Subject: **Urgent Review – Fraudulent Representation Order Compromising Proceedings by Tuckers Solicitor Firm Representatives**

Pages Included: 1 of 16.

- **This is the next reply from me that will be the 80 or so email sent!**

- **Nicole Windele (windelen@tuckerssolicitors.com)**
  a) This weblink is the main directory with the original Audio Recordings of the minutes of the meeting I recorded but for now the weblink below this is the most of importance to overview!
     1+ <**Dir**> 35.1. 02-10-25-Audio-Film-Meeting

- **This proves:**
  a) **Tuckers solicitors staff knew the reason of arrest and their attendance at Wood Green Police Station for me was because of Case 1 (s.4A Public Order Act, URN:** 01YE1267925
  b) **Tuckers solicitors staff knew they were going to complete a self-referral form to obtain legal aid for me and that the real reason for arrest had already been no further actioned under URN:** 01YE1267925

* Use **CTRL F** and search for **4A**
  1+ **Exhibited weblink to search:** https://everyoneloginto.me/01.%2002-08-2025-Another-Case/02.%20All-Docs/35.1.%2002-10-25-Audio-Film-Meeting/35.%20Draft-Minutes-of-the-Meeting-02-10-25.pdf

- **The Following emails of my concerns**
  1+ 37. Sent-02-10-25.pdf
  2+ 38. Sent-03-10-25.pdf
  3+ 39. Sent--06-10-25.pdf
  4+ 39. Sent-06-10-25.pdf
  5+ 40. Sent-06-10-25.pdf

- ⚖️ **LEGAL BREACH: CHARGE SUBSTITUTION AND O'HARA V RUC**
  a) The arrest was explicitly for **"Harassment,"** as confirmed by:
     1+ **PC Chan's statement**: "PC Obsiye arrested Simon through the door for harassment"
     2+ **PC Obsiye's Statement**: "I arrested the suspect… and gave the grounds as harassment"
     3+ **PC Williams's Statement**: "PC Obsiye explained to the resident… they were under arrest and cautioned them through the door"
  b) Yet the charge later substituted was "**Threats To Cause Criminal Damage,**" which was "**Never Articulated At The Time Of Arrest.**"
  c) This violates the legal precedent set in "**O'HARA V CHIEF CONSTABLE OF THE RUC (HOUSE OF LORDS, 1997),**" which ruled:

* "Suspicion by itself will not justify an arrest. There must be a factual basis for it… and the arresting officer must be able to articulate what offence they believed was being committed."

- **In plain terms:**
  a) You cannot arrest someone for one offence and later switch it to another
  b) The arresting officer must clearly state the offence at the time—not retroactively
  c) In your case, "**All Officers Stated Harassment,**" yet the charge was substituted without legal basis
     1+ This is not a technical error, it is a "**Procedural Breach**" that invalidates the arrest and undermines the legitimacy of the prosecution.

* **Exhibited Weblink:** 46. Sent-08-10-25.pdf

Subject: Urgent Review – Fraudulent Representation Order Compromising Proceedings by Tuckers Solicitor Firm Representatives

To: Legal Aid Agency (contactcivil@justice.gov.uk; LAAcomplaints@justice.gov.uk;)
CC:
1+ McLartys Solicitors (info@mclartyssolicitors.com)
2+ Tuckers Solicitors (tuckers@tuckerssolicitors.com)
3+ Kenneth Marsden, Compliance Manager (marsdeni@tuckerssolicitors.com)
4+ Claire Parrott, Senior Partner (parrottc@tuckerssolicitors.com)
5+ Highbury Corner Magistrates' Court (Northlondonmc@justice.gov.uk)
6+ CPS North London Team (northlondon@cps.gov.uk)
7+ DCS Caroline Haines, Met Police North BCU Disclosure Inbox (DPA&FOIA_NorthAreaBCU@met.police.uk)
8+ Solicitors Regulation Authority (report@sra.org.uk)

Dear Sirs/Madams,

I write to lodge a formal complaint and submit my disclosure submission. It has come to light that "**Fraudulent Representation Orders (RO1)"** is created in my name by Tuckers Solicitors LLP. This document is procedurally defective and was issued without lawful arrest, caution, or executed defendant forms.

