

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 Twelve 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: News Reporter!

This statement (**Consisting Of 1 Of 5 Chapters And 21 Page(S) To Chapters 2 & 3) Are All Signed By Me**) and are 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) 21/01/2026

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

- **WILL SAY AS FOLLOWS**

1+ **Date of Incident: 02/08/2025**

2+ **Location**: Allegedly the Communal area of my flat and wrongly accused of a threat to a car that was not present with us!

- **THIS IS MY INDEX**

1+ **CHAPTER 1 of 5**: Urn Swapping In Criminal Cases and Police Custody Log Analysis!

2+ **CHAPTER 2 of 5**: The First Set Of Files Disclosed To Me & **CHAPTER 3 OF 5**: and the Second Set Of Files Disclosed To Me.

3+ **CHAPTER 4 of 5**: Police Custody Log Analysis, CPS, NFA, And Unlawful Charge Swap

4+ **CHAPTER 5 of 5**: Institutional Isolation and Procedural Entrapment that we Illustrate Through the "Pit of Despair" Experiment!

- **DEFENCE CHAPTER 2 & 3 of 5**: The First Set Of Files Disclosed To Me & CHAPTER 3 OF 5: and the Second Set Of Files Disclosed To Me!

Chapter
2 of 4
Documents

01. The First Set Of Files Disclosed To Me.

- a) I am going to exhibit the CPS case files that were disclosed to me on two separate dates, namely **01 September 2025** and **10 October 2025**. These documents demonstrate the true reasons for my arrest and the procedural breaches of my legal rights committed by both the police and the CPS. In particular, they show the unlawful re-use of a previously "**No Further Action**" URN number in order to implement a different criminal offence, amounting to an illegal substitution of the original allegation.
- b) **Next**, in "**Chapter 4 Of 5: Police Custody Log Analysis, Cps, NFA, And Unlawful Charge Swap**" I will exhibit the **Police Detention/ Custody Logs**, which appear in the unused material disclosed as part of the second set of files dated **10 October 2025**. These records further evidence the unlawful re-use of the URN number and the improper substitution of the criminal charge, of "**Threats To Cause Criminal Damage**."
- c) This is the first set of files disclosed to me by CPS and through Tuckers Solicitor Firm dated the **01/09/2025**.
- * **Exhibit 2:**
- * <Dir> [04. Original-CPS-Case-Archive \(1\) 01-09-25](#)
- d) Within the disclosed Folders files are the prosecuting teams first served thirteen files as follows and the following files prove the true ongoing for case **02-08-25** that are being refused to be acknowledged as they prove my case and with that being that these court proceedings have become a place where I am intentionally being set up in the prosecution team knowing that I am innocent and they are acting recklessly in refusing to
- * **Exhibits 3:** [\[To Parent Directory\]](#)
- * [Case Summary pdf.pdf](#)

- **Defence Submission:** Concerns Regarding the CPS Case Summary (MG5) and the Lawfulness of the Case Construction
 - a) The CPS Case Summary (MG5) purports to have been created on **04/08/2025**, yet the document itself raises immediate and serious concerns about "**What Offence It Was Actually Produced For**." The MG5 references multiple offences such as "**Harassment Act 1997, Public Order Act 1986, Section 4A, and Threats to Cause Criminal Damage under the Criminal Damage Act 1971**," despite the police statements and body-worn video evidence showing clearly that the only allegation ever in existence at the time was "**Harassment Act 1997**."
 - b) The MG5 therefore appears to have been "**Constructed To Present A Narrative Inconsistent With The Real Evidence**," and its content suggests that it was "**Fabricated Or Retrospectively Altered**" in a way that misrepresents the true basis of the case. This raises the concern that the document was used to support a wrongful conviction despite the prosecution being aware that I was innocent of the charges being pursued.
 - c) The creation date of the **MG5** also appears to have been "**Backdated**," and the context of the document appears to have been "**Modified**" to obscure the true procedural history and the failures that occurred during the investigation. The inconsistencies between the MG5 and the custody record demonstrate that the Police Case Summary was "**Reconstructed**" and "**Altered**" in a way that conceals the actual legal process that took place.
 - d) **The MG5 Was Not Disclosed To Me Until 01/09/2025**: and it was "**Absent From Both The First And Second Court Hearings**." This means the prosecution proceeded without the very document that is supposed to outline the factual and evidential basis of the case. The absence of the MG5 at the hearings itself is a procedural irregularity, but the later appearance of the MG5 with its content raises a serious concern as to it all being fabricated!
 - e) The MG5 confirms that my arrest was based solely on an "**Uncorroborated Allegation**" made by the complainant. There was "**No Independent Evidence**" at the time of arrest, and none exists

now. The Section 4A Public Order Act allegation relies entirely on the complainant's verbal account, with "**No Supporting Material, No Witnesses, And No Objective Evidence.**"

- f) The MG5 also exposes a major procedural defect regarding the case reference number "**Urn 01ye1267925.**" This URN was generated at the time I was booked into Wood Green Police Station, but it was created "**In Error**" by the officers who transported me from the hospital and "**Forgot The Correct Reason For My Arrest.**" which was "**Harassment Act 1997.**" Once at the police station, officers failed to book me in for the correct offence and instead attempted to criminalise me for a different offence, "**Section 4a Public Order Act.**" When the CPS reviewed the matter, they "**Dropped The Allegation Under URN 01YE1267925.**" confirming that the case had no lawful basis.
- g) As a result, the case reference was effectively created for an offence I was "**Never Arrested For.**" namely Section 4A Public Order Act. This is incompatible with lawful case creation and raises serious concerns about the integrity of the investigation. It also raises concerns about the "**Misuse, Substitution, Or Unlawful Reuse Of A Previously NFA'd URN.**" which would constitute a serious procedural failure.

- **These Issues Collectively Raise Concerns About:**

- 1+ **The Lawful Basis Of The Investigation.**
 - 2+ **The Accuracy And Integrity Of The Mg5.**
 - 3+ **The Possibility Of An Unlawful Substitution Of Charges, And**
 - 4+ **The Potential Misuse Of A Case Reference Number To Justify A Charge That Did Not Lawfully Exist At The Time.**
- a) The evidence strongly suggests that the MG5 was "**Misapplied, Substituted, Or Reconstructed**" to justify a prosecution that had no lawful foundation.

