

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 Thirteenth 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 3 of 3 Page(s) Are Signed by Me**) is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false, or do not believe to be true.

(Signed)



(On behalf of Mr. Simon Paul CORDELL)

(Dated) 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!

- **Defence Submission: GPS Tag Exclusion From Residence (Revised and Strengthened Version)**

- **For The Attention Of The Court And Legal Representatives!**

- a) This submission sets out the factual and legal basis on which I challenge the GPS-tag exclusion zone that prevented me from entering my own home. The restriction was imposed on the basis of an allegation involving a *movable object* — specifically, a car — rather than any risk to a person.
- b) The purpose of this document is to clarify the relevant facts, demonstrate the legal errors in the decision-making process, and show why the condition was neither justified nor lawful.

- **Short Position (Summary)**

a) A person cannot lawfully be excluded from their own home by a GPS tag where the allegation concerns **"A Movable Object Such As A Car."**

b) **Electronic Monitoring Conditions Must Always Be:**

- 1+ Necessary
- 2+ Proportionate
- 3+ Supported By Evidence
- 4+ Linked To A Genuine Risk Involving A Person

c) A car is **"Not"** a protected person under bail legislation and cannot justify a home-exclusion zone.

- **Detailed Defence Analysis**

01. **GPS Tags Are Designed To Protect People And Not Objects: --**

- a) Electronic monitoring is intended to manage risks involving "**Individuals.**" not property. GPS tags are used to enforce:
 - 1+ Exclusion Zones Around A Person
 - 2+ Curfews
 - 3+ Residence Requirements
 - 4+ Risk-Based Restrictions Involving Human Safety
- b) **They Are Not Designed To Protect:**
 - 1+ Cars
 - 2+ Moveable Property
 - 3+ Driveways
 - 4+ Parking Spaces
 - 5+ Any Object That Can Be Relocated
- c) Excluding me from my own home because of a car is inconsistent with the statutory purpose of electronic monitoring and is legally unsound.

02. **A Person Cannot Be Excluded From Their Home Unless Strict Legal Tests Are Met: --**

- a) To justify excluding someone from their residence, the court must demonstrate:
 - 1+ **A "Real And Identifiable Risk Of Harm To A Person!"**
 - 2+ That "No Lesser Measure" could manage that risk
 - 3+ That the exclusion is "Proportionate!"
 - 4+ That the individual has **safe and suitable alternative accommodation**
- b) **Where The Allegation Concerns A Car:** none of these statutory requirements are satisfied.

03. **If The Allegation Does Not Involve A Threat To A Person, A GPS Exclusion Zone Is Generally Unlawful: --**

- a) **Where The Allegation Relates To:**
 - 1+ "Threatening A Car"
 - 2+ "Damaging A Car"
 - 3+ "Criminal Damage To Property"
- b) ...a GPS exclusion zone preventing me from entering my own home is almost always **"Disproportionate And Unjustified,"** because:
 - 1+ The Object Can Be Moved
 - 2+ The Alleged Risk Is Not Tied To A Fixed Location
 - 3+ The Alleged Risk Is Not Tied To A Person
 - 4+ The Restriction Is Far More Severe Than Necessary
- c) Courts are legally required to impose the **"Least Restrictive Conditions Available."**

04. **Excluding Me From My Home Because Of A Car Raises Major Procedural Concerns: --**

- a) Such a decision raises serious questions about the legality and reasoning behind the bail conditions:
 - 1+ Why was a GPS tag imposed at all?
 - 2+ Why was my home included in the exclusion zone?
 - 3+ Why was a *car* treated as if it were a *protected person*?
 - 4+ Why were less restrictive alternatives not considered?
 - 5+ Why was proportionality ignored?
- b) These are significant procedural defects that undermine the validity of the condition.

• **Defence Summary: --**

- a) The allegation concerns a movable object, not a person. GPS tags and exclusion zones exist to protect individuals, not property. Excluding me from my own home on the basis of a car is disproportionate, unnecessary, and inconsistent with the statutory purpose of electronic monitoring. The restriction was neither justified nor lawful.

Kind Regards
Mr. Simon Paul Cordell

(Signed)



(On behalf of Mr. Simon Paul CORDELL) (Dated Signed) 21/01/2026

Signature witnessed by:

