

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 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**.