Speaker 2 (Mr Cordell):
Hello.
How are you doing?

Speaker 1 (Court Staff):
May I ask who I'm speaking to please?

Speaker 2 (Mr Cordell):
I'm Mr Simon Paul Cordell.
I was just speaking to a lady a little while ago regarding issues I was having with my case.
I'm still trying to get them resolved.
We never reached the final points that need to be addressed.

Speaker 1 (Court Staff):
Do you have your case number please?

Speaker 2 (Mr Cordell):
The case number is ED049.
Hold on a second, I've got so many folders.
The new case number is E-0-0-E-D-0-4-9.
Can I say something here?
There's a woman making allegations against me in the file called Raviee Mathigalen.
She's been attacking me for two years.
There are 500 emails to councils and MPs before she ever made a complaint about me.
Her complaint says she believes I'm a drug addict.
That was used to cover up what had been done to me and Shannon in our home.
The claim is based on the belief that I stabbed a set of tyres in 2016.
Then the new claim is that they believe I told Lemmy that I was going to kill him.
In fact, I've got the original recording.
I told Lemmy what really happened.
I'll play it to you.
What happened was I phoned Lemmy and told him:
"This is out of order. Can you deal with the subject access request?"
All the MPs are in the first 500 emails.
Joanne Ryan and everyone else are attached to those emails.
I phoned Lemmy.
I'd done some research on him because I had his name.
I found a company address with a woman called Tracy Willis.
I wound him up a bit and asked him if Tracy Willis was related to him.
I've got the recording.
He said:
"I'm going to kill your mum. I'm going to kill your family. I'm going to kill all of you."
I've got that recording.
After I put the phone down, he phoned the police and claimed that I threatened him.
The police arrested me on 1 January.
They never charged me.

Six months passed.
The time limit expired.
There was not enough evidence for a criminal conviction.
At the same time he went to court and submitted what I believe is his third emergency application.
That is the application based on these allegations.
I've got the recording.
I've been involved in the lower court since 2016.
I've never once been allowed to show my evidence.
I've never got beyond the preliminary hearings.
I've never been allowed to explain my version of events.
But I've been kept under conditions because the court has agreed to the applications since 2016.
Now the criminal case has been dropped.
The threats allegation was thrown out.
But Lemmy is still using the emergency application.
I've still never had a trial or a jury hear my case.
They're saying because I was supposedly served on 1 January that I must have known about the application.
They say that because I attended court on the 5th, I must have been aware of it.
But I'm saying I wasn't served.
To be served properly, I should have been personally served with an affidavit of service.
I was in a police cell.
While I was in the police cell, somebody put paperwork through my letterbox.
My mother went to my flat while I was in custody.
She picked up the affidavit of service and left with it.
I've got that on video.
My camera points directly at the letterbox.
You can see my mother enter the property, pick up the paperwork, read it with my uncle and then leave with it.
I was never served.
I've got video evidence.
I never threatened Lemmy.
Lemmy threatened me and my mother.
I've also noticed that some of the court papers have seals on them.
But by law every seal should have a signature beneath it or they're not valid.
I've got a civil litigation book here from 2016 to 2017 showing how forms are supposed to be sealed and signed.
I spoke to a solicitor about it.
He said if there is no valid seal and signature then it should be challenged.
Not one signature exists on any of the four applications.
Not one judge has signed the paperwork.
The paperwork just contains printed names.
I believe one of them is Alison Ruth Diaz.
I've got the names and photographs.
I believe Diaz was one of the judges involved.
Hello?

Speaker 1 (Court Staff):
Yes, I'm listening to you.

Speaker 2 (Mr Cordell):
Diaz and the other judges.
I've got recordings and information concerning all of them.
I want to come to court.
I want to show that the threats allegation is false.
I want to show that Lemmy falsified the first possession application and that the second application was also false.
I've got recordings from the very first conversation I had with Lemmy through to the end.
I explained to Lemmy how everything started.
He didn't even understand emergency applications.
I was explaining to him that his paperwork was outside the limitation periods.
He copied and pasted all of his paperwork into the computer systems.
I then made Freedom of Information requests to the council and obtained records from their systems.
It shows every Call For Service entry.
You can see when the Mathigalen family made reports and you can see where Lemmy copied and pasted information.
He copied complaints about neighbours and inserted them.
I explained to him that his organisation was holding me in my home unlawfully because the original ASBO contained no signatures.
The police should have called an emergency meeting to correct it.
Instead another emergency meeting was used to cover everything up and avoid paying compensation.
I'm concerned.
I've spoken to the doctors.
I've explained everything.
The doctors said they may come out tomorrow.
They're going to review my website, reports and video evidence.
The police have already watched the video showing I wasn't served.
The police agreed the injunction is not valid against me.
The police said it isn't fair that a judge is sending me for an assessment when this evidence exists.

Speaker 1 (Court Staff):
I appreciate what you're saying.
But we're not legal advisers.
You need to put what you have to say in writing.

Speaker 2 (Mr Cordell):
I can't read and write properly.
I'm not able to get a solicitor at the moment because nobody will tell me whether the injunction has actually been activated.
I've written to the court.

I've explained the injunction was never served.
I've got evidence.
I've asked the court to bring the matter back and let me speak.
I've not been allowed to speak since 2016.
I've won every case that has actually been heard.
The people who recently made these allegations put their own names into the paperwork.
There is something very important.
I explained this to the police.
It concerns terrorism.
One woman included a doctor's note.
Most people use their own address or their mother's address.
She used an address at 14 Netley Drive.
I checked the address.
It led me to other names and records.
I've found what I believe are multiple names and properties connected to her.
I've been looking into all of this myself.

Speaker 1 (Court Staff):
Can you confirm your address for me please?

Speaker 2 (Mr Cordell):
109 Burncroft Avenue.
B-U-R-N-C-R-O-F-T.
Burncroft Avenue.
The court order says because I attended court on the 5th they believe I was served on the 1st.
I've got a recording showing I was in the police station.
I've got a recording showing paperwork being pushed through my letterbox.
I've got a recording showing my mother collecting it.
So how could I have been served properly if the paperwork never came to me?
My mother told me the court wanted me there on the 5th.
That's why I attended.
Not because I knew what was in the application.
Can I say something?
Why should I have to see doctors when I've got all this evidence?
You're allowing them to run into court and make emergency applications.
But you're not allowing me to come and present my evidence.
Can I come to court today?
Can I show my evidence?
Can we deal with what I've been saying?

Speaker 1 (Court Staff):
We can't do that because you don't have an appointment.

Speaker 2 (Mr Cordell):
Can I make an appointment then please?
I'm not waiting until the 26th.

I'm dealing with an application that I believe is fraudulent.
People are still upstairs banging and trying to activate this injunction.
They're calling the police.
The police are coming to my house and arresting me.
While I'm speaking to you, police are attending my address.
Are you asking if I'm recording you?

Speaker 1 (Court Staff):
Are you recording me right now?

Speaker 2 (Mr Cordell):
Yes, that's correct.
Can I explain something to you?
I'm allowed to record the conversation...
[Transcript ends]