

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 Chapter 4 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**: 01. Urn Swapping In Criminal Cases and Police Custody Log Analysis!

2+ **CHAPTER 2 of 5**: 03. The First Set Of Files Disclosed To Me & **CHAPTER 3 OF 5**: 04. 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**: 02. Institutional Isolation and Procedural Entrapment that we Illustrate Through the "Pit of Despair" Experiment!

- **DEFENCE CHAPTER 4 of 5**: Police Custody Log Analysis, CPS, NFA, And Unlawful Charge!

Chapter

4 Of 4

Documents

THE POLICE DETENTION CUSTODY LOGS

a) **Wrongfully Booked Into the Wood Green Police Station for a – Section 4A Arrest: On 03/08/2025**

at **07:43**, I was booked into "**Wood Green Police Station**" following an arrest for an alleged offence under "**Section 4A of the Public Order Act 1986**" (Intentional Harassment, Alarm or Distress). The custody record confirms that the "**Main Offence**" at the point of booking-in was recorded as:

1+ "**Public Order Act – Sec 4A – Intentional Harassment/Alarm/Distress.**"

* **Exhibit 21:**

 METROPOLITAN POLICE		OFFICIAL - SENSITIVE Custody Record Print Out	Date Printed: 07/08/2025
Detainee		Custody Reference: 01YD/5612/25	
Title	Mr		
Surname	CORDELL		
Forename(s)	Simon		
Date of Birth	26/01/1981		
Type of Special Group			
Gender	Male		
Self-Defined Gender	Male		
Height	180		
Place of Birth	ENFIELD		
Ethnicity	Black		
Self-Defined Ethnicity			
Nationality	British		
Immigration Status (If Foreign)			
Occupation	Self Employed		
School attending			
PNCID	97/99378V		
Address	109 BURNCROFT AVENUE ENFIELD ENFIELD EN3 7JQ		
Contact Details	Telephone - Mobile - 07864217519		
Arrest Detail			
Reason for Arrest	Public Order Act -Sec 4a - Int. Harass/Alarm/Distress		
Arrest Date/Time	02/08/2025 21:10		
Where Arrested	109 BURNCROFT AVENUE, Enfield, ENFIELD,		
Arresting Force	Metropolitan Police		
Arresting Officer	PC 01 P243682 Obsiye		
OIC			
Escorting Officer			
Officer giving account	PC 01 P243682 Obsiye		
Reason Arrest necessary	To prevent the person in question causing physical injury to themselves or any other person. PACE CodeG 2.9 (c)(i) Prompt and effective investigation - To interview - about the outcome of other investigative action for which their arrest is necessary. PACE CodeG 2.9 (e)(i)(b)		
Circumstances	It was reported from the victim that he was going to blow up the car, previously threatened her to beat her up and over the past year shouted threats and has been intimidated		
DP comment made when arrest account given			
Detention Authorisation			
Arrived Date/Time	03/08/2025 07:43		
Detention Authorised	Yes		
Detention Authorised by	Sgt 01 P240417 Ozcan		
Detention Authorised Date/Time	03/08/2025 07:58		
Reason for Detention	To Secure Or Preserve Evidence To Obtain Evidence By Questioning		

• **Evidential Statement: Charge Substitution And URN Reuse Proven Via Exhibit 21**

- The above exhibit 4 is an extracted snippet from the Wood Green police station and is the "**Custody Record Printout**" and is dated printed "**07/08/2025.**"
- If a person is arrested and held in the police station on "**02 03/08/2025**" and taken to court on

04/08/2025, then:

1+ **The Custody Record Printout Must Be Printed On Or Before 04/08/2025 And Normally It Is Printed On The Same Day That Person Is Taken To Court!**

c) **That Is The Only Way The Police Can Show:**

- 1+ The Detention Was Lawful
- 2+ The Timings Were Lawful
- 3+ The Release To Court Was Lawful
- 4+ The Charge Was Lawful
- 5+ The Handover To Cps Was Lawful

d) **If The Printout Is Dated After 04/08/2025:** it indicates the record was **“Altered, Reconstructed, Or Created After The Event,”** which is a procedural breach.

e) One of the clearest ways to prove beyond reasonable doubt that the criminal charge was **“Swapped Illegally”** and the **“Police URN Reused”** is by analysing **“Exhibit 21.”** When viewed correctly, the categories **“Detainee, Arrest Details, and Detention Authorisation”** expose the real reasons for arrest and the actual time Mr. Simon Paul Cordell was logged into custody.

- 1+ **Custody Reference:** 01YD/5612/25
- 2+ **Arrest Date/Time:** 02/08/2025 – 21:10
- 3+ **Charge Stated:** Section 4a Public Order Act – Intentional Harassment/Alarm/Distress
- 4+ **Detention Authorised:** 03/08/2025 – 07:43

f) This proves that the arrest was processed under **“Section 4a,”** but when cross-checked against the police officers’ own statements, who were present at the time of the real reason cited was **“Harassment Act 1997,”** as evidenced in:

* **Exhibit 22:**

[12. URN Swapped2 and 3- 1st and 2nd Files Disclosed To Me.pdf](#)

g) This contradiction confirms that the **“Wrong Charge Was Recorded In The Custody Log, And The URN Was Reused To Overwrite The Original Arrest Context.”**

• **Detention Authorisation Confirms No New Charge Was Introduced**

- a) The **“Detention Authorisation”** section in **“Exhibit 21 Shows Mr. Cordell Was Booked Into The Station”** at **07:43 on 03/08/2025**, nearly **10.5 hours** after arrest, with no new charge introduced. This proves the detention was unlawful.
- b) For this **“Wrongful Section 4a Detention, At Wood Green Police Staff Created URN 01/YE/12679/25,”** which the **“CPS Later Closed With No Further Action.”** No further arrest took place.

c) **This Evidence Confirms:**

- 1+ The charge was substituted
- 2+ The URN was reused
- 3+ The detention was unlawful
- 4+ The CPS closed the case, validating the defence position

• **During The Booking-In Process:**

- a) It is said that The arresting officer was **“PC 01 P243682 Obsiye”** on the **02/08/2025** which is not denied as truth, but it is also said that **“PC 01 P243682 Obsiye”** was present at the Wood Green Police Station and commenced with a search, but she was not present on the **“03/08/2025 - 08:21”** the Initial Search and she is a female officer and therefore this would not be prohibited.

