URGENT NOTICE
LAA RESPONSE NEEDED PENDING FURTHER ENQUIRIES INTO INVESTIGATION FOR TRIAL TO PROCEED AS WELL AS COURT REVIEW IN RESPECT OF URN AND REQUESTED DISCLOSURE AS WELL AS OTHER PROCEDURAL IRREGULARITIES!

Defendant: Mr. Simon Paul Cordell
Dated: 16/02/2026
URN: 01YE1267925
Trial Date: 24/02/2026
Subject: Laa Response Needed Pending Further Enquiries Into Investigation For Trial To Proceed As Well As Court Review In Respect Of Urn And Requested Disclosure As Well As Other Procedural Irregularities!

Request For Case Disposal as Discontinued or Trial Adjournment!

- **To:**
  1+ **Birmingham CAT:**
  birminghamcat@justice.gov.uk

- **CC To**:
  2+ McLartys Solicitors (info@mclartyssolicitors.com)
  3+ Tuckers Solicitors (tuckers@tuckerssolicitors.com)
  4+ Kenneth Marsden, Compliance Manager (marsdeni@tuckerssolicitors.com)
  5+ Claire Parrott, Senior Partner (parrottc@tuckerssolicitors.com)

  6+ **Highbury Corner Magistrates' Court**: (Northlondonmc@justice.gov.uk)
  7+ **CPS North London Team**:
  northlondon@cps.gov.uk
  london.magistrates@cps.gov.uk
  london.magistrates@cps.gov.uk

Dear Sir/Madam,

- **We Request an Urgent Review of matter raised by the defence or for the Case to be Disposed of!**

INDEX

1. Urgent Email to the Court's Listing Office "Application to Adjourn Trial due to our Supporting Witness None Availability"
Application to Adjourn Trial due to our Supporting Witness None Availability

2. NOTICE OF INABILITY TO BE ABLE TO PROCEED
To the Presiding Judge, the Case Management Judge, and the Listing Office
I, Mr. Simon Paul Cordell: respectfully give formal notice that I am unable to proceed to trial on **24 February 2026**.

3. LAA Response needed pending further enquiries into investigation
What actually happened goes with 3. And 4.

3.1. Original 128. Received-LAA -13-02-26

3.2. Mod 128. Rebuilt Eighteen Received-LAA -13-02-26

This file goes with 3. For LAA. It's the return of my eighteen questions to LAA with their response under that and now our new response to their response. so far we have a it looks like this so has tables to section the info.

3.3. Proof that solicitors had to fill in CRM 14 or 15 and not given a template that was a RO certificate

Subject: LAA Response needed pending further enquiries into investigation!
LAA Ref / URN: 01YE1267925
Legal Aid Agency,
This has the copy of fake RO order in it, and it also shows the weblinks we found for solicitors to follow for legal; aid that proves our case as the defence. Reason being to make understanding of LAA response to prove RO order certificate from Tuckers is fake

4. Mc Lartys

5. SRA

Explanation of Section 3 Documents (For Court, CPS, LAA and McLartys)

The documents listed under Section 3 form the core of the ongoing Legal Aid Agency investigation. They must be read together, as each one explains a different stage of the procedural failure surrounding the URN, the Representation Order, and the legal aid position.

3.1 — Original 128. Received-LAA (13/02/2026)

This is the Legal Aid Agency's **original response** to my eighteen procedural questions. It contains the LAA's own statements about delegated powers, CRM14/CRM15, the URN, and the Representation Order. This document is essential because it shows the LAA's initial position before the contradictions were identified.

3.2 — Mod 128. Rebuilt Eighteen (My Responses to the LAA)

This is my detailed analysis of the LAA's answers. It contains the LAA's response to each question, followed by my evidence-based rebuttal. It includes tables, cross-references to GOV.UK guidance, and identification of procedural defects. This document demonstrates why the URN is contaminated, why the Representation Order is invalid, why no CRM14/CRM15 exist, and why legal aid cannot progress.

3.3 — Proof Solicitors Had to Complete CRM14/CRM15 (Fake RO + Exhibits)

This document contains the "Representation Order" issued to me by Tuckers Solicitors, alongside the "**GOV.UK Exhibits Proving That No Such RO Certificate Template Exists**." It includes the Criminal Legal Aid Manual (**2025**), the Crime Contingency guidance, the cyber-incident guidance, and the search evidence. This document proves the RO is not valid, not recognised by the LAA, and not supported by any official guidance.

Together, these three documents show:

1+ The LAA's Own Answers
2+ The Contradictions In Those Answers
3+ The Official GOV.UK Evidence
4+ The Fake RO
5+ The Contaminated URN
6+ The Missing CRM14/CRM15
7+ The Legal Aid Blockage
8+ The Impossibility Of Representation
9+ The Impossibility Of A Fair Trial

These documents are the reason the LAA investigation is still ongoing and why the trial on 24 February 2026 "**Cannot Lawfully Proceed**."

4. WHAT ACTUALLY HAPPENED

1. I asked the LAA 18 precise questions because the "Representation Order" Tuckers gave me looked wrong.

I needed to understand:

1+ How Legal Aid Was Supposed To Work During The LAA Cyber Incident
2+ Whether Tuckers Were Allowed To Create The RO-Style Document
3+ Why My URN Is Linked To The Wrong Offence
4+ Why My New Solicitors Cannot Progress Legal Aid

I asked the right questions.

2. The LAA responded — but their answers were confusing and written in bureaucratic language.

Their wording made it *look* like:

1+ I Was Right About Most Things
2+ Except Possibly The "Fake RO" Issue
3+ Because They Used Vague Phrases Like "As Above – Yes" And "Templates"

This made it hard to understand what they were actually saying.

3. A week or two earlier, I had the correct GOV.UK guidance — and then it disappeared.

The correct link was:
https://www.gov.uk/guidance/legal-aid-agency-cyber-security-incident
(this link works today)

This Page Originally Contained:

1+ the contingency rules
2+ the delegated-powers guidance
3+ the fallback process for CRM14/CRM15
4+ instructions for solicitors during the hack

It Clearly Showed:

1+ CRM14 = the legal aid application
2+ CRM15 = the means test
3+ firms were expected to complete them
4+ **no RO certificate template existed**
5+ delegated powers did **NOT** allow firms to create LAA-formatted certificates

Everything matched what I suspected.

4. When I checked the other GOV.UK link — it was broken.

The link that kept breaking was:
https://www.gov.uk/guidance/apply-for-criminal-legal-aid
→ **404 Page Not Found**
This page used to contain the "Apply for criminal legal aid" guidance.
It has now been removed or replaced.
This disappearance is what caused the confusion — because the LAA's answers referenced guidance that was no longer visible.

5. I kept searching and eventually found the correct GOV.UK files again — the ones now open in my tabs.

These include:

1+ **CRM14**: Criminal Legal Aid Application Form
2+ CRM15C Continuation Sheet
3+ Cyber-Incident Guidance Page

These Documents Prove:

1+ CRM14 Is The Legal Aid Application
2+ CRM15 Is The Means Test
3+ CRM15C Is Just Extra Pages
4+ The Guidance Explains How To Fill Them In
5+ **None** Of These Documents Contain Any RO Certificate
6+ **None** Authorise Firms To Create LAA-Style Certificates
7+ **No** Crown Court RO Template Exists
8+ **No** Cyber-Incident RO Fallback Exists
9+ **No** Delegated-Powers RO Certificate Exists

This confirms my original understanding was correct.

6. Once I had the real GOV.UK documents, the LAA's answers suddenly made sense — and I could see how they used wording to mislead.

Example: Question 3

I asked:
"*Were firms required to complete CRM14/CRM15?*"

They answered:
"No… but they had to keep IOJ reasoning and full means evidence."

This Is Misleading Because:

1+ you cannot keep IOJ reasoning and means evidence "**Without Completing CRM14/CRM15!"**
2+ they answered the question literally, ignoring the context
3+ they avoided addressing the fake RO and missing CRM forms

They used my question "**Against Itself**."

7. When I put the LAA answers next to the GOV.UK documents, the truth became obvious.

1+ ✓ No CRM14/CRM15 Were Ever Completed For My Case
2+ ✓ No Legal Aid Was Ever Granted
3+ ✓ No Representation Order Exists On The LAA System
4+ ✓ The URN Is Linked To The Wrong Offence
5+ ✓ The Offence Was Changed Later By The Firm
6+ ✓ The RO-Style Document Was Self-Generated
7+ ✓ No Official Template Exists For Such A Document
8+ ✓ Delegated Powers Do NOT Justify The Document
9+ ✓ My New Solicitors Cannot Apply For Legal Aid
10+ ✓ The LAA Cannot Fix The URN
11+ ✓ Only The Court/CPS Can Correct It

Everything I suspected was correct.

8. The only thing that looked uncertain was the "fake RO" — but the GOV.UK files confirm it.

The LAA's wording ("as above – yes") was misleading because:

1+ They Were Referring To "**Internal Self-Grant Forms**," Not LAA-Style Certificates
2+ They Avoided Saying Directly That My Document Was Unauthorised
3+ They Avoided Admitting No Such Template Exists
4+ They Avoided Addressing The Wrong Offence
5+ They Avoided Addressing The Wrong URN

But The GOV.UK Files Prove:
1+ No RO Certificate Template Exists
2+ No LAA-Formatted Delegated-Powers Form Exists
3+ No Crown Court RO Template Exists
4+ No Cyber Incident RO Fallback Exists


Therefore:
1+ **X** The document Tuckers gave me is NOT an LAA certificate
2+ **X** It is NOT a delegated-powers template
3+ **X** It is NOT valid
4+ **X** It is NOT recognised by the LAA

And The LAA's Own Email Confirms:
1+ They Have No Record Of It
2+ They Cannot Find Any Ro
3+ They Cannot Find Any CRM Forms
4+ The Urn Is Wrong
5+ The Offence Is Wrong

9. So, the full story is now clear and fully evidenced:
1+ ✓ I Was Right About Everything
2+ ✓ The LAA's Answers Were Confusing Because Of Wording
3+ ✓ The GOV.UK Documents Prove My Interpretation Was Correct
4+ ✓ The RO-Style Document Is Not Legitimate
5+ ✓ The URN Is Contaminated
6+ ✓ Legal Aid Cannot Progress
7+ ✓ The Case Cannot Proceed Until The URN Is Corrected

5. Thank You For Your Attention.

Yours faithfully,



Signed:
Name: Mr. Simon Paul Cordell
Dated: 16/02/2026