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 8 Of 8 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) 18/12/2025**

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!

a) Chapter – What Happened at Court

a) I was forced to attend court despite the months of correspondence I had sent to the CPS, the magistrates, and others. I knew they had received my emails, yet they avoided acknowledging them, denying receipt time after time. This denial extended even to the separate emails sent by McLartys solicitors, who were acting independently of me. Their timeline of correspondence is clear:

1+ **15 October 2025, 10:59:** Email sent from tuckers@tuckerssolicitors.com.
2+ **15 October 2025, 11:54:** Email from Neil Allan at Tuckers confirming withdrawal.
3+ **16 October 2025, 14:29:** Email to Neil Allan.
4+ **16 October 2025, 14:44:** Email from Neil Allan confirming transfer forms to McLartys.
5+ **16 October 2025, 16:34:** Email to northlondonmc@justice.gov.uk.
6+ **27 October 2025, 15:46:** Email to northlondonmc@justice.gov.uk.
7+ **31 October 2025, 14:33:** Email to northlondonmc@justice.gov.uk and

london.magistrates@cps.gov.uk.

8+ **20 November 2025, 14:06:** Email to northlondonmc@justice.gov.uk.

9+ **1 December 2025, 10:20:** Email to northlondonmc@justice.gov.uk and contactcrime@justice.gov.uk.

10+ **1 December 2025, 10:24:** Email sent.

11+ **10 December 2025, 15:27:** Email to northlondonmc@justice.gov.uk, london.magistrates@cps.gov.uk, and contactcrime@justice.gov.uk.

12+ **15 December 2025, 09:22:** Email from CPS CJSM: "CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925 Initial Details Pros Case."

13+ **15 December 2025, 10:17:** Email to CPS and court CJSM addresses.

14+ **15 December 2025, 10:29:** Email addressed "Dear Simon."

a) Despite this chain, the only people who contacted me before trial were McLartys solicitors and Legal Aid. McLartys solicitors explained that legal aid had not been addressed and that their emails had not been acted upon and also noted that my own concerns about Case 1 (**02/08/25**) had not been addressed by CPS or the court. They told me that due to this that the trial date would still have to be adhered to as attended in person by myself and promised to send proof of my efforts to secure their assistance. They confirmed that they had complied with my requests but had failed due to non-compliance from Tuckers and other legal technical difficulties and not at their own fault, I knew that they was right!

b) **On 12 December 2025:** I contacted CPS directly and asked if they had received my correspondence. They said no. While still on the phone, we worked through why they had not received the files. We found that the emails I used were valid, but no one admitted to being able to find them, even though my exhibits proved they had been sent. I was given another email address to use and told to resend and call back the next day. That was **Saturday 13 December**, when no one picked up. On Sunday, they were closed. I had to wait until Monday, the day before trial.

c) **On 15 December 2025:** CPS finally picked up the telephone and accepted receipt of my disclosed files. I was on the phone from 9:15 a.m. until 9:39 a.m. and I recorded the conversation. At 09:22 a.m., while I was still on the call, McLartys received an email from CPS asking them to accept receipt of "**Initial Details Pros Case 15/12/2025"** and serve it to me for trial the next day. McLartys refused, stating legal aid was not in place and Section 9 was unserved. I examined the contents of the Section 9 files titled "**Initial Details Pros Case 15/12/2025**" and immediately saw that CPS had proven my point: the files were being illegally modified, with other documents sneaked into the Case Ratio folder after service, to make them look legally submitted after they have been served as disclosed and sealed materials that are now differently modified. The CPS now marked the file in the bundle with a "**V5,**" but I had not been served this. The last version I had seen was "**V3,**" dated **22 September 2025**, which already contained Rebecca "**O'Hare's Backdated Third Statement**." No "**V4**" had ever been seen. The Case Ratio folder remained "**V3**," and no "**V1 or V2**," ever existed proving unlawful manipulation and "**V3**," has "Rebecca O ' **Hares Third Backdated Statement"** in it while the first service of disclosure never, when it must have!

d) **On 13 December 2025:** I attended court with my two witnesses, and another aunt. We arrived at 9 a.m. though the trial was listed for 2 pm to our surprise. We waited on the second floor outside the courtroom three to speak to the clerk, hoping the case had been reviewed in light of my correspondence and disclosure. I soon afterwards, went downstairs with Sheead and spoke at reception. I recognised staff faces from PNC records, knowing they were the same staff my mother had spoken to about errors. I asked one woman two questions. "**First**," could she confirm the trial time and whether it could be brought forward or whether a decision had already been made to acquit or postpone. "**She Said No."** **Second**, I asked her to check if my emails had been received and reviewed by the courthouse staff. I showed her my printed folder by placing it on the counter table containing all

my defence files and emails. I supplied her with my email to cross reference with. I could see her through the glass panel, and we could still both hear each other as she went to her computer table and started typing away. She checked her computer and admitted they had them all. I reminded her that I had requested a hearing for Case 1, which had been scheduled and "**At The Request Of The Defendant**," but the court had failed to let me speak about Case 1, instead diverting to another matter. when the email contents was of a serious nature, about case 1. The lady never needed to see the emails in my defence folder as she walking back over to me as she admitted they had my emails and agreed to place them before the judge before the trial later that evening at my own request to her. "**I asked her**: why have I been brought to this trial date then and not to a hearing as requested beforehand by myself about case 1. She was lost for words. I then left the court with my witnesses, returning later that day. We went back to our ends / places of residence and met up an hour later and got back to the courthouse.

e) **Back At The Court, At 2Pm**: we waited outside and were called into Courtroom 3 on the second floor. I walked in with my attendees and stood at the oath stand, while the others went into the public gallery.

f) A woman was present for CPS, the court clerk was there, an usher, and one judge who is an older IC1 male. His Honor began abruptly, telling the usher to put me into the holding dock. He then announced to the prosecution team that the trial was being adjourned and asked them a question, by asking "and it is because he can't talk to the victim is that correct, I listened as I placed into the courts holding dock and faced the judge after putting my laptop bag down and defence folder, I felt I felt belittled by the Judge as my own defence team: as a litigant in person representing myself, I should have been allowed to sit at the defence bench, not locked in the dock behind glass. I was exercising my right of legal audience, but the judge refused to acknowledge it. No victim was present, and the judge knew the trial was going to be adjourned. The judge was aware of the adjournment and my legal rights to a fair trial including my rights to equal rights but never acknowledge them.

g) It is also clear that the illegally swapped charge alleges an offence for "**Threats To Cause Damage To A Car,**" to have intentionally wanted to be carried out and is not for "**Threats To Harm To Any Person."** And due to this No intent can be proved because there was no intent: I was recovering from a hospital operation only days earlier, disabled to the point I could barely move more than a few feet at a time. As a consequence, it was physically impossible for me to commit the alleged offence.

h) The judge asked whether I had a solicitor. I answered yes, that is correct by saying that I did not. He said he was adjourning the case and instructed the clerk to set a new trial date, then told me he was ordering a transfer of legal aid. When I tried to speak, he told me to be quiet. I tried again, and he warned that if I continued, he would have security remove me from the courtroom. He turned to the CPS prosecutor and asked if she was ready to proceed; she replied yes. At that point, everyone knew my Legal Rights were being undermined.

i) My three attendees understood what I had explained to them about the case, but they had not read all my files, so they were not fully up to date with the ongoing issues. The CPS acted as if they shared that limited understanding while actually knowing more: they had already said they were "**Ready**" even though they knew I had served disclosure requests and made sure that they were in receipt of them and they as the CPS had served materials to McLartys, who were not yet acting for me. That meant I would not be in lawful receipt of those materials. I had already provided CPS with multiple undeniable grounds for dismissal in my official correspondence as well and recorded the conversations that are legally undeniable.

j) The judge had been given my files earlier that morning as I confirmed with reception that my emails were found and would be placed before him but yet it became obvious I was being suppressed. I

raised my hand and asked to speak. He said no. I spoke anyway: I said I would comply with any order of his, but this Court Process is unfair.

k) My friend in the public gallery leaned forward and told me to shush. The judge then ordered all three of my attendees out of the courtroom and told the clerk to call security. They were not allowed to contest and left immediately.

l) I said to the judge, clearly, this is unfair, those are my two witnesses and my appropriate adult. He did not respond. I then asked His Honor for five minutes to speak directly, explaining the importance to these proceedings. He said OK I will let you speak in a moment for 5 minutes. He set the new trial date, and I explained the illegal charge swap, the reused URN, and that any attempt to "**Re-Use**" it to apply for legal aid would force my defence to commit fraud and that is now confirmed by the disclosed custody and detention logs.
I told him **Section 4A Was NFA'd** and I was never re-arrested. I tried to hand him the Legal Aid emails confirming none in my name for **2025** and the **Two Fraudulent Representation Orders From Tuckers** that blocked my legal Aid, but he refused to accept them.
I asked for my bail conditions to be changed because they infringed my human rights as they were wrongly imposed when CPS had no case files to review or risk-assess at the first and second hearings. I added: the alleged offence concerns a movable object (**A Car**), not a person, so why am I barred from my home rather than the car? No one buys a car to keep it parked most of the time and now for myself to have my home residence restricted is abuse of process.

m) He refused to accept any files, saying this was a trial, and ordered me to re-use the URN and apply with McLartys for legal aid. I said he was attempting to waive my defence and my legal rights and instructing the defence to commit a crime in the process. The judge stood and left the courtroom.

n) The usher released me from the dock. I approached the CPS prosecutor to discuss the files I had disclosed; she dismissed me and said not to speak to her. I then spoke to the court clerk, offered him the Legal Aid letter confirming no **2025** applications in my name and the two fraudulent RO orders. He reviewed them and claimed they were "**Self-Representation Orders**" allowed because of the LAA hack and then explained all about the hack. I listened. As he said they were perfectly lawful. I replied they had never been sent to the Legal Aid Agency and were therefore just ink on paper without legal weight. He shifted the topic and said Police and CPS can legally swap charges. I knew I was being misled.

o) I said to him, "**I Respect Your Opinion Because Of Your Experience And The Way You Present Yourself.**" He replied that he was not legally trained. I answered, "**That may be so, but I would still rather have someone with your practical knowledge on my side than most.**" I then said I will listen to you first If you're willing, to allow me to share my legal understanding with you as well, afterwards." He agreed.
He then stated that charge-swapping is a lawful process. At that point I began to explain myself clearly. I said, "I will do further homework on the "**RO1 and RO2**," but as it stands they were never sent to the Legal Aid Agency. That makes them fraudulent or, at best, inadmissible disclosures in these proceedings. As for the charge swap, I have case precedent that proves it is unlawful. I am not saying you are wrong in every circumstance as if I had given a committed interview admitting a related offence, and the "**URN"** had not been marked 'no further action,' then perhaps it might be arguable. But that is not what happened here in this cases situation, a further arrest would have been required, and that never occurred."
He responded that he could not comment further but advised me to put everything into a formal defence statement. At that point I turned to the CPS prosecutor, said goodbye politely, and added "**God Bless**." I reminded them firmly that I am an innocent man in these proceedings. Then I left the

courtroom with my family and friends. Later, at home, I spoke with Nova and asked her questions. After reviewing everything, I became certain: I am being set up, and now I can prove it. Due to the following:

- **Proof Of What We Worked Out Once Back At Home From The Courthouse About What Happened While In Court!**
  a) **Case 1**
     1+ everyonelogintо.me - /01. 02-08-2025-Another-Case/

  b) **Case 2**
     1+ <Dir> 09.1. Case2-26-08-25-Assult-GPS-Wrongfull-Arrest

01. Section: What I Discovered After Returning Home From Court

a) When I returned home after the hearing, I reviewed the documents again in light of what the court clerk had told me. His admission that the **"RO1 and RO2**" were "**Self-Representation Orders**" and were never sent to the Legal Aid Agency allowed me to re-examine the paperwork with clarity. Once I compared his statement with the exhibits and the Legal Aid Agency's confirmation, the contradictions became undeniable.

02. Reference to My Undeniable Defence Work

a) Since finding my **Undeniable** findings I have prepared a detailed Legal Aid Defence Statement for "**Case 2 (26/08/25)**, which already explains what latter was released once I was back at home as published here:

* **Legal Aid Defence Statement (Case 2):**
   A. https://everyonelogintо.me/01.%2002-08-2025-Another-Case/09.1.%20Case2-26-08-25-Assult-GPS-Wrongfull-Arrest/04.%20Simons%20Defence%20Statements/03.%20Defence%20Statement%20Legal%20Aid.pdf

b) That document already explains the systemic failures, the LAA hack, the missing applications, and the impossibility of any Representation Orders being issued in **2025**.

c) However, after returning home from court on this case, and cross-checking the clerk's admission with the exhibits, I was able to "**Prove The Situation Even More Clearly And Conclusively**."

03. Legal Aid Defence Statement case 2 26/08/25 already explains

a) But The following points set out what I was able to prove once I got home and cross-checked the evidence.

04. The RO1 and RO2 Were Never Issued by the Legal Aid Agency

a) Using the exhibits:
   1+ 78. Received-01-12-25.pdf
   2+ 78. Received-Cordell RO1.pdf
   3+ 78. Received-Cordell RO2.pdf
   4+ 83. Received-Monday 8 December 2025 at 1016.pdf

b) I confirmed the following:
   1+ **Both RO1 and RO2 are wrongly addressed as if issued by the Legal Aid**

Agency.

2+ They carry the LAA header and formatting, but the LAA later confirmed that **no application was ever made in 2025**.

3+ **Both documents are dated 04/08/2025.**

4+ This is the day *after* I signed the CRM14/CRM15 forms (**03/08/25**).

5+ **Both documents are labelled as "Representation Orders," not CRM14/CRM15 self-referral forms.**

c) This is critical because:

1+ **Solicitors cannot create or print Representation Orders.** Only the **Legal Aid Agency** can issue an **RO1** after processing **the CRM14/CRM15**

2+ The clerk's admission that these were "self-representation orders" is impossible, because **self-referral forms are CRM14/CRM15**, not RO1/RO2.

d) This means the "**RO1 and RO2**" in the "**CPS**" bundle "**Cannot Be Genuine.**"

05. Why Same-Day Representation Orders Were Impossible

a) Once home, I compared the dates with the known timeline of the **LAA Hack**:

1+ **In August 2025**: the LAA secure portal was offline.

2+ Applications had to be "**Posted Or Held"** until the portal reopened on **01/12/2025**.

3+ Even if posted immediately, the LAA would require "**Several Days"** to receive, log, and process the application.

b) **Therefore**: **An RO dated 04/08/2025 could not have been lawfully produced by the LAA.**

c) This alone proves the "**RO1/RO2**" in the bundle are not authentic.

06. What This Means for the Case

a) After reviewing the evidence at home, I realised the only possible explanations:

1+ **The RO1 Was Fabricated Or Inserted Later Into Disclosure:** to make it appear that legal aid had been granted when it had not.

2+ **Or Tuckers Never Submitted My CRM14/CRM15 At All:** leaving the LAA with no record, while someone later added a "**Dummy**" RO1 to cover the failure.

b) Either scenario is "**Procedural Fraud,**" because:

1+ Solicitors cannot self-issue Representation Orders.

2+ The LAA did not generate any RO in **2025**.

3+ The documents in the CPS bundle contradict the LAA's official confirmation.

07. How This Must Be Framed in Court

a) **I State That:**

1+ I signed the "**CRM14/CRM15 On 03/08/2025.**"

2+ The Legal Aid Agency confirms "**No Application Was Made In 2025.**"

3+ Yet the CPS bundle contains a Representation Order dated **04/08/2025**.

4+ Solicitors cannot self-issue Representation Orders, and the LAA could not have processed a postal application overnight during the portal outage.

5+ This contradiction proves:

A. Fabrication Of Legal Aid Documents, Or

B. Non-Submission Of My Application,

C. And That I Was Denied Lawful Representation Throughout The Proceedings.

08. Key Points Established Once I Reviewed the Evidence at Home

a) Representation Orders: Only the LAA can issue them.

Solicitors cannot create them. The RO1 dated **04/08/2025** is fraudulent.

b) Case Ratio Manipulation: Rebecca O'Hare's "**Third Statement**" (dated **07/08/25**) was not in the original disclosure (**01/09/2025**).
It only appeared later in the second disclosure (**10/10/2025**).
This proves back-dating and insertion.

c) Equality of Arms: As a litigant in person, I was denied equal treatment, silenced, and forced into the dock.

d) Fraud and Suppression: CPS and court staff suppressed correspondence, manipulated disclosure, and fabricated legal aid records.

09. 09A. Additional Findings: URN Misuse, Unlawful Charge Swap, and Disclosure Manipulation

a) Once back at home, I also documented the timeline of events surrounding the "**URN Being Reused**," the "**Unlawful Charge Swap**," and the "**Manipulation Of The Case Ratio Folder**." These issues are separate from the Legal Aid failures but directly connected to the procedural fraud affecting this case.

1+ **Timeline of Events Proving URN Misuse and Charge Swap: --**

A. **02/08/25:** Incident occurs.
B. **03/08/25:** I am in hospital until later that day, then taken to Wood Green Police Station.
C. **03/08/25 (6–8pm):** Tuckers attend for the "**Section 4A interview**." I sign the CRM14/CRM15.
D. **04/08/25 (4am):** Police drop the Section 4A case (NFA).
E. **Immediately After:** Instead of releasing me, the **same URN** is reused, and the charge is swapped to "**Threats To Cause Criminal Damage**" without a lawful re-arrest, interview, or new charge sheet.

- This proves the URN was unlawfully reused to create a new case without due process.

2+ **First Disclosure (01/09/25)**

A. The first disclosure contained:
a) "01. Case_Summary_pdf.pdf"
b) Witness statements
c) **No IDPC File**
d) **No Third Statement From Rebecca O'Hare**

- This shows that as of 01/09/25, the "third statement" did not exist.

3+ **Second Disclosure (10/10/25)**

A. The second disclosure contained:
a) "01. CORDELL Simon 01YE1267925 Initial Details Pros Case 22-09-2025.pdf"
b) This file now included the "**Third Statement."**

- Metadata shows the Case Ratio folder was "**Created On 10/10/25**," not on "**03/08/2025"** when the charge was swapped.
- The restructuring and redactions prove the file was "**Rebuilt**," not updated.

4+ **Why This Is Procedurally Impossible**

A. Under CPIA 1996 and Criminal Procedure Rules:
a) The IDPC must be created "**At The Point Of Charge**."

b) That means **03/08/25**, not 10/10/25.
c) All witness statements existing at the time must be included.

B. Because the Case Ratio folder was only created on **10/10/2025**:

1+ The "**Third Statement**" was not contemporaneous.
2+ It Was Added Later And Backdated.

5+ **Defence Value**

A. **Absence = Proof**: The missing IDPC file in the first disclosure proves the third statement did not exist at the time of charge.
B. **Metadata = Proof**: The Case Ratio folder creation date (**10/10/25**) proves the IDPC was rebuilt later.
C. **Procedural Breach: --**
- CPIA 1996
- Fraud Act 2006 s.2
- PACE s.78

6+ **Exclusion Argument**

a) The third statement must be excluded as unlawfully created and backdated.


7+ **Chronology Entry**

- **Date:** 01 September 2025
- **Event:** First disclosure served.
- **What Happened:** No IDPC file existed. No third statement existed.
- **Procedural Breach:** IDPC must be created at charge (03/08/25).
- **Defence Value:** Proves the third statement was fabricated after the fact.

- **P.S.**

a) Tuckers Solicitor Firms Staff till date of this defence statement has refused to reply to any correspondence.

Kind Regards
Mr. Simon Paul Cordell.

(Signed) 

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

Signature witnessed by: