Speaker 2 (Mr Cordell):
Thank you for calling and welcome to...
No, 6501 brings you back to that number as well.
That's no good.
What you're looking for is 0208 846 6502.
0001 are the same.
Pick up the phone, you bloody malicious process.
I'm bored of that, let's try this one.
0208 846 6510 is the number they advised.
The nearer one, I think.
Hello, how are you doing?
Is it possible to speak to Paul from administration please?

Speaker 1 (Court Officer):
Paul is not in today.
He's on annual leave.

Speaker 2 (Mr Cordell):
He's on annual leave, I can appreciate that.
I have a few concerns I'd like to raise with the court if that's possible.
Are you the person who could help me do this?

Speaker 1 (Court Officer):
It depends.
Is it to do with a case?

Speaker 2 (Mr Cordell):
It's to do with the court's running business objectives and what the court has signed to and allowed to happen.
The court has taken money and receipts for what's happening and what is being done to my life.
Can I take your name for a start please?

Speaker 1 (Court Officer):
Mr Hurchin.

Speaker 2 (Mr Cordell):
Mr Hurchin.
How are you doing, Mr Hurchin?
My name is Mr Cordell, Simon Paul Cordell.
I've been stuck in what I believe is a malicious process caused by Enfield Council and Edmonton Lower Court.
I understand malicious process is a criminal offence and malicious prosecution is also a criminal offence.
What the courts have allowed to happen in Edmonton County Court was, in short:
Enfield Council made an ASBO against me.
They did it under the Raves Bill, which is a criminal offence, and put an eight-year curfew on me.

The maximum sentence if someone was arrested under the Raves Bill is six months custody.
I was never arrested for it.
It's not on my criminal record.
I have a copy of my police criminal record here.
The police changed every name.
There were six events in the ASBO.
The police and Enfield Council changed all the names, URN numbers and other details.
I can prove that because I have records.
They falsified victim statements.
All MG11 victim statements should be signed.
None of the statements were signed.
When I started questioning the integrity of the evidence, they put up what I believe was a smokescreen and used my personal data.
I never gave anyone permission to use my information.
Because they wanted to cover this up, I was put on bail conditions and not allowed to be at my own home.
While I was on bail conditions at my mother's address, Lemmy and Enfield Council did not realise I was not at my house.
They made allegations and put possession proceedings in.
Luckily, I wasn't even allowed to be there because of bail conditions.
When I pointed that out, they made an injunction order.
Edmonton Lower Court accepted the injunction order based on the same allegations.
They copied and pasted claims and created new ones.
I obtained information through Freedom of Information requests.
I can see what they did through their systems.
After the first twelve claims they expanded it to thirty-one claims.
The first twelve were fabricated.
The rest are not reflected in the Council's own records.
I went to court regarding the injunction.
I won that matter.
The court then accepted another application and allowed it to continue.
They reinstated another injunction order.
The basis then became threats to kill.
Lemmy came to court and completed an affidavit of service.
I believe what he did amounted to perjury.
He brought the old allegations back into proceedings.
The original allegation was that I phoned him and threatened to kill him.
That never happened.
Afterwards, the old allegations were brought back again.
I had already won the criminal cases relating to those issues.
Witness Care had informed the Council that I had won the cases and could return home.
Then Lemmy took those old cases and used them in possession proceedings.
When I requested the statements, he only had the old statements from criminal proceedings.
Then he created an injunction application and obtained new statements.
After that I won that matter, but another injunction followed.
Then another possession application followed.

I'm still being pursued on the basis of the same allegations from years ago.
The people who supposedly made some of these complaints don't even live there anymore.
There is no realistic prospect of success.
This is malicious prosecution.
The court keeps accepting the applications.
I've never been properly allowed to explain myself.
Every time I attend court it's a preliminary matter and I'm told to stand there quietly.
Everything is hearsay.
It's all "he said", "she said".
I want the accusers present in court.
How do I call them if the paperwork simply says "he" and "she"?
Hello?

Speaker 1 (Court Officer):
Hello.
Yeah, I'm listening.

Speaker 2 (Mr Cordell):
Do you understand what I'm saying?
I know it's a lot to take in.
Somebody has gone beyond the normal business of the company and now I'm suffering because of it.
I believe it amounts to targeted malice, malicious prosecution and malicious process.
I've got a diary.
I've got evidence for every single day.
I'd like to resolve all this before the hearing in December.
I've got recordings of conversations with Paul and others from your team.
I've transcribed them.
I don't see how your court can deal with me impartially because I've also made claims against Enfield Council.
I've obtained copies of insurance information from different organisations.
If I bring all the recordings and transcripts into court and call court employees as witnesses, how can your court remain impartial?
There is a conflict of interest.
How can this be legal?
Why has the court accepted repeated applications based on the same allegations for years?
Why have I been effectively confined in my home for years by possession proceedings and injunctions?
I've won each one and then another application appears.
That's attempted manslaughter by process.
How is this being allowed to happen?

Speaker 1 (Court Officer):
I'll tell you one thing, sir.
I know it might not be what you want to hear, but I'm only a court officer.
You need to put what you've told me in writing.

You can do it by email or by letter and I can refer it to the court manager to look into.

Speaker 2 (Mr Cordell):
I've already been through the court managers.
There would now be a conflict of interest because I'm taking action relating to the court and its employees.
I've built a report.
I'm going to publish it.
I've got many recordings.
I've warned employees repeatedly.
I've spent days transcribing them.
I've explained everything.
You're happy to take Enfield Council's payments while this continues.
I believe the court is unable to deal with these issues fairly.
I'd like it escalated to a higher court.
There are ongoing matters that may go further.
How is your court going to deal with that?
Can I bring all the recordings and transcripts into trial?
Can I call court employees into the trial?
There is a conflict there.
How can your court hear a case where I am making allegations against the court itself?

Speaker 1 (Court Officer):
Unfortunately, I'll have to ask you to put it in writing.

Speaker 2 (Mr Cordell):
I've already put it in writing.
I've directed people to my website.
I have difficulties with reading and writing myself.
I've shown evidence there.
You're a court.
You're supposed to know the difference between right and wrong.
Holding somebody in their home while repeatedly accepting applications is wrong.
I'm being undermined by state officials.
It's a breach of my human rights.
How can you allow this?
I've been unable to get on with my life for years because of this process.
I can give you the criminal case numbers.
I can show that I won those cases before Lemmy brought them into your court.
He reused those allegations afterwards.
Please can somebody help me sort this out?
Why do I need to keep writing when there's a website available?
Paul has already gone to the website and looked at it while speaking to me.
Hello?

Speaker 1 (Court Officer):

Unfortunately, you have to understand that we can't sit here reading everything on a website.
We're a customer services team.
We have to answer calls.

Speaker 2 (Mr Cordell):
But you have legal administration staff.
This is a courthouse.
I'm not phoning a tyre shop.
You have administration that deals with legal subjects.

Speaker 1 (Court Officer):
We're only court officers.

Speaker 2 (Mr Cordell):
I appreciate that, but you work for the company.
The company has obligations.
When people sign to manage the court they are supposed to protect it.
I'm warning you that something bad is going to happen to the company if these issues are ignored.
Administration is supposed to handle information like this.
If the company suffers consequences after being warned, that's not my fault.

Speaker 1 (Court Officer):
We've been speaking for about fifteen minutes.
I've listened to you.
What I'm telling you is that talking all day isn't going to get you anywhere.

Speaker 2 (Mr Cordell):
I've obtained records from doctors and other authorities.
I've got evidence of discussions about me.
I've got insurance details.

Speaker 1 (Court Officer):
I'll have to let you go.
What you need to do is put it in writing.

Speaker 2 (Mr Cordell):
I'm telling you something serious is happening and administration should deal with it.

Speaker 1 (Court Officer):
I'm going to go, sir.
You have a good day.

Speaker 2 (Mr Cordell):
You too.
Thank you, sir.

Bye.

Speaker 1 (Court Officer):
Goodbye.