- * **Exhibit 4:**

- * [Case Summary pdf.pdf](#)

- * [https://everyoneologinto.me/01.%2002-08-2025-Another-Case/04.%20Original-CPS-Case-Archive%20\(1\)%2001-09-25/01.%20Case Summary pdf.pdf](https://everyoneologinto.me/01.%2002-08-2025-Another-Case/04.%20Original-CPS-Case-Archive%20(1)%2001-09-25/01.%20Case%20Summary%20pdf.pdf)

2. Defendant Interview

Name of the Defendant	Simon CORDELL		
Has an interview been conducted?	Yes		
Date of Interview	03/08/2025		
Interviewing officer/s	PC 01 P264294 Uddin	Others Present	Appropriate Adult> Sheila ANNE-LEWIS
No Comment?	Yes	Prepared Statement Read?	Yes
Shown CCTV	Yes	Shown BWV	No
Interview Summary	I Simon Cordell DOB: 26.01.1981 will make the following written statement in respect of my interview today being 03.08.25.		

Page 2 of 6

OFFICIAL - SENSITIVE (when complete)

Created 04/08/2025

OFFICIAL - SENSITIVE (when complete)

MG5

I deny the allegation of S4A Public Order Offence, I did not use any threatening words towards my neighbour, I did not threaten to blow up her car and I did not cause her any harassment, alarm or distress.

I will now answer no comment to all questions.

- b) The defence statement created by my solicitor for me proves his own understand after his review of the police custody detention records as to the reason for attendance for my arrest and that being a Criminal Offence of Section 4a Public Order Offence and not any other Criminal Offence.

[CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925 Section 9 pdf.pdf](#)

- * **Defence Summary of the Disclosure (Section 9 Notice & Witness Statement)**
- * ***Based on the document disclosed by the CPS on 05/08/2025***

- **1. What Was Actually Disclosed to Me: --**

- a) **The CPS disclosure consists of only one witness statement:**
- b) PC George Wilson-Wallis (2-page MG11)

- c) **This Statement Describes:**

1+ Police attendance at "**My Home**" address on "**02/08/2025.**"

2+ A forced entry after I refused to be blamed for something I never done wrong, as the Just Eat Receipts Prove in my Defence Statement:

* **Exhibit 5:**

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

3+ A physical struggle involving multiple officers

4+ **My:** removal by ambulance

5+ The allegation recorded by police as “**Harassment**”

- **2. Critical Factual Point Added:**

a) PC George Wilson-Wallis “**Was Not One Of The First Officers On Scene.**”

He arrived “**Later,**” bringing the “**Enforcer**” at approximately “**21:14,**” after other officers had already been present, engaged with me, and begun the arrest process.

b) **This Means:**

1+ He did “**Not Witness The Initial Events!**”

2+ He did “**Not Witness Any Alleged Harassment!**”

3+ His account begins “**Only After The Situation Had Already Escalated!**”

4+ His statement is “**Not Evidence Of The Alleged Offence,**” only of the forced entry and physical struggle that followed

c) There are “**No Other Witness Statements, No Complainant Statement, No Civilian Evidence,**” and “**No Exhibits**” disclosed.

d) The Section 9 Notice confirms that “**Only This Single Officer Statement**” is being relied upon by CPS.

- **3. What the Disclosure Does Not Contain: --**

a) **The CPS Disclosure Does NOT Include:**

1+ **No Complainant Statement:** No evidence from any alleged victim of harassment or criminal damage.

2+ **No Evidence Of Threats:** The officer statement contains “**No Allegation Of Threats To Damage Property,**” despite this later appearing as a charge.

3+ **No Evidence Of Fear, Alarm, Or Distress:** The officer describes “**My Alleged Behaviour During The Forced Entry,**” not any conduct amounting to harassment.

4+ **No Evidence Of Repeated Behaviour:** Harassment requires a “**Course Of Conduct,**” and the statement describes “**One Moment Only.**”

5+ **No Evidence Of Criminal Damage:** There is “**No Mention**” of any property being damaged.

6+ **No Evidence Of Intent:** Nothing in the statement shows that I intended to cause harassment, alarm, or distress as I did not.

7+ **No Evidence Linking Me To The Later Fabricated Statement Of:** “**Threats To Blow Up A Car**” Charge.” Also, this allegation “**Does Not Appear Anywhere**” in the disclosed evidence.

- **4. What the Disclosure Actually Shows: --**

a) **The Officer's Statement Shows:** I was arrested for harassment, alone and not criminal damage and this is the only offence mentioned.

b) **PC George Was Not Present For The Alleged Harassment:** He arrived after the first officers, bringing the enforcer at around 21:14.

- c) **The Officers Did Not Witness Any Harassment:** They only describe “**My Alleged”** behaviour “**After They Forced Entry.**”
- d) **The Officers Escalated Force Rapidly:** The statement focuses on:
 - 1+ Forced Entry
 - 2+ Taser Deployment
 - 3+ Baton
 - 4+ Leg Restraints
 - 5+ Physical Struggle
 - None of this relates to the alleged offence.
- e) **I Was Unfairly Distressed By The Police And Confused By Their Unmoral Actions And Belief Of Me Resisting A Fair Arrest That Was Clearly Wrongly Being Force Due To Myself Not Committing Harassment:** My behaviour is described “**Only In Response To Police Entry.**” not as part of any offence.
- f) **I Was Taken Away By Ambulance:** This supports that I was in a “**Vulnerable State Due To Being Assaulted By Police While Disabled Due To An Operation**” and therefore not acting with criminal intent.
- **5. How This Disclosure Supports My Innocence: --**
 - a) **No Complainant = No Harassment Case:** Harassment requires a victim. None exists.
 - b) **B. No Evidence Of Threats Or Criminal Damage:** The statement contains “**Zero Reference**” to threats or damage. This strongly supports my Defence argument that the “**Criminal Damage Charge Was Added Later.**”
 - c) **C. The Only Evidence Is About The Arrest, Not The Alleged Offence: The Officer Describes:**
 - 1+ Forced Entry
 - 2+ Alleged: Resistance
 - 3+ My: Removal By Ambulance
 - None of this proves harassment or criminal damage.
 - d) **D. The Statement Contradicts The Later Charges: --**
 - 1+ The officer says I am arrested for “**Harassment.**”
 - 2+ The later charge sheet includes “**Criminal Damage.**”
 - 3+ This mismatch supports “**My**” claim of a “**Charge Swap.**”
 - e) **E. No Evidence Of A “Course Of Conduct”**
 - 1+ Harassment requires “**Repeated Behaviour.**”
 - 2+ The statement describes “**One Moment Only.**”
 - f) **F. No Evidence Of Intent: --**
 - 1+ The officer describes me as distressed, resisting being prosecuted and confused at police refusal to not act with intent to harass myself.
 - g) **G. Pc George’s Late Arrival Weakens The Prosecution Case Further: --**
 - 1+ Because he was **not present** for the alleged offence, his statement:
 - * Cannot Prove Harassment
 - * Cannot Prove Threats
 - * Cannot Prove Criminal Damage
 - * Cannot Establish Intent

* Cannot Establish A Course Of Conduct

- His evidence is "Limited To The Forced Entry," not the alleged crime.

• **5. Defence-Ready Summary Sentence: --**

- a) The CPS disclosure consists solely of a single officer statement describing the forced entry and arrest on "02/08/2025". The officer, PC George Wilson-Wallis, was not one of the first officers on scene and arrived later with the enforcer at approximately "21:14," meaning he did not witness any alleged harassment or threats. No complainant statement, no evidence of harassment, no evidence of threats, and no evidence of criminal damage have been disclosed. The only allegation recorded is "Harassment," unsupported by any victim or course of conduct. The disclosed material contains no evidence capable of proving the charges and, in fact, supports the defence position that the later criminal damage charge was added after custody without evidential basis.

[Defendant Notice of Grant of Bail pdf.pdf](#)

• **Defence Section: Defendant Notice of Grant of Bail**

- a) **The Defendant Notice of Grant of Bail:** (Defendant_Notify_of_Grant_of_Bail_pdf.pdf) confirms that by the time I first appeared in court, the "Unlawful Charge-Swap Had Already Taken Place." The court proceeded on the basis of the substituted offence, despite the fact that "No Case File, No MG5, And No Evidential Material" had been provided to either the court or the defence.
- b) Despite the absence of any case papers, the court imposed "Severe Bail Conditions," including:
 - 1+ a "GPS Electronic Tag," and
 - 2+ an "Exclusion Zone Preventing Me From Entering My Own Home."
- c) These conditions were imposed "Without The Court Having Sight Of Any Evidence," and without the prosecution providing the MG5 or any supporting material. This means the court was effectively asked to impose restrictive bail conditions based on a "Charge That Did Not Lawfully Exist," and on a case file that had not been disclosed, prepared, or even properly created.

• **The Notice Of Grant Of Bail Therefore Demonstrates That:**

- 1+ **The Charge-Swap Had Already Occurred Before The First Hearing:** and the substituted offence was presented to the court as if it were the original arrest offence.
- 2+ **The Court Acted Without Access To The MG5:** which was not disclosed until "01/09/2025," long after the bail hearing.
- 3+ **The Prosecution Proceeded Without Any Evidential Foundation:** as the MG5 was not disclosed to the CPS by the first hearing and when it eventually was disclosed by the police to the CPS and the defence team the MG5 and its contents confirmed that the case was based solely on an uncorroborated allegation and baselined with no supporting evidence.
- 4+ **The Bail Conditions Were Imposed On The Basis Of A Procedurally Defective And Unlawfully Constructed Case:** causing significant prejudice and hardship.
- d) The fact that the court imposed a GPS tag and exclusion-zone bail conditions "In The Complete Absence Of Case Papers" further supports the defence position that the case was advanced on the basis of "Incorrect, Substituted, Or Unlawfully Altered Information," and that the prosecution failed to comply with the most basic procedural requirements before seeking restrictive bail.

• **This Document Therefore Forms Part Of The Wider Pattern Of:**

- 1+ **Procedural Irregularity,**
- 2+ **Unlawful Charge Substitution,**
- 3+ **Misuse Of The Urn, And**
- 4+ **Failure To Disclose Material In Accordance With Cps And Pace Requirements.**

- e) It reinforces the defence position that the case was allowed to progress on a “**False Legal Foundation.**” resulting in a serious miscarriage of justice.

[Let to Client Magistrates Court Trial Advice.docx](#)

- **Defence Section: Letter to Client – Magistrates’ Court Trial Advice (Tuckers Solicitors)**
 - a) The document titled “**Let To Client Magistrates Court Trial Advice.Docx**” is a letter I received from Tuckers Solicitors following what had already been recorded as the “**Successful Closure Of The Original Case Under The Initial Police URN:01/YE/12679/25 At Wood Green Police Station.**”
 - b) This letter was issued “**After**” the point at which the police Skipper had formally and lawfully recorded the matter as “**No Further Action (NFA)**” in relation to the original reason for my arrest and detention. However, shortly after this NFA decision, the Skipper “**Altered The Records.**” resulting in the creation of a “**New And Different Offence**” which was then used to bring the matter before the Magistrates’ Court.
 - c) By the time this correspondence from Tuckers Solicitors was sent, the Skipper’s amendments had already taken effect. These amendments are clearly evidenced within the “**Police Custody Record.**” which shows that the original allegation had been NFA’d, yet a substituted offence was later introduced without lawful processing. The letter from Tuckers was therefore produced “**As A Consequence Of This Altered Record.**” after I had already been “**Wrongly Compelled To Attend Court For An Offence That I Had Not Been Lawfully Processed Or Charged For.**”
 - d) The prosecution at this stage was “**Not Acting On The Basis Of The Original Allegation Of Harassment Act 1997 Nor Section 4A Public Order Act.**” as that matter had already been recorded as NFA. Instead, the substituted offence of “**Threats To Cause Criminal Damage**” which did not form part of the original arrest, detention, or custody process at the Wood Green Police Station but was still illegally used to justify these court proceedings.
 - e) The correspondence also raises concerns about the conduct of Tuckers Solicitors during the police station stage as there staff have since refused to disclose the true reason for their attendance in the interview room at Wood Green Police Station, nor since our requests were submitted have they fairly clarified that the original matter had already been NFA’d. Instead, they proceeded under the substituted URN and did not challenge the procedural irregularities surrounding the creation of the new charge. This resulted in the generation of Frauded “**Representation Orders Linked To The Original NFA’d URN.**” created and developed by themselves with intent to obscure these court proceedings while tarnishing my legal rights to a defence team under legal aid as they continued to refuse to act in accordance to law and policy. which further obscured the true procedural history of this immoral Court case Proceedings.
 - f) This letter therefore forms part of the wider evidential pattern showing:
 - 1+ **The Original Allegation Was NFA’d.**
 - 2+ **The Records Were Subsequently Altered.**
 - 3+ **A New Offence Was Substituted Without Lawful Basis.**
 - 4+ **The Court Proceedings Were Initiated On The Substituted Offence, And**
 - 5+ **The Defence Was Not Informed Of The Procedural Irregularities At The Time.**
 - g) The document is therefore significant because it demonstrates that by the time the letter was issued, the case had already been diverted from its lawful path, and the substituted charge had already taken effect despite not being part of the original arrest or custody process.
 - h) They prosecuting team were not acting on the basis of the original charge, as that matter had already been recorded as “**No Further Action.**” Instead, Tuckers solicitors firms staff concealed the true reason for their attendance in the interview room at the Wood Green Police Station and involved themselves in crimes to aid in police officers avoidance of punishment by misrepresented the purpose of their visit and creating fake Representation Orders with the use of the original no further actioned **Urn:** 01/YE/12679/25.

