro-claimed under wrongful civil proceedings, as for a multitude of incorrect procedures and legislation that I have occurred, for instance I have no previous nature offences of a similar sort as required by law when applying a stand alone Asbo on a persons statue, as I do feel I should of have had the right to challenge the allegations under a true Criminal investigation, especially when referring to the organisation of illegal raves as the respondent has clearly headlined the

offence to be. RE: SIMON CORDELL V. THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS APPEAL AGAINST THE IMPOSITION OF AN ASBO – 26TH SEPTEMBER 2016 AT

10:00 AM I write even further with concerns regarding: Your issues of concern dated 08/09/2016 that was received by email at the time: 06:00pm, So as towards the letter drafted by yourself and amended by myself is the response as detailed below, with the listed concerns. 1. I understand that the correct protocols for the offences I am being accused of should be carried out in a manner to be of a high professional standard as required by law, so for me to be able to defended myself. 2. I

am therefore not happy with the issues of police corruption not being addressed, by you self and all other legal persons, as I know I can not stand a fair trial or appeal without them issues being rectified first and this is why the amendments have been made to your letter to Sally Guill Hurst. 3. I have suffered since

2014 for conditions that have been wrongfully

imposed upon myself and still awaiting an appeal. 1.1 As my acting solicitor

you drafted a letter requesting the respondent to remove any CADS that have been placed in the Asbo bundle served to myself Mr Simon Cordell. 1.1.1 I

understand that they cads are all ready inputted incorrectly and you and the barrister take note of this, as do ,

we all achieve this in the understanding that I could not have and did not commit the alleged offences that I have been accused of that are contained with

a vast majority of other CADS

within incorrect and blocked out context; such as the Att Locations

that are un-redacted and do state Crown road and

other locations such as Hardy Way, on the same day as progress way so I could

not have committed as I could not be in two places at once. 1.1.2 There is a

further issue in relation to a significant amount of Cads that should contain

the Att Locations that have been blocked out such as referred to as retracted

and them CADS that also contain the Grid reference numbers that also prove other locations already. 1.1.3 However I am even

further worried about CADS such as all the listed and any in the format such as fully retracted where know

person can, or is able to see the true CAD intelligence in regards to the

wrongful fabricated claims being held against my person, being so reviled for all to see. 1.1.4 I do believe

when all CADS do get retracted and a blocked, then that

will help any barrister and put them in a better position to defend me, so for

all Cads and pages in his Asbo application being

served in an unedited format

and so for myself to understand the truth,

to why the conditions have been imposed upon myself since

the Asbo's on goings. 2. I am also seriously worried about the reasons why the

case has taken so long with all the evidence I have supported towards my

innocent plea, such as:- 2.1. The incorrect time stamps. 2.2. The facts of the

conditions of law relating to a section 63 of the crime and disorder act being

imposed upon myself for indoor house parties without tress

pass taking place. 2.3. The Events that I am being accused of no police

officers have gone and spoken to any land lord's or owners. 2.4. There has been

no evidence of a breach under the Licensing act 2003. 2.5. No proof of

organisation being presented

against myself. 2.6. There is also the matter being of; all incidents that

are in the Asbo application with particulars to them members of the police involved, not having 101 books that are time stamped for them incidents and I

once again would like to request them. 3. In relation to all cads that do have

a grid number of 53491,196790 and or Att location of Crown road I request that

the police officers involved in attending that incident attended court so to be

able to prove that what PC Elesmore stated to the Judge at the magistrates court on the date of trial to obtain a guilty plea against my person, not to be

creditable in any weight , that being of all the statements he made that are

contained in a copy of the court transcripts, which do quote: When making the

Asbo application and redacting any intelligence he was sure that all event on

the 7th 8th June 2014 was in fact 100% progress way and that he was sure that

there was no other parties / events in the borough on them dates. I intended

for my acting barrister to be able to use a copy of the magistrate's court trial

transcripts on the date of the appeal. Pleas can you reply to this letter of

concern Kind regards Simon Cordell

