Speaker 1 (00:02):

For your sister

Speaker 2 (00:03):

This firm is dealing with a case for myself and I'm wondering if it's possible to speak to a case handler that can go though.

New Speaker (00:10):

yeah. that's fine but who is your solicitor

Speaker 2 (00:14):

Um, I believe it's Ronhad, um, Ronhad amed,

New Speaker (00:19):

Ok, and who am i speaking to.

New Speaker (00:19):

Mr. Cordell, Simon Cordell.

Speaker 1 (00:23):

Yeah.

New Speaker (00:23):

Thank you for calling. Your call has been placed on hold and you will be attended to as soon as an operator becomes free.

New Speaker (00:40):

Hello?

New Speaker (00:40):

Hello Mr. Cordell how can i help

Speaker 2 (00:58):

How are you doing? Is this, um, I'm not too sure how you doing?

New Speaker (01:04):

Um, yeah, I'm well. Okay. Yeah, as best as can be I suspect in the circumstances. Um, obviously I'm upset and concerned for my house and for my well-being and so forth for what's being done and pursued against me. So I was just wondering, I have not being able to speak to you throughout it all, and I was just wondering, I needed a lot of evidence that I have transcribed up. I've got lots of audio recordings. I would like to put forward as my evidence under the evidence Act. Um, if your will I want to be able to see if your firm can help me achieve that.

Speaker 1 (01:37):

Yeah. So obviously the person that's been in contact with us throughout this is your mother.

New Speaker (01:43):

Yeah, that's correct.

New Speaker (01:44):

Um, and the situation is that you have a hearing December but that's not to hear any evidence.

Speaker 2 (01:52):

I understand that. But what I'm concerned about is that this company obviously has supposed to have my best interest at heart. And it's a professional litigation company. You are yourselves and I'm slightly. My mum, my mum keeps me away because she knows I don't. I go straight down the line with everything. I'm quite honest with it. And I feel that if you use lot were supposed to be having my best interest at heart, you would have already filed against them for malicious process or malicious prosecution because these same claims have been reinstated. I won them in a criminal court and yeah, I've never really had a chance to go through it with yourself. And I don't know if the phone is the correct place to go through it. Maybe a meeting in my house would be a lot better if you could arrange a meeting and just to go through this thing in my evidence,

New Speaker (02:32):

[inaudible]

New Speaker (02:32):

I've stripped up basically right now, where I stand with it all is the accusations that are in the report that you've got were maliciously made.

Speaker 2 (02:39):

They were made under the fraud act 2006. All of them, I wasn't in the house. When in my house, I was on bail conditions at my mother's house. And they didn't realize that I was on bail conditions in my mother's house the Council never the Council and the police basically made an Asbo against me in the beginning and this is their Mo. Why they've done this? They made an Asbo against me. The Asbo was accusing me of the organization of illegal raves under the 1994, Act? Which is a criminal offense. The police never arrested me for the criminal offense. And the maximum sentence is six months do three months that they never arrested me. I went to trial. I proved that the trespass hadn't taken place on these buildings, the only way a rave can happen is outdoors. 20 people listening, not inside a building, unless trespass can be proved. I proved that they were repeat. The police had said in their own admissions, that there were sections on all of the doors. So I said, well, trespass, hasn't taken place so, the Raves Bill hasn't been at fault

Speaker 1 (03:32):

Can I.

New Speaker (03:33):

Go on.

New Speaker (03:33):

Can I just say that the trial in your case is going to be probably be over a year or a year latter

Speaker 2 (03:41):

I don't think, I don't think, I don't think if you sit down with me, your client and you actually looked at my evidence that I have here now, I don't think it's even fair for you to let me go to a trial with the evidence that I will show you. I think you should write a letter directly to, I've gone to Enfield council and I've stripped them of their employer's liability, public policies. Just recently, I've got two policies of them last week for 15 million, each a hundred million in their policies I stripped the NHS of their policies as well, which is unlimited. The NHS trusts our script. So that's all Scotland yard. And everything think I've built a complete diary and filed the complete reasons to why I took every letter and every application, everyone has gave me and made a complete diary of it.

Speaker 2 (04:17):

My evidence is so overwhelming. You'd be sick. I've been recording all the conversations where they've been, where they're at fault with negligence and gross misconduct. And it says in there, it says under the constitution to which their companies are set out to it, to achieve the level that I will be treated with fairness, and that no person will breached. The equality rights to 2010, the right for me not to be, not to be. I wasn't in the house when they made all of this up. Yeah. They've gave me an eight year. Curfew heal me in my house, but forgot to arrest me for the Asbo because I'm phoning them up about the Asbo and saying, well, you're missing all your signatures on the Mg11 forms. They're 3rd aspect people . I requested for the victims to come to court so that I can stand.

Speaker 2 (04:59):

I can, I can question the integrity of there, of the statement makers or the accusers of me. No witnesses would attend court. I won the case. Hands done, never got arrested for it. It's not even a criminal offense. Yeah. So what I noticed is the police officers had changed all of the names in the Asbo, the copper's names to brand a brand B. I requested a copy of my criminal record out of the police computers. And I can prove that they changed all the names, forged. All the MG11 wrote for, each police officer wrote four statements each and none of them are signed by the victims. The victims don't work all the time stamps to the call centers go backwards. Yeah, the cases, the cases are shambles. And I would like it brought back to the Police they know that they're looking at custodial sentence for malfeasance of malfeasance of a public office targeted malice.

Speaker 2 (05:44):

Yeah. They know that the sentences that I would like to uphold against them, not, not perjury or nothing. Nice. I would like to do them for the interference of the course of justice. 1986. I'm not happy with what's being done to me. I wasn't in the house for the accusations, these accusations that you've got in that file. They were originally criminal cases. I went to court for the criminal cases and I wonder three criminal cases in the criminal court. I got NFAs and I was on bail conditioners not to come back to my flat while I was on these cases. Lemmy and the Council the Council never realize that I wasn't in the flat. So what they've done is they put the three cases that I want to criminal court. They called some person from upstairs. While I weren't in my house on bail conditions to go down to the civic center, they made up six more dates backdating them.

Speaker 2 (06:34):

nine months, eight months. So they were at the time limitation act. Anyway, I warned something the rest of them are, it's not even possible for me to be in, in the house for them. They started messaging my mum, trying to get away from the Asbo bullying my mother saying we've got a complaint against Simon. If he don't come to the civic center, we're going to take his flat off him. Yeah and we're going to put a possession Order if he dont. I wrote, I phoned up the civic center. I said, that's entrapment what you're doing. You're not police officers. I've been arrested for these three cases at a criminal Court and I've won them all already. No further actions. The witness care team wrote back to the civic center and gave them, I've got all of release notes saying, mr.

Speaker 2 (07:13):

Cordell has won these cases. Yeah. And he's allowed to go back to his home now. And then they realize, hang on. He's not been in his house because that's basically what's happening. They're saying 12 things and not giving no Id, no information to them, which is under the code of conduct. They should have basically identified who these people are, that are portraying these stories about me and so forth. And the rest of it, they called it all. He, she, he, she, he, she, you need a hearsay application to put that application. You should have noticed that yourself as a legal solicitor, that's all, he, she, he, she, I can't call none of these people.

New Speaker (07:44):

Mr. Cordell Mr. Cordell

Speaker 1 (07:47):

Um, I think the best thing to do, if you're going to be, uh, wanting to, uh, go down public, uh, public law, it's probably better that you instruct the solicitors firm that deals with these thing.

Speaker 2 (08:00):

There is no such thing as public law, but what there is civil litigation and criminal law, criminal, and civil

Speaker 2 (08:08):

Yeah, we don't deal with criminal litigation

New Speaker (08:08):

And what this is, my case is a civil. my case is a civil case at the present time. Now what they're pursuing.

Speaker 1 (08:13):

So, it might be better if you, uh, uh, found another firm,

Speaker 2 (08:16):

Why are you scared to represent me? And you've took 7,000 pounds. You've put your legal fees in. And I've got all the copies of your legal fees that you've took and everything you've had this money, 7,000 pounds you requested on your receipt. You've had, you've asked it for that money. The case got dismissed. And I won the case hands fair down

Speaker 1 (08:33):

We weren't resenting you in that case, we only came on board a few months back.

Speaker 2 (08:38):

I don't understand why you're scared to represent me.

New Speaker (08:42):

We never put a bill in. we haven't put a bill in for this case

New Speaker (08:42):

I've got a receipt. I've got a receipt for 7,000 pounds of Tyler Solicitors and it says the same, my legal aid fees being assigned,

Speaker 1 (08:48):

That's not correct. That's not correct. I can assure you.

Speaker 2 (08:52):

So you never put in a legal aid application in for my case.

Speaker 1 (08:56):

We will put a legal aid application but we haven't been paid a penny.

Speaker 2 (08:59):

Yeah. I can understand that. But on the legal application, it says 7,000 pounds is what this solicitors firms going to request once it's done the work for me. Yeah.

Speaker 1 (09:08):

No, that's not the case. Let me look at your file. Hold on. Uh,

Speaker 2 (09:14):

I had to put the legal application in myself and get the granted in otherwise , this firm wouldn't represent me without the forms.

Speaker 1 (09:20):

No, no, no, no. I think you're getting confused. With criminal legal aid The Criminal Legal Aid is different we don't deal with criminal law.

New Speaker (09:31):

yeah, it civil.

New Speaker (09:31):

we went representing you back then.

Speaker 2 (09:32):

This is under the access to justice. Is that not correct?

Speaker 1 (09:40):

Access to justice is about legal aid.

New Speaker (09:40):

Yeah.

New Speaker (09:41):

Yeah, your certificate let me look at the value of your certificate.

New Speaker (09:41):

For civil litigation.

New Speaker (09:41):

Its not 7,000 pounds, its like 2000 pounds.

Speaker 2 (09:48):

I don't, I don't mind either way. If you, if you represent me fairly, you, you deserve what your qualified for your qualification. No one took, you went to college, you studied hard. He was not deserved

Speaker 1 (09:59):

No hold up, hold up, hold up, where did you say you got the seven Thousand pounds from you said, you saw a bill for 7,000.

Speaker 2 (10:01):

Yeah. Basically. I've got a bill. It might just be for the cost. Basically. What's happened in this case here is like, I'm explaining it initially started from the criminal cases where I got arrested for these criminal offenses. But then what happened is lemmy got messaged. Lemmy got messaged. I had won them cases.

New Speaker (10:17):

Look i am not dealing with criminal law.

New Speaker (10:17):

So what, lemmy done. Yeah, bu it's not criminal law. What Lemmy has done after that is Lemmy took the criminal cases that I had already won and putting them in a possession order. Yeah. And he's saying to me now he's used the same cases that I've already won in a criminal court in a possession . And then he lost that possession order in court. Then he went for an injunction order and put the same claims into a next injunction order i won that in court, the same claims. Then he put them into another in junctional straight afterwards, which then he's filed them again in another possession order, which, which, which use lot are in control of now, this initially started from,

New Speaker (10:51):

That right.

New Speaker (10:51):

yeah, this is all civil right now. But the case is what I once was arrested for these cases. I'm on them

Speaker 1 (10:56):

For these case they are able to do that

Speaker 2 (10:59):

What that's called malicious prosecution.

New Speaker (11:03):

They can reuse evidence against you.

New Speaker (11:03):

No, they can't. They can't file it as far as I understand. Yeah. If you went, the judge refused to open the case ever again, he lemmy was sitting in the corner begging for free months with the case, after the

Speaker 1 (11:15):

Why didn't the Judge send him to prison,

Speaker 2 (11:17):

Why didn't the judge , what the judge what the judged done, what the judge done was try use me as an escape goat and try to say, Oh, well you need to have an assessment. Simon Cordell and the doctors.

New Speaker (11:27):

Yeah, but why didn't the judge send him to prison.

New Speaker (11:27):

I can't answer what the judges decisions. I can't answer what the judge is, what the judge's decision was. I think he was wrong in that decision. The same as you do, by the sounds of it,

New Speaker (11:36):

Yeah,

New Speaker (11:36):

the judge should have sent me to prison and he shouldn't allow this case to be refiled and refiled.

Speaker 1 (11:44):

[inaudible] there was another hearing in December and we'll take it from there. There's nothing really for us to do right now. They haven't written to us because

Speaker 2 (11:54):

They know how much trouble do you have about you? Is there any time that I could have a meeting with yourselves and just go over what has actually happened and present a fair case to you? Even if it's an online meeting on team teamviewer or something like that?

Speaker 1 (12:09):

Well, we're open between nine and five. You can come into the office. Okay.

Speaker 2 (12:13):

It's because a lot of my stuff that I hold is on a computer. Yeah. And I can look, I can show you in, like, do you ever use teamviewer? I can show you in my computer and work I built and how I filed it.

Speaker 1 (12:22):

Print it of and bring it into the office.

Speaker 2 (12:25):

I can understand what you're saying, but it's just the magnitude of the file itself. And the evidence I have is quite large.

Speaker 1 (12:33):

Yeah just print some of it of and bring it with you

Speaker 2 (12:33):

So, where do you think I stand with the application as it stands and what's on your desk now, forget that it was, it started from criminal cases on one end, he filed it again and he filed it again. And he filed again. Now that you've got that on your desk for a possession order, it says he, she, he, she, on every accuser, I would like to request these people to come to court, which is my right to request my accusers under the 1998 crime and disorder Act.

New Speaker (12:57):

Yep.

New Speaker (12:57):

now,

New Speaker (13:00):

That's fine, that's fine.

New Speaker (13:00):

I can't do that because the only two names, the only two names in that whole folder, are Lemmy and Lavinia the two council officers. So they're the only two people that I can call every other person that's in the application.

New Speaker (13:13):

We will tell that to the judge.

New Speaker (13:13):

Don't let me talk you interrupt me.

New Speaker (13:13):

Sorry,

New Speaker (13:13):

You sound very on edge and hyper.

New Speaker (13:13):

No, i just got a lot to say in the short term, I know your times important to you. So yeah,

Speaker 1 (13:22):

This case isn't going to be over for a year and a half. Uh, we will tell the judge that we want these people produced to give evidence, how is that

Speaker 2 (13:30):

How can you produce he or she, he or she, when everyone that lived in, lived in this block at that time has moved. I'm the only one that lives here Stain is the only one that lives beside me now, everyone

Speaker 1 (13:40):

Mr. Cordell, you have to bear in mind that I have dealt with Anti Social behavior cases like yours before. They do reuse evidence.

Speaker 2 (13:49):

You can't reuse the case was dismissed. And it was said that I'd won the case in criminal courts. If, lemmy, let me, the only way a Council can

Speaker 1 (13:58):

Mr. Cordell, you are aware that the burden of proof is different in Civil Cases

Speaker 2 (14:03):

It's different from Civil. Yes. I'm aware of this. We are fully, I'm fully aware of this and I'm fully aware that any civil case? No, no, no. Claimants should be. It should be should, should follow, pursue on a case that they know that there's no likelihood at the end of it off a realistic prospect of conviction at the end of it. Yeah. They're holding me in a malicious process with the company credit card because there an Authority and they can do so

Speaker 1 (14:27):

Subject to a conviction [inaudible]

Speaker 2 (14:30):

I'm not subject to a conviction at the end of it. But why, what they are asking for me is to lose my home, my home and belongings. I'm a man and I'm being told I'm going to, I can't even paint my walls in my house since 2015, because of, because, because they've had the same possession order against me, I've won it over four times.

Speaker 1 (14:48):
Bring the, important documents into the office, between Monday to Friday 9 till 5Pm.

New Speaker (14:53):
Ok.

New Speaker (14:53):
Then we can have a chat about it.

New Speaker (14:57):
I appreciate that.

New Speaker (14:57):
Monday to Friday 9 till 5Pm.

Speaker 2 (14:58):
Well, I appreciate your time.

New Speaker (15:02):
Well i gotta go i got to go over crimes coming in now.

New Speaker (15:02):
Thank you for your time, sir.

Speaker 1 (15:04):
Okay. Bye-bye.