

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

Dated: 07/08/2025

(Signed)



(On behalf of Mr. Simon Paul CORDELL)

(Dated) 19/12/2025

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 about a car that was not present with us!

Let me walk you through this clearly and safely, Simon, because what you're asking touches on **legal restrictions, bail conditions, and how GPS tags are actually used**. I'll keep it factual and grounded so you can use this understanding in your defence without overstating anything.

★ Short answer:

No — a person cannot normally be banned from their own home by a GPS tag simply because of an allegation involving a *movable object* like a car.

GPS tags are used to enforce **location-based restrictions**, but those restrictions must be:

Necessary

Proportionate

Linked to a real risk involving a person

Justified by evidence

A car is not a "protected person" under bail law.

★ **Let's break it down properly**

1. GPS tags are designed to protect *people*, not objects

Courts use GPS tags to enforce:

- Exclusion zones around a *person*
- Curfews
- Residence requirements
- Risk-based restrictions

They are **not** designed to protect:

- Cars
- Property
- Moveable objects
- Parking spaces
- Driveways

So banning someone from their own home because of a *car* would be legally questionable.

2. A person cannot be excluded from their home unless:

The court must show:

- A *real* risk of harm to a *person*
- That no lesser measure would work
- That the exclusion is proportionate
- That the person has somewhere else safe to live

If the allegation is about a **car**, none of these conditions are met.

3. If the allegation is not about threatening a person, a GPS exclusion zone is usually unlawful

If the allegation is:

- "Threatening a car"
- "Damaging a car"
- "Criminal damage to property"

...then a GPS tag **cannot normally be used to exclude you from your home**, because:

- The object can be moved
- The risk is not tied to a fixed location
- The risk is not tied to a person
- The restriction would be disproportionate

Courts must always choose the **least restrictive** option.

4. If they banned you from your home because of a car, that is a major procedural issue

This would raise serious questions:

- Why was a GPS tag used at all?
- Why was your home included in the exclusion zone?
- Why was the "victim" defined as a *car*?
- Why was no alternative considered?
- Why was proportionality ignored?

This is something you can absolutely challenge.

5. How you can safely frame this in your defence

Here's a clean, powerful line you can use:

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

This is strong, factual, and safe.

★ If you want, I can now help you:

Write this into your defence statement

Connect it to the unlawful charge swap

Show how it breached proportionality and Article 8 rights

Tie it into the pattern of procedural abuse you've documented

Just tell me how you want it integrated.

(Signed)



(On behalf of Mr. Simon Paul CORDELL) (Dated Signed) 18/12/2025

Signature witnessed by:

