

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 4TH DEFENCE 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: Police Constable

This statement (consisting **36 of 36 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: 26/11/2025

(Signed)



(On behalf of Mr. Simon Paul CORDELL) (Date Signed) 03/12/2025

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

WILL SAY AS FOLLOWS

- **Date of Incident:** 02/08/2025
- **Location:** Allegedly the Communal area of my flat!
- **Background:** As detailed below!
- **I am a secure tenant living on the ground floor of Address:** 109 Burncroft Avenue Enfield En3 7jq, **Since 2006.**
- **Neighbour Involvement**
 - (a) One of my neighbours, who is named as "**Rebecca O'Hare,**" has provided multiple MG11 witness statements which I contend against as they are fabricated, backdated, and inconsistent with any truth.
 - (b) Rebecca O'Hare's statements simply "**Misrepresent Enfield Councils Housing Tenancy Rights.**" They actively "**Fabricate Tenancy Status**" by falsely presenting herself as the lawful occupant of "**115 Burncroft Avenue,**" and this is "**Despite the Enfield Council Records That Would Show Otherwise!**" I would like it known that I have held my own Enfield Council secure tenant since 2006 and she has infringed upon those legal rights, while also committing criminal offences against my person and property. This tenancy fraud she commits gives her a false

platform to act as the "Victim" in these and "Other Police and CPS Proceedings, Unrightly."

- **Police as Cover ("Re-insurance")**

- (a) She repeatedly invoked police awareness by stating: ("Location Known to Police") to legitimise her unlawful occupation.
- (b) This tactic allowed her to avoid scrutiny of her tenancy status and gave her cover to continue to make these fake allegations.
- (c) Her, "Three Different Statements All" together "Contradict Themselves within Dates and Locations:
 - 1+ For an instance: She most recently swapped the alleged car-threat incident from the bottom of the "Communal Corridor (First Statement)" to the "Staircase itself (Second Statement,)" this proves a fabricated story.
 - 2+ She altered the timeline of alleged harassment incidents from "January → December → February," introducing confusion and added even more backdating of her own facts. "Rebecca O ' Hare Actions Demonstrate That She Had Never Read Her Own First MG11 Police Statement, Which Was Left Unsigned by Both Her and The Officer, Breaching MG11 Protocol and Undermining Its Authenticity."
 - 3+ Rebecca O ' Hare Has Also: added "Another Vexatious Fabricated Allegation to Deliberately Cause Me Annoyance, Loss and Wrongful Sufferings That Amount to More Than Just Breaches of the Criminal Acts of Harassment, Act 1997 And Stalking Act 1998." The Newest example of this is a fake historic allegation from 2021 that is based on no evidence and can only be found in her third statement, "Illegally Expanding The Scope Beyond The Live Swapped Criminal Police And CPS Charge" and is "Reckless Of Them All Involved To Do So, In A Criminal Court Case As It Becomes A Miscarriage Of Justice" due to the "Infringements Of My Human And Legal Rights."
- The Police, CPS and Prosecuting Teams: all "Allowed These Contradictions to Stand" by "Accepting Her Third Statement And Placing It In The Case-Ratio Folder Into An Already Sealed And Disclosed Document" after the 01/09/2025 and this meant that I would be "Given The Prosecuting Teams Folder And Files Just Three Days Before Trial By Tuckers Solicitor Firm" and I would not even notice the additional third statement until after the postponement of the trial, in fact it was over a week later! "They All Placed the Third Statement into A Sealed Document" and "Without Even a Disclosure Warning." despite the "Harassment Act 1997" having already been marked "No Further Action." This has "Enabled Irrelevant as Well as Fabricated Harassment Allegations to Be Smuggled into The Substituted Charge" of "Threats to Cause Criminal Damage." Dated the 02/08/2025 by the prosecuting team unmorally. By permitting backdated and contradictory statements, the police disclosure officer and CPS case handler engaged in "False Representation (Fraud Act 2006, S.2), Failure to Disclose True Chronology (S.3)," and "Abuse of Position (S.4)." This conduct directly undermines the integrity of the Case Ratio File Archive and "Infringes My Legal Rights and One Most Importantly of The Right to A Fair and Speedy Trial."

- **Rebecca O'Hare's MO – Copycat Killer Behaviour & Harassment**

- (a) **Copycat Violence / "Killing" References**

- 1+ From my defence file and diary notes, Rebecca has repeatedly "Mimicked Violent Behaviour" towards me and my family as we'll as friends and guests since she moved into the Burncroft Avenue estate, in or around the year of 2018.
- 2+ This "Copycat Murderer Want To Be" element shows "Rebecca O'Hare" is now acting independently while "Replicating the Intimidation and Violent Tactics" of the original adults who targeted me first and is easily proved by officially sent and received emails to the police and Enfield Council that my mother's sent at my request and on my behalf, as well as my diary

of events that I fulfilled at the request of the Enfield Council, both files that prove "**Rebecca O'Hare continues with Copycat Killer Behaviour,**" these files are web-linked below:

* **Weblink Mother Emails:** <Dir> [06. 06-03-2019 Emails Attachments](#)

- 3+ The emails titled as "**04. Enfield Council**" demonstrate the start of my victimisation and the refusal of the government officials to apprehend **Rebecca O'Hare & Co as the Copycat Killer wannabes.**
- 4+ "**Her Lack of Arrests Demonstrates the Governments Initial illegal Involvements and The Reason They Allow Her to Continue Assaulting Me, Such As the PNC Files and Asbo Files.**"
- 5+ **Rebecca O'Hare & Co all** initiated clear intent to escalate hostility against me by adopting the same illegal while threatening tactics and actions, despite herself having no lawful tenancy rights to 115 Burncroft Avenue EN3 7JQ.

* **Weblink Diary Extracts That Create A Shorter Version Of The Diary To Demonstrate The True Ongoings:** <Dir> [01. 2014-Extracts-from-Diary](#)

(b) **Banging on My Kitchen Homes Walls & Slamming her Own Doors, while Squeaking Floorboards to have a Deliberate while Reckless Negative Effect on My Way of Life: --**

- 1+ "**Rebecca O'Hare the Copycat Killer Wannabe,**" has continually engaged in repeated "**Banging on Walls and Doors,**" while also deliberately "**Squeaking Floorboards**" directed at my person and at my visitors (**Friends and Family**) who are willing to attend court and give evidence against her to this effect.
- 2+ These illegal and unmoral actions of "**Rebecca O'Hare & Co,**" are a deliberate tactic to create a hostile living environment, interfering with "**My Private and Family Life**" as well as "**Quiet Enjoyment**" of my secure tenancy causing a breach of (**Clause 3.5 of the Enfield Tenancy Agreement**).
- 3+ Her intent also amounts to harassment under the "**Protection from Harassment Act 1997,**" and this is even though the police have refused to arrest her no matter of the amount of complaints we make and the evidence we support in them and even in this "**Case1**" that is dated **02/08/2025.** "**I Have Been Made the Perpetrator and she was swapped to be the Victim When It Is Really the Other Way Around as The Evidence Proves Beyond Reasonable Doubt.**" CPS have already marked the harassment case that I was caution through a closed front door for without being identified as finished. "**I Was Wrongly Accused of Committing Harassment Against Her and CPPS Issued**" a "**No Further Action.**" Towards the Case!

(c) **Targeting Social Circles**

- 1+ By "**Rebecca O'Hare**" extending the banging and intimidation to my friends and family also, she widened the scope of harassment beyond her victimising just me personally, as she also victimised other persons who are willing to attend court against her to give evidence at the Courts Request.
- 2+ This shows her intent is not just too inconvenience me, but to "**Isolate me Socially**" and/ or "**Murder Me,**" as she has no observation of us as "**She Tortures Me While Were Alone Most of The Times, But I Record It and Document It All Down, It's Taken Me Years**" and due to this, she makes my home environment toxic for me, and anyone present with me.

(d) **The Council & Police Allowances of Themselves and "Rebecca O'Hare & Co,"**

- 1+ **The Exhibited Defence Files:** make it clear that the Enfield Council and Met Police were aware of these behaviors from "**Rebecca O'Hare & Co,**" & "**Themselves acting as Government Officials,**" but "**None of Them Ever Wanted to Get Caught Committing the Crimes That**

They Have Against Me, Leaving Me Fighting Over 80 Cases Just Like This One but Ones That I Have Recently One."

- 2+ Instead of acting against tenancy fraud and criminal conduct committed by "**Rebecca O'Hare & Co and others,**" the "**Involved Government Officials Continued to Encourage and Tolerate the Very Behaviour We Complained About, Including Misconduct by Their Staff.**" This is evidenced in my mother's emails already exhibited. "**Since Then,**" The "**Government Officials Involved Have Refused to Protect Us.**" **Case 1 (dated 02/08/2025)** proves once again that they are intent on setting me up to cover up the truth. **The evidence shows:**
- (a) Government Officials accepted Rebecca O'Hare's statements as disclosed materials, despite them being backdated and unsigned.
 - (b) They allowed her and her associates' evil conduct we complained about to become a crime spree against me and my family and one that has continued for years without arrests or accountability.
 - (c) These actions breached the "**Protection from Harassment Act,**" causing harm to me, my friends, and my family.
- 3+ This allowed and enabled "**Rebecca O'Hare & Co, Copycat Intimidation Tactics to Be Treated as Credible Evidence, Despite Its Unlawful and Fabricated Basis.**"

• **Defence Position**

(a) **Rebecca O'Hare's MO includes:**

- 1+ **Copycat Intimidation:** (mimicking violent threats and behaviour).
- 2+ **Physical Harassment:** (banging on walls/doors, as well as floors at me and my visitors).
- 3+ **Social Disruption:** (targeting friends and family to isolate me).
- 4+ **Reliance On Police/Council Tolerance:** to shield her unlawful inhabitants of 115 Burncroft Avenue Enfield EN3 7JQ and to give unfair weight to her fabricated statements.

(b) This pattern shows her conduct is not accidental but a deliberate strategy to undermine my secure tenancy, intimidate me, physically and mentally and all while misleading the court.

01.

- **Exhibit – Outside Video Evidence (06/10/2025)**
 - 1+ **Date of Recording:** 06 October 2025
 - 2+ **Location:** Road entrance and car park of Housing Estate Burncroft Avenue Enfield EN3 7JQ.
 - 3+ **Subject:** Route of Vehicle driven by "**Rebecca O'Hare**" entering the estate and parking as well as outside of the block of flats.
 - 4+ **Recorded By:** Independent third party (friend), acting on Simon's behalf.
- **Reason for Third-Party Recording:**
 - 1+ Simon was unable to attend the location himself due to "**Wrongly Imposed GPS Tag Bail Conditions,**" which prohibits him from entering his own housing estate.
 - 2+ To preserve evidence without breaching bail so, a friend recorded the video as a favour.
- **Narrative Significance:**
 - 1+ This video demonstrates the "**Physical Movements of Rebecca O'Hare**" on **02/08/2025**, corroborating Simon's account of events.
 - 2+ It also evidences the "**Impact of Bail Restrictions:** Simon was prevented from gathering his own material evidence, forcing reliance on third-party assistance.
 - 3+ The exhibit highlights how bail conditions obstructed Simon's ability to prepare his defence, amounting to a "**Procedural Disadvantage,**" and all while demonstrating the true layout of events so "**Rebecca O'Hare's**" fabricated statements of claims can be seen as that, "**fabricated statements!**"

02.

- **Exhibit 02 – Digital File Reference:--**
- **Dated:** 06-10-2025:
 - 1+ <VID-20251004-WA0000.mp4>
 - 2+ <server2.everyoneloginto.me/Durants/VID-20251004-WA0000.mp4>
 - 3+ <https://server2.everyoneloginto.me/Durants/VID-20251004-WA0000.mp4>

- **Copy of Rebecca O'Hare's First Statement**

- (a) Attached here is a copy of "**Rebecca O'Hare's First MG11 Statement.**" which forms part of the CPS disclosure. This statement is relied upon by the prosecution but contains contradictions in dates, places, and her version of events. These contradictions show even more impossibilities when compared against her later statements and for "**Clarification**" of what statement her "**Third Statement.**"

THIS IS A COPY OF REBECCA O ' HARES FIRST STATEMENT

01.

99/12

RESTRICTED (when complete)

WITNESS STATEMENT

Criminal Procedure Rules, r 27. 2; Criminal Justice Act 1967, s. 9; Magistrates' Courts Act 1980, s.5B

URN

Statement of: Rebecca O' hare

Age if under 18: Over (*if over 18 inserts 'over 18*) Occupation:

This statement (consisting of page(s) each 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.

Witness Signature:..... Date: **02/08/2025**

This statement relates to my neighbour at 109 Burncroft avenue, EN3 7JQ I am the above-named individual and reside at location known to police.

The incident I am about to describe occurred on Burncroft avenue, the address is a block of flats and there are 6 flats within the block and 2 flats per floor.

In January my neighbour Simon (109) was banging on my door shouting that I was making noise, I'll punch you up, I'll slap you up and your daughter. He also said he would do the same thing to my children's dad. I took a video of this and sent this to the police.

In January I was getting a new door fitted, I've taken my daughter to school. I've come home; the door was taken off the hinges by the contractor. Simon has come upstairs, and I was in the living room, and I could hear him, Simon was asking the contractor if the guy that lives opposite from me (113) was home. I've gone to the door, and he has started to accuse me of banging on the floor and keeping him awake at night. I've explained that I don't live

above him then he has then shouting saying that he would hit me, hit my eldest daughter and drag my unborn baby out my stomach. I kept telling him to move from the door, he then went to say he's got videos of me on a website about being corrupt. As I've called the police on that occasion, he has said call the fucking police I don't care.



On Saturday 2nd August 2025 I was driving into the estate where my block of flats is, as I'm driving in.

I have seen my neighbour who I only know as Simon, he resides at 109 Burncroft avenue. Whenever I come into the estate the first place, I look is the bottom of my block, to see if he is outside. If he is I know that he would try and intimidate me, shout at me or something is going to happen.

As I have driven in and drove around the bend, I could see him from the side staring at my car. I've driven into the small car park on the left and parked my car. I've got out my car to see if he was still there or not, once I've seen he is not there I've walked my two kids upstairs. I've had to go back downstairs to grab my children's nappy bag I told my eldest daughter if the baby wakes up to call my phone. I've locked the door and taken the key with me as I'm walking down the stairs I hear another door, Simon has got to the bottom of the stairs before me, he was saying stuff but facing away from

Witness Signature:.....

Signature Witnessed by Signature: Page 1 of 2



Continuation of Statement of:

me. So, I wasn't paying any attention, and he has turned around and been like 'you hear me', not in response to him I was like what? And then he has said 'I will blow up your car; I will blow it to the other side of the street.' Then he was like if you come and ask me, I will tell you I didn't do it.


I've closed the communal door to put space between us, I've walked towards my car to get the nappy bag he has opened the door and was shouting stuff at me as I'm walking towards my car, I wasn't paying attention to what he was shouting at me I was trying to get to my car as quick as possible. I've got to my car and got what I needed and looked if he was still by the door, he wasn't by the door, so I've started walking back home, once I got into my flat. I called the police.

Because of his behaviour I am worried to leave the house with my children. I have been getting other people to drop things off for me. I try my best to stay as far away from him as possible but every time I see him, I know that something would happen, there has been incidents **when I am at the shop, he** would stare at me but would not say anything, trying to intimidate me. I feel unsafe in my own home and fear for me and my children because of his threats, every time I make a complaint a feel that it is put down to his mental health. I am concerned that only if he touches me or my children that something would be done.

Witness Signature:.....

Signature Witnessed by Signature:.....

Page 2 of 2



FORENSIC BREAKDOWN: WHY REBECCA'S TIMELINE IS IMPOSSIBLE

MY SEQUENCE OF EVENTS (STEP-BY-STEP)

01. Initial Exit for Delivery

- I exited my home to meet the delivery driver.
- I handed him a number (e.g., 45 or 20) then collected the food and began walking back toward my front door.

As Exhibited in My Defence Statement:

1+ [07. Seven -Key-Screenshot- Just-Eat-Timining-and-115-Rebbeca -Statement!.pdf](#)

02. Realization and Immediate Return

- Before reaching my front door, I realised my bag was short of Food that I had paid for.
- I hurried back to the driver before he drove away.

As Exhibited in My Defence Statement:

1+ [One -Events on the Date and Leading Up to The Date!.pdf](#)

03. Driver's Delay

- The driver got out of his vehicle again.
- He attempted to phone his boss but couldn't get through.
- This added several minutes to the interaction, I would say about 10 minutes, but this error determined that he would have to later return with the missing food!

As Exhibited in My Defence Statement:

1+ [07. Seven -Key-Screenshot- Just-Eat-Timining-and-115-Rebbeca -Statement!.pdf](#)

04. Witnesses Present

- During this time, my next-door neighbours was outside and witnessed the exchange.
- I was visible and engaged in conversation, my location and activities were public and legal.

As Exhibited in My Defence Statement:

1+ [Statement of Witness Section 9 Criminal Justice Act 1967 Saheed Olowu.pdf](#)

05. Rebecca's Claimed Entry

- She claims she drove into the rear car park and brought her children upstairs, when I was not present, for the record I do not dispute this, as I never see her after she drove past me in a car.
- I see her drive past me and into the car park while I was still outside, I remember this

	because I have never seen her driving a car before. Therefore, she had not yet entered the block or brought the children up at this point of time. <u>As Exhibited in My Defence Statement:</u> 1+ 10. Rebecca O hare pdf.pdf
06.	<u>I Continued My Presence in an Orderly Manner Outside!</u> - As I remained outside for approximately 10 minutes resolving the delivery issue. - Rebecca must have remained hidden in the car park during this time; there's no evidence she entered the building. <u>As Exhibited in My Defence Statement:</u> 1+ 10. Rebecca O hare pdf.pdf
07.	<u>Second Delivery Agreement</u> - I and the driver agreed he would return with the rest of the food, as the <u>"Just Eat Exhibits Prove Below!"</u> - I then returned inside to eat the partial delivery (chicken korma). - I only left the flat once again to collect the second half of the delivered food as the Exhibited telephone log proves and this was <u>"20 minutes later."</u> <u>As Exhibited in My Defence Statement:</u> 1+ Seven -Key-Screenshot- Just-Eat-Timining-and-115-Rebbeca -Statement!.pdf
08.	<u>Logical Contradiction in Rebecca's Statement</u> (a) She claims she brought the children upstairs and <u>"Came Down to Retrieve Nappies,"</u> as quoted in her First Statement:-- <i>"I've got out my car to see if he was still there or not, <u>once I've seen he is not there I've walked my two kids upstairs.</u> <u>I've had to go back downstairs to grab my children's nappy bag</u> I told my eldest daughter if the baby wakes up to call my phone. I've locked the door and taken the key with me as I'm walking down the stairs I hear another door, Simon has got to the bottom of the stairs before me, he was saying stuff but facing away from me <u>So, I wasn't paying any attention,</u> and he has turned around and been like <u>'you hear me',</u>"</i> (b) <u>Rebecca O'Hare:</u> also claims she saw my <u>"Back"</u> in the corridor as she descended down the stairs and this would be impossible due to logic as I would have had to be coming back into the building for her to see my back, but I had already gone into the flat and had to wait an extra 20 minutes for the rest of my food to be re delivered. (c) <u>But Based Upon My True & Logical Timeline:</u> 1+ I was outside during her arrival. 2+ I only returned inside after the delivery issue was resolved as missing and not at any time when <u>"Rebecca O'Hare"</u> would not have had the children with her like she states in her <u>official MG11 statement,</u> or I would have seen her. 3+ It is obvious that I had no reason to re-enter the corridor once I was back inside my home because I had no one else to meet, and I don't walk backwards. I was waiting for the second part of my delivery, and during that time, I was logically

eating the first portion of food, the one I had already waited for and paid for. Had I not done so, it would have gone cold and spoiled. There was no justification for me to leave my home again, and any suggestion otherwise ignores both common sense and the documented sequence of my Exhibited true full version of events.

- (d) For **"Rebecca O'Hare"** to have been able to see me in the corridor, as she states in her first statement I would've had to descend back into the corridor once the delivery driver had left to get the second part of the order for no reason, as she states she went in and noticed the nappy bag was missing and went straight back out to get it and left her child on her own and this would equal to a timeline when I was no longer there. **"This Is Proven by "Rebecca O'Hare" First Official Version of Events Contained in Her First Statement and Also in The Second Telephone Call from The Driver to Me and for Me to Go Back Out and Collect the Missing Food as Exhibited in the Just Eat Records."**

As Exhibited in My Defence Statement:

- 1+ [10. Rebecca O hare pdf.pdf](#)
- 2+ [Seven -Key-Screenshot- Just-Eat-Timining-and-115-Rebbeca -Statement!.pdf](#)

- (e) Unless **"Rebecca O'Hare"** waited upstairs for 20–25 minutes almost half an hour before realising the nappies were missing **"Which She Does Not Claim,"** her version is **"Impossible,"** as it is not Chronological and true.

Conclusion: Her Account Is Not Plausible as it is Not Logically and Physically Possible!

- (a) **Rebecca O'Hare Statements:** rely on a compressed and contradictory timeline. **"My Actions Were Visible, Witnessed, And Consistent, By My Own and Other Persons Versions of Events to Be Legally Within the Constraints of the Law"** and this is why the police refused to take their statements at the alleged scene and all of whom all contend against her illogical version of events and some of whom I recovered and are now attending court to give oral evidence.

Her version requires:

- 1+ Me to be in two places at once.
 - 2+ For her too have entered the block while I was still outside (she admits didn't) happen.
 - 3+ A spontaneous corridor encounter that **"Couldn't"** have occurred based on my actual movements, now explained even further and a fabricated claim that has now caused me to also have to prove that I was not even fairly interviewed for this alleged incident **"Nor Was I Arrested for The Charge Brought Before the Court: Threats to Cause Criminal Damage 1971"** and **"In Knowing That Neither Did I Commit Such Crimes Or Offences."**
- (b) These factual observations undermine the credibility of her account and supports my assertion that **"Her Version of Events and The CPS Rules of Engagement at Court Is Not Just Flawed, They Are Both Structurally Impossible."**

As Exhibited in My Defence Statement:

- 1+ [Three -Unlawful Actions Taken Against Me by Rebbeca O' Hare and Co.pdf](#)

FORENSIC BREAKDOWN: WHY REBECCA'S TIMELINE IS IMPOSSIBLE

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

- | | |
|----|--|
| 1. | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Unsigned Statement:</u> Rebecca O'Hare.• The MG11C form explicitly states "<u>Witness Signature: ---</u>" with no signature present. This renders the statement inadmissible unless verified in court.• I am entitled to ask: "<u>Who signed this statement, and when?</u>"• If unsigned, it fails the basic threshold under the "<u>Criminal Justice Act 1967</u>" and "<u>Magistrates' Courts Act 1980,</u>" and we therefore "<u>Request For "Rebecca O'Hare's" First Statement to Be Officially: "Exclude as Evidence Under Section 78!" in these court proceedings dated 02/08/2025.</u> |
| 2. | <p><u>January Incident and August: Alleged Threats and Video Evidence</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>No video disclosed of alleged offences:</u> Despite claiming to have sent video evidence to police, no footage has been disclosed under <u>CPIA</u>. →that challenges the charge of Threats to cause criminal damage on the <u>02/08/2025</u> and "<u>Now Me and My Legal Defence Team If I Had One Want to Challenge:</u><ul style="list-style-type: none">1+ <u>Where is the video for this charge as its wrongly dated January and has nothing to do with threats to blow up a car, that are disputed.</u>2+ <u>Has it been reviewed, timestamped, and verified by an officer?</u>3+ <u>Why has this wrong exhibit been disclosed and where is the real exhibit?</u>• <u>Language used:</u> Highly emotive and inflammatory but lacks corroboration to alleged victims statements.• Also, there is only one BWV, and over 3 other important police officer BWF is still not disclosed
The one Disclosed is Pc Chans and he leaves me in my flat with other police officer while I am still being arrested as he had to leave after assaulting me. His BWF make it look as if I have been taken out of my flat and brought to the hospital. We requested the missing BWF that will prove police refused to collect evidence as statements of persons who were really present at the time that proved I was innocent.• <u>Pc Chans BWF Exhibits:</u> that he lies in his statement as he does not mention leaving Pc Obsiye and going back outside on his own. This proves he was not looking after "<u>Rebecca O'Hare's, Child While Pc Obsiye Was Taking Her First Statement.</u>" Pc Obsiye and Pc Chan Both fail to mention this in there official MG11 Police Officers statements, meaning that there was no other police officer present while "<u>Rebecca O'Hare,</u>" statement got took. Both Police officers failed to mention that Pc Chan went outside on his own and left Pc Obsiye and "<u>Rebecca O'Hare,</u>" <u>Upstairs on Their Own.</u>" Pc Chans BWF Proves this fact as the BWF footage Starts with Him Alone Outside and Him Heading Stright for My Ground Floor Front Door with Pc Obsiye. This worsens as Pc Obsiye even Backdated her own official statement with a backdated date to fabricate the creation date to deceive the courts.• Also, there is no third-party witnesses other than my own that was present when "<u>Rebecca O'Hare,</u>" alleges this offence happened as her version of events did not happen. |
| 3. | <p><u>Door Fitting and Accusation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Timeline Ambiguity:</u> "<u>Rebecca O'Hare,</u>" claims the door was off its hinges and she was inside, yet approached Simon unscared when she knew he was knocking on her next-door neighbours front door, why does she pretend in her First statement that she acts otherwise?• Simon and the contractor both spoke to each other and she choose to join happily join |

	in! • <u>No contractor statement</u>: The contractor is a key witness yet not cited or referenced, as he will prove Mr. Simon Cordell's True Version of events. • And then to her other → Contradictions:
4.	<u>Location Contradiction</u> • <u>"Rebbeca O'Hare,"</u> states: <u>"I Don't Live Above Him So I Can't Victimise Him as Her Defence This Is a Lie and Would Be Proved If the Crime Scene Is Visited and Reviewed"</u>
5.	<u>Website and Police Call</u> • <u>Website reference</u>: <u>"Rebbeca O'Hare,"</u> Fails to claims that I said she's on a corruption website. That's verifiable if checked, and this is one of the only things mentioned in her Exhibited Video. • <u>Police call</u>: No CAD number or officer response cited. Again, no disclosure for the only Video She Exhibited as backdated.
6.	<u>August 2nd Incident</u> <u>Rebbeca O'Hare, Driving into the estate</u> • <u>Pre-emptive fear</u>: <u>"Rebbeca O'Hare,"</u> admits she always checks if Mr Simon Paul Cordell is outside, but this really just shows bias and expectation and not an actual threat. • <u>Staring at car</u>: Not illegal. No verbal exchange yet she unfairly claims intimidation.
7.	<u>Parking and Entry</u> • <u>No interaction</u>: She confirms I Wasn't present when she parked and walked upstairs. No threat occurred.
8.	<u>An Alleged Threat to Blow a Car-up Once it was Parked That Rebbeca Was Seen Driving for the First Time When I Never Believed She Owned a Car or Licence to Drive Is Ridiculous: --</u> • This is definitely something that never really happened, to Rebbeca O'Hare by me as it is really a dirty cover up to protect her for what she has really done to me, Mr. Simon P. Cordell. • <u>No witnesses</u>: She claims I made a serious threat while facing away from her. → <u>Challenge</u>: <u>"How Did She Hear and Interpret the Words If She Wasn't Paying Attention or I was not facing her?"</u> • <u>No forensic follow-up</u>: <u>"No Real Time Incident," "No Witness To Verify Her Account," "No Police Forensic Sweep," "States I Was In Pajamers," "No Blown Up Car," "I Was Not Found Within The Vicinity Of The Car," "No Flammable Objects Were Found On My Person," "No Detonation Material Were Found," "I Was Not Caught Heading To A Petrol Station," "I Was Found Still In Pajamers Ready For Bed And Unable To Walk More Than A Few Feet When Arrested," and "I Was Not Even Arrested With A Coat Or Shoes On To Suggest Otherwise," This Must Leave No Case To Answer Towards As For Being The Defendant In These Proceedings!"</u> • <u>I Would Also Like to Note by Stating That I Have Never Seen Rebecca O ' Hare at The Shops as She Suggests</u>: happens and that there is also, <u>"No Shop CCTV To Verify"</u> this and there is <u>"No Shop Keeps Statement"</u> as well as <u>No Police Cad That Supports "Rebbeca O'Hare," Hallucinations of Seeing Me Stare at Her in A Shop of Hers."</u>

9.	<u>Shouting From Communal Door</u> <u>Rebbeca O'Hare Admits:</u> <i>"She Wasn't Paying Attention to What He Was Shouting."</i> → <u>Contradiction:</u> If she didn't hear the words, how can she claim threat or intent?
10.	<u>Fear and Mental Health Allegation</u> <u>Subjective Fear:</u> Her fear is real to her, but legally it must be based on an objective threat. <u>Mental Health Claim:</u> She alleges her complaints are dismissed due to mental health. That's discriminatory and irrelevant unless medically substantiated and it cannot be.
11.	<u>Legal Leverage Points</u> <u>Unsigned Statement:</u> Procedurally invalid unless signed and verified. <u>No Disclosed Evidence:</u> No video, BWV, No Video Exhibited of <u>Rebbeca O' Hare</u> demonstrating any of her claim's, no contractor statement, No CAD logs, or any third-party corroboration, backing her alleged allegations. <u>Contradictions:</u> Timeline, location, and attention inconsistencies. <u>Bias And Expectation:</u> Her own words show she anticipates conflict, not that it occurs. <u>Discriminatory Framing:</u> Mental health references are prejudicial and unsupported.

(Signed)



(On behalf of Mr. Simon Paul CORDELL) (Date Signed) 03/12/2025

Signature Witnessed by Signature:

Pages 11 of 11

01/21

OFFICIAL – SENSITIVE [when complete]

- **Clarified Exhibit Note – About Repetition in Statements**
 - (a) When reading the next statement immediately after the previous one, it may appear repetitive. This is because I have had to summarise "**Rebecca O'Hare's First Statement Again,**" in light of the new disclosure of her "**Third Official Statement,**" even aloe it must be inadmissible in these proceedings and I also, address her **second statement** in sequence again but with new intel highlights.
 - (b) The repetition arises not from choice but from necessity. Court procedure requires that each disclosure and statement be answered in turn, even if this means revisiting earlier material.
 - (c) In addition, the **different types of mandatory court forms** that must be completed to fulfil my defence require as similar patten of repetitiveness, meaning that this does not only happen in defence statements but also procedural forms for court that require me to restate and cross-reference issues multiple times.

- (d) This repetition should therefore be understood as a product of the legal process, not duplication for its own sake. It ensures that every statement, whether first, second, or third, is properly addressed and recorded within the required forms and **"Now for My Next Defence Statement the Third!"**

THIS IS MY THIRD DEFENCE 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: Police Constable

This statement (consisting of 22 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: 26/11/2025

(Signed)

(On behalf of Mr. Simon Paul CORDELL) (Date Signed) 03/12/2025

Dear CPS Prosecutor/Solicitor's,

- I am writing to bring to your immediate attention serious concerns regarding the handling of my case files "**Case Ref: 02/08/2025.**" Evidence shows that Rebecca O'Hare's third statement was frauded as fabricated, added just Three Days Before Trial, and backdated to appear as part of the original disclosure. Furthermore, the Case Ratio File Archive was created only after charge, then presented as if contemporaneous.
- **These Actions Constitute Offences Under the Fraud Act 2006:**
 - (a) False representation (s.2) by backdating statements.
 - (b) Failing to disclose (s.3) the true chronology of evidence creation.
 - (c) Abuse of position (s.4) by modifying disclosure after defence release.
 - (d) Possessing/making articles for use in fraud (s.6–7) through and with the Case Ratio File Archive.
 - (e) Obtaining services dishonestly (s.11) by engaging the court process with fabricated disclosure.
- 1+ **I Request Immediate Review and Rectification of These Breaches:** what must include complete disclosure of the true creation dates of all statements and case files and case folders, **i.e.** the Case ratio Folder!
- 2+ **Rebecca O' Hares Third statement:** was adapted and modified after my defense was released and overviewed!
- **Formal Statement – Application of Fraud Act 2006 to Case 02/08/2025**

- (a) We Prove the CPS have backdated the alleged Victims Rebecca O ' Hares Third statement and created the Case Ratio File Archive after they Charged me. We Prove that the CPS have caused misconduct while "**Handling Files of Disclosure**" and "**Recklessly Allowed the Backdating of Witness Statements.**" in court proceedings!
- **Section 2 – Fraud by False Representation**
 - (a) **Definition:** "*Dishonestly Making a False Representation. Intending to Make a Gain or Cause a Loss!*"
 - (b) **Application:** We prove that the CPS presented "**Rebecca O'Hare's third statement**" as if it were part of the original disclosure. In reality, it was "**Fabricated and Backdated after the File it was Presented in was Prior Sealed and Disclosed Just Three Days Before Trial.**" falsely representing that the evidence had existed contemporaneously.
 - (c) **Impact:** "**The False Representation and Prosecuting Teams Handling of these Court Proceedings is Set to Mislead the Court, & Deny Me Fair Preparation of Legal Defence, and Has Now created Unfair Losses to My Legal Defence.**"
 - **Section 3 – Fraud by Failing to Disclose Information**
 - (a) **Definition:** "*Dishonestly Failing to Disclose Information When Under a Legal Duty to Do So!*"
 - (b) **Application:** We prove that the CPS failed to disclose the "**True Creation Date of The Case Ratio File Archive**" and withheld the fact that statements were "**Adapted After My Defence Was Released.**"
 - (c) **Impact:** By failing to disclose the manipulation of evidence, "**The CPS Breached Their Disclosure Duty Under CPIA 1996, Obstructing My Right to A Fair Trial.**"
 - **Section 4 – Fraud by Abuse of Position**
 - (a) **Definition:** "*Dishonestly Abusing a Position of Trust to Make a Gain or Cause a Loss.*"
 - (b) **Application:** As prosecutors, the CPS hold a position of trust to ensure lawful disclosure. By "**Adapting and Modifying Witness Statements Post-Defence.**" they abused that position to strengthen their case unlawfully.
 - (c) **Impact:** "**This Abuse Caused Me Procedural Disadvantage, Undermining Article 6 HRA 1998 Rights.**"
 - **Section 6 & 7 – Possessing / Making Articles for Use in Fraud**
 - (a) **Definition:** "*Possessing or creating articles intended for use in fraud!*"
 - (b) **Application:** We prove that the "**Case Ratio File Archive**" was created after charge, then backdated to appear legitimate. This archive itself is an "**Article**" used to misrepresent the case chronology.
 - (c) **Impact:** "**Its Use in Court Proceedings Constitutes Fraudulent Handling of Case Materials.**"
 - **Section 11 – Obtaining Services Dishonestly**
 - (a) **Definition:** "*Dishonestly obtaining services without payment or proper entitlement!*"
 - (b) **Application:** We prove that by the prosecuting team submitting fabricated disclosure into the court process, the CPS dishonestly obtained the "**Service of Judicial Consideration**" under false pretenses.
 - (c) **Impact:** "**This Corrupted the Trial Process, Wasting Court Resources and Denying Me Lawful Representation.**"
 - **Case Ration Creation Date Exhibits to be Reviewed: --**
 - 1+ **Weblink 1:** <Dir> [69.1. 05-11-25-CPS Case Ratio Website](https://69.1.05-11-25-CPS-Case-Ratio-Website)
 - 2+ **Weblink 2:** <Dir> <https://everyoneologinto.me/01.%2002-08-2025-Another-Case/02.%20All-Docs/69.1.%2005-11-25-CPS%20Case%20Ratio%20Website/>

TIMELINE OF EVENTS

01. Timeline of Events – Case Ref: 02/08/2025

01. Procedural Milestones

Case started: 02-08-25

Hospital With Police: 03-08-25

Arrived At Police Station and Refused Bail to Court: 03-08-25

At Court: 04-08-25

Weblink Of Email Disclosing Files for The First Time:

- 1+ <Dir> [04. Original-CPS-Case-Archive \(1\) 01-09-25](#)
- 2+ <Dir> [05. CPS-caseratio-10-10-25-Case-Files-02-08-25-](#)

02. • Initial Disclosure

(a) On **01/09/2025**, I received the first disclosure bundle by email from Tucker Solicitors at **Highbury & Islington Court. This Was Labelled:**

1+ **“Original-CPS-Case-Archive (1)”**

Contents Included:

<u>Nub.</u>	<u>File Names</u>
<u>01</u>	Case_Summary_pdf.pdf
<u>02</u>	CORDELL_Simon_01YE1267925_Section_9_pdf.pdf
<u>03</u>	Defendant_Notice_of_Grant_of_Bail_pdf.pdf
<u>04</u>	Let_to_Client_Magistrates_Court_Trial_Advice.docx
<u>05</u>	PC_Chan_pdf.pdf
<u>06</u>	PC_obsiye_pdf.pdf
<u>07</u>	PC_Williams_pdf.pdf
<u>08</u>	PC_Wilson_Wallis_pdf.pdf
<u>09</u>	Rebecca O HARE 2nd pdf.pdf
<u>10</u>	Rebecca O hare pdf.pdf
<u>11</u>	<u>ROH 01 mp4.mp4</u>
<u>12</u>	Simon_CORDELL_Charges_pdf.pdf
<u>13</u>	Simon_CORDELL_Pre_Cons_pdf.pdf
<u>13</u>	Simon_CORDELL_Pre_Cons_pdf_pages.docx
—	output.doc
—	signature transparent bg_bd3b4ec2-9608-4754-bd6a-54dd565a5306.png

• Witness Statements – Rebecca O’Hare

(a) At this stage, **“Two Statements”** were disclosed.

(b) Metadata shows one statement of **“Rebecca O’Hare’s”** titled as her third statement and dated **07/08/2025**, is chronologically impossible given the archive disclosure date **“01/09/2025,”** as it did not exist in those files as Exhibited above! **“As For a Fact Two Statements Are Not Three!”**

(c) This discrepancy demonstrates that the statement was **“Added or Backdated After the**

Initial Disclosure,” undermining the integrity of the CPS archive.

- **Key Point for Defence**

- (a) The CPS “**Original-Case-Archive (1)**” disclosed on **01/09/2025** contained only two statements from Rebecca O’Hare. The later appearance of a third statement dated **07/08/2025** proves that disclosure was “**Modified After Charge,**” **Breaching CPIA 1996 And Crim PR 15.4.** “**This Is a Procedural Irregularity That Directly Impacts the Fairness of This Trial and It Preparation.**”

TIMELINE OF EVENTS

01. **Timeline of Events – Case Ref: 02/08/2025**

01. Procedural Milestones

Case started: 02-08-25

Hospital With Police: 03-08-25

Arrived At Police Station and Refused Bail to Court: 03-08-25

At Court: 04-08-25

Weblink Of Email Disclosing Files for The First Time:

- 1+ <Dir> [04. Original-CPS-Case-Archive \(1\) 01-09-25](#)
- 2+ <Dir> [05. CPS-caseratio-10-10-25-Case-Files-02-08-25-](#)

02. • **Disclosure on 10/10/2025**

- (a) On **10/10/2025**, Tucker Solicitors at Highbury & Islington Court emailed me a further disclosure bundle labelled:

“CPS-caseratio-10-10-25-Casefiles”

- **Contents included:**

Nub.	File Names	File Notes
<u>01</u>	CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925 Initial Details Pros Case 22-09-2025.pdf	<u>Original Prosecuting Teams File!</u> <u>This file now contains the Third Statement that is Backdated by Rebbeca O’Hare and the Prosecuting Teams & Co!</u> <u>The File was sealed and disclosed as the 22-09-2025 and I first received it on the 01/09/2025.</u>

02	CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925 Unused Material Disclosure 22-09-2025.docx	Docx version of Original
02	CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925 Unused Material Disclosure 22-09-2025.pdf	Original Prosecuting Teams File!
02	Return CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925 Unused Material Disclosure 22-09-2025.docx	Docx version of Original
02	Return CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925 Unused Material Disclosure 22-09-2025.pdf	Pdf version of Original
03	CKC 01 Witnessing arrest of Simon Cordell.mp4	Original Prosecuting Teams File!
04	Rebecca O'Hare's Video – 11. ROH 01 MP4.docx	Docx version of Original
04	Rebecca O'Hare's Video – 11. ROH 01 mp4.pdf	Pdf version of Original
04	Rebecca O'Hare's Video – 11. ROH 01 mp4.mp4	Original Prosecuting Teams File!
04	Rebecca O'Hare's Video.docx	Docx version of Original
05	Axon Interview Interview Room 7 Camera 1 mp4.mp4	Original Prosecuting Teams File!
06	CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925 Section 9 05-08-2025.pdf	Original Prosecuting Teams File!

- **Witness Statements – Rebecca O'Hare**

- This disclosure introduced "**Three Statements**" from "**Rebecca O'Hare.**"
- The "**Extra Statement**" is backdated to **07/08/2025**, which is impossible because:
 - The parent document ("**Initial Details Pros Case**") is explicitly dated **22/09/2025**.
 - Within that file, the third statement appears with a date of **07/08/2025**, predating the archive creation.
- This demonstrates that the statement was "**Inserted Later and Backdated.**" undermining the integrity of the CPS case ratio files.

- **04. CPS Case Ratio Website – 05/11/2025**

- A further CPS Case Ratio website entry shows:

Nub.	File Names
01	Get cloud data From Server
02	Get cloud data From Server
02	Get cloud data From Server
04	20251107_092100

1+ **Created by:** User 2258 on 10/10/2025 at 12:17

2+ **Modified by:** User 2258 on 10/10/2025 at 12:17

- **05. Procedural Breach – Manual of Guidance (2011 + NFS 2015)**

- (a) The Manual of Guidance requires that **“Case Ratio Files Must Exist Before CPS Can Lawfully Charge or Impose Bail Conditions.”**
- (b) In this case, the CPS ratio files were only created on **10/10/2025**, long after charge and bail decisions **“02–04/08/2025.”**
- (c) **This Proves a Breach of Lawful Process**: bail was imposed without the required case ratio foundation.

Key Point for Defence

- (b) The CPS **“Caseratio-10-10-25-Casefiles”** disclosure demonstrates **“Post-Charge Fabrication and Backdating of Witness Statements.”** The appearance of a third Rebecca O’Hare statement dated **07/08/2025** inside a file headed **22/09/2025** is procedurally impossible unless fabricated. Combined with the late creation of case ratio files **“10/10/2025.”** this shows CPS acted unlawfully in charging and imposing bail without the mandatory case ratio documentation.

- **Rex V Simon CORDELL -- Statement/Evidence List Added in the: CPS-caseratio-10-10-25-Case-Files-for the - 02-08-25 Disclosed!**

(a) Statement/Evidence disclosed to mee as an Index

No.	Statement(s), Deposition(s) & Documents (Other Than Exhibits)	Statement Date	Page(s)	Notes
<u>1</u>	Rebecca O’HARE	03/08/2025	1	Original
	– Ditto –	03/08/2025	2	Same witness, duplicate entry
	– Ditto –	02/08/2025	3–4	Same witness, earlier date
	<u>– Ditto –</u>	<u>07/08/2025</u>	<u>5–6</u>	<u>Backdated statement, added only in CPS-caseratio-10-10-25 files</u>
<u>2</u>	George Samuel Wilson-Wallis	Undated	—	Witness statement without date
<u>3</u>	S9 Notice/1 – Simon CORDELL	—	7–8	Defence notice

- **First Approach the Meaning of “Ditto” in Context**

- (a) In formal documents like this **“Statement/Evidence List,”** **“Ditto”** is shorthand for **“Same as Above”**. It’s used to avoid repeating the same name or detail multiple times.

- **Second Approach Evidence of Irregular Disclosure Contained in the Index:--**

- (a) Here, all four entries are attributed to **“Rebecca O’HARE,”** but with different dates and pagination.
 - 1+ The first statement from Rebecca O ‘ Hare herself has no signature from the reviewing while witnessing police officer present nor is it signed by herself!

2+ The second statement from Rebecca O ' Hare is also fabricated due to the signature being not a real signature signed by herself that would be if redacted demonstrate that she signed it with a black redacted marker pen still being present or her own signed signature.

3+ **The 07/08/2025 Entry Is Anomalous**: it did not exist in the "**01/09/2025 Disclosure**" as described in my prior defence statement and the statement was only introduced later in the "**10/10/2025 CPS-Caseratio Files, Disclosure**" proving it is backdated and submitted to appear earlier.

(b) **Legal Aid Email (01/09/2025)**: Confirms only two case references were covered by Tuckers solicitor firm and not Three or Four!

* **As Exhibited Below**: --

From: Legal Aid (Shared) (legalaid@tuckerssolicitors.com)

To: re_wired@ymail.com

Date: Monday 1 September 2025 at 12:42 BST

- Dear Simon, to clarify we have legal aid for the following cases;

- (a) **File COR10388/00001** – Case Reference 01YE1267925 - Trial 13/10/2025

- (b) **File COR10388/00002** – Case Reference 01YE1300125 – Trial 11/11/2025 We done have any file for any wrongful arrest cases.
Kind Regards Rosie Yates

- **Exhibit Breakdown:**

- (a) What this means and what is really going on here in the Exhibit above is the following: --

- (b) Two Arrests and four times different criminal charges, with both arrests equaling to two different police Caution charges. The Additional two Criminal charges were not bundled by the police at the times of arrests.

- **First Arrest:**

- (a) **File COR10388/00001** – Case Reference 01YE1267925 - Trial 13/10/2025

- Tuckers solicitors know and are deliberately misleading these court proceedings of the following circumstances. They attended Wood Green police station due to a duty call out and when arriving at the police station they signed with me a legal aid form for case ref: 01YE1267925, at this point of time the attending solicitor-based case ref: 01YE1267925, just of the custody logs intel for the reason of my arrest, The detention logs used by the attending solicitor demonstrate that I was arrested for just a section 4a criminal offence, as they prove. I Knew that I was arrested at my home for Harassment Act 1997 as the police Statements and their BWF Proves creating two different charges for case ref: 01YE1267925.
 - After being interviewed the solicitor left as did my appropriate adult, they both simply left the police station and the case for me was no Further actioned the following morning around 4Am by police.
 - **"But Before My Due Release I Was Pre Gate Charged and without any police Caution nor further Arrest I was then Remanded with No Bail And Detained in a cell Until I Was Sent Straight to Court and all while being denied my legal right to speak to a solicitor or appropriate Adult"** This **"Pre Gate Charged and without any police Caution nor further Arrest"** Started and now continues with no legal process and therefore no legal remedies

have yet been able to me as required to be in a legal process.

- At the Court Tucker was appointed by the judge to aid for me under section 38, as they had left wood green police station before the new charge swap of threats to cause criminal damage was introduced and since then Tuckers Solicitor firms staff have refused to comply by admitting that legal aid was never in place for the swapped charge while they was not there and that their reason for attendance at the Wood green police station under case ref: 01YE1267925, was not for threats to cause criminal damage but rather for a section 3a that was already muddled up as I was caution for harassment as in the police statements and BWF.

- **Second Arrest:**

(a) **File COR10388/00002** – Case Reference 01YE1300125 – “Trial 11/11/2025 We done have any file for any wrongful arrest cases. Kind Regards Rosie Yates!”

- 1+ This is a second case reference number and was created on the **26/08/2025** when legal aid was signed for an alleged assault case against police that I did not commit. This was when I was wrongful arrest for breach of bail conditions to do with case 1 and became the start of a new criminal allegation hence a new legal aid form being signed by me.

* **The First Arrest:** was used to add the additional charges as an illegal post swap due to no fair legal process and legal aid was never signed but the same police case number was illegally reused.

- 1+ **Weblink for above 1:** [21. Received-01-09-25.pdf](#)

- 2+ **Weblink for above 2:** <https://everyoneloginto.me/01.%2002-08-2025-Another-Case/02.%20All-Docs/21.%20Received-01-09-25.pdf>

(a) **First Disclosure (01/09/2025):** Emails and attachments prove only two Rebecca O'HARE statements were served and not Three!

- 1+ **Weblink Email:** [19. Email Sent-01-09-25.pdf](#)

- 2+ **Weblink Attachment:** <Dir> [20.1. Original-CPS-Case-Archive \(1\) 01-09-25](#)

(b) **The weblinks above also prove that Case Summary.pdf (01/09/2025):** Index wording states “**Statement Provided**” (**singular**), not plural, confirming only one statement existed at that time in the file that was sealed and disclosed titled as: “01. Case Summary .pdf”

<u>Surname / Police Witness/ Victim Organisation name</u>	<u>Forenames</u>	<u>Key Witness Status</u>	<u>What was the Role of the witness</u>
O'HARE	Rebecca	<u>Key</u>	<u>Victim</u>
<u>Evidence Summary</u>	statement provided		

- 1+ **Later Disclosure (10/10/2025):** The CPS-caseratio files introduced a third O'HARE statement dated 07/08/2025, which is procedurally impossible since the parent file is headed 22/09/2025.

- 2+ **CPS Case Ratio Website (05/11/2025):** Shows creation/modification logs by User 2258 on **10/10/2025**, proving the files were generated after charge and bail.

- **Defence Position**

(a) The CPS disclosure trail shows:

- 1+ **01/09/2025** – Only two O'HARE statements disclosed.
- 2+ **10/10/2025** – A third statement appears, backdated to 07/08/2025.
- 3+ **05/11/2025** – Case ratio website logs confirm late creation.

(b) This undermines the integrity of disclosure, demonstrates unlawful alteration of evidence, and infringes the right to a fair trial.

- **Procedural Breach**

(a) The disclosure officer **Joel Avigdor** dated the added statement to **07/08/2025**, while CPS prosecutor **J. Rainbird** was involved as of **22/09/2025**. **"I Am Concerned as These Actions Have Infringed Upon My Human Right to A Fair Trial."**

(b) This sequence demonstrates **"Post-Charge Fabrication and Backdating,"** infringing **Crim PR 15.4 and CPIA 1996.**

(c) **Manual of Guidance (2011 + NFS 2015):** requires case ratio files to exist **"Before Charge or Bail Conditions."** Here, they were only created on **10/10/2025**, proving unlawful process.

Nub	Name	Details of Person	Evidence in person ? (tick for yes)	Issue(s)
1.	Avigdor, Joel.	Disclosure officer: pc 01 p265750	☒ = Yes	
2.	PC Avigdor 2916NA	Taker, he took the third statement of Rebecca O'Hare dated <u>07/08-2025</u>		We request the BWF of PC AVIGDOR 2916NA third statement taker of Rebecca O'HARE dated 07/08-2025

Disclosure Breach – Rebecca O'Hare (Third Statement, 07/08/2025)

- **Summary of Breach:**

On **07 August 2025**, it is documented that a third witness statement was taken from **Rebecca O'Hare**. The CPS archive records this statement as **"Statement Taken By: PC Avigdor 2916NA."** Crucially, PC Avigdor is also logged as the **"Disclosure Handler"** for the case on **02 August 2025** and what must be dated the **04/08/2025**, with a new URN Number. This dual role of **"PC Jowel Avigdor!"** **CREATES A DIRECT CONFLICT: "The Officer Responsible for Ensuring Impartial Disclosure Was Simultaneously the Author of Undisclosed Evidence."**

- **Key Facts:**

(a) **Statement Date:** 07/08/2025

(b) **Taken By:** PC Avigdor 2916NA

(c) **Disclosure Role:** Same officer recorded as Disclosure Handler on **02/08/2025**

(d) **No Defence Disclosure: "No CPIA Disclosure Notice or Service Record Exists for This Taken Statement, as there mandatory must be!"**

(e) **Procedural Breach:** The statement was archived internally but withheld from the defence, breaching **CPIA 1996 and Crim PR 15.4.**

- **Why This Matters:**

(a) **A disclosure handler must act as a neutral gatekeeper, ensuring all material is served to the defence or filed otherwise!**

(b) **By taking the statement himself and then controlling disclosure, PC Avigdor compromised the**

integrity of the legal process of the case.

- (c) The defence was denied sight of an alleged victims witness statement that could materially affect the case, undermining fairness and transparency three days before trial.
- (d) This is not a minor oversight: it is a structural breach of disclosure safeguards designed to prevent concealment and manipulation of articles and materials for court.

- **Exhibit Note (Bundle Entry):**

- 1+ Exhibit 82 – Disclosure Breach (Rebecca O’Hare, Third Statement)
- 2+ CPS archive shows statement dated 07/08/2025, taken by PC Avigdor 2916NA.
- 3+ Same officer acted as Disclosure Handler on 04/08/2025.
- 4+ No disclosure notice served to defence.
- 5+ Statement withheld until trial.
- 6+ **Breach of CPIA 1996 and Crim PR 15.4 – “Conflict of Role and Denial of Lawful Disclosure.”**

- **Dual Roles (Disclosure Officer + Statement Taker)**

- (a) A **“Disclosure Officer”** is responsible for reviewing material gathered during an investigation and ensuring compliance with the **“Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996 (CPIA).”**
- (b) A **“Statement Taker”** (any police constable) records witness statement.
- (c) **It Is Possible for The Same Officer to Hold Both Roles:** in smaller cases, but it raises **“Conflict of Interest Act 1998 Concerns:**
 - 1+ The disclosure officer **“Must Remain Impartial and Ensure All Relevant Material (Including Anything Undermining the Prosecution) Is Revealed,”** but this has not happened.
 - 2+ If the same officer is also generating evidence (taking statements), **“It Compromises the Appearance of Neutrality,”** as has happened here!
- (d) **In Real Time Practice: “CPS Guidance Expects Clear Separation of Duties” in “Complex or Sensitive Cases”** to avoid fair allegations of bias or manipulation as has not happened here!

- **Backdating a Statement**

- (a) **“PC Jowel Avigdor,” Backdating A Witness Statement Like He Has Done Is Not Legally Allowed as Legitimate!**
- (b) A statement must accurately reflect:
 - 1+ The date it was taken.
 - 2+ The circumstances under which it was given but “PC Jowel Avigdor,” has failed to achieve this, “By Aiding and Allowing Rebecca O ‘ Hares Crime Spree to Escalate, With Frauded Backdates and Fabricated Claims!”
- (c) **Backdating = falsification of evidence,** which in this case amounts to:
 - 1+ **Pervverting the Course of Justice** (common law offence, punishable by life imprisonment).
 - 2+ **Misconduct in Public Office** (if done by a police officer in their official role).
- (d) Any evidence we have shown to be backdated must be **“Inadmissible”** in court and clearly collapses the **02/08/25** case.

- **Relevant Law & Guidance**

- (a) **CPIA 1996** → governs disclosure duties.
- (b) **Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (PACE)** → governs how statements are taken and recorded.
- (c) **Pervverting the Course of Justice** → applies if evidence is falsified.
- (d) **Misconduct in Public Office** → applies if a police officer abuses their role.

- **Summary for My situation:**

- (a) A police officer can technically be both disclosure officer and statement taker, but it's "**Bad Practice**" and open to challenge.
- (b) **Backdating A Statement Is Unlawful**: When PC Avigdor backdated Rebecca O'Hare's third statement, with her that amounted to "**Serious Misconduct and Even Criminal Liability.**"

REBBECA O'HARE'S FIRST STATEMENT 02/08/2025

02.

99/12

RESTRICTED (when complete)

WITNESS STATEMENT

Criminal Procedure Rules, r 27. 2; Criminal Justice Act 1967, s. 9; Magistrates' Courts Act 1980, s.5B

URN

Statement of: Rebecca O' hare

Age if under 18: Over (*if over 18 inserts 'over 18'*) Occupation:

This statement (consisting of page(s) each 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.

Witness Signature: Date: **02/08/2025**

This statement relates to my neighbour at 109 Burncroft avenue, EN3 7JQ I am the above-named individual and reside at location known to police.
The incident I am about to describe occurred on Burncroft avenue, the address is a block of flats and there are 6 flats within the block and 2 flats per floor.

In January my neighbour Simon (109) was banging on my door shouting that I was making noise. I'll punch you up, I'll slap you up and your daughter. He also said he would do the same thing to my children's dad. I took a video of this and sent this to the police.

In January I was getting a new door fitted, I've taken my daughter to school. I've come home; the door was taken off the hinges by the contractor. Simon has come upstairs, and I was in the living room, and I could hear him, Simon was asking the contractor if the guy that lives opposite from me (113) was home. I've gone to the door, and he has started to accuse me of banging on the floor and keeping him awake at night. I've explained that I don't live above him then he has then shouting saying that he would hit me, hit my eldest daughter and drag my unborn baby out my stomach. I kept telling him to move from the door, he then went to say he's got videos of me on a website about being corrupt. As I've called the police on that occasion, he has said call the fucking police I don't care.


On Saturday 2nd August 2025 I was driving into the estate where my block of flats is, as I'm driving in.

I have seen my neighbour who I only know as Simon, he resides at 109 Burncroft avenue. Whenever I come into the estate the first place, I look is the bottom of my block, to see if he is outside. If he is I know that he would try and intimidate me, shout at me or something is going to happen.

As I have driven in and drove around the bend, I could see him from the side staring at my car. I've driven into the small car park on the left and parked my car. I've got out my car to see if he was still there or not, once I've seen he is not there I've walked my two kids upstairs. I've had to go back downstairs to grab my children's nappy bag I told my eldest daughter if the baby wakes up to call my phone. I've locked the door and taken the key with me as I'm walking down the stairs I hear another door, Simon has got to the bottom of the stairs before me, he was saying stuff but facing away from

Witness Signature:

Signature Witnessed by Signature: Page 11 of 22



Continuation of Statement of:

me. So, I wasn't paying any attention, and he has turned around and been like 'you hear me', not in response to him I was like what? And then he has said 'I will blow up your car; I will blow it to the other side of the street.' Then he was like if you come and ask me, I will tell you I didn't do it.


I've closed the communal door to put space between us, I've walked towards my car to get the nappy bag he has opened the door and was shouting stuff at me as I'm walking towards my car, I wasn't paying attention to what he was shouting at me I was trying to get to my car as quick as possible. I've got to my car and got what I needed and looked if he was still by the door, he wasn't by the door, so I've started walking back home, once I got into my flat. I called the police.

Because of his behaviour I am worried to leave the house with my children. I have been getting other people to drop things off for me. I try my best to stay as far away from him as possible but every time I see him, I know that something would happen, there has been incidents **when I am at the shop, he** would stare at me but would not say anything, trying to intimidate me. I feel unsafe in my own home and fear for me and my children because of his threats, every time I make a complaint a feel that it is put down to his mental health. I am concerned that only if he touches me or my children that something would be done.

Witness Signature:

Signature Witnessed by Signature:

Page 2 of 2



- **What Happened**
(a) **Rebecca O'Hare's First Statement**
1+ Dated 02/08/2025.

- (b) **Disclosure of Statement:** I was served with "Rebecca O'Hare's First Statement" on 01/09/2025 by Tuckers Solicitor Firm, marked as an official MG11 statement and with this statement was one other statement of hers disclosed, what equals to just two statements from her.
- (c) **Missing Signatures from the First Statement:** "At the Time of Disclosure, Rebecca O'Hare's First Statement Was Incomplete:"
- 1+ All three pages required signatures from both Rebecca O'Hare and the attending police officer but "**Both of Their Signatures are Missing.**"
 - 2+ **It Is Also Very Important to Note That:** In the disclosed files served by Tuckers Solicitor firm to me on the 01/09/2025, there Were No Placeholder Boxes Visible Where the Signatures Should Have Appeared, As Well!
- (d) **The Asbo Case Relevance to this Case 1 Dated 02-08-25 Proceedings:** I believe this is highly relevant because similar irregularities have occurred in other cases held at "**Highbury & Islington Court**" where in one of those cases I was wrongly convicted under an ASBO Court Order. In that Asbo case, alleged witnesses and victims' signatures were also missing that we complained about to the prosecuting teams and Judges. A Miscarriage of Justice Occurred within the Court proceedings as none of those out of all of the alleged victims and witnesses would attend the courthouse as requested by the defence team, this became a breach of the Asbo Court Proceedings and also come alongside with a lot more serious errors of concern within the application that the "**Highbury & Islington Court.**" wrongly allowed to continue. Now, due to me standing up for myself and declaring my intentions to overturn the Asbo case and claim compensation for my losses, I am wrongly pursued, meaning that I suffer this case of the 02/08/2025 and multiple offer cases before it of a similar nature that I have had to overturn and therefore wrongly endure from Government Staffs illegal efforts to dispose of me and my truths.
- (e) There is also another case to do with "**Highbury & Islington Court**" and why I am sure that they keep setting me up with frauded cases with the police to destroy my life and wellbeing in knowing that I am an innocent person and that is the "**PNC / Acro Files as Exhibited Here:**"
- 1+ **Weblink disclosed to file Folder:** <Dir> [02. PNC-Claim](#)
- (f) **Pattern of Irregularities:** Because I have consistently claimed the truth about these cases and they are deliberately used against me and avoided in Court and police cases such as this Court and police "**Case 1 - Dated The 02-08-25.**" I can prove that "**The Metropolitan Police And Highbury & Islington Courthouse Staff**" have since attempted to set me up, by initiating and by allowing "**Rebecca O'Hare's & Co's Crime Spree to start, Escalate and Continue**" and also "**By Wrongly Using The Compromised PNC Files And Backdated Disclosures,**" to cover up the truths rather than address them. "**These Illegal Actions Have Created a Life-Endangering Situation for Me, Let Alone that I Have Had Serious Losses Also due to them and this all Must Now Be Stopped, Immediately and Rectified.**"
- (c) **Case Ratio Timeline: -- Case 1 Dated 02-08-25**
- 1+ I later in Court Proceedings managed to be able to prove that the "**Case Ratio Wasn't Created Until 10-10-25,**" as the weblink below proves.
 - 2+ That means the statement couldn't have come from Case Ratio on 01-09-25, and that is why **Tucker Solicitors only provided pdf files and no Case Ratio Folder weblink.**
 - 3+ It is most likely that Tuckers Solicitor firm received the pdf case files "**Directly from CPS By Email**" before the Case Ratio folder even existed.
- (d) **Critical Change After Tuckers Left**
- 1+ On 10-10-25, Tuckers withdrew from my cases.

- 2+ On that same day, they handed me the Case Ratio files by way of email and as dated the same day of the Case Ratio Folder being developed as creation.
- 3+ After the postponement of the trial dated the **13/10/2025** I was able to notice the following differences in the case Ratio folders files: --
- Signature locations now had "**Transparent Square Bordered Boxes**" as placeholders.
 - **Intelligence was redacted (blacked out).**
 - No "**Certification or Embedded Audit Trail**" to show when/why these changes were made.
- 4+ **After All of This I Noticed:** The Third Alleged statement from Rebecca O ' Hare that is backdated and modified to be adaptive to my defence statement contradicting all her previous statements.
- * **This Is the Second Exhibited Video Created:-- No Signatures then modded statements afterwards.**
- 1+ <Dir> [00. 16-11-25-Vid x2 Case Ratio Created-Date](#)
- * **This Is the First Exhibited Video Created:--**
- 2+ <Dir> [69.1. 05-11-25-CPS Case Ratio Website](#)

• **File Metadata**

a) **The File Is Labelled:**

"01. Cordell Simon 01YE1267925 Initial Details Pros Case 22-09-2025".

- b) But instead of being updated properly, it was "**Altered with Added Material**" and without certification.

• **Why This Is Problematic**

- (a) **Disclosure Rules (CPIA 1996):** Witness statements must be disclosed in their original form, with signatures intact.
- (b) **Modification Without Certification:** Adding placeholders and redactions without an audit trail is irregular and potentially unlawful.
- (c) **Timing:** The fact that these changes only appeared "**After Tuckers Left**" and just "**3 Days Before Trial**" raises serious questions about tampering.
- (d) **Legal Implication:** This must amount to "**Perverting the Course of Justice**" and "**Misconduct in Public Office**" due to "**CPS/Police Knowingly Altered Disclosure Material.**"

• **In Plain Terms:**

- (a) I am saying that Rebecca O ' Hares official MG11 statement was originally missing signatures but had no placeholder boxes and "**Only After Tuckers Left On 10-10-25 Did the Modified Version Appear**" and with: "**Transparent Square Boxes Where Signatures Should Be, Redacted Intel, And No Certification.**" That sequence of events strongly proves "**Tampering with Disclosure Material Right Before Trial,**" to illegally set me up, with "**The Metropolitan Police and Highbury & Islington Courthouse Staff & Rebecca O'Hare's Crime Spree, all involved!**"

REBBECA O'HARE'S SECOND STATEMENT 03/08/2025

OFFICIAL – SENSITIVE [when complete]

MG11

WITNESS STATEMENT

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

--	--	--	--

Statement of: Rebecca O'Hare

Age if under 18: Over (if over 18 insert 'over 18') Occupation: Police Constable

This statement (consisting of 2 page(s) each 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.

Witness Signature:

Date: 03/08/2025

I am the above name person, and this is **my second statement regarding an incident that took place on the 2nd of August 2025** concerning my neighbour who has harassed me.

I have submitted a video to the police upon request, that shows my neighbour hurling abuse at me whilst being at my front door. I exhibit the following video as ROH/01.

Witness Signature: Rebecca O'Hare

Signature Witnessed by Signature:

Page 1 of 1

01/21

OFFICIAL – SENSITIVE [when complete]

- **A Quick Short Reminder –**

- (a) **By This Stage and Date:** Dated the **01-09-2025** it is asserted that **“Rebecca O’Hare Had Produced Only Two Separate Statements.”** However, if that were true, the later **“Third Statement”** cannot logically stand, particularly when examined against the context within it and as it is backdated!

- **About Rebecca O’Hare’s Second Statement – Dated 03/08/2025**

- 1+ We explain this as the second statement of **Rebecca O’Hare’s** is marked with **“Witness Signature: Rebecca O’Hare”**.
- 2+ Yet the signature is not a genuine handwritten mark. Instead, it appears as a **“Typed Insertion,”** not a physical signature.
- 3+ **If A Real Signature Had Been Present but Redacted:** it would have been obscured with a black marker effect. No such redaction exists.
- 4+ Crucially, the **“Police Case Handler’s Signature”** is also absent. There is no indication of redaction, nor any authentic officer endorsement.

- **MG11 Statement Requirements**

- (a) An MG11 witness statement must be signed in person by the witness and countersigned by the officer taking it and this has not happened!
- (b) **Rebecca O’Hare Second Statement:** must not be emended or substituted with typed placeholders as it is as the absence of both real signatures demonstrates that the statement was not properly executed and in turn breaches these court proceedings.

- **Implication of the Signature**

- (a) The typed “Witness Signature: Rebecca O’Hare” strongly suggests:
- 1+ Rebecca O’Hare was **“Not Present”** when the statement was prepared.
 - 2+ **“The MG11 Statement”** was **“Not Brought to Her for Personal Signature.”**
 - 3+ The document therefore fails to meet the evidential threshold for admissibility without

verification in court.

- **Contradictions with the Second and First Statements**

- (a) **When Rebecca O'Hare's Second Statement (Purportedly Dated 03/08/2025) Is Compared Against Her Earlier Statements the First, (Purportedly Dated 02/08/2025) The Following Contradictions Emerge:**

- 1+ The Second statement of "**Rebecca O'Hare's**" relies on the existence of a properly signed prior First statement from "**Rebecca O'Hare**" but her first Statement is not signed by any person.
 - 2+ Since the second statement was not genuinely signed as well, the third statement cannot logically derive from it!
 - 3+ **This Undermines the Prosecuting Teams Claims:** that "**Rebecca O'Hare's First, Second, And Third Statements**" were all contemporaneously created in accordance with required protocols.
 - 4+ **Instead:** the evidence points to the third statement also being "**Fabricated or Backdated,**" as the first two statements of her prove also and later disclosure irregularities now confirm these facts!

- **My Defence Position**

- (a) The irregular signature practices and contradictions between the second and third statements demonstrate that Rebecca O'Hare's statements could not have been Signed on **02/08/2025**, nor the **03/08/2025**, despite the prosecution's attempt to imply otherwise. This supports the defence argument that disclosure was unlawfully and wrongly altered after charge, "**Breaching CPIA 1996 And Crim PR 15.4.**"

REBBECA O'HARE'S THIRD STATEMENT 07/08/2025

WITNESS STATEMENT

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

URN

01	YE	12679	25
----	----	-------	----

Statement of: Rebecca O'HARE

Age if under 18: Over (if over 18 insert 'over 18') Occupation: Police Constable

This statement (consisting of 2 page{s) each 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.

Signature: Signed Electronically (See Last Page)

Date: 07/08/2025

I am the above-named person. This is my third statement in regard to an incident that was reported to police on the **2nd of August 2025** concerning my neighbour who has harassed me - SIMON.

This is a clarification statement.

The block of flats on BURNCROFT AVENUE is made up of 6 flats within the block and 2 flats per floor. SIMON lives on the floor below me but not directly underneath me.

In my original statement I stated that in **January** my neighbour SIMON was banging on my door

shouting that I was making noise, I'll punch you up, I'll slap you up and your daughter.

He also said he would do the same thing to my children's dad.

This actually occurred on the 29th of DECEMBER, and I believe this was an error by the officer taking the statement as I did say it happened in DECEMBER.

I remember because I came back from my mother's house where I had been over Christmas.

I woke up at 0615 as I am a type 1 diabetic and had low blood sugar.

I was lying down waiting to retest my sugar levels when I heard the communal door open and then banging on my front door and shouting.

I knew it was SIMON as I recognise his voice due to him having shouted at me so many times. I Then Went to The Peephole and Saw It Was Him.

In my original statement I stated that I took a video of this and sent this to the police, but: -- I actually had a video of a different incident which occurred: --

when I was getting a New Door Fitted. I believe this was a mix up by the police officer taking the statement at the time.

I mentioned that in JANUARY I was getting a new door fitted when SIMON came to my front door and started shouting that he would hit me, hit my eldest daughter and drag my unborn baby out my stomach.

He was stood outside the threshold of my front door in the communal hallway.

I was stood inside my flat the entire time.

This is the incident that I filmed and sent to police, and I have since seen that I actually filmed that video on the 3rd of FEBRUARY 2025 and not in JANUARY.

It is hard to hear what is said on the video, but I believe he said he would hurt me and my unborn child as he was walking from my front door back into the communal corridor.

I would like to clarify that the incident which occurred on Saturday 2nd August 2025 occurred in the communal building corridor on the staircase.

This is where SIMON said, "I WILL BLOW UP YOUR CAR" and "I WILL BLOW IT TO THE OTHER SIDE OF THE STREET."

He also said, "WHEN YOU COME AND ASK ME ABOUT IT, I'LL TELL YOU IT WASN'T ME" and "I'LL COME AND LOOK FOR YOU AT YOUR NEW HOUSE."

I would like to add an incident which happened between SIMON and me: In 2021 called 101 because of him too

I was about to walk down the stairs to take my daughter outside when SIMON came to the bottom of the stairs. I looked down. He looked up. He started going off saying "YOU'RE A HORRIBLE PERSON"

"YOU'RE A SHIT MUM" "WHEN YOUR DAUGHTER IS NOT THERE, I AM GOING TO COME LOOKING FOR YOU".

I waited for him to go and then left to my friend's house.

Signature: Signed Electronically (See Last Page)

Statement Taken By: PC AVIGDOR 2916NA

• **My New Statement Returns!**

Timeline of Swapped / Altered Events in Rebecca O'Hare's Statements

Claimed Date / Place (Original)	Later "Clarified" Date / Place	Event Description	Issue / Contradiction
<u>January 2025 – Doorway</u>	29 December 2024 – Outside of her front door!	<u>Allegation:</u> It is said that Simon banging on her door, shouting threats ("I'll punch you up, slap you up, your daughter, children's dad").	<u>First claimed January:</u> later changed to December. Shows inconsistency in recollection and officer recording. She admits she only identified me by voice, then " <u>went to the peephole and saw it was him.</u> " Her own words prove she was uncertain who was speaking before she went to the peephole and never continued! " <u>Rebecca O'Hare</u> " admits she cannot confirm it was me.
<u>January 2025 – Door fitting</u>	3 February 2025 – Enfield Council Door fitting	<u>Allegation:</u> it's alleged that Simon was shouting threats during new door fitting ("hit me, hit my eldest daughter, drag unborn baby out my stomach"). Video evidence claimed.	<u>First said January:</u> later admitted she was wrong again as the video was filmed on <u>3rd of February.</u> Contradiction between statement and actual evidence date. Video vs. real life do not align. " <u>Rebecca O'Hare</u> " had " <u>180 days</u> " since the " <u>3rd of Feb till the 2nd of Aug 2025</u> " to review her own footage yet she still misquoted events. <u>She herself admits:</u> 1+ <u>It is hard to hear what is said on the video,</u> but <u>I believe</u> he said he would <u>hurt me</u> and <u>my unborn child</u> as he was <u>walking from my front door back into the communal corridor.</u> but " <u>Rebecca O'Hare</u> " still believes she can hear me saying thing that her own video proves otherwise Even the " <u>CPS</u> " confirmed this was not said, which is why the harassment case was dropped.
<u>2 August 2025 – Communal Corridor (First</u>	2 August 2025 – Staircase (Second Statement)	<u>Allegation:</u> Simon is wrongly accused of threatened to blow up her car ("I'll blow it to the	<u>Place Of Incident Swapped in Rebecca O'Hare First Claimed Statement:</u> She states she heard my door slam

<u>Statement)</u>		other side of the street”).	as she was going downstairs, but she only saw my back. This would mean I was entering the block of flats, not leaving my front door. She also stated she went outside the communal front door straight after, which proves her account does not match the physical layout. <u>In “Rebecca O’Hare” Third Statement:</u> she changed the location again, saying it happened on the stairs. This is impossible, as I have already demonstrated with images in my defence documents. These contradictions undermine the reliability of her account. <u>Reference:</u> 1+ <u>Weblink:</u> 04. Four -Rebecca O Hare Three Different Statements.pdf 2+ <u>Exhibit:</u> Evidence: Exhibit 11 / <u>Rebecca O’Hare:</u> also added new context in her third statement that was never mentioned before: <i>“I’ll come and look for you at your new house.”</i> This was fabricated after my defence was released. <u>Conclusion:</u> Rebecca O’Hare’s statements are inconsistent, unstable, and must carry no weight in these proceedings.
<u>No date given originally</u>	2021 (unspecified)	<u>Allegation:</u> Simons wrongly accused of verbally abusing her on stairwell (“You’re a horrible person, shit mum, I’ll come looking for you”).	Historic allegation added only in <u>“Rebecca O’Hare”</u> third statement, not part of original disclosure. Expands scope beyond charged incident. Shows fabrication and attempt to widen her case unlawfully.

• **Clear Takeaway**

- 1+ **Dates Shift:** (Jan → Dec, Jan → Feb).
- 2+ **Locations Swap:** (corridor → staircase).
- 3+ **Evidence Misquoted:** (video content vs. her belief).
- 4+ **Historic Allegations Added Late:** (2021 claim only in third statement).

(a) Together, **“These Contradictions Show Rebecca O’Hare’s Statements Are Unstable, Inconsistent, And Procedurally Unreliable.”**

- **Key Problems**

- (a) **Date Swaps**: December vs January vs February vs all over the place!
- (b) **Place Swap**: Corridor vs Staircase for the same alleged car threat.
- (c) **Late Additions**: **2021** stairwell incident introduced only in "**Rebecca O'Hare's**" third statement.
- (d) **Charge Substitution Conflict**: Harassment NFA'd, yet harassment-related incidents still introduced.

- **Defence Position**

- **Rebecca O'Hare's Statements Are "Procedurally Flawed and Inadmissible" Because:**

- (a) She swaps both "**Dates and Locations**" of alleged incidents.
- (b) She introduces "**Harassment Allegations After Harassment Was NFA'd.**"
- (c) She fabricates chronology by "**Backdating Dates and Re-Framing Events.**"
- (d) The contradictions (**Corridor Vs Staircase, January vs December Vs February**) shows "**Rebecca O'Hare's Testimony's are Unreliable and Misleading Alongside the Rest of Her Formal Context in all of her MG11 Forms for This Case 1 Dated The 02-08-25!**"
 - 1+ The Newest and therefore the third statement of Rebecca O'Hare's leaves the Context of all three of her official MG11 statements to being that of fabricated materials and not worthy enough to go before a court of this land in the United Kingdom.
 - 2+ Her own admittance Proves the underlying truth that she is obviously avoiding being honest, starting from the start of her first paragraph in the first and third statements due to Sub Renting an Enfield Council Flat illegally!
 - 3+ **It is said that Rebecca O'Hare Attempts to Mislead Both the Courts and Me:** by claiming she is a lawful tenant with a legal right to occupy the flat at 115 Burncroft Avenue, when she is not, She further alleges that I intended to damage her car, which is entirely untrue. This manipulation arises because she is not the correct council tenant of 115 Burncroft Avenue, which is a clear breach of the Enfield Council Housing Scheme. By using that flat unlawfully, she has victimised me and shown no respect for me as a person or for my life, despite the mandatory requirements of the Enfield Council Housing Scheme and Human Right Act 1998, Article 2 the Right to Life!

- * **Weblink:**

https://www.enfield.gov.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0028/4978/tenancy-agreement-2014-council-housing.pdf

- **What Rebecca O'Hare's First Statement States: --**

- (a) "This statement relates to my neighbour at 109 Burncroft Avenue, EN3 7JQ. I am the above-named individual and reside at location known to police."
- (b) **She Is Trying to Anchor Her Credibility By:**
 - 1+ Naming my address directly and avoiding mentioning her own!
 - 2+ Claiming residence "**known to police.**" which implies official recognition and corruption!
 - 3+ Using police involvement as reassurance, as if their awareness validates her tenancy.

- **Evidential and Tenancy Breaches**

- (a) **False Claim of Residence**

- 1+ Under the Enfield Tenancy Agreement "**Clause 2.3 – Use of Premises.**" only the registered secure tenant has the right to occupy the property.
- 2+ Rebecca is not the lawful tenant of 115 nor 109 Burncroft Avenue. Her claim misleads the court and breaches tenancy rules.

- (b) **Police as "Re-insurance"**

- 1+ By Rebecca O' Hares saying, "**Reside at Location Known to Police.**" she implies that police

awareness equals lawful tenancy.

- 2+ The tenancy agreement makes clear that tenancy rights are established only by council records, not police familiarity (**Clause 1.4 – Tenancy Verification**).
- 3+ This is a misuse of authority to bolster a false claim against me and strip me of my legal housing tenancy legal rights!

(c) **Subletting Implication**

- 1+ Enfield Council Housing Stock, tenancy agreement prohibits subletting without council permission (**Clause 2.26**).
- 2+ Her statement suggests she is allowed to remain in the flat because of cooperation with police, not because of lawful tenancy.
- 3+ This amounts to "**Fraudulent Occupation**" and breaches **Clause 3.18 (Prevention of Social Housing Fraud)**.

(d) **Interference with Secure Tenant Rights**

- 1+ **As the secure tenant of 109 Burncroft Avenue since 2006, "I am entitled to a private and family life with safety and "quiet enjoyment" Human Rights Act 1998 Article 13 and the Enfield Housing Tenancy agreement (Clause 3.5)"** but Rebecca O'Hare's victimisation of myself and that of my family have made having a family imposable. Their illegal hate crimes amount to tortures acts committed against my person.
- 2+ **Her False Claim of Legally Acquired Tenancy** interferes with my legal rights and undermines my lawful occupancy.

• **What Rebecca O'Hare Third Statement States: --**

- (a) *"The block of flats on BURNCROFT AVENUE is made up of 6 flats within the block and 2 flats per floor. SIMON lives on the floor below me but not directly underneath me."*

• **The Third Statement Compared Against Her Prior Statements.**

- (a) When the third statement of Rebecca O'Hare is compared against her prior statements, it proves the following contradictions that prove the third statement was Not created on the **07/08/2025** as the prosecuting team have allowed it to imply!
- (b) Rebecca O'Hare's third statement was fabricated with fraud as it is a backdated as an official mg11 statement that is frauded. The statement of hers was misleadingly added three days before trial, the CPS case handler and Rebecca took apart in this together
 - 1+ The CPS took apart as they engaged in false representation (s.2) and also failed to disclose the true chronology (s.3), and all while:--
 - 2+ **Rebecca abused her position as a witness (s.4)** under the **Fraud Act 2006**. This conduct directly contributed to the CPS's unlawful backdating of the Case Ratio File Archive.

• **Legal Characterisation of Rebecca's Conduct**

(a) **Fraud by False Representation (s.2)**

By permitting her third statement to be "**Backdated and Presented as If Contemporaneous**," she allowed a false representation to be made to the court. The representation was dishonest because it concealed the true creation date and intent was to strengthen the prosecution case.

(b) **Fraud by Failing to Disclose Information (s.3)**

By not disclosing that her statement was "**Altered After Your Defence Was Served**," she failed in her duty to provide truthful, complete information. This omission misled the court and denied you fair disclosure.

(c) **Fraud by Abuse of Position (s.4)**

As a complainant/witness, she occupies a position of trust in the justice process. By allowing her evidence to be "**Adapted to Fit the CPS Narrative**," she abused that position to cause you

disadvantage and risk of wrongful conviction.

- **Procedural Impact**

- (a) Her cooperation with the CPS in modifying statements after disclosure undermines the integrity of the evidence bundle.
- (b) It demonstrates collusion in “**Retroactive Fabrication of Disclosure**,” which is unlawful under the Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996.
- (c) It directly contributed to the CPS’s ability to present a “**Case Ratio File Archive**” that was created after charge but disguised as original.

- **Charge Substitution**

* **Rebecca O’Hare Quoted:** -- “*In my original statement I stated that in January my neighbour SIMON was banging on my door shouting that I was making noise, I’ll punch you up, I’ll slap you up and your daughter. He also said he would do the same thing to my children’s dad. This actually occurred on the 29th of DECEMBER, and I believe this was an error by the officer taking the statement as I did say it happened in DECEMBER.*” And so on: --

- (a) If the original allegation was “**Harassment**,” but the CPS later substituted it with “**Threats to Cause Criminal Damage**,” then the harassment charge was formally marked as “**No Further Action**” (NFA).”
- (b) Once a charge is NFA’d, evidence tied specifically to that charge should not be relied upon to prosecute a different offence unless it is “**Re-Served and Re-Framed**” under the new charge.

- **Irrelevant Statements**

- (a) Rebecca O’Hare’s statements that relate to harassment (and not to the “alleged car incident” or “**The Date of The Criminal Damage Allegation**,” are “**Not Relevant to The Substituted Charge**.”
- (b) Continuing to introduce them after the harassment case was dropped is procedurally improper.
- (c) **Under Crim PR 15.2–15.4 “Disclosure”** : only evidence relevant to the live charge should be disclosed and relied upon.

- **Perjurious Flaw**

- (a) If Rebecca knowingly introduced statements about harassment after the CPS had already decided “no further action,” then those statements are “**Misleading the Court**.”
- (b) This creates a “**Perjurious Flaw**” because she is presenting evidence as if it supports a live charge when it does not.
- (c) It undermines the credibility of her testimony and can render the statement **inadmissible** under the rules of evidence (irrelevance, prejudice, and unreliability).

- **Admissibility**

- (a) Evidence must be “**Relevant, Reliable, And Fair**” to be admissible.
- (b) A statement about harassment, after that charge was dropped, is “**Irrelevant**” to the substituted charge of criminal damage.
- (c) Introducing it risks prejudicing the jury or magistrates by smuggling in allegations that are no longer part of the case.
- (d) On that basis, her statement is “**Inadmissible**” unless the CPS formally re-links it to the new charge (which they did not).

- **My Defence Position**

- (a) The CPS substituted harassment with threats to cause criminal damage.
- (b) Rebecca O’Hare’s harassment-related statements were introduced after harassment was NFA’d.
- (c) This makes her statement “**Procedurally Flawed, Perjurious in Effect, And Inadmissible**” because it is irrelevant to the live charge and misleads the court.


- (d) It demonstrates unlawful disclosure practices and supports your argument that the CPS engaged in "**False Representation and Abuse of Process.**"
- **Perverting the Course of Justice (PCJ)**
 - (a) **Applies To Everyone**: not just members of the public.
 - (b) That includes "**Police Officers, Prosecutors, And Officials**" if they:
 - 1+ Fabricate Or Destroy Evidence
 - 2+ Intimidate Or Coach Witnesses
 - 3+ Lie In Statements or In Court
 - 4+ Suppress Disclosure Material
 - (c) **Case law confirms** that police officers have been prosecuted for PCJ when they falsify records or mislead investigations. CPS staff could also be liable if they deliberately interfere with justice.
- **Misconduct in Public Office**
 - (a) A separate **common law offence** that applies specifically to public officials (police, CPS lawyers, civil servants).
 - (b) **Definition**: A public officer who, while acting in their official capacity, willfully neglects to perform their duty or willfully misconducts themselves to such a degree as to amount to an abuse of the public's trust.
 - (c) **Examples**:
 - 1+ Police hiding or altering evidence
 - 2+ CPS deliberately failing to disclose material
 - (d) **Penalty**: Up to life imprisonment (though sentences vary).
- **Contempt of Court**
 - (a) If CPS or police deliberately disobey disclosure orders or mislead the court, they can be cited for contempt.
 - (b) This is a direct sanction by the court itself.
- **Summary for CPS, DPS, and Police**
 - (a) **Perverting the Course of Justice**: Applies to *anyone*, including officials.
 - (b) **Misconduct in Public Office**: Applies specifically to public servants abusing their role.
 - (c) **Contempt of Court**: Applies when court orders are ignored or undermined.
 - 1+ **In File**: 70. Sent_Soon_New1
 - 2+ **Is**: Exhibit E1
 - * **Weblink**: <Dir> [04. Rent-Years](#)
 - * **Weblink**: <Dir> [05. Court Order 4 Transfer Housing Part](#)
 - * **Weblink**: <Dir> [10-08-2018-LBE v Simon Cordell-E00ED049 amended Order 09082018](#)
 - (d) So, if CPS lawyers, DPS investigators, or police officers commit acts of sabotage in proceedings, they are not exempt — they can be charged under **PCJ** and/or **Misconduct in Public Office**, depending on the circumstances.
- **These Laws Add Further Depth to My List and Highlight the Gravity of The Situation of The Laws and Regulations That Have Been Infringed Upon of Mine:**
 - (a) **Contempt of Court Act 1981**: Manipulating evidence or backdating documents to mislead the court can be considered contempt of court.
 - (b) **Fraud Act 2006**: False representation or dishonestly failing to disclose information could be prosecutable under this act.
 - (c) **Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984**: Code C covers the detention, treatment, and

questioning of suspects, including the handling of evidence.

- (d) **Crown Prosecution Service Code**: Sets out the general principles prosecutors should follow, including fairness and disclosure of evidence.
- (e) **Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act 1996**: Requires the disclosure of all relevant material gathered during an investigation.
- (f) **CPS Disclosure Manual**: Outlines the procedures for disclosing evidence to ensure a fair trial.
- (g) **Criminal Justice Act 2003**: This act includes provisions against tampering with evidence and perverting the course of justice.
- (h) **Perjury Act 1911**: Making false statements under oath, including in written statements, is an offense under this act.
- (i) **Criminal Attempts Act 1981**: Attempting to pervert the course of justice, even if not completed, is covered here.
- (j) **Police Act 1996**: Offenses related to misconduct by police officers, including improper handling of evidence.
- (k) **Data Protection Act 2018**: Unlawful handling or manipulation of personal data, including evidence, could breach this act.
- **Continuing With the Impact on Human Rights and Codes of Practice**:
 - (a) **Human Rights Act 1998**: Articles 6 and 8 guarantee a fair trial and respect for private life, which might be violated by evidence tampering or withholding information.
 - (b) **European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)**: Ensuring fair trials and protection from discrimination under Articles 6 and 14.
 - (c) **Equality Act 2010**: Discriminatory practices in legal proceedings could breach this act.
 - (d) **Police Reform Act 2002**: Relates to police conduct and handling of evidence.
 - (e) **Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) Code of Practice**: Stipulates prosecutors' duties, including disclosure obligations.
 - (f) **Code for Crown Prosecutors**: Governs the principles to be followed in decision-making.

These laws and codes emphasize the importance of fairness, transparency, and equality in legal proceedings. It's essential to address any alleged breaches to uphold these standards in my cases especially

(Signed)



(On behalf of Mr. Simon Paul CORDELL) (Date Signed) 03/12/2025

Signature Witnessed by Signature:

Page 34 of 43

01/21

OFFICIAL – SENSITIVE [when complete]