

MASTER SUMMERY INDEX OF DEFENCE STATEMENTS (STATEMENTS 1–14)

Structured, chronological, court-ready index of your full defence bundle

My Defence File Is Now Organised Into 7 Clear Sections

- A — Core Defence Statements (1–6)**
- B — Timeline Reconstruction (7)**
- C — Bail, Tag & Systemic Failures (8–9)**
- D — Court Misconduct (10)**
- E — Bail & Human Rights (11)**
- F — Custody Sergeant Identification (12–14)**
- G — Exhibits (A–E)**

SECTION A — CORE DEFENCE STATEMENTS (Chronological Order)

1. Defence Statement 1 – Initial Account & Background

- Early outline of harassment history
- Context of neighbour conflict
- Early procedural concerns

2. Defence Statement 2 – Early Evidence & Diary Extracts

- Enfield Council diary
- Early witness accounts
- Pattern of behaviour by complainant

3. Defence Statement 3 – Early Police Conduct Issues

- First mention of procedural irregularities
- Early custody concerns
- Early ACRO/PNC contradictions

4. Defence Statement 4 – Rebecca O’Hare’s Three Different Statements

(Tab open: “04. Four - Rebecca O’Hare Three Different Statements.pdf”)

- Comparison of all three MG11s
- Contradictions in dates, times, content
- Missing signatures
- Impossible timelines
- Evidence of retrospective alteration

5. Defence Statement 5 – Officers’ Arrest Timeline & Procedural Inaccuracies

(Tab open: “05. Five - Officers Arrest Timeline...”)

- Timeline reconstruction of police arrival
- BWV inconsistencies
- Officer presence contradictions
- Wrong arrest reason recorded
- No lawful grounds for arrest

6. Defence Statement 6 – Absence of Intent & Recklessness + Procedural Breach

(Tab open: “06. Six - Absence of Intent...”)

- No intent

- No recklessness
- No physical evidence
- No digital evidence
- No behavioural evidence
- No lawful arrest for the charge
- Charge substituted retrospectively
- Fatal flaw in prosecution case

SECTION B — EVIDENCE-BASED TIMELINE RECONSTRUCTION

7. Defence Statement 7 – Just Eat Timeline & 115 Burncroft Contradictions

- Full timeline reconstruction
- Delivery timestamps
- Call logs
- Driver presence
- 7-minute and 12-minute corridor gaps
- CAD timing contradictions
- Proves you were not present at alleged time
- Proves allegation impossible

SECTION C — BAIL, TAG, AND SYSTEMIC FAILURES

8. Defence Statement 8 – Events of 14 August 2025 (Wrongful Tag Breach Arrest)

- Full narrative of wrongful arrest
- Tag company failure
- Court failure
- Police failure
- CPS failure
- Four-safeguard collapse
- Unlawful detention
- Video link hearing irregularities

9. Defence Statement 9 – Case Ratio Metadata, Backdating & Fabrication

- Case Ratio folder created 10/10/25 (not at charge)
- Third statement inserted later
- Metadata proves reconstruction
- Files dated before and after creation date
- Breach of CPIA 1996
- Breach of AG Guidelines
- Fraud Act 2006 s.2 relevance
- PACE s.78 exclusion argument

SECTION D — SECOND TRIAL DATE & COURT MISCONDUCT

10. Defence Statement 10 – Second Trial Date & Court Suppression

- Emails ignored
- CPS denial of receipt
- Legal aid obstruction
- Court clerk admissions
- Judge refusing to hear defence
- Forced adjournment

- URN misuse explained
- Fraudulent RO1/RO2 exposed

SECTION E — BAIL CONDITIONS, GPS TAG & HUMAN RIGHTS

11. Defence Statement 11 – Illegal Bail Restrictions & GPS Tag

(Tab open: “13. Illegal Bail Restrictions Tag GPS.pdf”)

- GPS tag used unlawfully
- Exclusion from home disproportionate
- Car is not a protected person
- Article 8 ECHR breach
- Sentencing Council comparison
- 207 days of unlawful restrictions

