

1. Reporting Everything to the police, missing belongings and £30,000 Pounds in Cash!

- a) To 999 then 101 Recording 01-09-26 at 2046 New
- b) To 999 then 101 Recording 01-09-26 at 2046 New
- c) Met Screenshot_01-09-26 Message.jpg
- On **26-08-26**, I regained lawful access to 23 Byron Terrace for the first time since being barred by bail. When I entered, I discovered the property had been emptied without my knowledge — including years of belongings and approximately **£30,000 in cash**, which I had already disclosed to police during my arrest. By **01-09-26**, after documenting the full extent of the damage and loss, I reported everything to the police through the **999 → 101 call**, where I explained the missing items, the council's role, and the fact I had been prevented from entering the home. The **recording** and the **Met Police text message (CHS 33946/01Sep26)** prove the police formally logged my report, acknowledged it as a civil matter caused by council actions, and confirmed I acted immediately and in good faith as soon as I was physically able to access the property and understand what had happened.

2. Letter Delivered to 23 Byron Terrace:

- a) 03. Letter Received 01-09-26.pdf

2. LETTER DELIVERED TO 23 BYRON TERRACE

1) "Personal Reps of Miss Lorraine Cordell & Persons Unknown, 23 Byron Terrace"

- The letter was deliberately misaddressed by Georgina, the Enfield Council housing officer, and her management. They removed the lawful occupier's identity and replaced it with "Persons Unknown," despite having full knowledge of my name, CO registration, overnight carer status, and succession involvement. This misidentification erased the lawful occupier from the process and enabled unauthorised individuals to be treated as legal representatives.
- At the time this letter was issued, I was the CO-registered occupier, living at 23 Byron Terrace as my primary home, with my address formally recorded. My temporary absence was due to bail conditions — now lifted — and the property still contained furniture and a bed for my use. The officer was fully aware of this from prior emails, evidence submissions, and the formal complaint already lodged.
- The use of "Persons Unknown" was not an administrative error. Georgina had already communicated with me directly in dozens of emails, confirming she knew exactly who the lawful occupier was. Addressing the letter to unidentified individuals demonstrates intentional misrepresentation and a deliberate attempt to exclude the lawful occupier from statutory succession procedures.

2) “Date: 27 August 2026”

- The letter was issued one day after bail conditions were varied on **26 August 2026**, restoring lawful access. The timing demonstrates that the officer acted behind me the legal occupier’s back, issuing formal correspondence to unauthorised persons instead of the lawful resident who had applied to them as the occupier for succession, keep them up to date and had just regained legal entry.

4) “Following the death... the tenancy has now ended.”

- While the tenancy ended upon the tenant’s death, the officer was already in possession of the completed succession form submitted by the lawful occupier me. The statement omits the fact that succession was actively underway and that the officer failed to process it.

5) “Our records indicate nobody is currently residing in the property.”

- This assertion is false. Council records showed the lawful occupier as the CO-registered overnight carer and key holder. The main reason the occupier was not present prior was due to police bail restrictions, which the Council officers are fully aware of.
- The house is my primary home, and I intend to live in the house unless a court order says otherwise.

6) “Occupied through storage of personal belongings... vacant possession not provided.”

- **THE PROPERTY IS NOT ABANDONED**; The only reason it appeared empty was because I was unlawfully prevented from accessing my own home due to the misinformation provided by Georgina Solan to the police about succession law and my legal right to remain in the property. She repeatedly told me that I had no right to be in the home while applying for succession and that I would only have rights *after* a successful outcome. This was completely false, and I provided her with case law and Ombudsman rulings proving that successors retain lawful occupation during the process. She ignored all of it. Throughout this period, Georgina kept me in active correspondence, making me believe that my succession application had been submitted and was being reviewed. She told me to wait for updates, reassured me that she was dealing with my concerns, and never once informed me that she had failed to process my application or that she was treating the property as vacant. She withheld every notice, every warning, and every piece of information that would have alerted me to her misconduct. At the same time, she contacted third-party individuals — including a hostel resident — who she knew had **no legal right of occupation**, no succession rights, and no authority to act on the property. She told these individuals to remove belongings from the home while I was asking her for access to protect my property. She denied me my legal right to enter, safeguard my belongings, and remain in my home, while encouraging others to clear the house under her direction. She did all of this knowing that I was in bereavement, vulnerable, and relying on her guidance as the case handler. She knew I had provided her with legal precedents proving my rights. She knew she was bypassing the legal safeguards that require the council to apply to court before removing belongings or treating a property as vacant. She knew that clearing a home without a court order can cause irreversible damage to a successor’s life if the case has not been ruled on by a judge. Despite all of this, she still wrote in the letter that the property was only “occupied through storage of

personal belongings” and that “vacant possession had not been provided.” This statement, made after everything she had done and everything she knew, is not just inaccurate — it is evidence of gross misconduct. She created the false appearance of an empty property through her own failures, her own misdirection, and her own decisions to exclude me from the process while empowering people with no rights to act in my place.

7) “Keys have not been returned to the Council.”

- This statement is knowingly false and was written with full awareness of the real circumstances. Seven days before this letter was issued, during my recorded call with Georgina on **20-08-26**, I made my situation completely clear to her. I explained that I had only just regained lawful access to my home after being wrongly barred due to the misinformation she gave to police about succession law. I told her directly that the property had been emptied while I was excluded, that my belongings were missing, and that I had changed the locks to secure what remained. She acknowledged all of this in the call. In that same conversation, she admitted that she had not submitted my succession claim to the correct statutory channels, had not put it before a panel, had not issued the required landlord notices, and had instead passed my case to unnamed “management” without informing me. She admitted she had not followed the legal process and that no formal decision had ever been made. I also told her that her misinformation to police had caused me serious harm during a period of bereavement, and that her actions had allowed third parties — who she knew had no legal right of occupation — to enter the property and remove my belongings. Despite hearing all of this directly from me, and despite admitting her own failures, she continued with the same attitude she had shown throughout the handling of my succession case. She ignored everything I told her, ignored the damage caused, ignored the fact that I had been unlawfully excluded, ignored the fact that I had changed the locks for safety, and ignored the fact that she had addressed notices to a property she knew I could not legally enter at the time. She then wrote this letter **seven days later**, claiming the keys had not been returned. She knew exactly why the keys had not been returned. She knew I had been barred because of her misinformation. She knew I had only just regained access. She knew the property had been cleared while I was excluded. She knew I had changed the locks because of the loss she caused. She knew she had not submitted my succession. She knew she had addressed notices to third parties behind my back. She knew she had stripped my legal name from the documents. She knew the notices were not legally served. And she knew I had told her all of this personally. Writing **“keys have not been returned”** after admitting all of this is not an administrative oversight — it is **malicious misrepresentation**, designed to shift blame onto me and conceal her breach of statutory succession protocol, her misuse of authority, and her role in enabling unauthorised access to my home and the loss of my property.

8) “Property remains in use and is unavailable for reletting.”

- The property was only “unavailable for reletting” because the officer herself blocked the legal process. She failed to submit my succession claim to the statutory panel and instead acted on incorrect advice from unnamed management members who wrongly told her I could not succeed because I held another tenancy — a position later disproven to be correct by them as admitted by herself.

- Her mistake has left the tenancy in a legal standstill at no fault of my own: no confirmed successor, no lawful refusal, and no lawful termination. Under housing law, a property cannot be relet while a succession claim is unresolved, and she is the reason it remained unresolved.

9) “Use and Occupation Account established... charges accrue until belongings removed.”

- **“£146.71 per week / £20.96 per day.”**
- **“Outstanding balance £1,467.10 as of 28 August 2026.”**
- **“This is a use and occupation charge only and is not rent.”**
 - The officer manufactured financial liability in my name with deliberate intent. In earlier correspondence contained in the **Binder**, Email: **“09. Received 20-05-26”** on the **“Wednesday, 20 May 2026 at 09:05 BST”**
 - she told me she would set up a rent account for me — confirming she was treating my succession as active. She never did it. She never updated me. She never submitted my succession claim. Instead, she kept me believing I was in lawful proceedings while withholding the truth and blocking my access to the property.
 - After months of misleading me, she then wrote on **27 August 2026** that she had **“now established” a Use and Occupation Account** — meaning she created charges after undermining my legal rights, after misinforming police, after preventing me from entering my home, and after removing my name from all correspondence.
 - Every charge — £146.71 per week, £20.96 per day, and the balance of £1,467.10 — was created during a period she personally caused. She told police I could not stay in my primary home, withheld my succession, served notices to third parties, and ensured I had no knowledge of any charges until after I regained access.
 - Had she lawfully allowed me to remain in the property while my case was reviewed — as succession law requires — I would have kept all bills up to date. Instead, she barred me, misled me, withheld the process, and then attempted to impose charges for a period in which she alone caused my exclusion.
 - Her own words prove the misconduct: she offered to set up a rent account at the start, withheld my legal rights for months, and then claimed she had “now established” an account only after creating the very situation she used to justify the debt.
 - **This Means:**
 - a) She told you on **20 May 2026** that a **Left in Occupation account would be set up** *while your succession was being considered.*
 - b) She **did not set it up.**
 - c) She **did not process your succession.**
 - d) She **did not update you.**
 - e) She **kept you believing succession was active.**
 - f) She **blocked your access.**
 - g) She **misinformed police.**
 - h) She **let others into the property.**
 - i) She **erased your name from correspondence.**
 - j) She **served notices to third parties.**
 - k) And **99 days later**, she suddenly wrote a letter claiming she had **“now established” a Use & Occupation account** — for a period **she herself caused.**

This 99-day gap is **proof of deliberate misconduct**, not an administrative mistake.

13) “No landlord and tenant relationship exists.”

- This condition was manufactured by the officer’s failure to submit the succession form. I as the occupier had already initiated succession and was awaiting processing, making this statement misleading.

14) “Remove belongings and return keys as soon as possible.”

- I should not have been removing my belongings or handing back the keys at this stage, and I should never have been advised to do so given the contents of the case file. Georgina, the Enfield Council housing officer, and her management failed to advise me correctly under the Housing Act 1985. They withheld the lawful submission of my succession case, failed to notify me of any required court proceedings to evict me lawfully, and attempted to exploit my documented disabilities through intimidating tactics that have already caused serious harm due to others being misled about succession law.
- Their instruction was issued without providing me — the lawful applying occupier of the premises — with the statutory notices, legal rights, or procedural information required before any belongings can be removed or keys surrendered. Without proper legal notification, no lawful obligation to clear the home or return keys can arise.
- A lawful successor cannot be compelled to act on an instruction issued by officers who have ignored statutory duties, concealed legal processes, and failed to advise him of his rights. This makes the direction “Remove belongings and return keys as soon as possible” fundamentally unlawful.

15) “If difficulties preventing clearance or return of keys, contact me immediately.”

- It was Georgina, the Enfield Council housing officer, and her management who created the very “**Difficulties**” they now pretend I should contact them about. It was them who wrongly barred me from my home, misinformed the police, withheld my succession, served notices to other people, erased my name from the documents, and allowed my belongings to be removed behind my back.
- Enfield Council’s Georgina and her management also knew — from the evidence I provided — that 23 Byron Terrace is my primary home. For me to “**Clear the Home**” or “**Return the Keys**” while they were actively abusing the process would mean accepting their unlawful actions and abandoning my legal rights. No successor is required to comply with instructions that arise from procedural misconduct.
- They cannot ask me to contact them about problems they deliberately caused, concealed, and maintained. The obstruction was theirs, not mine. The impossibility was theirs, not mine. The “**Difficulties**” existed only because they engineered them — which makes the instruction “**If Difficulties Preventing Clearance or Return of Keys, Contact Me Immediately**” fundamentally dishonest.

16) “Seek independent legal advice... Citizens Advice Bureau.”

- Georgina, the Enfield Council housing officer, and her management advised me to seek independent legal advice while simultaneously withholding the very information a lawful occupier would need to obtain meaningful legal guidance. Their instruction was given without providing a legal succession status, without confirming any right of appeal,

without identifying the officers involved, and without issuing any formal documentation beyond scattered emails.

- Advising legal consultation while withholding the facts required for that consultation is not genuine guidance — it is an attempt to shift responsibility while preventing the occupier from accessing the very rights that legal advice would protect. This makes the instruction **“Seek independent legal advice... Citizens Advice Bureau”** fundamentally misleading.

17) “Yours sincerely, Georgina Solan”

- The officer’s signature confirms responsibility for the misdirection, misidentification, and administrative manipulation contained within the letter.

18) “Joanne Drew, Strategic Director of Housing and Regeneration”

- The inclusion of the director’s name elevates the letter’s authority, making the misrepresentation more serious. The officer issued a formal document under senior endorsement while knowingly erasing the lawful occupier.

3. My Computer Issues as of 01-09-26:

- One of my drives recently failed and began clicking, which caused significant data loss and the loss of a large amount of work. I am in the process of recovering what I can, and this has been extremely upsetting, as it directly affected important case material. I intend to use this setback to my advantage by rebuilding and upgrading my system properly over the next couple of months, and I will be preparing a damage report once the recovery process is complete. I hope to be able to recover 98% or more from my lost work in time!