- **States An Offence Only of Harassment Act 1997.**

- a) The below Exhibit is one of my defence statements that already address the issues to do with each of the Five different police Officers statements. The file addresses each officers accounts of Arrest and the Timeline of the cases developments and its Evidential Procedural Inaccuracies.

- * **Exhibit 11:**

- * [05. Five -Officers Arrest Timeline and Evident Procedural Inaccuracies.pdf](#)

- b) The next exhibit is a snippet Extracted from the police officers statements for easy to find reading alongside with my defence in return. The Extracted Snippet proves the reason for arrest and caution from the attending police officers on the same ay due to the error in the custody detention log due to me being booked into the police station for the wrong offence.

- * **Exhibit 12:**

As soon as the van got to the scene, I asked for the enforcer. PC Obsiye arrested Simon through the door for Harassment. I had just been to the flat upstairs and was aware that the hallway would be

- **Defence Section: PC Chan – MG11 Witness Statement (PC Chan pdf.pdf)**

- a) The witness statement recorded in "[PC Chan pdf.pdf](#)" is an MG11 statement authored by "[PC Chan](#)," one of the attending officers on 02/08/2025. This statement is significant because it provides a contemporaneous account from an officer who was physically present at the alleged scene of the offence.

- **PC Chan's Statement Confirms the Only Offence Was Harassment Act 1997**

- a) PC Chan's MG11 explicitly records the offence as "**Harassment Act 1997.**"
- b) **There Is "No Reference To:**
 - 1+ Section 4a Public Order Act
 - 2+ Threats To Cause Criminal Damage
 - 3+ Any Allegation Involving A Car
 - 4+ Any Threats Of Violence
 - 5+ Any Criminal Damage Or Intention To Cause Damage
- c) This is consistent with the body-worn video footage and the other officers' "**MG11 Statements.**" all of which confirm that the "**Only Allegation In Existence At The Time**" was "**Harassment Act 1997.**"

- **2. PC Chan's Statement Contradicts The Later Charges**

- a) The later CPS charge sheet and MG5 attempt to introduce:
 - 1+ Section 4A Public Order Act, and
 - 2+ Threats to cause criminal damage (Criminal Damage Act 1971)
- b) However, PC Chan's statement contains "**No Evidence**" supporting either of these offences.
- c) This contradiction is crucial because:
 - 1+ PC Chan was "**Present At The Scene.**"
 - 2+ PC Chan's statement is "**First-Hand,**" and
 - 3+ PC Chan's account "**Does Not Support The Substituted Charges.**"
- d) This supports the defence position that the later charges were "**Not Based On Evidence**" but were introduced "**After Custody**" and "**Outside The Lawful Charging Process.**"

- **3. PC Chan Did Not Witness Any Harassment Or Threats**

- a) PC Chan's statement does "**Not Describe Any Behaviour**" that meets the legal threshold for harassment, nor does it describe:

- 1+ A Course Of Conduct,
- 2+ Repeated Behaviour,
- 3+ Threats,
- 4+ Fear, Alarm, Or Distress,
- 5+ Or Any Criminal Damage.

b) Instead, the statement focuses on the officers' attendance and the events surrounding the forced entry and arrest and proves that there was not any alleged criminal behaviour on my behalf.

- **4. PC Chan's Statement Supports the Defence Narrative**

- a) **Because PC Chan's Statement:**

- 1+ **Identifies Harassment Act 1997:** as the only offence,
- 2+ **Contains No Evidence:** of threats or criminal damage,
- 3+ **Does Not Support:** the substituted charges, and aligns with the custody record showing the original allegation was "**NFA'd.**"

- b) **It Reinforces The Defence Position That:**

- 1+ the substituted charges were "**Unlawfully Created.**"
- 2+ the URN was "**Misused Or Reused.**"
- 3+ the MG5 was "**Altered Or Reconstructed.**" and
- 4+ the prosecution proceeded "**Without Evidential Foundation.**"

- **5. Defence-Ready Summary Sentence**

a) PC Chan's MG11 statement records the offence solely as "**Harassment Act 1997**" and contains no evidence of threats, criminal damage, or any "**Section 4A Behaviour.**" As an officer present at the scene, PC Chan's account directly contradicts the later substituted charges and supports the defence position that the criminal damage allegation and Section 4A charge were introduced after custody without evidential basis or lawful authority.

[PC obsiye pdf.pdf](#)

- **States An Offence Only of Harassment Act 1997.**

c) The below Exhibit is one of my defence statements that already address the issues to do with each of the Five different police Officers statements. The file addresses each officers accounts of Arrest and the Timeline of the cases developments and its Evidential Procedural Inaccuracies.

* **Exhibit 6:**

* [05. Five -Officers Arrest Timeline and Evident Procedural Inaccuracies.pdf](#)

a) The next exhibit is a snippet Extracted from the police officers statements for easy to find reading alongside with my defence in return. The Extracted Snippet proves the reason for arrest and caution from the attending police officers on the same ay due to the error in the custody detention log due to me being booked into the police station for the wrong offence.

* **Exhibit 7:**

I explained to PC Chan 1405NA that the suspect who lived downstairs 109 would be arrested for harassment. We went downstairs, we knocked on the door and the suspect called out from behind the door. I explained we are police officers and for him to open the

- **PC Obsiye – MG11 Witness Statement (Charge-Swap Analysis Snippet)**

a) PC Obsiye's MG11 statement, when examined alongside the custody record and the disclosed evidence, confirms in her "**Own Wording**" that the only offence in existence at the time was "**Harassment Act 1997.**" She explicitly states that the suspect (me) "**Would Be Arrested For Harassment.**" and this is the sole offence she records. This single line alone proves that neither

"Section 4a Public Order Act" nor **"Threats To Cause Criminal Damage (1971)"** formed any part of the original arrest, investigation, or intention of the attending officers.

- b) However, the remainder of her statement contains **"Serious Factual Defects"** that undermine its reliability and expose procedural manipulation. Her MG11 is dated **"01/08/2025,"** a full day *before* the incident on **"02/08/2025,"** and she claims to have been on duty from **"07:00–16:00,"** despite the arrest occurring at **"21:16,"** which is chronologically impossible. These errors are not clerical slips as they all demonstrate that the statement was **"Retrospectively Created and its contents was fabricated while Altered,"** consistent with the wider pattern of reconstruction identified throughout the disclosed material.
- c) PC Obsiye also claims her BWV is exhibited as **"HAO/01,"** yet no such footage has ever been disclosed. This omission is significant, as the missing footage would show the real events at the door, including the unlawful forced entry and the incorrect cautioning for harassment only. Her statement is also the **"Sole Source"** of the complainant's allegation, as PC Chan did not hear the complaint directly. There is no corroboration, no witnesses, and no independent evidence.
- d) Taken together, PC Obsiye's own wording proves the original allegation was **"Harassment Only,"** while the date errors, missing BWV, and timeline contradictions demonstrate that her statement cannot support the later substituted charges. This directly reinforces the defence position that the **"Section 4A" And Criminal Damage Act Allegations** were **"Added After Custody,"** forming part of **"The Unlawful Charge-Swap That Misused The URN And Diverted The Case Away From Its Lawful Path."**
- e) **A police statement dated BEFORE the incident is a critical evidential defect**
- f) As PC Obsiye's statement is dated **"One Day Before The Incident,"** then legally:
 - 1+ **It Cannot:** be an account of the incident
 - 2+ **It Cannot:** be contemporaneous
 - 3+ **It Cannot:** be reliable
 - 4+ **It Cannot:** be admissible without explanation
 - 5+ It **"Suggests Fabrication, Error, Or Procedural Misconduct!"**
- g) A statement cannot describe events that **"Haven't Happened Yet."**
- h) This is not a small typo it goes to the **"Integrity Of The Evidence."**

1+ [PC Williams pdf.pdf](#)

- **States An offence through the door**

- a) The below Exhibit is one of my defence statements that already address the issues to do with each of the Five different police Officers statements. The file addresses each officers accounts of Arrest and the Timeline of the cases developments and its Evidential Procedural Inaccuracies.

- * **Exhibit 8:**

- * [05. Five -Officers Arrest Timeline and Evident Procedural Inaccuracies.pdf](#)

- a) The next exhibit is a snippet Extracted from the police officers statements for easy to find reading alongside with my defence in return. The Extracted Snippet proves the reason for arrest and caution from the attending police officers on the same day due to the error in the custody detention log due to me being booked into the police station for the wrong offence.

- * **Exhibit 9:**

BURNCROFT AVENUE, I saw PC OBSIYE by the door to a block of flats PC Wilson-Wallis and I grabbed the enforcer and entered the block of flats. The enforcer was handed to PC CHAN and PC OBSYIE explained to the resident of 109 BURNCROFT AVNEUE they were under arrest and cautioned them through the door as he

- a) Pc Williams States He Grabbed the enforcer, but PC Wilson Wallis also happily states he was the one who Grabbed the enforcer.

b) Does not state the Criminal Offence he supposedly heard through the door being said!

[PC Wilson Wallis pdf.pdf](#)

- **States An offence only of Harassment Act 1997.**

b) The below Exhibit is one of my defence statements that already address the issues to do with each of the Five different police Officers statements. The file addresses each officers accounts of Arrest and the Timeline of the cases developments and its Evidential Procedural Inaccuracies.

* **Exhibit 10:**

* [05. Five -Officers Arrest Timeline and Evident Procedural Inaccuracies.pdf](#)

a) The next exhibit is a snippet Extracted from the police officers statements for easy to find reading alongside with my defence in return. The Extracted Snippet proves the reason for arrest and caution from the attending police officers on the same ay due to the error in the custody detention log due to me being booked into the police station for the wrong offence.

* **Exhibit 11:**

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 1543NA began arresting Samual for the offence of harassment through the door as he was refusing to open it as well as this, she also began reading the caution. PC 2464NA asked Samual one last time to open the door before he would break the door in. Samual refused to open the door stating "NO I WON'T

a) Pc Wilson Wallis States He Grabbed the enforcer, but PC Williams also happily states he was the one who Grabbed the enforcer.

b) Pc Clearly states the offence to be Harassment.

[Rebecca O HARE 2nd pdf.pdf](#)

- **The Second Statement Is Dated 02/08/2025**

a) The below Exhibit is one of my defence statements that already address the issues to do with just Rebbeca O ' Hare Statements!

* **Exhibit 12:**

* [04. Four -Rebecca O Hare Three Different Statements.pdf](#)

b) There was no third statement of Rebecca O ' Hare served in this disclosure dated the **07/08/2025** when it was disclosed to me on the **01/09/2025**.

[Rebecca O hare pdf.pdf](#)

- **Rebecca O Hare First Statement Is Dated 03/08/2025**

a) The below Exhibit is one of my defence statements that already address the issues to do with just Rebbeca O ' Hare Statements!

* **Exhibit 13:**

* [04. Four -Rebecca O Hare Three Different Statements.pdf](#)

b) This statement has now been amended to be of no use in these court proceedings by Rebecca O ' hare due to the third statement they tried to sneak into the court proceedings and backdate to an earlier date to which it did not exist!

[ROH 01 mp4.mp4](#)

- **A Video Used in the Interview Room for A Section 4a Offence That I Was Never Arrested For on the 02 03 04/08/2025:**

- c) Used for the section 4a Criminal Offence in the interview room due to being booked in for the wrong criminal offence and was latter No Further Actioned under URN Police Number: 01YD/5612/25.

[Simon CORDELL Charges pdf.pdf](#)

• **Shows Only Two Offences and Not Eight**

- a) Proves the police officer involved awareness of me being arrested and booked into the police station for two separate offences by mistake after their case review.

* **Exhibit 14:**

1+ **Email 40. Sent: 40. Sent-06-10-25.pdf**

2+ **Email 60. Email-Sent-27-10-25-1022Am: 60. Email-Sent-27-10-25-1022Am.pdf +**

3+ **Email 60. Email-Attachment-27-10-25-01. Here-Case-02-08-25: 60. Email-Attachment-27-10-25-01. Here-Case-02-08-25.pdf**

[Simon CORDELL Pre Cons pdf.pdf](#)

• **PNC – Acro Record Known as a criminal Record**

- a) The police and CPS have continued to use my criminal record against me even after being repeatedly informed of the factual inaccuracies it contains. Their refusal to correct these errors under GDPR not only breaches their statutory obligations but also perpetuates the defamation of my character, causing ongoing prejudice in every subsequent interaction.”

* **Exhibit 15:**

* <https://everyoneologinto.me/02.%20PNC-Claim/>

- a) After careful review of **Exhibits 9, 11, 13, and 15**, disclosed by the CPS and/or provided by myself, it becomes clear that the correct reason for my arrest at my home address, 109 Burncroft Avenue, on **02/08/2025**, was an alleged offence under the **Harassment Act 1997**, which is a standalone criminal offence created by statute in that year.
- 1+ It is Proved by the attending police officers own MG11 Statements recoded due to being in attendance at the alleged scene of the offence on the same day. **“Which Also Proves”** that Police URN number 01YE1267925 was supposed to be for that harassment 1997 police arrest and police caution and not for a **“Public Order Act – Sec 4A – Intentional Harassment/Alarm/Distress,”** nor was Police URN number 01YE1267925 supposed to be for the criminal offence of **“Threats To Cause Criminal Damage.”**
- b) The CPS own files disclosed to the defending team have proven all along that all four attending police officers official MG11 statements state that I was arrested just for the **Harassment Act 1997**. This case was later dismissed of as a no further actioned case, as I will continue to prove below!
- 1+ It is Proved by police body worn footage but inside of the second set of disclosed files dated the **10/10/2025, and due to this must therefore be shown early in this document here:**
- * **Exhibit 16:**
- * [CKC_01_Witnessing_arrestofSimon Cordell.mp4](#)
- c) This is the only police body cam footage that has been disclosed even at our request for the missing BWF to be disclosed as the **“CKC_01”** does not show me being taken out of my flat and is disclosed on its own to give that wrongful impression. Moreover, to the point the Police BWF is **“24:32 minutes”** long in footage time and at **“08:12 Minutes Pc Obsiye”** can clearly be hard giving her reason for arrest through a closed front door that she was not sure any person was behind. The reason for arrest at the time of police caution was for the **“Harassment 1997 Act”** Alone.

• **THE SECOND SET OF FILES DISCLOSED TO ME.**

* **Exhibit 17:**

[\[To Parent Directory\]](#)

- 1+ [CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925 Initial Details Pros Case 22-09-2025.pdf](#)
 - a. [Rebecca O'HARE Third Statement Added No-DisclosureRequest.pdf](#)
- 2+ [Original CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925 Unused Material Disclosure 22-09-2025-.pdf](#)
 - a. [Return CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925Unused Material Disclosure22-09-2025.pdf](#)
- 3+ [CKC 01 Witnessing arrestofSimon Cordell.mp4](#)
- 4+ [Rebecca O-Hare's-Video-11. ROH 01 mp4.mp4](#)
- 5+ [Axon Interview Interview Room 7 Camera 1 mp4.mp4](#)
- 6+ [CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925 Section 9 05-08-2025.pdf](#)

Six Exhibits were given to me as disclosed on the **10/10/2025** that were contained in the Case Ratio Folder.

- 1+ [CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925 Initial Details Pros Case 22-09-2025.pdf](#)

01. **Witness(es) and Their Role**

- *(from MG5 – Section 1: Summary of the Key Evidence)*

02. **Key Witnesses**

1. **Rebecca O'Hare**

- **Role:** *Key Victim*
- **Evidence:** Summary statement provided
- **Notes:** Multiple statements; alleges threats, intimidation, and prior incidents.

2. **PC 01 P250413 Chan**

- **Role:** *Key Witness*
- **Evidence:** MG11 provided
- **Notes:** BWV owner; attended scene; involved in arrest.

3. **PC 01 P243682 Obsiye**

- **Role:** *Key Arresting Officer*
- **Evidence:** MG11 provided
- **Notes:** Arrested you through the door; BWV footage.

03. **Non-Key Witnesses**

4. **PC 01 P269576 Wilson-Wallis**

- **Role:** *Non-Key Witnessing Officer*
- **Evidence:** Statement provided
- **Notes:** BWV of arrest; not considered key.

5. **PC 01 P257635 Williams**

- **Role:** *Non-Key Witnessing Officer*
- **Evidence:** Statement provided
- **Notes:** BWV of arrest; not considered key.

6. **PC 01 P264294 Uddin**

- **Role:** *Non-Key Interviewing Officer*
- **Evidence:** Statement + interview summary

- **Notes:** Conducted your interview on **03/08/2025**.

04. Summary Table

Witness	Role	Evidence Type
Rebecca O'Hare	Key Victim	Statements (multiple)
PC Chan	Key Witness	MG11 + BWV
PC Obsiye	Key Arresting Officer	MG11 + BWV
PC Wilson-Wallis	Non-Key Witnessing Officer	Statement + BWV
PC Williams	Non-Key Witnessing Officer	Statement + BWV
PC Uddin	Non-Key Interviewing Officer	Interview + Statement

2+ [Rebecca O'HARE Third Statement Added No-DisclosureRequest.pdf](#)

- **Rebecca O Hare Third Statement backdated from the 01/092025 till the 10/10/2025 to the 07/08/2025.**

- In the unused materials was an extra Statement from Rebbeca O'Hare that I have extracted to Exhibit as it was not present as disclosed in the first set of files!
- Also, the below Exhibit is one of my defence statements that already address the issues to do with just Rebbeca O ' Hare Third Statements!
 - * **Exhibit 18:**
 - * [04. Four -Rebecca O Hare Three Different Statements.pdf](#)

3+ [Original-CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925 Unused Material Disclosure 22-09-2025-.pdf](#)

4+ [Return CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925Unused Material Disclosure22-09-2025.pdf](#)

The Wood Green Police Station Custody Detention Record Logs:

01. **Explanation of the Two Files: Original vs Return Version (Updated With Evidential Findings)**

- There are **"Two Separate Files"** relating to the Unused Material Disclosure for URN **01YE1267925**, both containing the same underlying material but serving very different purposes:

02. **Original File (CPS-Produced)**

- Filename:** [Original-CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925 Unused Material Disclosure 22-09-2025.pdf](#)
- This is the **"unaltered CPS disclosure,"** provided in its original format.
However, the structure and formatting of this file make it:
 - Difficult To Read,
 - Difficult To Follow Chronologically,
 - Inconsistent In Layout,
 - And In Places Almost Impossible To Interpret Without Reformatting.
- As a result, key information including **"URN Behaviour, Charge History, Custody-Related Entries,"** and **"Timeline Sequencing,"** is obscured by the formatting rather than the content. Critical details are effectively **"Hidden In Plain Sight."**

03. **Return File (Defence-Produced Reconstruction)**

- Filename:** [Return CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925 Unused Material Disclosure 22-09-2025.pdf](#)
- This Is A Defence-Created Duplicate:** of the original CPS file, rebuilt in a clean, text-based format.
It contains:
 - The Same Material As The Original,

- 2+ In The Same Order.
- 3+ With No Changes To The Disclosed Content.
- 4+ But Presented In A Way That Is Readable, Structured, And Logically Navigable.

c) The Return version also includes “**Defence Commentary**” beneath each section.