12. Defence Statement 12 – URN Swapping (Chapters 1–5)

- CH1: URN swapping & custody log analysis
- CH2: First disclosure bundle
- CH3: Second disclosure bundle
- CH4: Custody log contradictions
- CH5: Institutional isolation pattern
- Proves unlawful charge swap
- Proves URN reuse
- Proves solicitor misconduct
- Proves systemic pattern

SECTION F — CUSTODY SERGEANTS, SHIFT ANALYSIS & IDENTIFICATION

13. Defence Statement 13 – GPS Tag Exclusion (Revised Submission)

(Tab open: “13. Illegal Bail Restrictions Tag GPS.pdf”)

- Condensed legal argument
- Proportionality analysis
- Statutory purpose of EM
- Why exclusion was unlawful

14. Defence Statement 14 – Custody Sergeants & Identification Analysis

(Tab open: “14. Defence Statement.pdf”)

- Full breakdown of custody sergeants
- Shift patterns
- Identification of key sergeant
- Timeline of each sergeant’s involvement
- Evidence of misconduct
- Psychosis entry fabrication
- PC Quick anomaly
- Charge acceptance irregularities

SECTION G — SUPPORTING EXHIBITS (Referenced Across Statements)

A. Custody Logs

- Exhibit 21–35
- Arrest reason mismatch
- Search contradictions
- No OIC assigned

- CPS review NFA
- New charge inserted at 03:09
- Officers White & Quick appear only for swapped charge

B. Case Ratio Files

- Metadata
- Creation timestamps
- Backdated PDFs
- Missing IDPC
- Reconstructed disclosure

C. Just Eat Evidence

- Screenshots
- Call logs
- Delivery timestamps
- Driver testimony

D. ACRO / PNC / Work-Out Code

- Incorrect entries
- Fabricated ASBO
- Repeated NFA pattern
- Institutional isolation

E. Emails & Correspondence

- Court emails
- CPS emails
- Solicitor emails
- Legal aid confirmations

End of Summery Index

MASTER INDEX OF DEFENCE FILES

01. Defence Statement – Rebecca O’Hare’s Three Different Statements

What I prove:

I show that Rebecca gave **three different versions** of events, each contradicting the others.

The dates, times, descriptions, and claimed actions change every time.

Her statements cannot all be true — meaning **none of them can be relied upon**.

I highlight inconsistencies about:

- Whether she saw me
- Whether the car was present
- Whether she went past me
- Whether she heard anything
- Whether she was inside or outside

This destroys her credibility.

02. Officers’ Arrest Timeline & Procedural Inaccuracies

What I prove:

I expose contradictions in the officers' statements about:

- Arrival times
- Who arrested me
- Who witnessed what
- BWV usage
- Whether they reviewed evidence

I show that officers wrote statements with **impossible dates, wrong years, and fabricated timings.**

This proves the arrest process was **procedurally defective** and unreliable.

03. Absence of Intent & Recklessness + Procedural Breach

What I prove:

I demonstrate that the prosecution cannot prove **intent**, which is required by law.

I show:

- No accelerant
- No lighter
- No tools
- No movement toward any car
- No digital evidence
- No planning
- No behaviour showing intent

I also show I was in **pyjamas**, not dressed to go anywhere.

I prove the arrest was for **harassment**, not criminal damage — meaning the charge was **retrospectively substituted**, which is unlawful.

04. Just Eat Timeline – Alibi & Contradictions

What I prove:

I provide a **timestamped alibi** using:

- Just Eat order
- Delivery time
- Call logs
- Driver return time

I show that during the exact time Rebecca claims I threatened her, I was:

- Receiving food
- Speaking to the delivery driver
- Inside my flat
- Not outside

I prove she could not have seen me because **I wasn't there.**

Her timeline collapses completely.

05. Statement of Events – 14 August 2025 (Wrongful Tag Arrest)

What I prove:

I show that the police arrested me for a **tag breach that was impossible**, because:

- The court had already approved my new bail address
- The tagging company installed the tag at the new address
- The warrant was outdated

I prove all four safeguards failed:

- Court

- CPS
 - Police
 - Tagging company
- This shows systemic procedural abuse.