* **Exhibit23:**



OFFICIAL - SENSITIVE
Custody Record Print Out

Date Printed: 07/08/2025

03/08/2025 08:21	Initial Search	Staff 01 C749973 Novo Rodriguez	A Normal Search of the detainee was carried out at 07:58 on 03/08/2025 at Location Unspecified Custody officers search authority This search of the detainee was carried out under Section 54 PACE to ascertain everything that they have with them and where applicable the seizure and retention of property under 54(3) PACE The search was conducted by PC 01 P243682 Obsiye The search was authorised by Sgt 01 P240417 Ozcan
---------------------	----------------	---------------------------------------	--

• **"The Search Was Conducted By PC 01 P243682 Obsiye"**

- All early custody entries relate **Only** to the Section 4A allegation in the police detention custody log records!
- No allegation of **"Threat To Damage/Destroy Property"** existed at this stage under **"PC 01 P243682 Obsiye"** name and does not afterwards!
- No other officers were assigned to the original case until it was disposed of the following morning.
- No **MG4** or charge paperwork was created, as would be if charged for the section 4a offence or harassment offence!

1+ **This Establishes The Starting Point of the Police Detention Custody Logged Record.**: I was detained **"Solely"** for a Section 4A Public Order allegation.

* **Exhibit24:**

03/08/2025 08:08	Main Arrest Set	Staff 01 C749973 Novo Rodriguez	Associated crime number was not specified Main Offence set to Public Order Act -Sec 4a - Int. Harass/Alarm/Distress
---------------------	-----------------	---------------------------------------	---

• **2. CPS Review – Section 4A Discontinued (NFA)**

- At 22:38 On 03/08/2025, The Custody Record States: "To Allow Sufficient Time For An ERO/CPS Prosecutor To Review The Case File And Evidence To Come To An Informed Decision On Suitable Case Disposal."** This is the formal CPS charging review.

* **Exhibit25:**

This is the second review of the detainee's detention.

This matter will be progressed by PC UDDIN. Further detention is authorised for the following reasons:



OFFICIAL - SENSITIVE
Custody Record Print Out

Date Printed: 07/08/2025

			To allow officers to secure and preserve evidence. To allow sufficient time for an ERO/CPS prosecutor to review the case file and evidence to come to an informed decision on suitable case disposal. Solicitor requested and arranged. Nominated person requested and contacted. AA required and arranged. Interpreter not required. FNO checks completed. THRIVE+ completed. Samples taken. COZART not required. IMEI checks not applicable. No phone. DP has been offered food/drink. DP has been provided with a blanket. DP has been assessed by the HCP. I have offered the DP an opportunity of exercise and fresh air. This offer has been declined. I have offered the DP an opportunity to wash, brush their teeth and freshen up including the use shower facilities. This offer has been declined. I have spoken to the OIC and supervisor and informed them that the charging decision must go through the CPS. They will review if this is suitable for RC. The OIC did not inform the authorising officer of any documents or materials in their possession or control which appear to undermine the need to keep the suspect in custody.
03/08/2025 22:45	Cell Visit	Staff 01 C748236 Nelson-Cole	At 22:40 on 03/08/2025 Staff 01 C748236 Nelson-Cole visited the detainee for the following reasons: Cell visit. The detainee's status and condition were

b) **After This Review:**

- 1+ No charge was authorised!
- 2+ No MG4 was completed!
- 3+ No "Detainee Charged With Section 4A" entry exists.
- 4+ No "charge authorised" entry exists.
- 5+ No continuation of Section 4A appears in the log.

c) **Under CPS Charging Rules:** if CPS authorises a charge, the detainee "**Must**" be charged before release.

d) **I Was Not. Therefore: CPS** Reviewed **Section 4A** And Issued No Further Action (**NFA**).

e) This is the only lawful interpretation of the custody record.

- **3. No Officer in Case – 09:19 Entry Proves No Charge Was Being Prepared**
 - a) **At 09:19 on 03/08/2025, the custody log states:** “Officer in case was NA VCT.”

* **Exhibit 26:**

03/08/2025 09:19	Arrest	Sgt 01 P235743 Hales	Officer in case was NA VCT
03/08/2025 09:28	Contact	Staff 01 C746655 Raza	Solicitor Rana was contacted by By Phone on 03/08/2025 at 09:28 for reason solicitor called. done by ddo eren . The call out was answered. Reference not specified arriving at not specified

b) **This Means:**

- 1+ No officer was assigned
- 2+ No one was managing the case.
- 3+ No one could authorise a charge
- 4+ No one could lawfully swap the offence
- 5+ But a solicitor was still called for the Section 4A Public Order allegation.

c) This is incompatible with any lawful charging process.

- **4. No Lawful PACE Process for Any New Offence**

a) Between booking-in and release, the custody record contains **“No Entries Showing:**

- 1+ A further arrest
- 2+ A caution for a new offence
- 3+ Grounds for further arrest
- 4+ A new detention authorisation
- 5+ A lawful handover between officers
- 6+ CPS authorisation for a new charge
- 7+ MG4 completion inside custody

b) This proves that **“No New Offence Was Created During Lawful Detention.”**

- **5. New Offence Appears for the First Time at 03:09 on 04/08/2025**

* **Exhibit 27:**

04/08/2025 03:33	Offence Disposal	Sgt 01 P201985 Smith	were not recorded. The detainee was not roused. The detainee was given a Charge for the following on 04/08/2025 at 03:09 Offence: Threat to damage / destroy property The Charging Officer was PC 01 P255681 White. The Officer Accepting Charge was Sgt 01 P201985 Smith. The Officer in the Case was PC 01 P257543 Quick. The Appropriate Adult was present. A signature was not provided by the Appropriate Adult because Paper Signature. A signature was not provided by the detainee because Paper Signature. Detention clock was stopped. The expected departure time recorded is 04/08/2025, 07:43. Review after charge scheduled on 04/08/2025 at 07:33.
04/08/2025 03:34	Free Text	Staff 01 C744379 Etherington	WTJ7358H serco
04/08/2025 03:35	Disposal	Sgt 01 P201985 Smith	A risk assessment of the Demand Assessment

a) **The custody log shows: 04/08/2025 – 03:09 “Offence: Threat To Damage/Destroy Property.”** This is the **“First Time”** this offence appears anywhere in the custody record.

b) **This is:**

- 1+ **Over 4 Hours After:** the CPS review
- 2+ **After:** Section 4A was discontinued
- 3+ **After:** the point where any lawful charging process should have occurred
- 4+ **Without:** any PACE-required entries

- c) This proves the new offence was **“Not Part Of The Original Arrest.”**
- **6. Two New Police Officers Appear Only for the Newly Swapped Offence**
 - a) **At 03:09 on 04/08/2025, the custody log lists:**
 - 1+ **Charging Officer:** PC 01 P255681 **White**
 - 2+ **Officer Accepting Charge:** Sgt 01 **“P201985 Smith”**
 - 3+ **Officer in the Case:** PC 01 P257543 **“Quick.”** The 04/08/2025 at 03:33 is the first and only entry in the police custody detention log record that PC 01 P257543 **“Quick”** name appears.
 - b) **These Officers:**
 - 1+ Never appear in the **“Section 4A Entries Other Than Sgt 01 P201985 Smith.”**
 - 2+ We’re not present during arrest!
 - 3+ We’re not present during booking-in!
 - 4+ We’re not involved in the CPS review!
 - 5+ Only appear **“After”** the new illegally swapped offence of threats to cause criminal damage is inserted into the official Police Custody Record and is also the only time **“PC 01 P255681 White And PC 01 P257543 Quick”** are both mentioned in the custody record as the case handlers!
 - c) This proves that a **“Separate Process”** was used for the third criminal offence used by police and that no person from the defending team ever met **“PC 01 P255681 White And PC 01 P257543 Quick”** for the wrongly alleged offence of **“Threats To Cause Criminal Damage,”** also wrongly Charged Allegation!
- **7. No Lawful Handover Between Officers**
 - a) **PACE requires:**
 - 1+ A handover entry
 - 2+ A new grounds entry
 - 3+ A new caution
 - 4+ A new detention authorisation
 - b) None exist. Therefore: **“The New Offence Was Not Created Inside Custody.”**
- **8. MG4 Charge Sheet Contains Offences Not in the Custody Log**
 - a) **The MG4 Later Contains:**
 - 1+ Harassment fear of violence
 - 2+ Threat to blow up a car
 - b) **But The Custody Log Contains:**
 - 1+ No charge authorisation
 - 2+ No MG4 entry
 - 3+ No lawful process for either charge
 - c) This proves the **“MG4”** was created **“After Custody,”** not during it.
- **9. Final Defence Position**
 - a) The custody record proves that I was booked in for a **Section 4A Public Order** allegation only. The CPS reviewed this allegation at **22:38** on **03/08/2025** and did not authorise a charge, which is the CPS definition of No Further Action. The new offence (**“Threat To Damage/Destroy Property”**) appears for the first time at **03:09 on 04/08/2025**, after the CPS review, with three completely different officers (**PC White, Sgt Smith, and PC Quick**) handling it. There is no record of a further arrest, caution, grounds, charge authorisation, **“MG4”** completion, or lawful handover. This proves that the new offence was introduced through a separate process after the **Section 4A allegation** had already been discontinued, and not during lawful custody.
- * **Exhibit 28:**
- **What the CPS Charging Guidance actually says (relevant to this case)**
 - * **Exhibited Weblink:** <https://www.cps.gov.uk/prosecution-guidance/directors-guidance-charging-sixth->

- a) The Exhibited Web linked page explains “**How Charging Decisions MUST Be Made.**” and it proves several things that directly support my argument about the police detention custody record and the illegal charge swap.
- b) Here are those key points.

- **Police Can Only Charge Certain Offences**

- a) **Annex 1 Of The Guidance States That Police May Only Charge:**

- 1+ summary-only offences.
 - 2+ retail theft.
 - 3+ either-way offences “**ONLY If A Guilty Plea Is Anticipated!**”
 - 4+ and “**NOT**” offences requiring CPS authority.

- b) **Police Cannot Charge:**

- 1+ **Public Order Act s4A**: (if not anticipated guilty plea.)
 - 2+ Criminal Damage (depending on value and circumstances.)
 - 3+ ANY offence requiring CPS review.

- c) **This Is Important Because the police Custody Record Shows:**

- 1+ **No CPS authorisation**
 - 2+ **No MG3**
 - 3+ **No “Charge Authorised” entry**
 - 4+ **No Police Officer** further arresting me or putting me through a legal process before charging me, I clearly requested for the return of my solicitor and due to none compliance by them was not replaced with one by the police, considering all the legal requirements for this to be implemented.

- **Exhibited Timeline Extracted From Police Custody Logs Of Solicitors Attendance.**

- * **Exhibit 29:**

03/08/2025 15:34	Contact	Bertrand Sgt 01 P235743 Hales	C740008 Bertrand: Solicitor Shafiq Suleman was contacted by In Person on 03/08/2025 at 15:33 for reason Interview. The call out was answered. Reference not specified arriving at not specified Solicitor Shafiq Suleman arrived on 03/08/2025 at 15:33
---------------------	---------	-------------------------------------	---

- * **Exhibit 30:**

03/08/2025 15:49	Interview Start	Mehmood Sgt 01 P235743 Hales	PC 01 P264294 Uddin An interview was requested with the detainee at 15:49 on 03/08/2025 Access to the detainee was not denied The interview will take place in an Interview room with recording facilities The following persons were due to be present at the interview: Appropriate Adult, Solicitor The following officers were due to be present at the interview: PC 01 P264294 Uddin, Interviewing Officer Interview media was to be used The following media was to be used Digital Storage/ The media was issued to PC 01 P264294 Uddin on 03/08/2025 at 15:49 The detainee was not recorded as requiring an urgent interview. The detainee had received legal advice. The detainee was transferred for interview on 03/08/2025 at 15:49 to PC 01 P264294 Uddin
03/08/2025 16:17	Risk Assessment	Sgt 01 P232415 Bloomfield	A risk assessment of type Post Interview Assessment was completed by Sgt 01 P232415 Bloomfield.
03/08/2025 16:17	Interview Finish	Sgt 01 P232415 Bloomfield	The detainee was returned from interview at 16:16 on 03/08/2025 The cell visit clock was reset as a result of the detainee being returned directly to cell from interview. PACE and the Codes of Practice were complied with and PC 01 P264294 Uddin signed to this effect at 03/08/2025 16:16 The following persons were present at the interview: Appropriate Adult, Solicitor

 METROPOLITAN POLICE		OFFICIAL - SENSITIVE Custody Record Print Out		Date Printed: 07/08/2025
			The detainee was returned to custody on 03/08/2025 at 16:17. The officer returned to was Sgt 01 P232415 Bloomfield	
03/08/2025 16:34	Cell Visit	Staff 01 C098409 Mehmood	At 16:33 on 03/08/2025 Staff 01 C098409 Mehmood visited the detainee for the following reasons: Observation as per the current obs level. The detainee's status and condition were DP	

- **I was interviewed at the time of:**
 - a) Time of only Interview video disclosed **"16:13 Pm 03/08/2025"** and ends at **"16:14.53."**
 - b) The Video of the interview is the second half and does not show the charge or complete interview.
 - c) The Solicitor left with the appropriate adult as I was placed back into a cell and never returned.
 - 1+ **No More Solicitor for Harassment 1997**
 - 2+ **03/08/2025 - 16:17 the Interview was Finish**

* **Exhibit 31:**

03/08/2025 22:38	Review	Sgt 01 P236409 Clements	detainee was not present Inspector: The detainee's detention was reviewed at 22:35 on 03/08/2025 by Sgt 01 P236409 Clements The review was conducted in person Representations were not communicated The following persons were present at the review: Detainee present. All were given an opportunity to represent. The custody officer was informed of the review outcome The detainee was informed of the decision. The detainee was not informed of the detention circumstances The outcome of the review was that continued detention was authorised on grounds : I have been authorised by a Superintendent under section 107 of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 to perform the duties of an Inspector and thereby may exercise all the power and duties conferred on that rank by PACE. This is the second review of the detainee's detention. This matter will be progressed by PC UDDIN. Further detention is authorised for the following reasons:
---------------------	--------	-------------------------------	---

 METROPOLITAN POLICE		OFFICIAL - SENSITIVE Custody Record Print Out	Date Printed: 07/08/2025
			To allow officers to secure and preserve evidence. To allow sufficient time for an ERO/CPS prosecutor to review the case file and evidence to come to an informed decision on suitable case disposal. Solicitor requested and arranged. Nominated person requested and contacted. AA required and arranged. Interpreter not required. FNO checks completed. THRIVE+ completed. Samples taken. COZART not required. IMEI checks not applicable. No phone. DP has been offered food/drink. DP has been provided with a blanket. DP has been assessed by the HCP. I have offered the DP an opportunity of exercise and fresh air. This offer has been declined. I have offered the DP an opportunity to wash, brush their teeth and freshen up including the use shower facilities. This offer has been declined. I have spoken to the OIC and supervisor and informed them that the charging decision must go through the CPS. They will review if this is suitable for RIC. The OIC did not inform the authorising officer of any documents or materials in their possession or control which appear to undermine the need to keep the suspect in custody.

1+ 03/08/2025 - 22:38 - a. Solicitor requested and arranged.

2+ The detainee's detention was reviewed at 22:35 on 03/08/2025 by Sgt 01 P236409 Cleme

* **Exhibit 32:**

03/08/2025 23:23	HCP Exam	Staff 01 C748428 Aguilar	The detainee was fit to be interviewed.
---------------------	----------	--------------------------------	---

1+ 03/08/2025 - 23:23 - HCP Exam Staff 01 C748428 Aguilar - The detainee was fit to be interviewed.

* **Exhibit 33:**

04/08/2025 01:22	Contact	Staff 01 C728029 Sil	not roused. Solicitor Shafiq Suleman was contacted by By Phone on 04/08/2025 at 01:22 for reason DP requested to speak to solicitor, I have contacted MR Shafiq who stated they were from an agency and is no longer dealing with the matter I called Eliott stern MS Rana she did not answer either. DP informed and I will try again later on. . The call out was not answered.
04/08/2025	Call Log	Staff 01	At 01:22 on 04/08/2025 Staff 01 C728029 Sil

1+ **04/08/2025 at 01:22 Contact Staff 01 C728029 Sil**

- **Solicitor Shafiq Suleman Was Contacted by Phone On 04/08/2025 At 01:22 For Reason:**
 - A. DP requested to speak to solicitor.
 - B. I have contacted Mr. Shafiq who stated they were from an agency and is no longer dealing with the matter.
 - C. I called Eliott stern Ms. rana she did not answer either.
 - D. DP informed and I will try again later on.
 - E. The call out was not answered.

* **Exhibit 34:**

04/08/2025 03:59	Contact	Staff 01 C744379 Etherington	not roused. the demand was not roused. Solicitor Shafiq Suleman was contacted by By Phone on 04/08/2025 at 03:59 for reason Tried to contact for DP no answer. The call out was not answered.
04/08/2025	Call Log	Staff 01	DP was not answered and the demand was not roused.

1+ **04/08/2025 at 03:59 Contact Staff 01 - C744379 Etherington**

- Solicitor Shafiq Suleman Was Contacted by Phone On 04/08/2025 At 03:59 For Reason.
 - A. Tried To Contact for DP No Answer.
 - B. The Call Out Was Not Answered.

* **Exhibit 35:**

04/08/2025 07:21	Handover	Sgt 01 P232415 Bloomfield	Handover from Sgt 01 P201985 Smith to Sgt 01 P232415 Bloomfield has taken place. Handover comment: Custody officer's handover (incoming) I participated in a handover between the incoming and outgoing custody teams, which was conducted within the sight and sound of CCTV.
---------------------	----------	---------------------------------	--



OFFICIAL - SENSITIVE
Custody Record Print Out

Date Printed: 07/08/2025

			Custody activity was paused to allow all custody staff to be present. I am aware of the detainees location and have visited them. Detainee made no representations I am aware of the physical condition of the detainee and their current healthcare needs. I am aware of the detainee's current risk assessment and decided the observation should be REMAINING THE SAME. I have briefed custody staff to conduct them accordingly. I am aware of the detainees current status and continued grounds for detention (e.g. investigative process, charge decision, remand for court, request for solicitor, awaits appropriate adult) (*enter details*). I accept responsibility for the detainee.
--	--	--	---

- **Handover from:** "Date & Time Logged: 04/08/2025 - 07:21 by Sgt 01 P201985 Smith and Sgt 01 P232415 Bloomfield, The Wood Green Police Station Handover Had Taken Place."
- **Handover comment:** Custody officer's handover (Incoming)
 - a. I participated in a handover between the incoming and outgoing custody teams, which was conducted within the sight and sound of CCTV.
 - b. Custody activity was paused to allow all custody staff to be present.
 - c. I am aware of the detainees location and have visited them.
 - d. Detainee made no representations I am aware of the physical condition of the detainee and their current healthcare needs.
 - e. "I am aware of the detainee's current risk assessment and decided the observation should be REMAINING THE SAME.
 - f. I have briefed custody staff to conduct them accordingly.
 - g. I am aware of the detainees current status and continued grounds for detention (e.g.
- **The Defences Return Statements:**
 - a) It is said that "Sgt 01 P201985 Smith & Sgt 01 P232415 Bloomfield," as police officers both "Never Really Offered The Defendant Any Offers Of Legal Representation" as the recorded in the police custody detention logs to have happened, at this stage of time and even so a new Criminal offence still appeared without a further arrest.
 - 1+ The Investigative Process: Did not happen as "Pc Quick and Pc White" did not follow standard Protocols.
 - 2+ The Charge Decision: as it is missing and not present in the custody log or case files!

- 3+ Remand For Court Decision from CPS: is missing as it is not present in the custody log.
- 4+ Request For Solicitor: Not Completed, after case Section 4a was disposed of by way of no Further Actioned. Urn 01YE1267925!
- 5+ Awaits Appropriate Adult) (*Enter Details*): show none was called and stated as it still awaits details to be entered as (*Enter Details*).
- 6+ I accept responsibility for the detainee.

- **Clear And Formal Explanation Of Your Concern:**

- a) The police "**Abused This Fact**" because the line: "*I am aware of the physical condition of the detainee and their current healthcare needs: the review of this decision was not ...*"
- b) I believe that the way the custody record was written, including the misuse of the welfare statement, has been used to create a misleading impression of me. In my view, this was done to undermine my credibility and to protect certain officers from accountability for errors made in the earlier case. I am concerned that this misleading information could influence how I am treated in future proceedings and could be used to discredit me.
- c) I also believe that raising the issue of an insurance claim may have contributed to the way I have been treated. From my perspective, the actions taken against me appear designed to divert attention away from the mistakes made in the previous case and to prevent those responsible from facing consequences.
- d) I am worried that the way I have been portrayed in official records could affect how other agencies view me, including healthcare services. This creates a risk that decisions about me could be influenced by inaccurate or unfair information. I am also concerned that the absence of a strong support network could make it easier for these misunderstandings to continue without challenge.
- e) The damage to my reputation is significant. The way I have been described in these documents affects how others see me and harms my character. I believe this misrepresentation has caused real harm and has contributed to the difficulties I now face.

- **It Is Said That: If CPS is required, police MUST NOT charge Alone: "The Law I'm Referring To is: The Director's Guidance on Charging (DG6) issued under section 37A of PACE 1984**

- a) **Section 4.4 Says:**

- 1+ "Where A Case Is Required To Be Referred To The CPS... The Police Are **"Not Authorised"** To Take No Further Action On Public Interest Grounds."

- b) **Meaning:**

- 1+ If CPS must decide, police cannot **"Decide"** anything themselves.
- 2+ They cannot charge.
- 3+ They cannot play the NFA.
- 4+ They cannot swap offences.

- The police's custody record shows **"No CPS Decision Recorded,"** which is a **Breach, Under Section 37A Of PACE 1984!**

- **It Is Said That: CPS decisions "MUST" be recorded**

- a) **Section 4.26:**

- 1+ **"Prosecutors Will Record Their Charging Decision And Share It With The Police."**
- 2+ The police's custody record in my name contains **"No CPS Decision Entry At All."**
- 3+ These findings are all major procedural failures.

- **It Is Said That: Police Must Record The Rationale For Charging**

- a) **Section 4.8:**

- 1+ Police must record the rationale for charging, including:
 - 1+1 Evidential Basis
 - 2+1 Public Interest Basis
 - 3+1 Assessment Of Any Defence
 - 4+1 Assurance About Disclosure

- **My Record Contains None Of This!**

- **It Is Said: In English Law that if the Police Charge is Incorrect, that the CPS Must Review the Case And then Automatically Discontinue it!**
 - a) **Section 4.10–4.12:**
 - b) **If police charge when they shouldn't:**
 - 1+ CPS must review
 - 2+ If the Full Code Test is not met, the case must be "Discontinued!"
 - 3+ **"POLICE may FACE: "CIVIL LIABILITY!"**
 - c) **This Supports My Argument That:**
 - 1+ **The Prosecuting Team Are Liable For:** The New Offence as it was Not Lawfully Charged
 - 2+ **The Prosecuting Team Are Liable As:** CPS Never Authorised It
 - 3+ **The Prosecuting Team Are Liable Because:** The Record Was Manipulated Before Closure By Them As A Team!

- **Emergency Charging Is Extremely Limited and "Never Happened!"**

- a) **Section 4.35 States that:**
- b) **Emergency Charging Can Only Be Used If:**
 - 1+ Suspect Will Remain In Custody,
 - 2+ Cps Cannot Be Reached,
 - 3+ Offence Is Serious,
 - 4+ Rationale Is Recorded,
 - 5+ Cps Must Ratify Immediately but none of these occurred.
- c) **The Police Custody Log Record In My Name Shows:**
 - 1+ No Emergency Charging
 - 2+ No Rationale
 - 3+ No CPS Ratification
 - 4+ **"I Was To Be Released And Not Detained!"**

d) So emergency charging does not apply.

- **7. The Custody Officer Must Give Written Notice If CPS Says NFA**

- a) **Section 4.30:**
 - 1+ If CPS says there is insufficient evidence:
 - 2+ **"The Custody Officer Will Provide The Person With A Notice In Writing."**
 - 3+ **I Received No Such Notice:** even though CPS clearly did not authorise a charge for the original s4A and was placed back in a cell so I could not understand what was being illegally done to me.

- **What This Means For the Defenses Submissions**

- a) **The CPS Guidance Proves:**
 - 1+ Police cannot lawfully add a new offence without CPS
 - 2+ Police cannot charge an offence requiring CPS authority
 - 3+ CPS decisions MUST be recorded but mine is missing and Illegally swapped.
 - 4+ Police must record rationale but mine is missing and Illegally swapped.
 - 5+ Emergency charging does not apply as they were not executed.
 - 6+ The custody record does not meet PACE or CPS standards
 - 7+ The new offence was inserted without lawful authority

* **Exhibit 36:**

04/08/2025 03:39	PNC Transmission Log	Sgt 01 P201985 Smith	Keep the suspect in custody. Custody record 01YD/5612/25 submitted to PNC.
---------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------	---

 METROPOLITAN POLICE		OFFICIAL - SENSITIVE Custody Record Print Out	Date Printed: 07/08/2025
--	--	--	--------------------------

04/08/2025 03:39	PNC Transmission Log		CustodyAmendArrestRequest - NOMINAL UPDATE completed successfully CustodyInsertOffenceRequest - NOMINAL UPDATE completed successfully AD - NOMINAL UPDATE completed successfully DE - NOMINAL UPDATE completed successfully OC - NOMINAL UPDATE completed successfully PH - NOMINAL UPDATE completed successfully CustodyDeleteOffenceByRefRequest - NOMINAL UPDATE completed successfully CustodyCreateDisposalByRefRequest - NOMINAL UPDATE completed successfully CustodyAmendArrestRequest - NOMINAL UPDATE completed successfully
04/08/2025	Cel Visit	Staff 01	At 03:58 on 04/08/2025 Staff 01 C748822 Van

• **What These Entries Mean (Plain English)**

a) **"Custody Delete Offence by Ref Request – NOMINAL UPDATE completed successfully"**

b) **Meaning:**

- 1+ An offence that "**The Police**" had already recorded against my name was deleted.
- 2+ The deletion happened "**After The Original Offence Was Entered.**"
- 3+ **It Required A Manual Override By Police:** meaning a member of police staff deliberately removed it.
- 4+ **The Deletion Was Applied Directly To My PNC Nominal Record:** not just the local custody sheet.

c) **Why This Matters:** "**This Is Not Part Of Normal Custody Procedure.**" Offences are not deleted in routine processing.

5. This is exactly what happens when the original offence (Section 4A) is removed from the system after being entered.

• **Custody Create Disposal by Ref Request – NOMINAL UPDATE completed successfully**

a) **This Means:**

- 1+ **A new disposal (outcome) was created**
- 2+ **It was added After Custody**
- 3+ **It required a manual override**
- 4+ **It Was Applied To The Polices PNC Nominal Record Held In My Name By Them!"**

b) **A "Disposal" Is:**

- 1+ **Charge**
- 2+ **NFA**

- 3+ Caution
- 4+ Community resolution
- 5+ Any outcome

- c) **This Proves:** → **A new outcome was created for a different offence than the one I was arrested for. This Is Exactly What Happens When:**
 - 1+ The case offence of a Section 4A got discontinued.
 - 2+ A new offence was intentionally inserted by a Acting Police Officer.
 - 3+ **Meaning that a New Case Disposal Got Created Without Any Fair Law For The New Criminal Offence!**

- **Custody Amend Arrest Request – NOMINAL UPDATE completed successfully**

- a) This is the most important one.
- b) It means:
 - 1+ **The Police Arrest Record Itself Was Amended By Officers!**
 - 2+ The amendment was done **"After The Original Arrest."**
 - 3+ **It Required A Manual Override: by Officers in Charge!**
 - 4+ **It Was Applied To The PNC Nominal Record Held In My Name By Police!!**
- c) **This Is Only Used When: "The Original Arrest Offence Is Being Replaced With A Different Offence."** This is **"The Technical Footprint Of An Illegal Charge Swap By Corrupt Police Officers."**
- d) **What These Three Entries Prove Together:** When a moral person puts them together, as they show:
 - 1+ **The Original Offence Was Deleted:** ("Custody Delete Offence by Ref Request")
 - 2+ **A New Offence Disposal Was Created:** ("Custody Create Disposal by Ref Request")
 - 3+ **The Arrest Record Was Amended To Match The New Offence:** ("Custody Amend Arrest Request")
- e) These three actions **"Cannot And Must Not Be Allowed To Occur During Normal Police Station Custody Time!"**
- f) **They Only Occur When:**
 - 1+ **CPS Or Police Change The Offence After Custody**
 - 2+ The system must be manually updated to reflect the new charge Wrongly
 - 3+ The original offence is removed
 - 4+ A new offence is inserted Wrongly
 - 5+ The arrest record is rewritten to match the new charge Wrongly
- g) This is exactly what happened in **"This Police Case."**

- **Why This Is So Important Legally**

- a) **These entries prove:**
 - 1+ Section 4A was removed (deleted)
 - 2+ A new offence was created (threat to damage/destroy property)
 - 3+ The arrest record was amended to match the new offence
 - 4+ All of this happened AFTER custody, not during it
 - 5+ None of this appears in the lawful custody timeline
 - 6+ The charge swap was done administratively, not procedurally
- b) This is **"Not Allowed Under PACE Codes Of Practice."**
- c) **A Charge Cannot Be:**
 - 1+ Added
 - 2+ Swapped
 - 3+ Amended
 - 4+ Created

5+ Or Disposed Of

d) **Without A Lawful Custody Entry, Including:**

- 1+ Further Arrest
- 2+ Caution
- 3+ Grounds
- 4+ Authorisation
- 5+ Mg4
- 6+ **An Officer In the Case other than PC Quick that Anyone has met before!**
- 7+ Cps Approval

e) None of these exist in my custody record apart from "**PC Quick Name.**"

f) And the "**Backend System Logs Show The Swap Happened.**"

g) This is Another part of our proof as the Defence Team that Mr. Cordell is facing a miscarriage of justice due to these proceedings

• **Defence Sentence**

a) The custody system logs contain three administrative override entries — "**Custody Delete Offence By Ref Request**", "**Custody Create Disposal by Ref Request**", and "**Custody Amend Arrest Request**", each marked as "**NOMINAL UPDATE Completed Successfully**".

b) These entries prove that the original **Section 4A** offence was deleted, a new disposal was created, and the arrest record was amended after custody. None of these actions appear in the lawful custody timeline, meaning the new offence was inserted through a separate administrative process after the CPS had already discontinued the Section 4A allegation. "**This Is Our Direct Evidence Of An Unlawful Charge Swap.**"

• **CHRONOLOGICAL TIMELINE, STARTING AT 08:08 (03/08/2025)**

a) All entries are rewritten into clean English, with explanations of what they mean and what they prove.

• **03/08/2025 — 08:08: Booking-In Begins (This is the TRUE start of custody)**

- a) I arrive at Wood Green Police Station at **07:43**, Sgt 01 P240417 Ozcan.
- b) Booking-in is logged by police officer at **08:08**.
- c) **Arresting Officer**: PC 01 P243682 Obsiye but was no present as I went to the hospital after arrest.
- d) **Arrest Reason**: Harassment Act 997 was the alleged reason for arrest at the scene, but I was also wrongly booked into the police station for "**Public Order Act – Section 4A – Intentional Harassment/Alarm/Distress.**" instead of **Harassment Act 997.**
- e) **Circumstances Recorded**: neighbour alleged that I "**Threatened Her On More Than One Occasion**" and with the first occasion being at her front door and the second occasion being that I threatened to "**blow up her car,**" causing her harassment under the **1997** Act of law. This is proved in the disclosed Police Body Worn Footage, but the police officers at "**The Wood Green Police Station Wrongly Logged Another Criminal Offence In Its Place Under Section 4A**" and it's important to note that the Criminal Offence of "**Threats To Cause Criminal Damage,**" did not exist at this time.
 - 1+ Detention authorised at **07:58**.
 - 2+ **Main Offence Set To: Section 4A.**
 - 3+ No other offences existed at this time proved by the police Detention Custody Log as **Section 4A.** was the only Criminal Offence marked in the official Record.
 - 4+ No mention of "**Threat To Cause Damage/Destroy Property**".

f) **What This Proves:**

- 1+ This is the **Only Lawful Arrest.**
- 2+ I was never detained legally from the start Solely for Section 4A or Harassment Act 1997 under URN 01YE1267925 and that: --
- 3+ No Threats to Cause Criminal Damage Offence under URN 01YE1267925, existed at this point

- **03/08/2025 — 08:18 To 08:21**

- a) **Risk Assessment, Demeanor, Search**

- 1+ Risk assessment completed.
- 2+ Demeanor recorded as “aggressive”. If my Demeanor was aggressive then I would have had more police transport me from the hospital and my handcuffs would not have been taken of straight away. Nor would I have been willing to supply answers to the question or to be in compliance to protocols as I was.
- 3+ Search conducted by PC Obsiye (Contradiction: I only see her on the 02-08-25 at my home when she assaulted me and broke into my home unfairly. I was in the hospital with two different sets of male police officers as each set of two had to change work shifts due to the hours that passed.).
- 4+ No male officer listed for the search (as PC Obsiye is PC Obsiye is female, and I am a male and **Under PACE Code C and D**, a strip or intimate search must be conducted by an officer of the same sex, unless in exceptional circumstances and with explicit authorisation. There is no record of a male officer conducting or witnessing the search, nor any exceptional authorisation logged. **There Is Also No BWV Footage Disclosed**: no witness, and no audit trail confirming Pc Obsiye’s presence at the Wood Green Police Custody Suite on the morning of the **03/08/2025**. Nor do I have any recollection of her as in fact I did not see her!

“Observations questions were not asked at this time because not required to complete the risk assessment of type Child Related Questions were not asked at this time because not required to complete.”

- b) **What this proves:** The custody record is already showing “**Fabrication.**” and “**Case Profiling Intentional Manipulation**” but still only refers to **Section 4A.**

- **03/08/2025 — 08:19 to 08:26**

- a) **Rights, Legal Advice, Duty Solicitor**

- 1+ Rights given at 08:19.
- 2+ Offered To Inform Someone: It states that I declined when I never would have!
- 3+ Offered Legal Advice: I accepted.
- 4+ Duty solicitor requested at 08:26.

- b) **What This Proves:**

- 1+ I followed procedure.
- 2+ No new offences were introduced.
- 3+ Still **Section 4A** only.

- **03/08/2025 — 09:19**

- a) **Critical Entry: “Officer In Case was **NA VCT**”**

- b) **This Means:**

- 1+ **No Case Police Officer Was Assigned To My Case.**
- 2+ No one was managing the investigation.
- 3+ **No One Could Authorise A Charge.**
- 4+ **No One Could Lawfully Introduce A New Offence.**

- c) **What This Proves:**

- 1+ **This Is Impossible:** if a charge was being prepared.
- 2+ It proves “**No Charge Was Being Worked On at this time.**”

- **03/08/2025 — 22:38**

- a) **CPS Review Entry: The Custody Log States: “To Allow Sufficient Time For An ERO/CPS Prosecutor To Review The Case File And Evidence To Come To An Informed Decision**

On Suitable Case Disposal. This is the **“Formal CPS Charging Review.”**

b) **What This Proves:**

- 1+ CPS reviewed the **Section 4A** allegation.
- 2+ **CPS Did Not Authorise A Charge.**
- 3+ No **MG4** was completed.
- 4+ No **“Charge Authorised”** entry exists.
- 5+ **I WAS NOT CHARGED FOR SECTION 4A BEFORE RELEASE.**

c) This is the CPS definition of **“NFA (No Further Action).”**

• **04/08/2025 — 03:09**

- **THE FIRST APPEARANCE OF THE NEW OFFENCE:** The custody log suddenly shows: **“Offence: Threat To Damage/Destroy Property.”** on the **04/08/2025** and at the time of **03:09**.

a) **This Is:**

- 1+ **The first time** this offence appears.
- 2+ **Hours after** the CPS review.
- 3+ **Not linked** to any lawful arrest.
- 4+ **Not linked** to any caution.
- 5+ **Not linked** to any grounds.
- 6+ **Not linked** to any officer who arrested me.

b) **What This Proves:**

- 1+ This is the **charge swap**.
- 2+ The new offence was inserted **“After Custody,”** not during it.

• **04/08/2025 — 03:09 (same entry)**

a) **Three New Officers Appear Out of Nowhere!**

- 1+ **Charging Officer:** PC 01 P255681 White
- 2+ **Officer Accepting Charge:** Sgt 01 P201985 Smith
- 3+ **Officer in the Case:** PC 01 P257543 Quick

b) **These Officers:**

- 1+ Never appear in the Section 4A entries.
- 2+ We're not present at arrest.
- 3+ We're not present at booking-in.
- 4+ We're not present during CPS review.
- 5+ Only appear **“After The New Offence Is Inserted.”**

c) **What This Proves:**

- 1+ **This Is A Separate Police Process:** not part of **“Any Lawful Detention For The Section4a Criminal Offence!”**
- 2+ The new offence was created **“Administratively, Not Procedurally.”**

• **04/08/2025 — 03:33 (same entry)**

Listed As: Entry Name = Offence Disposal

• **04/08/2025 — 08:15 to 09:00**

a) **Detention Record Closed + PNC Upload**

- 1+ Detention record closed at **08:15**.
- 2+ System auto-generates: **“Arrest outcome: Charge”** for Section 4A.
- 3+ At **09:00**, custody record submitted to PNC.

b) **What This Proves:**

- 1+ This is **“Not A Real Charge.”**
- 2+ It is an **automatic system close-out**.

* **The Real Disposal Was Applied Later Via:**

- 1+ Custody Delete Offence by Ref Request
- 2+ Custody Create Disposal by Ref Request
- 3+ Custody Amend Arrest Request

c) **These Prove:**

- 1+ Section 4A was deleted.
- 2+ A new offence was created.
- 3+ The arrest record was amended.
- 4+ **All Of This Happened After Custody, Not During It."**

• **Backend System Entries (NOMINAL UPDATE)**

a) **These Entries Prove The Administrative Manipulation:**

- 1+ Custody Delete Offence by Ref Request
- 2+ Custody Create Disposal by Ref Request
- 3+ Custody Amend Arrest Request

b) All marked "**NOMINAL UPDATE Completed Successfully.**"

c) **What This Proves: These Commands Were All Used To:**

- 1+ Delete the original offence
- 2+ Insert a new offence
- 3+ Rewrite the arrest record
- 4+ Create a new disposal
- 5+ Push the altered record to PNC

d) This is the "**Technical Footprint Of The Polices Illegal Charge Swap.**"

• **SUMMARY**

- a) I was arrested and booked in for **Section 4A** at 08:08 on **03/08/2025**.
CPS reviewed the case at **22:38** and did not authorise a charge and (NFA) the case URN Number!
At 03:09 on **04/08/2025**, a completely new offence ("**Threat To Damage/Destroy Property**") appears for the first time, handled by three different officers who were not involved in **my** arrest.
- b) No lawful entries exist showing any further police arrests, police cautions, police grounds, police charge authorization's, nor a supporting case MG4 being completed for CPS Review!
- c) **The Polices Backend System Logs Show:** the original offence was deleted, a new disposal was created, and the arrest record was amended after custody.
- d) This is conclusive evidence of an unlawful charge swap.

* **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 5 of 5!

Kind Regards
Mr. Simon Paul Cordell

(Signed)



(On behalf of Mr. Simon Paul CORDELL)

(Dated Signed) 21/01/2026

Signature witnessed by:

