

The Appellant will state that this date should be struck from the Respondent's bundle as there was no rave / Event. The Appellant did not supply any sound recording equipment.

The admission of this disputed conversation is extremely prejudicial to the Appellant. The Appellant finds it bizarre that he was not arrested for any criminal offences bearing in mind the manner of driving described. The Appellant will state that he did not engage in any anti-social behaviour on this date. The Appellant will also state that he was in his private motor vehicle.

(f) MILLMARSH LANE- 9th AUGUST 2014

The Appellant will state that he was invited to a private birthday party by one of the persons occupying the premises at Millmarsh Lane, and that they had been occupying these premises since before the 27/07/2014 which the police were aware off.

There is also a missing CAD 9717 which related to some intelligence received, The Appellant believe this intelligence will hold information that will show he had done nothing wrong.

The Appellant will state that there was a section 144 LAPSO notice displayed and the building was being treated as a home. The Appellant will state that he was an invited guest and not a trespasser.

The Appellant will state that there was no rave as the location was not open air and by virtue of him being invited by one of the occupiers who had established a section 144 LAPSO notice he was not a trespasser so the legal definition of a rave could not be made out.

The Appellant was a guest at the location and not an organiser. He attended the location in his private motor vehicle. He did not provide any audio or sound equipment.

The Appellant did not commit any criminal offences. The Appellant did not engage in any anti-social behaviour.

The second event at Millmarsh Lane on the 27/07/2014 the Appellant disputes that he was an organiser. He disputes that he was operating the gate as stated by police.

The Appellant will state that this was not an illegal rave but a private birthday party for a girl who lived there, that he attended as a guest and not as an organiser.

The Appellant did not commit any criminal offences. The Appellant did not engage in any anti-social behaviour.

(2) WHETHER THE APPLICANT CONTENDS THAT THE INVOLVEMENT HE ADMITS, WAS IN FACT WITHIN THE LAW, IF SO WHY

Please see above.