06. Case Ratio Extract – Disclosure Manipulation & Backdating

What I prove:

I show that the CPS **created the Case Ratio folder two months late** (10/10/25).

This proves:

- The IDPC was not created at charge
 - Evidence was inserted later
 - Rebecca’s “third statement” was **backdated**
 - Files were reconstructed, not contemporaneous
- I use CPS metadata to prove the prosecution **tampered with disclosure**.

07. Second Trial Date – Court Misconduct & Legal Aid Fraud

What I prove:

I show that:

- My emails were ignored
 - My defence was suppressed
 - The judge refused to hear my evidence
 - The CPS served a “V5” file that never existed before
 - Tuckers produced **fraudulent Representation Orders**
 - The URN was reused illegally
- I prove the court process was **unfair, unlawful, and procedurally abusive**.

08. Illegal Bail Restrictions – GPS Tag & Exclusion From Home

What I prove:

I show that excluding me from my home because of a **car** is unlawful.

I prove:

- GPS tags protect people, not objects
 - A car is movable
 - No risk assessment justified exclusion
 - The restriction was disproportionate
 - I spent **207 days** under harsher restrictions than any possible sentence
- This proves the bail conditions were **illegal and excessive**.

09. URN Swapped – Chapter 1 (Custody Log Analysis)

What I prove:

I show the police:

- Arrested me for Section 4A
- Logged me for Section 4A
- Interviewed me for Section 4A
- CPS NFA’d Section 4A

Then **illegally swapped the charge** to “Threats to Cause Criminal Damage” without:

- Re-arrest

- Caution
- Interview
- MG4

I prove the URN was **reused**, which is unlawful.

10. URN Swapped – Chapter 4 (Full Custody Log Breakdown)

What I prove:

I break down the custody log line-by-line and show:

- Fabricated entries
- Impossible timings
- Officers appearing only after the illegal charge swap
- No lawful handover
- No lawful arrest for the new offence
- No CPS authorisation

I prove the charge was inserted **after the CPS NFA**, which is illegal.

11. URN Swapped – Chapter 5 (Institutional Isolation Pattern)

What I prove:

I show the long-term pattern of:

- False allegations
- NFA outcomes
- Bail restrictions
- Fabricated mental-health entries
- Incorrect ACRO/PNC data
- Repeated procedural abuse

I demonstrate that the URN swap fits a **systemic pattern of institutional isolation**, not a one-off error.

12. Defence Statement 14 – Identifying the Custody Sergeant

What I prove:

I analyse shift patterns to identify which sergeant was present at:

- 08:00
- 04:00

I show that the same sergeant could not legally be present at both times unless:

- He manipulated the logs
- Or entries were altered

I identify Sgt Bloomfield as the likely officer involved in:

- Fabricated mental-health entries
- Procedural manipulation
- Past ASBO-related misconduct

I show a pattern linking him to multiple past injustices.

13. Defence Statement 13 – GPS Tag (Short Version)

What I prove:

I summarise the illegality of the GPS exclusion zone in a short, sharp format for court.

I show:

- A car cannot justify exclusion
- The restriction was disproportionate

- The condition was unlawful
This is the concise version for judges.

14. Defence Statement – Identifying the Custody Sergeant

What I prove:

I use the custody logs to work out which custody sergeant was actually present at the key times I remember — **08:00 in the morning and 04:00 the next day.**

The shift patterns show that:

- **08:00** falls under the **day-shift sergeant,**
- **04:00** falls under the **night-shift sergeant,**
- and custody sergeants work **12-hour shifts**, meaning **no sergeant can legally appear at both times.**

Because I saw the **same officer's face** at both times, the only way this is possible is if:

- the custody logs were manipulated,
- entries were altered after the fact,
- or the same sergeant inserted himself into the process outside his shift.

When I compare the logs with my memory, the officer whose face I recognise — the one who has appeared in **multiple past injustices** — matches **Sgt Bloomfield.**

I show that Bloomfield is linked to:

- **a fabricated mental-health entry** (“psychosis”) that has no clinical basis,
- **procedural manipulation**, including certifying interview compliance despite missing disclosure,
- **past ASBO-related misconduct,**
- **previous NFA cases involving the same pattern,**
- **council-linked fabricated injunctions and possession orders,**
- **and repeated involvement in cases where I was set up or misrepresented.**

By mapping the shift patterns, the custody logs, and my lived experience, I show a **clear pattern** connecting

Bloomfield to:

- irregular entries,
- false notes,
- unlawful decisions,
- and the environment in which the illegal charge swap occurred.

This evidence proves that the officer I recognise — the one consistently present during procedural abuse — is **Sgt Bloomfield**, and that the custody record was altered to hide his involvement.

But when at the Wood Green Police station on the 00/00/2026 I met the officer again and asked him for his name and after some hassle he gave it to me **but its wrote down and I need to find it, it started with a “G” I believe!**

Notice to Defendant – Section 9 Objection

What I prove:

I show that the prosecution attempted to introduce key witness evidence **in writing only**, under Section 9 CJA 1967, which would prevent cross-examination.

I formally object because the written statements contain **contradictions, impossible timestamps, identity errors, missing evidence, and procedural irregularities** that can only be resolved through **live questioning.**

I prove that the following witnesses **must attend in person** because their written statements cannot be relied upon:

- 1. Rebecca O'Hare – Alleged Victim**
- 2. Rebecca O'Hare's Children's Father**

Disclosure / Evidence Officers

- 3. PC Joel Avigdor – Disclosure Officer**
- 4. PC Calvin Chan – Arresting Officer**
- 5. PC Obsiye – Arresting Officer**
- 6. PC Reece Williams – Van Officer**
- 7. PC George Wilson-Wallis – Van Officer**
- 8. PC Uddin – Interviewing Officer**

Custody Sergeants (“Skippers”)

- 9. Sgt Ozcan**
- 10. Sgt Hales**
- 11. Sgt Bloomfield**
- 12. Sgt Smith**
- 13. Sgt Willans**

Custody Staff (DDOs)

I prove each DDO must attend

Healthcare Professional

- 14. HCP Lepadatu**

CPS

- 15. CPS Prosecutor Jrainbird**

What I prove overall:

03. Defendant's Application for Prosecution Disclosure

What I prove:

I show that the prosecution failed to disclose critical evidence that they are legally required to provide under the CPIA 1996.

I prove that the disclosure officer certified the file as “complete” even though:

- key evidence is missing,
- timestamps are impossible,
- MG11s are backdated,
- BWV is withheld,
- custody logs contradict the charge,
- and the substituted charge was never lawfully processed.

I list the exact evidence I require because each item exposes procedural breaches, unlawful charge substitution, and misconduct by police and CPS.

What I prove about the missing evidence:

1. Custody Logs (02/08/25–04/08/25)

I prove the custody logs will show:

- the harassment charge was dropped,
- the Section 4A charge was dropped,
- the substituted charge was inserted after NFA,
- no lawful arrest or caution for the new charge,
- and the detention clock was never restarted.

This undermines the entire prosecution case.

2. Custody Suite CCTV

I prove CCTV will show:

- the booking-in process was irregular,
- the search entry is fabricated,
- the appropriate adult was removed without reason,
- and the substituted charge was never explained to me.

This proves unlawful detention.

3. Body-Worn Footage (All Officers)

I prove BWV will show:

- I was calm and seated, not threatening,
- officers assaulted me,
- officers contradicted each other,
- PC Chan was outside while Obsiye was upstairs,
- and the arrest narrative in MG11s is false.

Missing BWV is deliberate.

4. Full Interview Footage

I prove the prosecution only disclosed **one minute** of the interview.

The missing footage will show:

- the real reason for arrest,
- the absence of any criminal damage allegation,
- and that the substituted charge was never put to me.

This proves the charge swap was unlawful.

5. MG11 Statements & Police Notebooks

I prove these documents contain:

- backdated statements,
- impossible timestamps,
- identity errors (“Samual”),
- badge number contradictions,
- and missing signatures.

The notebooks will expose the truth.

6. Case Ratio Files (Created & Modified Dates)

I prove the Case Ratio folder was:

- created late,

- modified after disclosure,
- and used to insert the third statement.

Metadata proves fabrication.

7. Legal Aid Documentation (2012 Act)

I prove:

- no legal aid application exists for the substituted charge,
- no solicitor was assigned for the new offence,
- and the RO1/RO2 documents are fraudulent.

This proves I was unrepresented unlawfully.

8. Internal CPS Communications

I prove these will show:

- CPS knew the charge was substituted without process,
- CPS accepted backdated files,
- and CPS certified disclosure knowing it was incomplete.

This undermines the prosecution's integrity.

9. 999 Call Audio

I prove the 999 calls will show:

- the allegation does not match the MG11s,
- the timeline is impossible,
- and the risk assessment was flawed.

This supports my innocence.

10. Risk Assessments

I prove:

- no risk assessment justified GPS tagging,
- no risk assessment justified exclusion from home,
- and no risk assessment justified detention.

This proves the bail conditions were unlawful.

Why this material undermines the prosecution

I prove that:

- the substituted charge was never lawfully created,
- the arrest was for harassment only,
- the CPS NFA'd the original charge,
- the new charge was inserted after NFA,
- and the prosecution's entire case is built on altered paperwork.

Why this material assists my defence

I prove:

- I was assaulted, not the aggressor,
- I was denied solicitor access,
- my appropriate adult was removed,
- evidence was withheld,
- and the custody process was unlawful.

Why I request a hearing

I prove a hearing is needed to:

- compel disclosure,
- expose the unlawful charge substitution,
- challenge procedural breaches,
- and correct the record.

04. Application to Exclude Evidence Under Section 78

What I prove:

I show that the prosecution is relying on evidence that is **unfair, incomplete, unsigned, unlawfully obtained, or created after the fact**, and that admitting it would **undermine the fairness of the trial**.

Under **PACE 1984, Section 78**, I prove that this evidence must be excluded.

What I prove about Case 1 (URN: 01YE1267925)

1. The MG11 from the alleged victim is not admissible

I prove:

- the MG11 is **unsigned**,
- it has **no declaration of truth**,
- it cannot be accepted under **Section 9 CJA 1967**,
- the witness cannot be cross-examined on contradictions,
- and it was used to support a **substituted charge** after the original charge was NFA'd.

This makes the MG11 **inadmissible**.

2. The police officer statements rely on an unlawful substituted charge

I prove:

- PC Quick, PC White, and Sgt Smith all rely on a charge that was **never lawfully created**,
- the custody log falsely claims an appropriate adult was present,
- CCTV will show I was **never removed from my cell**,
- my father was denied access,
- and there was **no new arrest, no new caution, and no legal aid form** for the substituted charge.

This makes their statements **unsafe and inadmissible**.

What I prove about Case 2 (URN: 01YE1300125)

3. The MG11s and officer statements contradict the BWV

I prove:

- the officers' statements claim an assault,
- but the BWV shows **no assault**,
- more than six officers were present,
- excessive force was used against me,
- and a witness who tried to speak was refused.

The written statements cannot be trusted.

4. The interview footage is incomplete and manipulated

I prove:

- only the **final 2 minutes** were disclosed,
- **95%** of the interview is missing,
- the solicitor-requested break was used to cut the video,
- and the full recording must exist.

An incomplete interview cannot be admitted.

Legal Basis I rely on

I prove exclusion is justified under:

- **PACE 1984, Section 78** — unfair or improperly obtained evidence must be excluded
- **CJA 2003, Sections 9 & 116** — written statements must be signed and truthful
- **PACE Code C** — breaches of solicitor access, appropriate adult, and custody procedure

The prosecution breached all three.

What I ask the court to exclude

I request the court to:

- exclude the **unsigned MG11** in Case 1,
- exclude the **police statements** based on fabricated custody entries,
- exclude the **incomplete interview footage**,
- exclude the **unsupported officer statements** in Case 2,
- and list this application for hearing before trial.

1. I prove the CPS added a third statement from Rebecca after disclosure

I show:

- When Tuckers disclosed the case on **01/09/25**, there were **only two** statements from Rebecca.
- When the CPS created the Case Ratio folder on **10/10/25**, suddenly a **third statement** appeared.
- This “new” statement was **backdated to 07/08/25** to make it look legitimate.
- That date is impossible because the Case Ratio folder **did not exist** until **10/10/25**.

This proves the CPS inserted evidence **after the fact**.

2. I prove the Case Ratio file was created AFTER charge, not before

I show:

- The Case Ratio server metadata says:
CREATED BY USER 2258 ON 10 OCTOBER 2025 AT 12:17
- But the documents inside the folder pretend to be from:
 - **05/08/25**
 - **22/09/25**
 - **07/08/25**
- These dates are **before** the folder existed.

This proves the CPS **retro-built** the case file.

3. I prove the CPS backdated Rebecca’s statements

I show:

- Rebecca’s statements appear with four different dates:
 - **02/08/25**
 - **03/08/25**
 - **03/08/25 (duplicate)**
 - **07/08/25 (backdated)**
- The “Ditto” entries hide the fact that the dates jump around.
- The 07/08/25 statement **did not exist** when Tuckers disclosed the case.
- It only appeared after the Case Ratio folder was created.

This proves the CPS **altered witness evidence**.

4. I prove the CPS modified the original MG11 after Tuckers withdrew

I show:

- The original MG11 had **missing signatures** but **no signature boxes**.
- After Tuckers withdrew on **10/10/25**, the MG11 suddenly had:
 - transparent signature boxes,
 - redacted intelligence,
 - formatting changes,
 - and no audit trail.

This proves the MG11 was **edited** after disclosure.

5. I prove the disclosure officer signed BEFORE the evidence existed

I show:

- PC Avigdor signed the disclosure certificate on **07/08/25**.
- But the third statement from Rebecca (dated 07/08/25) was **not in the file** until **10/10/25**.
- That means he signed disclosure **before all evidence existed**, which is impossible.

This proves the disclosure certification is **invalid**.

6. I prove the CPS prosecutor signed AFTER the evidence was altered

I show:

- CPS prosecutor J. Rainbird signed on **22/09/25**.
- But the Case Ratio folder was created on **10/10/25**.
- That means the prosecutor signed off on disclosure **before the evidence was created**.

This proves the CPS **misled the court**.

7. I prove the CPS breached multiple laws

I show the CPS actions breach:

- **CPIA 1996** (disclosure duties)
- **PACE 1984** (evidence handling)
- **Fraud Act 2006** (false representation)
- **Perverting the Course of Justice**
- **Misconduct in Public Office**
- **Contempt of Court Act 1981**
- **Human Rights Act 1998 – Article 6** (fair trial)

This is not a minor error — it is **systemic evidence tampering**.

8. I prove the CPS had no paperwork at court

I show:

- At the first hearing, the CPS had **no case file**.
- The Case Ratio file was created **two months later**.
- The evidence inside it was **fabricated to fill gaps**.

This proves the CPS built the case **after charging me**, not before.

9. I prove the metadata exposes everything

I show:

- The Case Ratio server logs show creation and modification on **10/10/25**.
- The PDFs inside pretend to be from **August and September**.
- The video files are all from **29/08/25**, not from the date of the incident.
- The “Initial Details” file is dated **22/09/25** but was created **10/10/25**.

The metadata proves that the CPS **constructed the case retrospectively**.

What I prove overall

I prove that:

- The CPS added new statements after disclosure.
- They backdated documents to hide this.
- They created the Case Ratio file after charge.
- They modified MG11s after Tuckers withdrew.
- They certified disclosure before evidence existed.
- They breached multiple laws and codes of practice.
- They undermined my right to a fair trial.

This is **evidence tampering, procedural fraud, and abuse of process**.

Taken together, these statements prove that the prosecution case is procedurally unsafe, factually unsupported, and legally invalid. The evidence shows systemic failures in arrest, custody, disclosure, charge creation, and bail decisions. The court cannot rely on any part of the prosecution's case.