DEFENCE STATEMENT

(Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996, section 5 & 6; Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996 (Defence Disclosure Time Limits) Regulations 2011; Criminal Procedure Rules, rule 15.4)

This Is My First Statement

OFFICIAL – SENSITIVE [when complete] MG11

WITNESS STATEMENT

Criminal Procedure Rules, r27. 2; Criminal Justice Act 1967, s. 9; Magistrates' Courts Act 1930, s.5B

URN | | | | |

Statement of: Mr. Simon Paul Cordell

Age if under 18: Over *(if over 18 insert 'over 18')* **Occupation**: News Reporter!

This statement **(Consisting 8 Of 8 Page{s)** all signed by me) is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false, or do not believe to be true.

Dated: 15/01/2026

(Signed) 

(On behalf of Mr. Simon Paul CORDELL) **(Dated) 15/01/2026**

- **DEFENCE STATEMENT – CASE 2 (URN: 01YE1300125)**
- **Alleged Assault With Intent To Resist Or Prevent Arrest:** Contrary to section 38 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861– 26 August 2025
- **Defendant**: Mr. Simon Cordell
- **Date**: [15/01/2026]

I, Mr Simon Paul Cordell, of 109 Burncroft Avenue PO BOX EN3 7JQ.

- **WILL SAY AS FOLLOWS: --**

1. **Case Details: --**
   1+ **Date of Incident: 26/08/2025**
   2+ **Alleged Offence Location:** Bail Address!
   3+ **Background of Case:** As detailed below!
   4+ **I am a secure tenant living on the ground floor of Address:** 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield En3 7jq, **Since 2006.**

2. **Defence Position: --**

a) I deny the allegation of assault.
b) No assault occurred.
c) The allegation is unsupported by physical evidence, contradicted by the officers' own statements, and procedurally flawed.

3. My Account of the Arrest: --

a) <Dir> 04. Simons Defence Statements
01. Defence Statement 1 .pdf

4. Contradictions Between the Two Officer Statements

a) Only two officers provided statements:
1+ **PC Sudoollah (MG11)**
2+ **PC Dechamps (MG11)**

b) Their accounts contradict each other in multiple key areas.

4.1 Contradiction on Intent

1+ **Sudoollah Wrongly Claims**: I assaulted PC Dechamps *"with intent to resist or prevent lawful apprehension."*
2+ **Dechamps Describes A Flung Arm During Restraint**: with no mention of intent, aggression, or deliberate strike.

a) This removes the required element of intent for the charge.

4.2 Contradiction on Nature of Contact

1+ **Sudoollah** frames the incident as a deliberate assault.
2+ **Dechamps** describes incidental contact during a chaotic arrest.

a) This supports a reactive movement, not a targeted assault.

4.3 Contradiction on Location of the Alleged Assault

a) **Spatial Layout Analysis Based on My Photo**
* **Exhibit: *A1**



b) **From The Image**: "**Exhibit: *A1,"** we can clearly see:
   1+ The **Front Door:** is separated from the main living space by a "**Partition Wall On The Right Side Of The Image!"**
   2+ The **sofa** is positioned deep into the far-Left side of the front room, "**Not Adjacent To The Entry Point In The Image!"**
   3+ There is "**No Direct Line Of Movement"** from the front door to the sofa without passing through a transitional space.
   4+ **The Hallway And Door Area** are clearly distinct from the "**Main Lounge"** where the sofa sits.

c) **This Means:**
   1+ Any contact occurring "**At Or Near The Front Door"** would be in the "**Hallway Area**," not the front room as they are separated rooms.
   2+ If the police officers claim the assault happened "**On Or Near The Sofa**," they must have already "**Entered And Moved Through The Hallway**," which contradicts their earlier claim of contact during entry.
   3+ **The Flung Arm Described By PC Dechamps**: could only have occurred **before** reaching the sofa — during restraint or movement, not as a deliberate strike in the lounge.

5. What Both Officers Agree On

a) Both officers describe the initial confrontation at the "**Front Door,"** involving:
   1+ Both of themselves taking Advantage of the front door being Partially Opened for them at their own request!

2+ Officers Pushing In
3+ Forced Police Entry
4+ Movement Backwards by the defendant Into The Property

6. What They Disagree On

a) When describing the alleged assault, they give "**Two Incompatible Locations**:

1+ **Sudoollah:** claims the assault happened *"**As He Was Moving Back… Into The Front Room**"* — implying the contact occurred "**During Entry**," in the hallway and before the front-room threshold.

2+ **Dechamps:** states he had to "**Chase Me**," then the contact occurred when he grabbed me, and "We **Landed On The Sofa,"** deep inside the front room.

7. Why This Is Physically Impossible

a) Based on the layout of my home:

1+ The "**Front Door Is Separated From The Lounge By A Partition Wall.**"
2+ The "**Sofa Is Positioned Deep Inside The Room**," far from the entry point.
3+ There is "**No Direct Line Of Movement"** from the door to the sofa without passing through a hallway.
4+ Any contact at the door would occur in the "**Hallway**," not the lounge.

8. What This Means For The Police Officers Allegations

1+ If the contact happened at the door (**As Sudoollah Claims**), we could not have landed on the sofa.
2+ If the contact happened at the sofa (**As Dechamps Claims**), then he had already "**Chased Me Through The Hallway**," contradicting Sudoollah's version.
3+ If I was running away with my "**Back To The Officers**," I could not deliberately strike backwards.
4+ The "**Flung Arm**" described by Dechamps could only have occurred "**During Movement**," not as a deliberate strike.

a) The location shift undermines the reliability of both accounts.

9. Additional Contradictions in the MG11 Statements

a) Door-Pushing Claim (Dechamps)

1+ He states my father and I were "**Pushing The Door**" against him.
2+ **Defence Response:** This did not happen.

b) **His Own Thoughts Prove No Assault Occurred**

1+ He states he believed I was "**Planning To Do Something**" as he pushed past my father.
2+ **Defence Response:** This shows he is describing his own assumptions, not my actions. At this point, my "**Back Was Turned**," making it impossible to strike backwards. He admits I had "**Not Assaulted Anyone"** at this stage.

c) **The "Chase" Contradiction**

1+ **He states**: "**I Have Chased After Simon…**"
2+ This contradicts Pc Sudoollah version entirely.
3+ If he had to "**Chase Me, Then**:

01. I Was Ahead Of Him
02. My Back Was To Him
03. I Was Moving Away From The Door
04. The Contact Could Not Have Happened During Entry
05. The Contact Could Not Have Been Deliberate

d) **The Sofa Landing**

1+ **He States**: "I have taken him to the floor but landed on the sofa."

2+ **This Proves**:

01. The Struggle Ended "**Deep Inside The Front Room!"**
02. Not At The Door
03. Not In The Hallway
04. Not During Entry

3+ This directly contradicts Sudoollah's version.

10. Contradictions and Issues With Body-Worn Video (BWV)

1+ Officer Claims to Have Reviewed BWV

2+ PC Sudoollah States:

01. He reviewed BWV
02. It was "exhibited as **FAS/01**"
03. Notes commenced at **21:30** at Wood Green Custody but no time logs for the video or its meta data exist as viewable as of yet!

3+ But the IDPC Shows:

01. BWV is listed as **PCD/01**, not FAS/01 and is not disclosed as a hard copy to be able view!
02. No footage labelled AS **FAS/01** has been disclosed ALSO as viewable!
03. **The Description Is Vague**: *"**Shows The Arrest Of The Defendant**"*
04. No timings
05. No breakdown
06. No footage has been provided to the defence, mindless of the disclosure requests I legally made!

4+ This contradicts his own statement and raises concerns about the existence, accuracy, or completeness of the footage.

a) Missing BWV From Other Officers

1+ The latter wrongfully introduced MG5 confirms "**Eight Police Officers"** attended from the TSG Team Including:

01. Inspector Horton,
02. Sgt Ward,
03. PC White,
04. PC Kenny,
05. PC Cheung,
06. PC Afreh-Mensa Jnr,
07. PC Sudoollah. = **"Exhibited His BWV as FAS/01"**
08. PC DECHAMPS 3379U = **"Exhibited His BWV as PCD/01"**

2+ And that PC Philip Dechamps is listed as the "Key Victim" in the MG5 summary, and he is the officer who is wrong by stating that I assaulted him.

3+ Yet:

01. Only **Two** BWV files are referenced and out of the Two none are provided as working viewable video footage!
02. No footage Exhibits from the other officers Six Police officers in attendance!
03. No explanation for missing their cameras
04. No confirmation of activation or retention for all eight BWV!

4+ This raises concerns about missing or withheld evidence.

11. Missing Pocket Notebooks and Timestamps

1+ None of the following have been disclosed:
   01. Pocket Notebook Entries
   02. Arrival Times
   03. Entry Times
   04. Arrest Times
   05. Use Of Force Logs
   06. BWV Activation/Deactivation Times

2+ These omissions prevent proper cross-examination and timeline verification.

12. Procedural Breaches Relevant To Defence

1+ I Was Not Interviewed.
2+ I Was Not Booked In For The Alleged Assault.
3+ I Had No Solicitor Present.
4+ I Was Not Allowed To Consult With My Appropriate Adult Alone.
5+ Only Police Officer Statements Have Been Provided.
6+ No Clear Description Of What Happened Has Been Given.
7+ I Had No Legal Support.
8+ **Mandatory Disclosure Has Not Been Provided.**

13. Summary of Defence Position

1+ The allegation is denied.
2+ The officers' statements contradict each other on:
   01. Intent
   02. Nature Of Contact
   03. Location Of Incident
   04. Sequence Of Events
   05. Whether A Chase Occurred
   06. Whether The Contact Happened During Entry Or Deep Inside The Room
   07. BWV Review And Submission
   08. Presence Of Other Officers And Missing Footage

3+ **Key Evidence Is Missing Or Undisclosed.**
4+ **Procedural Safeguards Were Not Followed.**
5+ **No Injury Was Recorded.**
6+ **No Deliberate Assault Occurred.**

14. Summary Of the Full Reversal

1+ PC Sudoollah. = **"Exhibited His BWV as FAS/01"**

14.1. The Officer's Introduction Attempts To:

1+ **Establish Authority:** By opening with his TSG role and specialist training, he tries to position himself as an unquestionable expert whose account should be accepted without scrutiny.
2+ **Justify Force In Advance:** He cites multiple legal powers for using force *before* describing any events, preparing the reader to accept whatever force he later claims to have used.
3+ **Frame Me As Dangerous:** He references violent crime, weapons, drugs, and public-order policing to create an atmosphere of threat around me, despite this being a non-violent tag-breach enquiry.
4+ **Justify A Large TSG Presence:** He lists a full TSG team to make the deployment sound proportionate, even though the situation did not require a high-risk tactical unit.
5+ **Use Unrelated Tag Issues To Imply Risk:** He brings up previous tag-monitoring issues to paint

me as evasive or risky, even though these have no connection to the alleged assault.

14.2. My Reversed Interpretation Shows:

1+ **His Training Makes His Contradictions More Serious:** A highly trained TSG officer should produce a precise, consistent account — the inconsistencies instead undermine his reliability.
2+ **His Pre-Emptive Force Justification Suggests Defensive Writing:** By front-loading force legislation, he appears to be defending his own actions rather than neutrally reporting facts.
3+ **The Missing BWV And Notebooks Undermine Credibility:** A full TSG team attended, yet only one BWV file and no notebooks are disclosed, raising questions about what was not recorded or not revealed.
4+ **The Tag Breach Has No Relevance To The Alleged Assault:** A tag breach is administrative, not violent — it does not justify forced entry, a TSG deployment, or the level of force described.
5+ **The Escalation Came From The Officers, Not You:** Nothing in his introduction describes you being violent; all escalation — forced entry, physical confrontation, and the chase — originated from the officers.

15. Summary Of The Full Reversal

1+ PC DECHAMPS 3379U = **"Exhibited His BWV as PCD/01"**

14.2. The Officer's Introduction Attempts To:

1+ **Establish Authority By Emphasising His TSG Role And Specialist Training:** presenting himself as a highly trained tactical officer whose account should be accepted without question.
2+ **Justify The Use Of Force In Advance By Citing Multiple Legal Powers Before Describing Any Events:** preparing the reader to accept whatever force he later claims to have used, regardless of necessity.
3+ **Frame Me As Dangerous By Referencing Violent Crime, Weapons, Drugs, And Public-Order Policing:** creating an atmosphere of threat around me even though the incident involved no violence or risk.
4+ **Justify A Large TSG Presence For What Was A Non-Violent Tag-Breach Enquiry:** making a disproportionate deployment appear routine and reasonable.
5+ **Use Unrelated Tag-Monitoring Issues To Imply I Posed A Risk:** padding the narrative with irrelevant background to make me appear evasive or threatening.

14.2. My Reversed Interpretation Shows:

1+ **His Specialist Training Makes The Contradictions In His Account More Serious, Not Less:** because a TSG officer is expected to give a precise, consistent, professional account.
2+ **His Pre-Emptive Force Justification Suggests Defensive Writing Rather Than Neutral Reporting:** indicating he is protecting his own actions rather than simply describing events.
3+ **The Missing BWV, Missing Notebooks, And Missing Documentation Undermine His Credibility:**
especially given the size of the team and the seriousness of the allegation.
4+ **The Tag Breach Has No Relevance To The Alleged Assault And Does Not Justify The Force Used:** making its inclusion appear manipulative rather than factual.
5+ **The Escalation Came Entirely From The Officers — Not From Me?:** as nothing in his introduction describes any threat or aggression from me before they forced entry and initiated physical contact.

Missing Medical Reports

- Kind Regards
- Mr. Simon Paul Cordell

(Signed) 

(On behalf of Mr. Simon Paul CORDELL) (Dated Signed) 15/01/2026

Signature witnessed by: