

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 5th 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: Newspaper Owner

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.

(Signed)



(On behalf of Mr. Simon Paul CORDELL)

(Dated) 09/10/202603/12/2025

- **EXHIBIT:**
 - * **CORRUPT TIME LOG – DEVELOPED BY THE ARRESTING POLICE OFFICER**
- **Subject:** Officer's Arrest Timeline & Evident Procedural Inaccuracies!
- **My Introduction Note**
 - a) This exhibit documents the arresting officer's timeline and highlights clear contradictions, timestamp anomalies, and procedural breaches. It forms part of the master chronology and supports the rebuttal against fabricated or misrepresented arrest details.
- **Quoted Statement:**
 - a) **Statement of:** PC George WILSON-WALLIS
 - b) **Date:** **02/08/2025**
 - c) **Context:** Witnessing officer statement regarding the arrest performed by **Police officer 1543NA**
 - d) **Narrative:** "Mobile patrol NA22L called for a van to facilitate the transport of an individual I would later find out to be called "**Samual**" to "**Custody For The Offence Of Harassment.**"
- **Timestamped Action:**
 - a) Whilst this was going on at "**21:16 PC 1543NA began arresting Samual**" for the offence of harassment through the door!
- **Forensic Corrections to PC Wilson-Wallis Statement:**
 - a) **Misidentification:**

The individual arrested was "**Simon Cordell,**" not "**Samual.**" This error undermines identification procedures and evidentiary integrity. **PACE Code D** refers to the Police and **Criminal Evidence Act 1984** – "**Code of Practice D, governs**" how police officers in England and Wales conduct identification procedures. It's all about ensuring that suspects are identified fairly, accurately, and lawfully, especially when eyewitnesses are involved and this **PACE Code D** is in breach, as .Mr.

1+ **Statutory Breach:**

1+1 **PACE Code D:** Governs identification procedures. Misnaming violates fair identification standards.

2+1 **Data Protection Act 2018:** Contains incorrect personal data handling breaches lawful processing obligations.

2+ **Procedural Failure:**

1+1 Invalidates the **MG11** as a reliable witness statement.

2+1 Undermines chain of custody and suspect tracking.

3+ **Consequences:**

1+1 Grounds for exclusion of the statement under **Section 78 of PACE.**

2+1 Potential for case dismissal due to evidentiary contamination.

- b) **False Attribution:** PC Wilson-Wallis claims the arrest was performed by **PC 1543NA (Obsiye)**, but he was **“Not Present”** during the victim’s statement upstairs and did **“Not Witness”** the full engagement sequence.
- c) **Arrival Timing:** He arrived **“After”** PC Chan and PC Obsiye had already engaged with the alleged victim and after they had both gone downstairs. His statement omits this and falsely implies full-scene awareness.
- d) **Limited Scope:** His account references **“Only Harassment,”** omitting the broader allegations of: **“Threats To Cause Criminal Damage 1971 Which Mandate Arrest And Charge, That Has Never Happened.”**
- e) **PC George WILSON-WALLIS States:** on the **02nd of August 2025** myself and PC WILLIAMS and not on the **01st of August 2025** as the arresting officer and statement taker of Rebecca O’Hare, states.
- f) **Pc George Wilson Wallis States:** the time of him witnessing the arrest outside of the door was at: **21 :16Pm**
- g) **Pc George Wilson Wallis:** Also, states that they managed to open the door at: **21 :17.**

• **ADDITIONAL OFFICER STATEMENTS TIMELINE & CONTRADICTIONS**

a) **PC “Obsiye 1543NA” — Statement Date: 01/08/2025**

1+ **Extract from statement:**

1+1 We asked to enter, and we spoke with her in the living room.

2+1 She stated that she has been having issues with her neighbour, and it’s been ongoing for a while. She quickly grabbed her children and ran into the address. She remembered she left her nappy bag so went to go get it. That’s when the suspect caught her near the door and began saying something she did not know what he was saying at first so made a comment to herself that’s when the suspect said,

3+1 She also stated there was another incident earlier in the year, when she did not have a front door and was getting it replaced.

4+1 I explained to **PC Chan 1405NA** that the suspect who lived downstairs 109 **would be arrested for harassment.**

5+1 I explained that he was arrested for harassment as today he went up to the victim and threatened to blow up her car and that no one would know it was him, also previously you had turned up to her house and threatened to slap her. You have been causing her distress. **“My BWV was on at the time and is exhibited as HAO/01!”**

- b) **Pc Obsiye 1543NA is misleading everyone astray:** from the truth in her statement and has withheld her BWF Due to the assault she committed on me with PC Chain and it demonstrating this!

• **Impossible Date:**

- a) The incident occurred on **“02/08/2025,”** yet Obsiye’s statement is dated **01/08/2025**, a full day earlier.

- b) He repeats the “**Incorrect Date Twice,**” including the weekday (“**Friday**”), indicating “**Deliberate Backdating,**” not clerical error.
- **Impossible Time:**
 - a) Statement claims duty between “**0700 and 1600,**” yet the arrest occurred at “**21:16.**”
 - b) This discrepancy invalidates the statement’s temporal integrity.
- **Key Contradictions:**
 - a) Obsiye claims to have received the full victim statement, yet “**PC Chan confirms**” Obsiye was the only one speaking to her, while this was taken and the arrest of harassment was decided, alone.
 - 1+ On “**Friday 1st August 2025**” between the hours of 0700 and 1600 I was on duty in full uniform carrying full PPE kit and “**BWV.**” This day is incorrect, and nobody worn footage has been disclosed as watchable.
 - 2+ **Evidence Gap:** No BWV footage has been disclosed showing this interaction in the living room.
 - 3+ **Discredited Motive:** Her statements have been reused from prior NFA cases, which were already dismissed as displayed in the CPS files.
- **PC Chan — Statement Date: 02/08/2025 at 1300 hours**
- **EXHIBIT: PC CHAN PDF.PDF — Statement Analysis and Evidentiary Breakdown**
 - a) **Statement of: Calvin Chan**
- **Quoted Statement:**
 - a) On Saturday 2nd August **2025** I was on duty in uniform
 - b) **On arrival PC Obsiye spoke with Rebecca O’Hare,**
 - c) **I was trying to distract the daughter from listening to Rebecca explaining the allegation to PC Obsiye.**
 - d) **she described him as wearing a blue checkered pyjama.**
 - e) We went downstairs to knock on the door
 - f) I exhibit my **BWV** as **CKC/01,** “**Exhibit Does not work as cant view video footage as intended.**”
- **Impossible Time:**
 - a) Arrest occurred at “**21:16,**” yet Chan’s statement is timestamped “**1300 Hours, 8 Hours Earlier.**”
 - b) He was present during the arrest but did “**Not Receive The Victim’s Statement As He States That**” he was distracting Rebecca O’Hare’s child while Obsiye spoke with her.
- **Key Contradictions:**
 - a) Chan references the suspect’s name as “**Simon,**” contradicting Wilson-Wallis’s “**Samual.**”
 - b) He confirms that “**Obsiye Performed The Arrest,**” not himself.
 - c) His **BWV (CKC/01)** must be reviewed for timestamp accuracy and officer presence.

• **Contradiction Analysis Table:**

Element	Quoted Statement	Implication
Date/Time	“ <u>Time: 1300 hours</u> ”	<u>Impossible:</u> Arrest occurred at “ <u>21:16,</u> ” per PC George Wilson-Wallis. Chan’s timeline is chronologically incoherent.
Uniformed Duty	“ <u>I was on duty in uniform</u> ”	Confirms presence but does “ <u>Not Reconcile</u> ” with the arrest timeline.
Allegation Discussion	“ <u>She was explaining the allegation to PC Obsiye</u> ”	Chan was “ <u>Not The Recipient</u> ” of the allegation. His account is “ <u>Second-Hand.</u> ”
Suspect Description	“ <u>She described him</u> ”	Description was relayed to “ <u>Obsiye,</u> ” not

	as wearing a blue checkered pajama”	Chan. Chan’s reference is “ <u>Indirect.</u> ”
Door Knock	“We went downstairs to knock on the door”	Implies “ <u>First Contact</u> ” but timestamp makes this “ <u>Impossible</u> ” unless arrest occurred earlier.
BWV Exhibit	“I exhibit my BWV as CKC/01”	Must be scrutinized for “ <u>Timestamp</u> ” accuracy. If it shows events near 21:00, Chan’s statement is misdated and is not viewable as we request it to be disclosed to us.

- **Forensic Narrative:** Initial Police Attendance and Arrest Chronology
- **Date:** 02/08/2025
- **Location:** 109 Burncroft Avenue, Enfield
- **Timeframe:** Leading to arrest at 21:16

- **Scene Attendance:** Only Two Officers Present
 - a) **Officers’ Present:**
 - 1+ PC Calvin Chan
 - 2+ PC Obsiye
 - 3+ These were the “**Only Two Officers**” on scene. No van. No backup. No prior units.
 - b) **Arrival Context:**
 - 1+ Both officers arrived together and proceeded “**Downstairs**” to knock on the door.
 - 2+ This was the “**First Point Of Contact.**”

- **Victim Interaction:** Exclusivity of Dialogue
 - a) The “**Alleged Victim**” spoke “**only to PC Obsiye.**”
 - 1+ Chan was “**Not Actively Involved.**”
 - 2+ He did “**Not Receive Or Record**” any direct allegation.
 - 3+ Any claim of independent verification by Chan is “**Unsupported.**”

- **Suspect Description:** Source and Validity
 - b) Description of “**Blue Checkered Pyjamas**” was given “**Verbally To PC Obsiye.**”
 - 1+ Chan’s reference is “**Second-Hand.**” and only independently observed as to this statement.

- **BWV Footage:** CKC/01
 - a) Chan exhibits “**CKC/01**” as his BWV.
 - 1+ Must be reviewed for:
 - 1+1 **Timestamp integrity**
 - 2+1 **Presence of other officers (none)**
 - 3+1 **Sequence of engagement and arrest**

- **Arrest Execution**
 - a) **Arresting Officer:** PC Obsiye
 - 1+ Sole officer who engaged the alleged victim.
 - 2+ Arrest performed “**Through The Door At 21:16.**” corroborated by PC George Wilson-Wallis.
 - 3+ Chan did “**Not**” perform the arrest.

- **Contradictions and Implications**
 - a) Chan’s timestamp of “**1300 Hours Is Factually Impossible.**”
 - b) His claim to have received the allegation or participated in the arrest is “**Invalid.**”
 - c) CKC/01 must be disclosed in full to expose:
 - 1+ **Timestamp anomalies**
 - 2+ **Officer’s presence**

3+ Engagement sequence

- **EXHIBIT: TIME LOG OF POLICE OFFICER ABOUT ANOTHER POLICE OFFICER'S ARREST TIME**
 - a. **Statement of:** PC George WILSON-WALLIS
 - b. **Date:** 02/08/2025
 - c. **Context:** Witnessing officer statement regarding the arrest performed by officer 1543NA
- **Narrative:**
 - a. **"Mobile patrol NA22L called for a van to facilitate the transport of an individual I would later find out to be called Samual to custody for the offence of harassment."**
- **Timestamped Action:**
 - a) **"Whilst this was going on at 21:16 PC 1543NA began arresting Samual for the offence of harassment through the door!"**
- **Evidentiary Implications of the Time Log:**
 - a) **Exact Arrest Initiation Time:** Arrest began at **21:16**, witnessed and recorded by PC George Wilson-Wallis.
 - b) **Third-Party Corroboration:** Independent verification of arrest time and method.
 - c) **Sequence of Events:** Van request occurred **before** arrest—suggesting **premeditated logistics**.
 - d) **Location and Method of Arrest:** **"Through The Door"** implies **"No Direct Contact," "Raising Serious Questions About Lawful Entry And Suspect Awareness."**
 - e) **Potential Contradictions:** Any custody logs or statements suggesting a different arrest time (e.g., 21:30) are to be challenged using this timestamp.
- **Misidentification Alert**
 - a) The individual referred to as **"Samual"** in Wilson-Wallis's statement is **"Not Simon."**
 - 1+ This misnaming introduces a **"Critical Identity Error."**
 - 2+ If this name appears in custody logs, BWV audio, or witness statements, it may invalidate identification procedures and expose procedural negligence.
 - b) **Master Rebuttal:** PC Williams — Statement Date: **30/08/2022**
- **Impossible Year & Document Integrity:**
 - a) PC Williams' statement is dated **30/08/2022**, yet the incident occurred on **"02/08/2025, a three-year discrepancy."**
 - b) This is not a clerical error, it reflects **"Template Reuse Or Misfiling,"** undermining the document's admissibility and casting doubt on its authenticity.
- **Procedural Breaches & Contradictions:**
 - a) **Caution Through Closed Door:**
Williams confirms that **"PC Obsiye Delivered The Caution Through The Closed Door"** prior to entry. This violates **"PACE Code C,"** which requires:
 - 1+ Lawful access
 - 2+ Visual identification
 - 3+ Clear comprehension and acknowledgment of the caution.
 - b) Without direct contact, the **"Police Caution"** is **"Legally Invalid."** This undermines the arrest's enforceability and must be scrutinized in court.
 - c) **Chan's Role Misrepresented:** Williams describes **"PC Chan (2464NA)"** as receiving the enforcer and breaching the door. However:
 - 1+ **Wilson-Wallis attributes enforcer use to 2464NA, not Chan!**
 - c) **Wilson-Wallis's statement:** **"Once arriving at the scene, I brought PC 2464NA the enforcer to help break the door in whilst this was going on at 21 :16 PC."**

- 1+ Chan's own MG11 omits his badge number out!
- 2+ Obsiye's statement confirms Chan is 1405NA, not 2464NA, as Pc Wilson-Wallis attributes.

d) This creates "**Badge Number Ambiguity,**" and the obstructs from the prosecuting teams to disclose working copies of all attending police officers **BWV Footage**, raises serious questions about Police officer "**Identity And Accountability, As It Seems To Be Hiding The Truth About Official Frauded Documentation By The Police Officers Involved.**"

- **Officer Index Confusion:**

Officer Name	Badge Number	Role Claimed
PC George Wilson-Wallis	1456NA	NA30L Operator
PC Reece Williams	1675NA	NA30L Driver
PC Obsiye	1543NA	Arresting Officer, Leg Restraint
PC Chan	1405NA/2464NA	Enforcer, Taser, Entry
Unknown Officer	2464NA	Enforcer User (if not Chan)
Unknown Officer	2546NA	Leg Restraint (second set)

e) This table reveals "**Two Unnamed Officers**" and "**Badge Number Inconsistencies,**" suggesting either:

- 1+ "**FABRICATED POLICE OFFICERS' IDENTITIES**" and / or.
- 2+ "**DELIBERATE IDENTIFICATION OBFUSCATIONS.**"

- **Call Sign Confusion:**

- a) **NA22L**: Chan and Obsiye's unit
- b) **NA30L**: Williams and Wilson-Wallis' van
- c) **NA22N**: Mentioned as the unit left with Simon but "**Not Listed In Police Or CPS Disclosed Files, Such As CAD Logs.**"

This mislabeling is being wrongly used to:

- a) Distance **PC Calvin Chan** from his Gross Misconduct and negligent act that led to Mr. Simon Paul Cordell medical injuries.
- b) Create confusion in the chain of custody, to wrongly waver legal responsibility away from **NA22L**: Chan and Obsiye's police mobile unit and so that they can avoid accountability for post-arrest due care responsibilities.

- **Legal Precedent: O'HARA V CHIEF CONSTABLE OF THE RUC (1997)**

- a) The House of Lords ruled that an arrest is only lawful if the officer had "**Reasonable Grounds To Suspect The Specific Offence**" at the time, "**Not One Substituted Later.**"

- 1+ **In this Case:**

- a. Arrest was for "**Harassment,**" as confirmed in multiple statements!
- b. Charge later reframed to "**Threats To Cause Criminal Damage!**"
- c. No new arrest, caution, or interview occurred!

- b) This violates "**PACE Code C**" and supports a challenge to the charge's admissibility.

- **The Police and CPS, Trap for Defendants:**

- a) In most cases, defendants "**Cannot Prove**" the arrest was for a different offence unless:
 - 1+ The "**Police Admit It**" in their statements (**As They Have Here).**
 - 2+ There's "**Clear Documentation**" showing the original arrest basis (e.g., CAD logs, BWV

footage, custody records).

3+ The defence team “**Challenges The Procedural Timeline**” and demands disclosure.

b) Without that admission, courts often assume the charge and arrest were aligned, even if they weren’t.

- **Eyewitness & Medical Neglect:**

a) Upon exiting the building, I was told “**No Ambulance Would Be Dispatched,**” despite visible distress. It was only thanks to my neighbours, especially **Saheed**, who personally called emergency services, that an ambulance arrived. This occurred as “**I Collapsed Again Outside,**” confirming the severity of my injuries.

- **BWV Reliability:**

a) Williams admits he “**Did Not Review His BWV (RAW/01)**” prior to writing the statement. This weakens its reliability and opens it to challenge under evidentiary standards.

	<u>Legal Significance Of Our Findings!</u>
	<u>These contradictions affect:</u> All police officers’ statements in regards towards! a. <u>Credibility of officer testimony.</u> b. <u>Chain of responsibility for use of force.</u> c. <u>Procedural accuracy in the arrest narrative.</u> d. <u>Misrepresentation of roles in official documentation.</u>
	a) In the statement titled “<u>05. PC Chan Pdf,</u>” PC Chan is identified as “<u>Calvin Chan,</u>” but his “<u>Badge Number Is Not Explicitly Listed</u>” in the document. • <u>Here’s what we can confirm:</u> a) The statement header includes: 1+ <u>Name:</u> Calvin Chan 2+ <u>Call sign:</u> NA22L (shared with PC Obsiye) 3+ <u>Date of statement:</u> 02/08/<u>2025</u> 4+ <u>Exhibit reference:</u> CKC/01 (Chan’s BWV) b) However, unlike other officers (e.g., PC Williams 1675NA), Chan’s “<u>Collar Number Or Warrant ID</u>” is not included in the MG11 form or continuation pages. c) <u>PC Chan’s badge number is 1405NA, as confirmed in both:</u> 1+ <u>Obsiye’s statement:</u> “I was working alongside PC Chan “<u>1405NA as NA22L</u>” 2+ <u>Chan’s own statement:</u> While his MG11 doesn’t list the badge number directly, Obsiye’s cross-reference confirms it. d) This aligns Chan with the call sign “<u>NA22L,</u>” and his BWV is exhibited as “<u>CKC/01.</u>” e) In the statement titled “<u>07. PC Williams Pdf,</u>” PC Chan is explicitly identified with the badge number “<u>2464na.</u>” f) <u>Here’s the relevant line from Williams’ account:</u> 1+ “At approx. 2100hrs NA22L PC CHAN <u>2464NA</u> and PC OBSIYE 1543NA called for a van...” g) This confirms Chan’s collar number as “<u>2464NA,</u>” aligning him with call sign “<u>NA22L</u>” and the enforcer entry described in multiple statements. h) In the statement by <u>PC George Wilson-Wallis,</u> PC Chan is identified with the badge number <u>2464NA.</u>

- i) This is confirmed in the line:
 - a. "In this statement I will be referring to myself, PC WILLIAMS 1675NA, 1543NA and 2464NA..."
- j) Since PC Obsiye is "1543NA" and Williams is 1675NA, the remaining identifier, "2464NA," belongs to "PC Chan."
- k) This aligns with other statements and confirms Chan's active role in the arrest and use of the enforcer.

• **Police Officers Involved**

- * **Attache to call sign:** NA30L.
- * NA30L was called out, by
- * PC CHAN 2464NA = NA22L
- * PC OBSIYE 1543NA = NA22L
- * and the operator was PC George Wilson-Wallis 1456NA.
- * **The case is:** CAD 6844/02AUG25.
- * **And this is the CAD log:** NA22L on 02/08/2025.

- a) **As Simon did not like us** and was being more **"Aggressive Towards Us"** and NA22L **"We Have"** left Simon with NA22N and gone outside. Simon has eventually been taken in an ambulance to NMH. I have not watched my BWV prior to writing this statement and it is true to the best of my knowledge. I exhibit my BWV as RAW/01.

Mr. Simon Paul Cordells Additional Statement 5

• **Statement Regarding Arrest and Use of Force at 109 Burncroft Avenue – 02/08/2025**

- a) **The First Officers Who Arrived At My Door Were Met With A Calm And Reasonable Request:** that I be allowed to attend the police station voluntarily at a later date, in line with my **"Medical Note And Scheduled Operation."** I explained my situation clearly, yet they showed no regard for my health condition, nor did they acknowledge that I had **"No Prior Warnings, No Criminal History, And Had Committed No Offence."** There was **"No Immediate Risk,"** I had been inside for over **"30 Minutes,"** alone, still in my **"Pyjamas,"** and entirely non-threatening.
- b) Despite this, PC Chan exited the building and returned moments later with a **"Battering Ram (Enforcer)."** At that time, I was attempting to **"Slide My Medical Note Under The Door"** for PC Obsiye to read. She refused to engage with it and appeared determined to escalate the situation unnecessarily.
- c) Chan then **"Forced The Door Open,"** immediately threw the enforcer to the floor, and I instinctively stepped back, **"Holding The Medical Note Above My Head,"** a moment clearly captured on **"Body-Worn Video (BWV)."** As confirmed in my **"MG11 Statement Submitted To Tuckers Solicitors,"** Chan **"Aimed The Stun Gun At My Head"** and **"Threatened To Shoot Me In The Face"** if I didn't drop the note. His behaviour was **"Aggressive, Reckless, And Entirely Disproportionate"**. If the BWV footage has not been tampered with or concealed, it will demonstrate this clearly.
- d) I was **"Not Resisting."** Nonetheless, Chan struck me over the head with his **stun gun**, causing me to **"Collapse Backwards Onto My Sofa,"** screaming in pain and confusion. At that moment, **"No Other Officers Were Present."**

- e) PC Obsiye then targeted my “Legs,” despite my repeated warnings about the location of my “Hernia,” which I had explained to her multiple times. This too is documented on BWV. I was eventually “Dragged To The Floor,” with Chan on top of me while Obsiye continued to “Apply Pressure And Communicate Via Radio.”
- f) As I cried out for help, I repeatedly shouted to Chan, “Get Me An Ambulance!” to which he responded, “I’m Not Getting You One.” This exchange is also captured on BWV and must be disclosed in full.
- g) When additional officers arrived, they appeared “Shocked By The Conduct Of Chan And Obsiye.” They instructed both to “Leave The Flat Immediately,” which they did. The new officers “Removed My Leg Restraints,” helped me “Stand Slowly,” and allowed me to “Gather My Belongings And Secure What Remained Of My Home.”
- h) Upon exiting the building, I was informed that “No Ambulance Would Be Dispatched,” despite my repeated pleas and visible distress. It was only thanks to my neighbours—whose “Witness Statements, Including That Of Saheed,” confirm the truth—that emergency services were contacted. Saheed personally called for medical assistance, and the ambulance crew “Agreed To Attend Immediately.” This occurred just as I stepped outside and “Collapsed Again In Pain,” further confirming the severity of the injuries I had sustained and the “Urgent Need For Medical Intervention.” Their actions were not only compassionate, but they were also “Lifesaving.” Without their intervention, I would have been left without care, despite the presence of multiple officers and my clear medical distress.

• **Structural Breakdown:**

- a) “At approx. 2100hrs “NA 22L” PC CHAN 2464NA and PC OBSIYE 1543NA called for a van not on the hurry up”
- b) “NA 22L”: This is a **call sign** for a mobile patrol unit. But the spacing—“NA 22L” instead of the standard “NA22L”—implies a “Separation Of Responsibility” or a deliberate attempt to “Distance The Unit From The Officers Named After.”
- 1+ PC CHAN 2464NA
2+ PC OBSIYE 1543NA

• **Forensic Timeline Integrity Table**

Officer	Statement Date	Claimed Time	Role	Contradiction
PC Wilson-Wallis	02/08/2025	21:16	Witness to arrest	Misidentifies suspect; not present upstairs, BWV not reviewed!
PC Obsiye	01/08/2025	0700–1600	Arresting officer	Date/time impossible; backdated statement, BWV not reviewed!
PC Chan	02/08/2025	1300	Passive witness	Time mismatch: did not receive allegation, BWV not reviewed!
PC Williams	30/08/2022:	2100	Late arrival	Wrong year: BWV not reviewed!

(Signed)



(On behalf of Mr. Simon Paul CORDELL)

(Dated)

03/12/202

Signature Witnessed by Signature:

Page 9 of 10

01/21

OFFICIAL – SENSITIVE [when complete]