- **The Exhibited Article of Fraud They Have Created Is in My Name Mr. Simon Paul Cordell and We Exhibited as**: --

Legal Aid Agency

Legal Aid Agency
Crime Applications Team
23 Stephenson Street
Birmingham
B2 4BH

DX 13041
Birmingham 1

T : 0300 200 2020
E : BirminghamCAT@justice.gov.uk

Simon Cordell
280 Durant Road

EN3 7AZ

Date of Order : 04/08/2025
URN: 01YE1267925

Date of Birth: 26/01/1981

Court Name: Highbury Corner Magistrates' Court

Representation Order

In accordance with the Legal Aid Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012, you are granted legal aid for magistrates' court proceedings in relation to the offences listed below.

This order covers work by a litigator only (including advice and assistance regarding an appeal against conviction or sentence but excluding the actual appeal proceedings).

This order automatically extends if your case is or has been committed to the Crown Court for sentencing to cover work by a litigator and junior advocate in respect of the Crown Court proceedings. It does not, however, cover work in the Crown Court if your case is committed or sent there for trial. If this happens, a further application will need to be made, and this will be assessed by the Legal Aid Agency.

The litigator/Solicitor appointed is:

Andrew Benington
Tuckers Solicitors LLP
39 Warren Street,
London,
W1T 6AF

Tuckers Solicitors LLP- On behalf of the Director of Legal Aid Casework

Offences

Offence	Date
Threats of Criminal Damage to another's Property	02/08/2025

- **Representation Order (RO1):**
  a) In this official document I will be addressing one of two Representation Orders, namely **"RO1."** as exhibited above.

b) The Representation Order I am addressing was **"Illegally Created in My Name by Tuckers Solicitors Through Fraudulent Means**."
c) **I Never Signed This Document:** and the original Criminal Charge for the urn must be **"Section 4A Public Order Act 1986 (Intentional Harassment, Alarm, Distress),"** as the **"Police Station Detention Custody Log,"** Prove!
d) The Criminal Charge for **"Threats to Criminal Damage."** has been improperly substituted while reusing the original Criminal Case that was No Further Actioned, URN number. I have only recently received disclosure of this fraudulent article, dated **"01/08/2025,"** and it constitutes an unlawful activity.
e) The document Legal Aid Form disclosed as "**Exhibit RO1 By The CPS And Prosecuting Teams,"** titled ***"Cordell RO1"***, is highly revealing of the **"Gross Misconduct Committed by Staff at Tuckers Solicitors LLP**," a contracted and regulated private firm that once acted on my behalf.
f) **The Illegality of Court Exhibit "RO1:** becomes clear when the article is cross-checked against my prior **"Email Complaints About Legal Aid"** (**As Evidenced In Emails**: 02. All-Docs) and against the disclosed **"Police Station Detention Custody Log:** 02. Return CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925Unused Material Disclosure22-09-2025.pdf
g) Together, these records prove the Representation Order was not lawfully created.
h) Accordingly, to the **"Representation Order RO1"** and is shown to be **"Fraudulent and Procedurally Defective,"** and I can prove this fact **"Beyond Reasonable Doubt."**

- **What the Representation Orders Say**
  a) **04/08/2025 URN: 01YE1267925:** Legal Aid granted for *Threats of Criminal Damage to another's Property*.
  b) **26/08/2025 URN: 01YE1300125:** Legal Aid granted for *Assault with Intent to Resist or Prevent Arrest*.
  c) Both orders list **"Tuckers Solicitors LLP"** as the appointed firm.
  d) Both orders cover *litigator work only*, not full Crown Court trial representation.

- **What the Custody Logs & Emails Prove**
  a) **Custody Log Entries (02–04/08/2025)**
    1+ I was booked in for **"Section 4A Public Order Act 1986 (Intentional Harassment, Alarm, Distress),"** not **"Threats to Criminal Damage."**
    2+ The charge swap occurred later, without a fresh arrest or caution.
    3+ This means the Representation Order must be dated **04/08/2025** and it is not as based on the **"Criminal Charge That Did Not Exist at The Time of Arrest**."

  b) **Emails (05–10/08/2025)**
    1+ I and your mother sent repeated emails to Highbury & Islington Court about bail conditions.
    2+ No CPS case files existed in the beginning months.
    3+ Yet Tuckers Solicitors claimed to have Representation Orders already in place — impossible if the CPS hadn't even served disclosure.

  c) **Solicitor Correspondence (Sept–Oct 2025)**

1+ Tuckers withdrew representation citing **"Client Confidentiality"** after I recorded the minutes to our first meeting.

2+ Tuckers solicitors staff admitted disclosure was incomplete and that the criminal charges had been swapped in the recording but stated it was law abiding when it is not. They failed to mention that they signed a self-referral legal aid consent form and swapped Criminal Charge from the no further Actioned case with urn number: **01YE1267925,** for a new Criminal Charge that happened a day latter after they had left and refused to return to the police station again and act on my behalf for the new charge swapped. They also failed to ask me to sign for the document as is mandatory procedure.

3+ This shows they knew that the self-generated legal aid Representation Order would be procedurally defective if recognised.

- **Why Else Can Exhibit "RO1" Be Proved to be Frauded Beyond Reasonable Doubt is Listed Below!**
  - a) **Mismatch Of Dates and Charges**: Custody logs prove I was arrested for harassment (**S.4A Public Order Act**), not threats to criminal damage.
  - b) The Representation Order must be dated **04/08/2025** but is not and lists a charge that wasn't lawfully booked until later.
  - c) **Procedural Breach**: No fresh arrest, caution, or Legal Aid application was made when charges were swapped. Yet Tuckers produced Representation Orders as if they were valid and failed to disclose them when requested at all other opportunities.
  - d) **Self-Grant Irregularity**: Emails confirm Tuckers used the LAA hack (**Self-Grant Scheme Illegally**) and still refused to act. This shows they issued orders without proper authority.
  - e) **Documentary Trail**: My Official Emails, custody logs, and solicitor correspondence all line up chronologically to show the Representation Orders don't match reality.

- **Statement Focusing Only on RO1**
  - a) The Representation Order title as: **"**Cordell RO1.pdf**"** exhibits the offence of **"Threats to Criminal Damage"** and is attached to **"URN 01YE1267925"** as (**RO1**) this Exhibited legal aid form is procedurally invalid. Custody logs confirm that the arrest recorded (**Public Order Act s.4A**) and that (**Threats of Criminal Damage**) was not lawfully adapted into a charge with the required process: there was **"No Caution Before Arrest, No Proper Custody Booking, No Interview,"** and **"No Lawful Legal Aid Application"** contemporaneous with the detention. The charge was later substituted without a fresh arrest, caution, meaning no Legal Aid application could exist!
  - b) **Emails From August–November 2025:** further confirm that Tuckers Solicitors relied on a **"Self-Granted Representation Order During the LAA Hack,"** then refused to act at any subsequent hearings.
  - c) The mismatch between **"Custody Records, CPS Disclosure, And RO1 All Demonstrate Beyond Reasonable Doubt That RO1 Was Fraudulently or Improperly Issued, Leaving the Defendant Unrepresented and Denied Fair Trial Rights."**

- **Legal Aid Contingency Limits Due to LAA Hack and Tuckers Solicitors' Abuse of Representation Orders!**
  a) It is submitted that the **"Legal Aid Agency (LAA) Hack"** created contingency limits which were **"Exploited by Tuckers Solicitors LLP."** In the course of this exploitation, staff at Tuckers unlawfully **"Self-Granted Representation Orders in My Name and Without Legal Consent.**
  b) **"This Order Was Created Without My Consent Or Signature And Is Illegally Being Used To Cover Charges That Had Been "Illegally Substituted."**

- **This Conduct Amounts To:**
  a) **Fraudulent creation of Representation Orders (RO1 and related documents).**
  b) **Unlawful charge substitution without fresh arrest, caution, or lawful Legal Aid application.**
  c) **Abuse of Legal Aid contingency limits during the LAA hack, resulting in denial of fair trial rights.**

- **Details of the LAA Hack**
  a) **Yes**: the Legal Aid Agency (**LAA**) cyber incident has been documented online**.**
  b) The hack began in **"December 2024,"** but it wasn't discovered until **"April 2025,"** and it caused months of disruption to legal aid systems.
  c) Contingency measures (**Including Self-Granting Representation Orders**) were formally introduced from **"10 June 2025"** and expanded on **"27 June 2025"** while the systems were being restored

    a) GOV.UK GOV.UK LCCSA solicitornews.co.uk The Law Society Gazette.

- **What This Means for My Case Dated 02/08/2025**
  a) **Contingency In Force:** By **02 August 2025**, LAA hack contingencies allowed solicitors to send self-grant Representation Orders when systems were unavailable.
  b) **Scope Of Self-Grant:** The contingency only authorised coverage for **"Existing Lawful Charges Recorded in Custody;"** it did not permit creating, substituting, or backdating offences.
  c) **The RO1 Context:** The **"Exhibited Ro1"** dated **04/08/2025** looks official but was **"Self-Granted."** That is acceptable only if it matched the custody-booked offence.
  d) **Mismatch:** Custody logs show arrest and detention for **"Public Order Act s.4A."** The **"RO1 Exhibit"** lists **"Threats to Criminal Damage."** This is a substitution without lawful arrest/caution or a new Legal Aid application tied to that offence.

- **Why Tuckers Solicitor Firm Is In The Wrong**
  a) **Tuckers Solicitor Firm Does Not Have A Licence to Alter Charges:** The self-grant scheme was a stopgap to keep defendants represented and not unrepresented as they have me in case 1 dated the **02/08/2025**. Also, the **"Self-Granted Representation Order Scheme"** is and was not a licence for **"Tuckers Solicitor Firm"** to be able to **"Backdate, Alter, Or Swap Criminal Charges At Their Own Discretion And For Unethical Reasons With Bad Intent!"**

b) **Unlawful Reinforcement of Their Own Misconduct: Tuckers Solicitor Firm Staff**: cannot use a hack contingency to **"Reinforce Police Misconduct Or Public Office Abuse"** by swapping an **"NFA'd URN"** to a different offence to keep a prosecution Team alive and set up their clients like me and all while pertaining to act as defending agency. Tuckers solicitor firms' actions are not lawful.

c) **Custody/Logs Confirm "Tuckers Solicitor Firm" Limited Attendance:** Their own attendance/release notes and the police disclosed detention custody logs show they **"Tuckers Solicitor Firm Was Only Present For S.4A And Not For Any Criminal Damage Allegation."**

d) **The Defendant Never Singed Legal Aid Execution for Case 1 Dated the 02/008/2025 with Tuckers Solicitor Firms Staff:** I **"Never Signed Any Legal Aid Form For The Substituted Offence;"** and therefore No executed defendant form for Legal Aid Act 2012 must exist for **"Tuckers Solicitor Firm Covering Any Criminal Damage Act Of Law."**

e) **Procedural Breach Chain: Police Detention Custody Records that they were withheld by Tuckers Solicitor Firm at times of Needed Disclosure that Prove**: No fresh arrest, caution, or custody re-booking; no CPS disclosure foundation; yet a **"Representation Order (RO)"** was issued for a different offence. That breaks the custody-to-charge-to-funding chain.

- **Exhibits That Prove "Tuckers Solicitor Firm has Committed Fraud that are Beyond Reasonable Doubt**
  a) **Exhibit C1 – Custody logs (02–04/08/2025):** 02. Return CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925Unused Material Disclosure22-09-2025.docx
     1+ **Label:** Arrested and detained for **s.4A**; **no** arrest/caution for criminal damage.
     2+ **Proof:** Timeline entries show **s.4A** as the booked offence throughout detention until the illegal swap took place the following morning after the custody clock was stopped and the **s.4A** was **No Further Actioned!**

  b) **Exhibit R1 – Representation Orders (04/08/2025 and 26/08/2025):**
     * 78. Received-Cordell RO1.pdf
     * 78. Received-Cordell RO2.pdf
     1+ **Label:** RO lists **Criminal Damage Threats** on **04/08/2025.**
     2+ **Proof:** Offences do not match custody-booked **s.4A** at the relevant times.

  c) **Exhibit S1 – Solicitor attendance/release Notes By Police:** 02. Return CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925Unused Material Disclosure22-09-2025.docx
     1+ **Label:** Tuckers Solicitor Firm Solicitor attendance recorded is in relation to **s.4A only.**
     2+ **Proof:** tuckers solicitor attendance aligns with police custody noted offence; **"No Record Of Any Further Arrest Or Police Caution For The Swapped Charge Of Criminal Damage though their Attendance."**

  d) **Exhibit E1 – CPS Files Disclosed (01-09-25** & the **10/10/2025):**

- **04. Original-CPS-Case-Archive (1) 01-09-25/**
  * [To Parent Directory]

  a) **CPS Case Summary**: 01. Case_Summary_pdf.pdf **States Arrested for**: S4a in the defendant Prepared Interview.
  b) **CPS S9 Witness Statements**: 02. CORDELL_Simon_01YE1267925_Section_9_pdf.pdf **States Arrested for:** Harassment Act 1997 through the door as he was refusing to open it
  c) **Court Notice of Grant of Bail**: 03. Defendant_Notice_of_Grant_of_Bail_pdf.pdf **States Arrested for:** Case reference: 01YE1267925. the threat would be carried out Contrary to sections 2(a) and 4 of the Criminal Damage Act 1971
  d) **Police Officers Statement**: 05. PC_Chan_pdf.pdf **States Arrested for:** Harassment Act 1997 through a closed front door.
  e) **Police Officers Statement**: 06. PC_obsiye_pdf.pdf **States Arrested for:** Harassment Act 1997 through a closed front door.
  f) **Police Officers Statement**: 07. PC_Williams_pdf.pdf **States Arrested for:** Harassment Act 1997 through a closed front door.
  g) **Police Officers Statement**: 08. PC_Wilson_Wallis_pdf.pdf **States Arrested for:** Harassment Act 1997 through a closed front door.
  h) **Police Officers BWF**: 11. ROH_01_mp4.mp4 **Demonstrates Arrested for:** Harassment Act 1997 through a closed front door.
  i) **The Prosecuting Teams Disclosed Charges Sheet**:12. Simon_CORDELL_Charges_pdf.pdf **States Arrested for:** Harassment Act 1997 through a closed front door and Threats to Cause Criminal Damage Act 1971 But no : **S4a.**

- **05. CPS-caseratio-10-10-25-Case-Files-02-08-25-/**
  * [To Parent Directory]

  a) **Initial Details Pros Case 22-09-2025:** 01. CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925 Initial Details Pros Case 22-09-2025.pdf **States Arrested for**: S4a In The Police Detention Custody Logs.
    1+ **Illegally Added Statement**: 01. Rebecca O'HARE Third Statement Added No-DisclosureRequest.pdf
  b) **Unused Material Disclosure 22-09-2025**: 02. Original-CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925 Unused Material Disclosure 22-09-2025-.pdf **States Arrested for**:
    2+ **Mr. S. P. Cordell's Return File**: 02. Return CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925Unused Material Disclosure22-09-2025.pdf
  c) **Police officers BWF:** 03. CKC 01 Witness arrest of Simon Cordell.mp4.mp4 **Demonstrates Arrested for:** Harassment Act 1997 through a closed front door.
  d) **A very small Part of the police Interview:** 05. Axon_Interview_Interview_Room_7_Camera_1_mp4.mp4 **Demonstrates Reason for Arrested**: Has been Deliberately Obscured to hide the start of the interview that proves the police detention was for Section 4a.
  e) **CPS Section 9 Witness Statements:** 06. CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925 Section 9 05-08-2025.pdf **States Arrested for:** Harassment Act 1997 through the

door as he was refusing to open it!

1+ **Label:** Bail/disclosure correspondence references **s.4A** for reason of arrest but the criminal offence disappeared from being inside of the MG4 Charge Sheet due to being no further actioned. **CPS** case paperwork served as disclosed proves **CPS** have already themselves No Further Action case **URN: 01YE1267925**.
CPS case disclosure also proves no; **"Representation Order (RO)**" could therefore be in place as no further arrests have taken place and now, we as the defending team claim the **"Representation Order (RO)"**anyway.

2+ **Proof:** Demonstrates **"Representation Order (RO)"** does not predates any lawful charge swap or disclosure foundation.

e) **Exhibit MG4 – Charge sheet history/metadata:** 12. Simon_CORDELL_Charges_pdf.pdf

1+ **Label:** Post-detention edits to offence description without matching custody event.

2+ **Proof:** No linked arrest/caution entry for the **"Threats To Cause Criminal Damage Act"** and the **s.4Act**; that is "**The Real Reason For Mr. Simon Paul Cordells Arrest In The Official Police Custody Detention Log Records Is Missing Proving It Got No Further Actioned.**"

f) **Exhibit L1 – Legal Aid transfer emails (02-08-25 till 30/10/25 & 01/12/2025):** <**Dir**> 02. All-Docs

1+ **Labels: Confirm** the **Fraud Act 2006** was committed by "**Tuckers Solicitor Firm when they Frauded a Self-Granted Representation Order (RO) Now Proved by It Being In Existence!**

2+ **More Proof:** Self-grant context does not authorise charge substitution or backdating.

g) **Exhibit F1 – The Defendant Statements:** <Dir> 02. Simons Defence Statements

1+ **Statements:** No signed defendant legal aid form for Threats To Cause Criminal Damage coverage that occurred on the **04/08/2025**.

2+ **Proof:** Absence of my signature for the substituted offence.

- **My Submissions**

a) While contingency measures were introduced due to the **"Legal Aid Agency Hack LLA,**" this caused the **"LLA Establishment To Authorise Solicitors To Be Allowed To Permit Themselves "Self-Grant Representation Orders,"** but the "**Legal Aid Agency**" did not authorise retrospective charge substitutions or reinforcement of police misconduct by abuse of their implemented systems of those solicitors!

b) The **04/08/2025 RO (Exhibit R1**) lists **"Threats to Criminal Damage,"** yet custody logs (**Exhibit C1**) and "**Attending Solicitor Notes (Exhibit C1 and S1)"** both confirm my arrest and police detention were solely for **s.4A Public Order Act.**

c) There was no fresh police arrest, police caution or executed legal aid form fulfilled by me at the request of any of the "**Police and/or Tuckers Solicitor Firm**

Representatives" for the alleged Threats to Cause Criminal Damage Act of Law (**Exhibit F1**), and the police charge sheet metadata shows post-detention edits without a matching detention Custody logs Record for any of the charges contained inside of (**Exhibit MG4**).

d) **CPS Files Disclosed (01-09-25 & the 10/10/2025):** (**Exhibit E1**) show CPS disclosure real reasons for arrest and a different reason for booking in at police station in the custody logs. Sealed and disclosed files were tampered with after disclosure was served. "**Rebeca O 'Hares Statements**" are fabricated as well as none signed by herself and the witnessing police officer and also that of her third statement has been illegally backdated and submitted to add additional fabrications to retrospective claims that have already been no further actioned by the prosecuting teams.

e) **All Emails From 02– Till Date (Exhibit L1) Prove That The Representation Order (RO Coverage Was Not Claimed In Accordance To Legal Protocols BY Tuckers Solicitor Firms Staff And That The CPS Have Backdated Disclosure To Times When It Never Existed**.

f) The attempt to swap a no further actioned "**NFA'd URN**" into another offence via a hack contingency (**Exhibit E1 "RO1"**) is procedurally unlawful.

g) This chain of exhibits proves beyond reasonable doubt that the "**Exhibited RO1**" was improperly used to legitimise an unsupported offence.

- **Requested Action:**
  a) Immediate review of the fraudulent Representation Orders.
  b) Confirmation that CPS North London has received this disclosure.
  c) Escalation to the Legal Aid Agency and Solicitors Regulation Authority for regulatory action against all those involved such as Tuckers Solicitor Firm & Co!
  d) Court acknowledgement that disclosure has been served via CPS, Court, and Police inbox and not to the compromised Police officers and/or Case Handlers!

- **Closing Line: I Mr. S. P. Cordell Claim Anyway Tuckers Solicitor Firm Frauded Self-Granted Representation Order (RO):**
  a) **Although RO1 Has Been Disclosed And Treated As Claimed**: I never signed or authorised this Representation Order. It was created without lawful process and is therefore invalid.
  b) **Tie To Custody Logs:** Custody records confirm no lawful arrest, caution, or Legal Aid application was made contemporaneous with the alleged charge. The order was later illegally substituted without lawful authority.
  c) **Prevent And Punish & Penalize For The Fraud:** The CPS disclosure bundle includes RO1 (Cordell RO1') as if valid, but cross-checking against custody logs and prior Legal Aid complaints proves it was fraudulently issued alongside with the rest of the disclosed.

d) **Conclusion:** RO1 may appear in CPS disclosure as claimed, but procedurally it is defective and cannot stand as lawful representation. Its existence in the bundle is itself evidence of misconduct.

- This is my 80th formal email submission in relation to these proceedings. I respectfully request urgent review and acknowledgement of receipt.

Yours faithfully,
Simon Paul Cordell

Additionally Attached Notes for the Email Above Are as Follows: --

- **Additionally Notes for Attachment: --**

- **Hospital Events (02–03/08/2025)**
  a) On **02/08/2025**, after police entered my home, I was taken by ambulance to hospital.
  b) Hospital records (**Exhibit HOSP-02/03** <Dir> 00.5. 02 03-08-25-Hospital) confirms that I was treated for injuries caused by assault from police officers while they were on active duty during the wrongful arrest for **Harassment Act 1997** that got latter No further Actioned By the police and the CPS.
  c) Two new officers took over at the hospital, then later another pair escorted me to **"Wood Green Police Station."**
  d) This means **"The Custody Booking On 03/08/2025"** was already disconnected from the original arresting officers and based on second-hand information hence **The Section 4a Act 1986** booking in at the police station and the **harassment Act 1997** being stated at time of arrest and caution in the **"Police BWF**!**"**

- **Why the Hospital Matters**
  a) **Break In Continuity**
    1+ I was first processed medically, not legally.
    2+ The hospital notes prove that I was injured and treated before being booked into the Wood Green Police Station.
    3+ That gap makes it impossible for police to claim a seamless custody-to-charge chain of events.

  b) **Custody Logs Vs Hospital Records**
    1+ Custody logs show that I was booked into the Wood Green Police Station for a **"Criminal Offence of Section 4a Public Order Act 1986."**
    2+ Hospital records confirm that I was not police cautioned or police charged at the hospital.
    3+ Therefore, any later substitution (criminal damage threats) was not founded in a legal law-abiding situation were a lawful arrest occurred for that Criminal Offence.

  c) **Solicitor Presence Mismatch**

1+ Tuckers attended custody on **03/08/2025** for the **s.4A** matter.
2+ They were not present at the hospital, nor for any later substitution.
3+ Their own notes confirm attendance only for **s.4A**, and not the newly swapped criminal offence of threats to cause criminal damage.

d) Gate Arrest Scenario Explanation – Gate Arrest and Procedural Abuse

When a person is sentenced to prison for an imprisonable offence, they serve their term and are due to be released at the end of that sentence. Sometimes, on the day of release, the police carry out what is known as a **"Gate Arrest"** — arresting the individual at the prison gates for a separate offence allegedly committed before the sentence began. In practice, this often means the offence dates back years, to a time when the person was free before custody.

This practice causes concern because the police usually know about such offences much earlier. If they deliberately hold back the arrest until release, "**It Wrongly Prevents The New Sentence From Running Consecutively With The Existing One, Effectively Extending The Person's Time In Custody."** By law, a gate arrest requires the officer to take the person back to the police station for processing before any further action.

In my case, the "**Alleged S.4A Public Order Act Offence"** was reviewed and dropped by the CPS at Wood Green Police Station. However, the custody officer — who has a history of targeting me and has lost prior cases — was determined to set me up again. As the senior officer ("**Skipper**") at Wood Green, he openly encouraged his staff to act against me. When the CPS dropped the charge, he did not release me at the gate as required. Instead, he "**Unlawfully Swapped The Charges**," refused to release me, and forced me back into the police cells and then into court. This constitutes an "**Illegal Gate Caution Instead Of Legal Arrest"** and a clear abuse of process. The officer's actions demonstrate deliberate misconduct: withholding charges to manipulate sentencing, failing to release me when the case was dropped, and fabricating grounds to continue detention.

Logs Prove

1+ From the hospital into the police Custody Suite, the only lawful offence was Harassment Act 1997, but I got booked into custody for a **s.4A.**
2+ Tuckers solicitor attended and acted on the custody logs intel which stated a **s.4A**. and then afterwards left the police station on the same day what was again the **03/08/2025** and his departure was at 7pm. The police told me that the Cps dropped the case on the 04/08/2025 at around 4Am.
3+ Tuckers Solicitors Firm Staff refused to come back for the new charge dated the **04/08/2025.**
4+ When Case 1 for (s.4A Public Order Act, and with URN: **01YE1267925** was formally withdrawn by Government Staff), with a (**NFA**), police should have

gate-arrested me with a new process if they wanted to pursue threats to cause criminal damage.

5+ They did not. Instead, they illegally swapped charges on paper after the hospital and custody sequence ended for what I was booked in for.

- **How it is Framed**
  a) On **02/08/2025** I was taken by ambulance to hospital after being injured during arrest. Hospital records confirm treatment, not caution or charge. On **03/08/2025** when I was booked into custody for **Section 4A Public Order Act**. Tuckers Solicitors attended only for that offence and was present only on the **03/08/2025**.
  b) On **04/08/2025** the **Section 4A case was dropped**, yet police created a new charge for **"Threats to Criminal Damage"** without **CPS** involvement as they never even had the paperwork at court. This also happened without any solicitor being presence at my requests and as if it were at police station gate arrest without legal process. The hospital records and custody logs together prove the substituted charge was fabricated after the No Further action fact and without ant new mandatory lawful arrest or caution able to support it.

Timeline proof of the 04/08/2025 swap

a) **04/08/2025 — Charge substitution recorded without arrest/caution**

1+ **Exhibit C1 (Custody logs, 02–04/08/2025):** Booking and detention entries show arrest for Public Order Act s.4A (intentional harassment/alarm/distress) throughout 02–03/08/2025. No entry records an arrest or caution for **"**Threats to Criminal Damage.**"**

2+ **Exhibit R1 (Representation Order, 04/08/2025, URN: 01YE1267925):** Lists **"Threats Of Criminal Damage To Another's Property"** as did **PC Obsiye** and **Pc Chan** as they founded another offence on the **02/08/2025**, that lead to the custody records **showing s.4A** on the **03/08/2025**.

3+ **Exhibit D1 (CPS unused material disclosure schedule):** Lists a 999 call (**CAD6844/02AUG25**) and harassment-related crime report, but the criminal damage threat appears only as a narrative derived from the CAD, not as a booked charge on **02–03/08/2025**.

4+ **Exhibit MG4 (Charge Sheet History):** Created/modified dates show the charge description was updated post-detention. No linked custody event exists to lawfully found the substituted charge.

5+ **Exhibit H1 (Weblinks List):** Links to **RO1 PDFs** and custody record exports confirm timestamp mismatch between the RO1 offence and the custody offence.

b) Direct inference: The offence on the RO1 (**Threats to Criminal Damage**) was substituted on or by **04/08/2025** without a matching custody event (arrest/caution), which is only visible via document timestamps and custody log content.

- **Why the swap is unlawful**
  a) **No Fresh Arrest or Caution:**
  1+ **Exhibit C1 (Custody logs)** shows no entry for arrest or caution for criminal damage. Substituting a charge requires a lawful process step (fresh arrest or formal re-booking with caution). It did not occur.

b) **Breaks The Custody-To-Charge Chain of Accountability:**
   1+ **Exhibit MG4 (Charge sheet history)** shows retroactive alteration, but custody records don't support it. This violates the requirement that the charge must reflect the arrest/caution basis and interview grounds.

c) **Disclosure Inconsistency Undermines Lawfulness:**
   1+ **Exhibit D1 (CPS unused material disclosure): "**Nothing to disclose**"** conflicts with listed materials that would be essential to justify a new charge (CAD audio, BWV, full interview). The absence of those materials prevents a lawful evidential foundation for the substituted charge.

d) **Representation Order Scope Mismatch:**
   1+ **Exhibit R1 (RO1, 04/08/2025):** Funding granted for a substituted offence not lawfully grounded in custody. The RO was used to legitimise defective process, not to reflect an actual booked offence on 02–03/08/2025.

e) **Self-Grant Irregularity Context:**
   1+ **Exhibit L1 (30/11/2025 emails):** Confirms Tuckers relied on **"**self-granted**"** RO during the LAA hack. That contingency did not authorise retrospective charge substitutions or bypass arrest/caution requirements.

- **How it is easily proved from your exhibits**

a) **Timestamp Conflict (Single-Day Substitution):**
   1+ Compare the custody log offence entries on 02–03/08/2025 (s.4A Public Order Act) with the RO1 issued 04/08/2025 listing **"**Threats to Criminal Damage.**"**
   2+ Exhibits: **C1 vs R1** demonstrate the same-day mismatch without any intervening lawful event.

b) **Absence Of Procedural Events:**
   1+ Verify there is no custody record line for **"**Arrested for criminal damage**"** and no **"**Caution administered for criminal damage.**"**
   2+ Exhibits: **C1** (full export) shows no such lines.

c) **Charge Sheet Edit Trail:**
   1+ Pull created/modified metadata from the charge sheet. It will show a post-detention edit with no custody linkage.
   2+ Exhibits: **MG4**, **D1**.

d) **Disclosure Contradictions:**
   1+ The CPS **"**Nothing to disclose**"** certification vs listed CAD and custody records proves the evidential basis for substitution was not disclosed and likely added later.
   2+ Exhibits: **D1**.

e) **Funding-Document Mismatch:**
   1+ The RO1 offence (criminal damage threats) cannot lawfully exist in funding if it never existed as a booked custody offence at the time.

2+ Exhibits: **R1**, cross-checked against **C1**.

f) **Email Corroboration:**
1+ Emails between 05–10/08/2025 show you were still dealing with bail and harassment charge context, not criminal damage; Tuckers claiming RO coverage before CPS served disclosure further shows procedural defects.
2+ Exhibits: **E1**.

- **Tight submission paragraph with exhibits**
  a) The **04/08/2025** Representation Order (**Exhibit R1**) lists **"Threats of Criminal Damage"** under **URN 01YE1267925**, yet the custody logs for 02–04/08/2025 (Exhibit C1) record arrest and detention for **Public Order Act s.4A** only, with no lawful arrest or caution for criminal damage. The CPS unused material schedule (Exhibit D1) retrofits a criminal damage narrative from **CAD6844/02AUG25** and simultaneously certifies **"**Nothing to disclose,**"** while the charge sheet history (**Exhibit MG4**) shows post-detention edits unsupported by any custody event. Emails from **05–10/08/2025** (Exhibit E1) confirm the absence of CPS disclosure when Tuckers asserted RO coverage. In context of the LAA hack **"**self-grant**"** admissions (Exhibit L1), the substitution on **04/08/2025** is procedurally unlawful and is easily proven by the timestamp and content mismatch across Exhibits C1, R1, D1, MG4, E1, and L1.