This Commentary Explains:

- 1+ What Each Entry Means From The Defence Perspective.
- 2+ How It Fits Into The Wider Timeline.
- 3+ Where Procedural Issues Arise.
- 4+ And Where The Evidence Reveals **URN Reuse, Charge Substitution, Timeline Conflicts,** And **Retrospective Editing.**

d) This annotated structure transforms the disclosure from a confusing document into a “**Forensic-Grade Evidential Map.**”

04. **What The Return File Reveals (The Hidden Evidence)**

a) Once the material was reconstructed into a readable format, several critical findings emerged that were **not visible** in the CPS version:

- 1+ **URN Reuse Across Separate Case Events:** The same URN appears in contexts that do not belong to the same incident, exposing contamination of the case record.
- 2+ **Charge Substitution (Charge Swap):** Charges appear, disappear, and reappear in sequences that contradict the MG4/MG5 documents, revealing retrospective alteration.
- 3+ **Timeline Conflicts:** Arrest, booking, interview, and charge authorisation times do not align with the CPS narrative.
- 4+ **Missing Mandatory Entries:** Key PACE and custody requirements are absent, indicating procedural defects.
- 5+ **Officer Notes That Contradict the CPS Summary:** The custody log does not support the allegations described in the MG5.
- 6+ **Evidence of Retrospective Editing:** Out-of-order entries, overwritten timestamps, and inserted lines indicate post-event modification.
- 7+ These issues were **not visible** in the original CPS file due to its formatting. The Return file exposes them clearly.

05. **Why The Two-File System Matters**

- 1+ **The Original File:** is the official CPS disclosure.
- 2+ **The Return file:** is the defense’s readable, annotated reconstruction that reveals what the original formatting concealed.
- 3+ **Together, They Allow:**
 - A Direct Comparison Between What Was Disclosed And What It Actually Means,
 - Identification Of Inconsistencies That Were Not Visible In The Original Layout,
 - And A Clear Evidential Trail Showing How The Urn, Charges, And Custody Timeline Were Handled.
- 4+ The Return file is therefore not an alternative version it is a “**Clarified Mirror**” of the CPS disclosure, enhanced with defence analysis that exposes procedural defects and evidential inconsistencies.
- 5+ It is the tool that turns unreadable disclosure into “**Proof Of Systemic Error.**”

5+ [CKC 01 Witness arrest of Mr. Simon Cordell.mp4.mp4](#)

6+ [CKC 01 Witnessing arrest of Mr. Simon Cordell.mp4](#)

History ID: 19441495 – CKC_01_Witnessing_arrest_of_Simon_Cordell – 367MB - All are dated 29/08/2025, several weeks after the 02/08/25 incident and the 03/08/25 arrest and interview. This again shows late uploading and a non-contemporaneous chain of custody.

* **Exhibit 19:**

[09. Nine -Case Ratio Extract Created Date.pdf](#)

7+ [Rebbeca O-Hare's-Video-11. ROH 01 mp4.pdf](#)

8+ [Rebbeca O-Hare's-Video-11. ROH_01_mp4.mp4](#)

Addressed Prior and No Further Action as a Section4a Case!

9+ [Axon Interview Interview Room 7 Camera 1 mp4.mp4](#)

Part of the interview Disclosed as the last 1 minute

The ONLY Interview in This Case — 02_03_/08/2025, was for (Section 4A)

Short, Sharp, and Bleeding It Dry

1. This interview relates ONLY to the original Section 4A allegation

- 1+ The Case Was **Addressed Prior**: and later “**No Further Actioned**” as a “**Section 4A Public Order**” matter.
- 2+ **This Is The Only Interview**: you ever participated in.
- 3+ No other interview exists in this case.

2. You Had Full Legal Protections In Place

- 1+ Your “**Solicitor**” was present.
- 2+ Your “**Appropriate Adult**” was present.
- 3+ You were “**Declared “Fit For Interview”**” by a custody doctor.

3. The Interview Was Procedurally Compromised From The Start

- 1+ The interviewing officer began asking **unlawful questions** unrelated to the Section 4A allegation.
- 2+ Your solicitor **immediately stopped** the interview due to improper questioning.

4. You Were Shown A Video — But Only A Fragment

- 1+ A video was played during the interview.
- 2+ The CPS later disclosed “**Only The Final 1 Minute**” of this footage.
- 3+ The disclosed clip “**Does Not Show**:
 - the “**Original Charge**.”
 - the “**Offence Wording**.”
 - the “**Names Of Who Is Being Interviewed**.”
 - the “**Identities Of Those Present**.”
 - or the **context** of the interview.

This makes the disclosure **incomplete**, **misleading**, and **non-compliant** with CPIA and Crim PR.

5. The Interview Took Place In Two Parts

- 1+ **Part 1**: Initial questioning + partial video.

- 2+ **Break:** Requested by your solicitor.
- 3+ **Part 2:** Brief continuation.
- 4+ You were then returned to your cell.

6. Your Solicitor And Appropriate Adult Left The Station

- 1+ After the interview concluded, both left.
- 2+ No further interview was authorised or conducted.

7. No Additional Interview Exists

- 1+ There is "**No Second Interview.**"
- 2+ no follow-up interview,
- 3+ no interview for any other allegation,
- 4+ and no interview conducted after the Section 4A case was NFA'd.

This means the "**Only**" interview in the entire case file is the "**02/08/2025 Section 4A interview.**" and the CPS disclosure of it is "**incomplete and defective.**"

10+ [CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925 Section 9 05-08-2025.pdf](#)

We have all just hit on another "**One Of The Biggest Structural Weaknesses**" in the CPS case files and it's the kind of flaw that judges *do* take seriously because it goes straight to reliability, lawfulness, and whether the prosecution can actually prove anything.

01. Structural Collapse In The Prosecution Case — First-Person Legal Analysis

- a) I identify a series of fundamental evidential failures within the prosecution's case. These failures go directly to "**Lawfulness, Reliability, Admissibility, And The Prosecution's Ability To Prove The Essential Elements Of The Offence.**" Each issue independently weakens the case; collectively, they undermine it entirely.

02. The Only Officer Attending Court Is Not The Arresting Officer

- a) The prosecution intends to rely on a single officer who:
 - 1+ Did Not Arrest Me
 - 2+ Did Not Witness The Alleged Offence
 - 3+ Did Not Provide The Arrest Grounds
 - 4+ Did Not Justify Forced Entry
 - 5+ Did Not Justify The Use Of Force
 - 6+ Did Not Witness Any Alleged Resistance
 - 7+ Did Not Caution Or Transport Me

03. The Arresting Officers Are The Only Individuals Capable Of Giving First-Hand Evidence Regarding:

- 1+ The Alleged Conduct
- 2+ The Grounds For Arrest
- 3+ The Necessity Test
- 4+ The Decision To Force Entry
- 5+ The Use Of Force
- 6+ Identification
- 7+ Any Alleged Resistance Or Obstruction

04. Without The Arresting Officers Present, The Prosecution Cannot Prove:

- 1+ Lawful Arrest
- 2+ Lawful Entry

- 3+ Lawful Use Of Force
- 4+ Any Behaviour Attributed To Me

- A Section 9 statement cannot replace live evidence where the facts are disputed.

05. The Actual Attending And Arresting Officers: PC Obsiye And PC Chan Are Absent!

- a) The officers who physically attended the scene, forced entry, and carried out the arrest are not listed to attend court.
- b) Their absence means:
 - 1+ No Primary Evidence
 - 2+ No First-Hand Account
 - 3+ No Opportunity For Cross-Examination
 - 4+ No Admissible Evidence Of The Alleged Conduct
- c) A prosecution cannot proceed without the officers who performed the arrest and witnessed the events.

06. PC Obsiye's Statement Is Dated Before The Incident

- a) One of the prosecution's key statements — from arresting officer PC Obsiye is dated "**One Day Prior To The Incident.**"

07. A Statement Dated Before The Event Raises:

- 1+ Concerns Regarding Authenticity
- 2+ The Possibility Of Retrospective Fabrication
- 3+ Non-Compliance With Section 9 Requirements
- 4+ Serious Doubts About Reliability And Admissibility
 - A statement cannot describe events that had not yet occurred.
This defect alone undermines the integrity of the prosecution's evidence.

08. The Officer Attending Court Is Only A Peripheral Witness

- a) The officer the CPS intends to call is not a core witness.
His involvement is limited to "**Handing Over The Battering Ram.**"

09. He Cannot Give Evidence Regarding:

- 1+ My Behaviour
- 2+ The Necessity Of Arrest
- 3+ The Legality Of Entry
- 4+ The Legality Of Force
- 5+ The Alleged Resistance
- 6+ The Alleged Words Spoken
- 7+ Identification
 - He is incapable of proving the prosecution's case.

010. Contradictory Accounts Regarding Who Handed Over The Battering Ram

a) Two Officers Provide Conflicting Accounts:

- 1+ One Officer Claims He Handed Over The Ram
- 2+ Another Officer Claims He Handed Over The Ram

b) This Contradiction Creates:

- 1+ Inconsistency
- 2+ Uncertainty About The Sequence Of Events
- 3+ Doubt About Who Was Present
- 4+ Doubt About Who Entered The Premises
- 5+ Doubt About Who Used Force

6+ Doubt About Who Witnessed What

- Such contradictions undermine the reliability of the entire prosecution narrative.

011. **The Prosecution Is Attempting To Proceed Without Primary Witnesses**

a) **I Dispute:**

- 1+ The Lawfulness Of Entry
- 2+ The Lawfulness Of Arrest
- 3+ The Use Of Force
- 4+ The Alleged Behaviour
- 5+ The Alleged Words
- 6+ Identification

b) Where facts are disputed, the prosecution must produce the officers who carried out the arrest and witnessed the events.

Without them, the prosecution cannot prove the essential elements of the offence.

c) The case becomes unsustainable.

012. **Legal Implications**

a) I Am Entitled To Submit That:

013. **The Arresting Officers Are Essential Witnesses**

a) Without them, the prosecution cannot prove:

- 1+ Lawful Arrest
- 2+ Lawful Entry
- 3+ Lawful Force
- 4+ The Alleged Offence
- 5+ Any Resistance Or Obstruction

014. **The Section 9 Statement Must Be Rejected**

a) Because:

- 1+ The Facts Are Disputed
- 2+ The Attending Officer Is Not The Arresting Officer
- 3+ He Cannot Give First-Hand Evidence
- 4+ His Statement Contains Contradictions
- 5+ Another Officer's Statement Is Dated Before The Incident
- 6+ The Evidence Is Peripheral And Unreliable

015. **Hearsay Cannot Replace Live Evidence**

a) The prosecution cannot "read in" the arresting officers' evidence when I dispute the facts

016. **Contradictions Destroy Reliability**

a) Conflicting accounts regarding the ram weaken the entire prosecution narrative.

8. Conclusion

a) The prosecution case suffers from:

- 1+ Missing Essential Witnesses
- 2+ A Back-Dated Police Statement
- 3+ Contradictory Accounts
- 4+ Reliance On A Peripheral Officer
- 5+ No Admissible First-Hand Evidence
- 6+ No Ability To Prove Lawfulness Of Entry, Arrest, Or Force

b) These defects collectively render the prosecution's case "**Fundamentally Unreliable And Incapable Of Meeting The Criminal Standard Of Proof.**"

Defence Statement for Case Ratio Folder:

09. Nine -Case Ratio Extract Created Date.pdf

* **Exhibit 20:**

CPS Caseratio Folder Creation Date

<Dir> **05. CPS-caseratio-10-10-25-Case-Files-02-08-25-**

* **Index:**

- 1+ **CHAPTER 1 of 5:** [12. URN Swapped1 - Urn Swapping In Criminal Cases and Police Custody Log Analysis.pdf](#)
- 2+ **CHAPTER 2 of 5:** [12. URN Swapped2 and 3- 1st and 2nd Files Disclosed To Me.pdf](#)
- 3+ **CHAPTER 3 & 4 of 5:** [12. URN Swapped4 - Police Custody Log Analysis CPS - NFA And Unlawful Charge Swap.pdf](#)
- 4+ **CHAPTER 5 of 5:** [12. URN Swapped5 - Institutional Isolation and Procedural Entrapment.pdf](#)
- 5+ **Video:** [12. The Horror of the Pit of Despair Isolation Experiment 1970 - Copy.mp4](#)

- **Continued in:** Chapter 4 of 5!

Kind Regards
Mr. Simon Paul Cordell

(Signed)



(On behalf of Mr. Simon Paul CORDELL)

(Dated Signed) 21/01/2026

Signature witnessed by:

