CORE FILE 1

FORMAL STAGE 2 COMPLAINT REVIEW REQUEST
Case Reference: ENF228458
Complainant: Mr Simon Paul Cordell
Property: 23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London N9 7DG
Pages: 8
Core File: 1 of 3.
Date: 11th October 2026

Subject: Stage 2 Complaint Review Request - ENF228458
The Stage 1 Review Officer was a:
Jayne Paterson
Business Development Manager
Housing and Regeneration

Dear Stage, 2 Review Officer,
Introduction
I formally request a Stage 2 Review of the Stage 1, Seven Core, Complaint Response, issued by **Jayne Paterson** on **8 October 2026**.
Having carefully reviewed the response, I am adamant that the complaint I submitted was "Not" properly investigated.
My complaint was not limited to whether I ultimately succeeded to the tenancy of 23 Byron Terrace. It concerned the handling of the succession application, the treatment of evidence, the conduct and communications of Enfield Council Officers, procedural fairness, chronology, disclosure concerns, exclusion from the property, loss of possessions, and the adequacy of the Council's complaint investigation itself.
The Stage 1 Response: does not demonstrate a meaningful investigation into those matters.
Instead, it repeatedly returns to a single conclusion, namely that I failed to provide sufficient evidence demonstrating that 23 Byron Terrace was my only or principal home during the relevant period.
That conclusion is stated repeatedly.
However, the investigation necessary to support that conclusion is not demonstrated.
The central concern raised by this Stage 2 complaint is therefore straightforward:

- **The Stage 1 Response Appears to Defend an Existing Succession Decision Rather Than Investigate the Complaint That Was Submitted.**

Ground 1 - Failure to Explain How the Evidence Was Assessed
The Stage 1 response repeatedly states that I provided insufficient evidence.
However, the response does not explain:

1) Which Exhibits Were Reviewed.
2) Which Exhibits Were Accepted.
3) Which Exhibits Were Rejected.
4) Why Any Exhibit Was Rejected.
5) What Evidential Weight Was Attributed to Each Exhibit.
6) How The Evidence Was Assessed Collectively.
7) What Evidence Was Relied Upon to Reach the Opposite Conclusion

My Official Seven Core Complaint Bundle contained substantial evidence relating to my occupation, residence, caring responsibilities, Council records, government records, medical records, financial records and independent third-party documentation.
The issue is not whether evidence existed.
The issue is whether the evidence was properly analysed before the conclusion of ***"Insufficient Evidence"*** was reached.

A detailed examination of the evidential review process, progression through the succession procedure, and the manner in which the exhibits should have been assessed is contained within the:

- **See Core Files 02 – 03 For the Evidential Review Process, Progression to Panel, and the Stage 1 Investigator's Failure to Examine Those Stages.**

Ground 2 - Failure to Investigate the Contradictory Reasons Used to Refuse the Succession Claim

One of the most serious defects within the Stage 1 response is its failure to investigate the contradictory reasons relied upon throughout the succession process.

For a considerable period, I was not being told that my evidence was insufficient.

Instead, I was being told that I could not succeed because I remained the tenant of 109 Burncroft Avenue.

That was the reason communicated to me and the reason I was expected to challenge.

During The Same Period:

1) I Completed the Succession Application.
2) Supporting Evidence Was Never Requested due to the evidence already submitted being insufficient!
3) Further Evidence Was Requested, **"As Exhibited in The Table Below!"**
4) Bank Statements Were Requested.
5) My Mother's Death Certificate Was Requested.
6) Additional Material Continued to Be Supplied.
7) My Application Remained Active Within the Succession Process.

From the binder alone, the evidence supports my case: [00. Binder...26 up to 40 | PDF]

When did Georgina Solan ask for further evidence?

1. Initial supporting documents request

On **18 May 2026**, after receiving my succession application and supporting statement, **Georgina Solan wrote:**

"We can only consider your application once we have the supporting documents."

That was not a refusal.

That was an instruction to provide evidence so the application could be considered.

2. I Immediately Complied

On **19 May 2026**, the following day, I supplied:

"11 folders in total" containing identification documents and supporting evidence and told Georgina that I had more evidence available if required.

3. Further Evidence Request

Only **1 hour and 47 minutes later**, at **11:30 on 19 May 2026**, Georgina requested:

"Bank statements for all of your bank accounts covering the 12 months before Miss Lorraine Cordell passing away."

4. I Complied Same Day

At **15:10 on 19 May 2026**, approximately **3 Hours 40 Minutes Later**, I sent the requested bank statements.

5. More Evidence Requested From me by Georgina Solan

On **20 May 2026**, Georgina requested:

1) My Mothers Death Certificate;
2) And My Reasons for Requiring a Two-Bedroom Property.

Again, this was Georgina further evidence gathering, not a refusal for insufficient evidence, from me.

6. I Complied

Later on, **20 May 2026**, I supplied:

1) A Copy of an Interim Death Certificate in My Late Mothers Name;
2) My Explanation Regarding the Edmonton County Court Order that Orders the Enfield Council to supply me with a two-bedroom home rather than 109 Burncroft Avenue the Council failed to comply with!
3) My Caring Arrangements.
4) My Support Needs.

7. Official Death Certificate Requested

On **12 June 2026**, she requested the official death certificate.
I supplied it on **16 June 2026** and re-sent it again the same day.

Why This Is Important

The Timeline Shows a Very Different Picture From:
"Mr Cordell never passed the evidence stage."
Because The Documentary Record Shows:

1) Application Received.
2) Evidence Requested.
3) Evidence Supplied.
4) More Evidence Requested.
5) More Evidence Supplied.
6) Death Certificate Requested.
7) Death Certificate Supplied.
8) Application review stage 1 Passed and Housing test stage 2, Stated and Under Consideration.

The correspondence looks like a case progressing through review, not a case being rejected at the threshold stage for lack of evidence.

The Question

If I never met the initial evidential threshold, why was I repeatedly asked for further evidence, asked for bank statements, asked for death certificates, told the application was being considered, told a Left in Occupation account would operate whilst the application was being considered, and later refused on the separate basis of holding a tenancy at 109 Burncroft Avenue before any allegation of insufficient evidence appeared?

Also, when I challenged the Burncroft reason and demonstrated that holding another tenancy does not automatically prevent succession, the Council's position changed.
For the first time, the focus moved away from Burncroft and onto an allegation that my evidence was insufficient to establish occupation of 23 Byron Terrace.
That raises obvious questions.

If My Evidence Was Genuinely Insufficient:

1) Why Was Burncroft Originally Relied Upon?
2) Why Was That Position Communicated to Me for So Long?
3) Why Was Additional Evidence Repeatedly Requested?
4) Why Was the Application Continuing Through the Procedure?
5) Why Did the Evidential Issue Only Emerge After the Burncroft Position Had Been Challenged?

The Stage 1 response fails to address those questions.
Instead, it accepts the Council's final position without investigating how that position developed or whether the documentary record is consistent with it.

Ground 3 - Failure to Investigate the Seven Core Complaint Files

My complaint was organised into Seven Core Complaint Files supported by exhibits, chronology evidence and documentary records.
The purpose of that structure was to enable each issue to be reviewed separately and findings to be provided against every complaint head.

The Stage 1 Response Does Not Identify:

1) Which Core Files Were Reviewed.
2) Which Sections Were Reviewed.
3) Which Exhibits Were Reviewed.
4) Which Findings Relate to Which Complaint Heads.
5) What Conclusions Were Reached Against Each Issue Raised.

The complaint submitted and the response received appear to be two very different documents.
A full analysis of the Seven Core Complaint Files, the investigation duties they created, and the matters left unanswered by the Stage 1 response is contained within:

- **See Core File 03 - The Seven Core Complaint, the Investigation Duties It Created, and the Stage 1 Investigator's Failure to Properly Examine Them.**

Ground 4 - Failure to Address the Timeline of Proven Facts

Particular concern arises from the failure to address File 04 - Timeline of Proven Facts.
I prepared that chronology so the investigator could follow the succession process, evidence submissions, communications, decisions and events in the order that they occurred.

The Stage 1 Response:

1) Does Not Identify Any Factual Error in the Chronology.
2) Does Not Dispute Any Chronology Document.
3) Does Not Dispute Any Chronology Event.
4) Does Not Provide an Alternative Chronology.
5) Does Not Explain Why the Chronology Was Largely Ignored.

If the chronology is wrong, I require the disputed entries to be identified.
If it is correct, I require an explanation as to why it was not properly addressed.

Ground 5 - Failure to Investigate Officer Conduct, Communications and Representations

A substantial part of my complaint concerned the conduct and communications of Georgina Solan throughout the succession process.
The documentary record shows that:

1) A Succession Application Was Issued.
2) Supporting Evidence Was Requested.
3) Further Evidence Was Requested.
4) Bank Statements Were Requested.
5) The Death Certificate Was Requested.
6) The Application Continued Through the Process.
7) Further Review Was Represented as Taking Place.

The complaint questioned how those actions were consistent with the explanations later relied upon by the Council.
The Stage 1 response simply states conclusions.
It does not explain what questions were put to Georgina Solan, what explanations were obtained, how those explanations were tested against the documentary record, or how the findings were reached.

Ground 6, Failure to Address Property Loss, Exclusion and Consequential Harm

The Stage 1 response acknowledges my complaint regarding missing and damaged possessions and then suggests that such matters should be pursued through my own insurance arrangements.
That does not answer the complaint.
My complaint was not whether an insurance company may or may not compensate me.

My complaint was whether actions, omissions, decisions, communications or failures by Council staff contributed to:

1) My Exclusion from The Property.
2) My Inability to Access Possessions.
3) The Loss or Damage Discovered Afterwards.
4) The Disadvantage and Prejudice I Experienced as A Result.

Those are the issues requiring investigation.
The insurance response avoids those issues rather than addressing them.

SECTION 6A: CONFLICT OF INTEREST, THE INSURANCE BREACH AND BREACH OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS ACT 1998

1. The Investigator's Fundamental Failure: the Insurance Breach In common sense and everyday life, household insurance is taken out by the **legal tenant or owner**, in this case, my late mother was that person & upon her death, that policy became invalid.
As the Council has refused my succession claim, I got put at a legal hardship from being able to hold an insurance protection policy for a property I do not own/rent or could not enter, due to Enfield councils staffs instructions given to the police from straight after my mother's passing **Jayne Paterson**, acting as the Complaint Investigator, should possess the basic professional experience to understand this. As a senior manager handling vulnerable people during bereavement, she should know that instructing me to claim on ***"my own insurance"*** is a **logical impossibility**. Instead, the position taken places me in a contradictory and impossible situation.:

1) She Tells Me to Claim on Insurance **"Which Requires Me to Be the Tenant".**
2) She Simultaneously Confirms I Am **Not** the Tenant.
3) **Result:** She Is Forcing Me to Either **Commit Fraud "By Lying to An Insurer"** Or **Accept Zero Compensation** for My Lost Property. I believe it is reasonable to question whether this was the result of malice rather than error. Furthermore, Her Investigation Is So Flawed That She Has **Incorrectly Listed the Missing Items** "**Adding Cars and Generators That Are Still on the Driveway"** And Has Failed to Ensure My Sister Returns the Property or Its Contents. Her work does not supply a fair Investigation into these matters; I allege her actions obstructed a fair and proper examination of the issues raised.
4) **Conflict of Interest: Violation of the Human Rights Act 1998 (Article 6)** Jayne Paterson is not an independent regulator. She is the **Business Development Manager for Housing and Regeneration at Enfield Council**.
1) **The Conflict:** She is an employee of the very organization I am accusing of misconduct. She is being asked to investigate her own department, her own colleague (Georgina Solan), and her own organization's liability.
2) **The Law: Under Article 6 of the Human Rights Act 1998**, I am entitled to a fair hearing by an "**Independent and Impartial Tribunal**," Jayne Paterson is neither. She is the "**Defendant, the Judge, and the Gatekeeper all at once**."
3) **The Breach:** By using her "internal findings" to clear her colleague and then using those same findings to deny me access to insurance policies, she is acting as a judge in her own cause ***"NEMO JUDIX IN CAUSA SUA."*** This renders her entire ***"Investigation"*** **As Possibly Legally Void**.

3. Unlawful Refusal of Policy Access and Statutory Duty: Jayne Paterson has used her **"Internal Decision"** to refuse me access to the very insurance policies she claims I should use.

1) **The Reality:** An internal email from a biased manager cannot override the "**Statutory Duty"** of the Council to provide access to insurance information or to compensate for losses caused by their employees' negligence.
2) **The Separation of Duties:** The person handling the complaint **"Jayne Paterson"** is **not** the insurance provider. She has no authority to deny me access to the Council's liability insurance or to dictate the terms of a claim that involves her own department's negligence.
3) **The Demand:** She should have immediately transferred this aspect of the complaint to the Council's "**Risk Management Team** or **Insurance Manager,"** an independent party not involved in

the housing dispute. By failing to do so, and instead blocking my access to redress, she is personally liable for this obstruction.

4. Conclusion and Required Action: Jayne Paterson's actions constitute a **"Gross Violation of The Human Rights Act 1998, The Housing Ombudsman's Complaint Handling Code,"** and basic principles of natural justice.

1) She has created a **"Catch-22"** regarding insurance.
2) She has **"Fabricated Evidence"** regarding the missing items.
3) She has acted as **"Judge in Her Own Cause."**

I DEMAND:

1) **Immediate Recusal:** Jayne Paterson and all Housing staff involved must be removed from this case.
2) **Independent Investigation:** An external auditor or the **"Enfield Council's Monitoring Officer"** must take over immediately.
3) **Policy Disclosure:** The Council must provide details of their **"Liability Insurance"** and the specific policies governing this case within 5 days.
4) **Acknowledgement of Liability:** The Council must admit that Jayne Paterson's **"Internal Findings"** are void and that they are solely liable for the loss of my property.

- Failure to comply will be treated as a **"Continuing Breach of The Human Rights Act"** and will be escalated to the **"High Court, The Housing Ombudsman, And the Police Immediately!"**

Ground 7, Manipulation of Vulnerability, Statutory Disclosure Failures, And the Illegal Use Of "Real-Time Data" Policies to Hide Liability

1. Exploitation of Vulnerability During Pending Proceedings I am a bereaved family member navigating a complex Housing Succession case. Under the **Equality Act 2010** and the **Housing Ombudsman's Complaint Handling Code**, Enfield Council has a heightened duty to treat me with fairness, transparency, and extra care. Instead, senior management has **manipulated this vulnerability**:

1) They Have Withheld Critical Information About **Who Made the Decisions** To Exclude Me And Authorize Third-Party Entry.
2) They Have Falsely Claimed That "Real-Time Data Policies" Or "Ongoing Case Status" Prevents Them from Disclosing This Information.
3) They Have Forced Me into A Position Where I Must File a **Subject Access Request (SAR)** Just to Identify the Staff Responsible for My Exclusion and The Loss of My Property. This Is Not Standard Procedure; It Is what I would say to be of **Predatory Behaviour**. Using Bureaucracy to Hide the Identity of Decision-Makers from A Vulnerable Applicant Is a Breach of Your **Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED)** Under Section 149 Of the Equality Act 2010.

2. The Legal Reality: "Real-Time Data" "Policies Cannot Override Statutory Duty" Enfield Council has implied that internal "real-time data policies" or the fact that this is an "ongoing dispute" prevents the disclosure of decision-maker identities and action logs. **"This is Alleged by me to be legally false and a direct violation of Housing Law."**

1) **No Legal Basis for Secrecy:** There is **"No Provision in The Housing Act 1985,"** the **"Data Protection Act 2018**,' or any Government regulation that allows a Council to hide the identities of its employees or the details of their official actions from the person they affected.
2) **ICO Guidance:** The '**Information Commissioner's Office (ICO)'** explicitly states that public authorities **cannot** use data protection laws to withhold information about how decisions are made or who made them. Employee identities in an official capacity are "**Not"** personal data protected by GDPR. Claiming otherwise is a "**Misrepresentation of the Law**."
3) **Statutory Duty to Explain (Housing Act 1985):** Under "**Section 111 of the Housing Act 1985"** and the **"Housing Ombudsman's Complaint Handling Code,"** the Council is legally required to provide a full, written explanation of any decision, including the **"Reasons and The Authority Behind It."** By withholding the names of the managers who authorized my exclusion, you are in

direct violation of this statutory duty. You **"Must"** provide this information as part of the complaint response; it cannot be withheld until a SAR is filed.

4) **The "Ongoing Case" Fallacy:** Claiming that an **"Ongoing Dispute"** prevents disclosure is a misleading. The **"Pre-Action Protocol for Judicial Review Requires Greater Transparency"** during disputes to resolve issues without court. Hiding behind "ongoing proceedings" to withhold basic facts is **"Bad Faith and Maladministration."**

3. The Forced SAR as a Barrier to Justice: It is an abuse of process to force a complainant to file a **"Subject Access Request (SAR)"** simply to find out:

1) Which Managers Authorized My Exclusion.
2) Which Staff Members Provided False Legal Advice to The Police.
3) Which Staff Members Authorized Third Parties to Enter My Home. These Are **"Basic Facts of The Case"** That Should Have Been Disclosed Voluntarily in the Stage 1 Response. By Forcing Me To File A SAR, The Council Is:
4) **Creating An Unreasonable Barrier:** Making It Harder for A Vulnerable Person to Seek Redress.
5) **Delaying Accountability:** Using The SAR Timeline to Stall the Complaint Process.
6) **Violating Transparency Principles: GDPR Article 5** Requires Processing to Be Lawful, Fair, And Transparent. Hiding The Identity of Decisionmakers Behind A SAR Requirement Is the Opposite of Transparency.

4. Conclusion: Stop the Manipulation You are not dealing with a generic administrative error. You are dealing with a **"Systematic Attempt to Hide Liability"** by exploiting a vulnerable person's lack of knowledge and lying about the law.

- **I Demand:** the immediate disclosure of all names, roles, and decision logs related to my exclusion and the loss of my property **"Without Requiring A SAR." "The Law Mandates You Provide This."**
- **I Demand:** a copy of the specific **"Real-Time Data Policy"** you claim prevents this disclosure. If it does not exist (and it doesn't), admit the truth.
- **I Demand:** an end to the manipulation and obstruction.

If Council staff continue to hide behind "process" while I am in crisis, I will add **"Misfeasance in Public Office, Violation of the Equality Act 2010",** and **"Perverting the Course of Justice"** to my claims against every individual involved.

Ground 8 The Finding of "No Service Failure" Is Unsupported

The Stage 1 response concludes that no service failure occurred.

However, The Response Does Not Demonstrate:

1) A Detailed Evidential Assessment.
2) Findings Against Each Core Complaint File.
3) Findings Against the Chronology.
4) Findings Regarding the Changing Refusal Reasons.
5) Findings Regarding Officer Conduct and Communications.
6) Findings Regarding Procedural Compliance.
7) Findings Regarding Consequential Harm and Loss.

The conclusion is stated.
The investigation supporting it is not demonstrated.

Remedy Requested

I Respectfully Request That the Stage 2 Investigator:

1) Re-Review All Seven Core Complaint Files in Full.
2) Review Core File 02 And Core File 03 Alongside This Complaint.
3) Explain What Evidence Was Reviewed and How It Was Assessed.
4) Identify Which Exhibits Were Accepted and Rejected.
5) Explain Why the Refusal Reasons Changed Throughout the Succession Process.
6) Address File 04 - Timeline Of Proven Facts.

7) Investigate The Conduct, Communications and Representations of The Officers Involved.
8) Consider Procedural Failures Irrespective of The Final Succession Decision.
9) Investigate Whether Council Actions or Omissions Caused Avoidable Disadvantage, Distress, Exclusion, Prejudice, Loss or Damage.
10) Provide Reasoned Findings Supported by Evidence.

Conclusion

The issue is not simply whether succession was refused.
The issue is whether the complaint I submitted was properly investigated.
The Stage 1 response contains conclusions but does not demonstrate the investigation necessary to support those conclusions.
For that reason, I respectfully request a full Stage 2 Review.

Mr. Simon Paul Cordell



(Signed) Mr. Simon Paul CORDELL)
(Date Signed) 21/10/2026

Core File 2

The Evidential Review Process, Progression to Panel, and the Stage 1 Investigator's Failure to Examine Those Stages

Following the death of my mother at 23 Byron Terrace, I entered into a housing succession process with Georgina Solan. Throughout that process I was asked to complete a succession application, provide supporting evidence, provide further evidence when requested, provide bank statements, and later provide my mother's death certificate. My application remained active for a considerable period of time, and I was repeatedly led to believe that my succession claim was progressing through the Council's internal succession procedure.

The first reason given to me for refusing succession was not that my evidence was weak, insufficient, or incapable of proving occupation. The reason given was that I already held a tenancy at 109 Burncroft Avenue. For a considerable period, that was the reason relied upon by the Council.

I challenged that position because Ombudsman decisions, case law, and the succession test itself demonstrate that simply holding another tenancy does not automatically disqualify a person from succeeding to a tenancy. The key question is whether 23 Byron Terrace was the applicant's only or principal home during the relevant period.

Eventually the Council moved away from the Burncroft explanation and, for the first time, began relying upon a different reason, namely that my evidence was insufficient to prove occupation of 23 Byron Terrace.

That change creates an obvious problem.

If my evidence was genuinely insufficient from the beginning:

1) Why Was Burncroft Presented as The Reason for Refusal?
2) Why Was Further Evidence Repeatedly Requested?
3) Why Was My Application Allowed to Continue Through the Process?
4) Why Was I Led to Believe That My Case Was Progressing Towards a Decision?
5) Why Did the Alleged Evidential Failure Only Become the Issue After the Original Reason Had Been Challenged and turned around?
6) Why is there no official correspondence to the effect, "Of Me Being Told I Do Not Qualify to Proceed," especially when I offered to provide any more proof if ever required.

Those questions still remain unanswered.

This Core File Exists, because the Council's present position appears to suggest that my evidence never passed the initial evidential stage of the succession process. In simple terms, the Council now appears to be saying that my evidence was never strong enough to progress beyond the first review stage.

The Handling & Real Time Data of My Case," is not consistent with the Enfield Councils given explanation.

Before any succession application can properly proceed to a management review, decisionmaker, or panel, **"There Must First Be an Evidential Assessment Stage."** The evidence supplied by the applicant must be reviewed, analysed, compared, checked for consistency, tested against available records, and assessed to determine whether it is capable of supporting the succession claim.

Only after that stage has been completed can the matter properly progress to the next stage, where management or a panel applies the succession criteria to the evidence that has already been reviewed.

In practical terms, there are two separate stages:

Stage One - Evidential Review

At this stage the officer handling the application examines the exhibits and supporting documentation. The purpose is to establish what facts the evidence proves, whether the evidence is reliable, whether the exhibits support one another, whether additional enquiries are required, and whether the evidential threshold has been met for the application to progress further.

Stage Two - Management or Panel Determination

Only after the evidence has been reviewed can management or any decision-making panel properly consider the application. At this stage the succession criteria are applied to the evidence already assessed and a decision is reached regarding entitlement to succession.
The significance of this distinction is important.
The first reason communicated to me concerned my tenancy at Burncroft. That naturally created the impression that my evidence had already passed the initial review stage and that the dispute concerned how the succession rules were being applied to my circumstances. It did not suggest that my exhibits had failed an evidential threshold and were incapable of progressing through the process.
This Core File, therefore, sets out the review stages that should have existed between the submission of my succession application and the final decision communicated to me.
Using the very same exhibits submitted with my succession claim, this document demonstrates:

1) How The Evidence Should Have Been Analysed;
2) How The Exhibits Should Have Been Weighed and Compared;
3) How Corroboration and Consistency Checks Should Have Been Carried Out;
4) How Evidential Strength Should Have Been Assessed;
5) How The Evidence Should Have Been Prepared for Management or Panel Consideration; And
6) How The Succession Criteria Should Then Have Been Applied to That Evidence.

The importance of this issue extends beyond the original succession decision itself.
One of the central complaints raised within my Stage 1 complaint was that the documentary record did not support the explanations eventually relied upon by the Council. I repeatedly questioned how my evidence had been assessed, who assessed it, what findings were reached against it, and how the conclusion of insufficient evidence had been reached.

Those matters required investigation, as I requested!

If the Council's position is that my evidence failed at the evidential review stage, then the Stage 1 investigator should have established:

1) Who Carried Out That Review;
2) What Exhibits Were Assessed;
3) What Findings Were Reached;
4) Which Exhibits Were Accepted;
5) Which Exhibits Were Rejected;
6) Why Any Exhibits Were Rejected;
7) Whether The Application Progressed Beyond the Evidential Stage; And
8) What Information Was Ultimately Placed Before Management or Any Decisionmakers.

Instead, the Stage 1 response appears to accept the Council's conclusion without properly examining the process that was said to have produced it.

For That Reason, This Core File Serves Two Purposes.

First, it demonstrates how the evidence supplied with my succession application should have been reviewed before any decision was reached.
Second, it demonstrates why the failure of the Stage 1 investigator to examine those review stages raises serious concerns regarding both the original succession decision and the adequacy of the Stage 1 investigation.

1) **Table of Context**

Exhibit Category	What It Proves	Evidential Strength (1-10)	Comments
01. Motor-Insurance Schedule	Recorded residence at 23 Byron Terrace and vehicle kept at N9 7DG	**9/10**	Independent commercial contract issued before the dispute. Shows Simon Cordell recorded at **23 Byron Terrace, Hertford Road, London N9 7DG** and confirms the vehicle was kept at **N9 7DG**. False information could affect the validity of the insurance, giving the address significant evidential value.

Why not 10/10?

A 10/10 Exhibit Is Usually Something Like:

1) GP Registration Records
2) DWP / Universal Credit Records
3) Council Tax Records
4) Electoral Register
5) Court Records
6) Official Government Correspondence

Why 9/10?

The Insurance Document Is Particularly Strong Because:

1) It Predates the Succession Dispute.
2) It Was Created by An Independent Third Party.
3) It Records Your Address As **23 Byron Terrace**.
4) It Records the Vehicle as Being Kept at **N9 7DG**.
1) There Are Financial and Contractual Consequences for Providing Inaccurate Information to an Insurer.

Car Insurance Schedule (Score: 9/10) - This exhibit was an independently generated commercial record created before any succession dispute arose. It records my address as **23 Byron Terrace, Hertford Road, London N9 7DG**, and further records my vehicle as being kept at the same postcode. The document therefore provides strong third-party evidence of occupation and residence at the property and should have been specifically accounted for by the investigator when assessing my claim.

02. Mother's letters concerning overnight care	Simon Cordell was selected and named by his mother as an overnight carer at 23 Byron Terrace from 2013, with the caring arrangement subsequently submitted	**10/10**	This evidence proves that I was selected and named by my mother as an overnight carer at 23 Byron Terrace from 2013 onward. This was not an arrangement invented after her death or created for my succession application. My mother repeatedly notified Enfield

Exhibit Category	What It Proves	Evidential Strength (1-10)	Comments
	to and recorded by Enfield Council		Council of her need for overnight care, formally named me as one of the people staying overnight to provide that care, and the Council later confirmed that the overnight-carer application was held on its own systems. It therefore proves a longstanding caring role and overnight presence at 23 Byron Terrace which was declared to, known by and registered through Enfield Council years before the present succession dispute.

Why 10/10?

A 10/10 Exhibit Is Usually Something Like:

1) Contemporaneous Evidence Created Years Before the Dispute.
2) Direct Evidence from The Person Receiving the Care.
3) Evidence Specifically Naming the Person Providing Overnight Care.
4) Council Records Confirming Prior Knowledge of The Arrangement.
5) Evidence Supported by Independent Medical Documentation.
6) Evidence That Could Not Reasonably Have Been Created to Support the Later Succession Claim.

Why This Evidence Is 10/10

The Mother's Overnight-Carer Evidence Is Particularly Strong Because:

1) **The Overnight-Care Arrangement Dates From 5 May 2013.**
   Lorraine Cordell told the Council that members of her family took turns staying overnight at 23 Byron Terrace to look after her because of her illnesses and safety needs.
2) **Simon Cordell Was Specifically Named by His Mother.**
   In her complaint dated 9 February 2015, Lorraine Cordell identified Simon Cordell as one of the main people who stayed overnight and helped her.
3) **The Evidence Came Directly from the Tenant and Person Receiving Care.**
   It was Lorraine Cordell herself who described the care she required, the use of the bedroom, the overnight arrangement and the identities of the people providing that care.
4) **The Arrangement Was Submitted to Enfield Council.**
   The letters and overnight-carer application were provided to the Council through its official Revenues and Benefits and housing procedures.
5) **Enfield Homes confirmed the application was recorded on its systems.**
   In its response dated 18 February 2015, Enfield Homes stated that the overnight-carer application was visible on its systems and awaiting processing.
6) **The Arrangement Was Supported by Extensive Medical Evidence.**
   Medical records document serious spinal, mobility, bowel, bladder, pain and other health conditions affecting Lorraine Cordell, supporting the genuine need for family members to provide care and stay overnight.

Exhibit Category	What It Proves	Evidential Strength (1-10)	Comments
7) <u>The Evidence Was Created Many Years Before the Succession Dispute.</u> It could not reasonably be dismissed as evidence produced after Lorraine Cordell's death for the purpose of obtaining succession. **8) <u>It Establishes a Historical Connection With 23 Byron Terrace.</u>** It proves that Simon Cordell's overnight presence and caring role at the property did not suddenly begin when succession was requested. It formed part of an arrangement previously declared to and recorded by the Council. **9) <u>It Later Strengthens the Meaning of Other Exhibits.</u>** When later Council correspondence was addressed to Simon Cordell care of his mother at 23 Byron Terrace, that address did not appear without explanation. The overnight-carer evidence provides the earlier historical context showing why Simon Cordell was already officially connected with his mother and the property. **10) <u>The Evidence Is Cumulative.</u>** The mother's letters, Council acknowledgements, overnight-carer application, Council response and medical records support one another. The grade is therefore based upon the documented evidential chain, not merely one isolated letter.			
03. Edmonton County Court Order	Independent judicial recognition that Simon Cordell required a suitable two-bedroom property, including a spare room for carers and family members to provide the support he required	**10/10**	Independent court documentation arising from proceedings between Enfield Council and Simon Cordell. The order records that the Council was to deal with a housing management transfer application as quickly as possible and take into account the need for a suitable two-bedroom property so Simon could have a spare room for carers and family support. It also records the dismissal of the interim injunction, the Council's injunction claim, two committal applications and a further application. This is powerful independent evidence that Simon's need for carers and family support was formally placed before the court and recognised in the proceedings
<u>Why 10/10?</u> **<u>A 10/10 Exhibit Is Usually Something Like:</u>** **1)** <u>A Sealed or Approved Court Order.</u> **2)** <u>A Formal Judicial Finding or Direction.</u> **3)** <u>Independent Evidence Created Through Official Legal Proceedings.</u> **4)** <u>Evidence Involving Both the Council and the Affected Person.</u>			

Exhibit Category	What It Proves	Evidential Strength (1-10)	Comments

5) A Document Carrying Legal Authority and Procedural Consequences.
6) Evidence That Existed Years Before the Present Succession Dispute.

Why This Evidence Is 10/10

The Edmonton County Court Order Is Particularly Strong Because:

1) **It Arose from Formal Court Proceedings.**
   The document concerns claim number **E00ED049**, between The London Borough of Enfield as claimant and Simon Cordell as defendant, before District Judge Dias.
2) **The Council Was Directly Involved.**
   This was not a statement created privately by Simon or his mother. Enfield Council was itself the claimant and was represented during the proceedings.
3) **The Court Considered Independent Medical Evidence.**
   The order records the court's consideration of Dr Dhinakaran's psychiatric report dated **8 July 2018**.
4) **The Proceedings Formally Recognised the Need for Family Involvement.**
   The order records Lorraine Cordell's involvement in assisting with the housing management transfer application.
5) **The Council Agreed to Act Quickly.**
   The order records the Council's agreement that it would deal with the housing management transfer application as quickly as possible after it was made.
6) **The Need for A Suitable Two-Bedroom Property Was Expressly Recorded.**
   The amended order states that, when dealing with the transfer, the Council was to take into account the need for a suitable two-bedroom property so Simon could have a spare room for carers and family members to provide the support he required.
7) **It Supports the Established History of Overnight and Family Care.**
   The court evidence is consistent with the earlier evidence showing that Simon had been selected and named by his mother within an overnight family-care arrangement. It provides later, independent judicial support for the continuing need for carers and family assistance.
8) **The Evidence Predates the Succession Dispute by Several Years.**
   The hearing took place on **9 August 2018**, with the approved general form of order dated **6 September 2018**. It was therefore not created after Lorraine Cordell's death to assist the succession application.
9) **The Council's Applications Were Dismissed.**
   The order records that the interim injunction was discharged, and that the Council's injunction claim, two committal applications and its application dated 7 August 2018 stood dismissed.
10) **The Order Was Officially Approved and Issued.**
    Edmonton County Court confirmed that the approved order was sent to both parties on **6 September 2018**, including directly to the solicitors acting for Simon.

Important Accuracy About What It Proves

This court order should receive:

1) **10/10 For Proving the Established Need for Carers, Family Support and Consideration of a Suitable Two-Bedroom Property.**
2) **10/10 As Independent Judicial Documentation of Those Matters.**

Exhibit Category	What It Proves	Evidential Strength (1-10)	Comments

3) **A Much Lower Grade as Direct Proof of Occupation At 23 Byron Terrace**, Because the Order Does Not State That Simon Lived At 23 Byron Terrace.

Its importance to the succession evidence is **cumulative**. It supports the earlier overnight-carer evidence by showing that the need for carers and family support continued and was later formally raised and recognised in court proceedings.

Edmonton County Court Order and Judicial Recognition of the Need for Carers and Family Support (Score: 10/10)

This exhibit is independent judicial documentation arising from formal proceedings between Enfield Council and myself under claim number E00ED049. The proceedings were heard before District Judge Dias on 9 August 2018 and involved consideration of independent psychiatric evidence, my vulnerability, my housing circumstances and my need for continuing support from carers and family members.

The order records that Enfield Council agreed to deal with my housing management transfer application as quickly as possible. More importantly, the amended order expressly records that, when dealing with that transfer, the Council was to take into account the need for a suitable two-bedroom property so that I could have a spare room for carers and family members to stay and provide the support I required.

This evidence is significant because it did not originate from me as part of the present succession application. It arose through independent court proceedings involving Enfield Council itself, years before my mother's death and the current succession dispute. It confirms that my need for carers and family support was not recently invented or raised only after the death of my mother. It formed part of a documented and longstanding history that had already been placed before a court.

When read together with my mother's earlier overnight-carer applications and letters, this order provides powerful cumulative evidence of the longstanding caring arrangement within my family. My mother had previously selected and named me as an overnight carer for her, and the later court proceedings formally recorded that I myself required a spare room so carers and family members could stay and support me. The evidence therefore demonstrates a continuing and reciprocal family-care arrangement extending over many years.

The Stage 1 investigator should have identified and addressed this order when considering the full history of my connection with my mother, my caring role, my vulnerability and my dependence upon family support. Although the order does not by itself state that I occupied 23 Byron Terrace, it provides highly significant independent support for the wider evidential chronology. Its omission leaves an important part of that chronology entirely unaccounted for.

Strongest central point

The court order does not independently prove my occupation of 23 Byron Terrace. What it proves at the highest available level is that my need for carers and continuing family support had already been formally recognised in proceedings involving Enfield Council years before the present succession dispute.

04. Care-of Address: 23 Byron Terrace and Mother's Council Tax Letter	Enfield Council's own records officially connected Simon Cordell with his mother at 23 Byron Terrace	**10/10 cumulatively**	Official Council Tax bill issued on **10 March 2026** to **Mr Simon Cordell, C/O Mrs L Cordell, 23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London N9 7DG**. Read after the

Exhibit Category	What It Proves	Evidential Strength (1-10)	Comments
	immediately before the succession claim		longstanding Overnight Carer evidence and Edmonton County Court order, this is not merely an isolated postal address. It is Enfield Council's own later record continuing the documented connection between Simon Cordell, his mother, their caring arrangements and 23 Byron Terrace before the succession dispute.

Why 10/10 cumulatively?

1) It Was Created by **Enfield Council Itself**.
2) It Specifically Names **Simon Cordell and Mrs L Cordell Together**.
3) It Records **23 Byron Terrace** as The Care-Of Address.
4) It Was Issued On **10 March 2026**, Immediately Before the Succession Claim.
5) The Earlier Overnight Carer Evidence Explains the Longstanding Reason for Simon's Connection with His Mother at The Property.
6) The Edmonton County Court Order Adds to The Established History of Family Care and Support.
7) Read In Its Correct Evidential Order, It Supports Continuity Rather Than a Newly Created or Temporary Postal Arrangement.

Care-of Address: 23 Byron Terrace and Mother's Council Tax Letter (Score: 10/10 cumulatively)

This is an official Enfield Council document issued on 10 March 2026 to "Mr Simon Cordell, C/O Mrs L Cordell, 23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London N9 7DG." It directly records Enfield Council's own continuing association of me with my mother at 23 Byron Terrace immediately before the succession claim.

This exhibit must not be viewed in isolation. When read after the longstanding Overnight Carer evidence and the Edmonton County Court order concerning carers and family support, the "C/O Mrs L Cordell" entry forms part of an already documented history connecting me, my mother and 23 Byron Terrace. It provides strong Council-generated evidence continuing that established connection shortly before my mother's death and should have been specifically accounted for by the investigator.

05. Doctors / GP Correspondence	Simon Cordell declared 23 Byron Terrace as his continuing address when seeking urgent medical assistance and re-registration with his longstanding GP	**7/10 standalone; 8/10 cumulatively**	Email sent to Nightingale House Surgery on **22 July 2024**, recording Simon Cordell's address as **23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London N9 7DG**. It states that identification and current and former driving licences were attached to show that he remained at that address. It was created before the

Exhibit Category	What It Proves	Evidential Strength (1-10)	Comments
			succession dispute and during a genuine request for urgent medical assistance. However, it is correspondence sent **to** the GP rather than a GP-produced registration record confirming the address.
Doctors / GP Correspondence (Score: 7/10 standalone; 8/10 cumulatively) This email was sent to my longstanding GP surgery on **22 July 2024**, recording my address as 23 Byron Terrace and attaching identification and driving-licence evidence to demonstrate that I remained at that address. It arose from a genuine request for urgent medical assistance, well before the succession dispute. Although it is not itself a GP-generated registration record, it provides strong contemporaneous supporting evidence of my declared and continuing residence at 23 Byron Terrace when read alongside the complete evidential chronology.			
06. Universal Credit Account and Banking	Official government evidence linking Simon Cordell with his mother at 23 Byron Terrace and confirming his continuing reliance upon her support when managing official matters	**9/10 cumulatively**	On **31 March 2025**, the Universal Credit journal records twice that all Simon Cordell's mail went to his mother's address at **23 Byron Terrace, Edmonton, London N9 7DG**. The account records completed identity, address, previous-address, housing, household and banking processes. It also contains entries made by his mother on his behalf, identifying Simon as her son and explaining the support she provided in managing his official affairs. Read together with the longstanding overnight-care arrangement, the Edmonton County Court order recording Simon's need for carers and family support, and Enfield Council's own care-of-address record, this forms part of a continuing evidential chain showing the mutual care and dependence between Simon and his mother and his established connection with 23 Byron Terrace before the succession dispute.
Universal Credit Account and Banking (Score: 9/10 cumulatively) This official government account records twice on 31 March 2025 that all my mail went to my			

Exhibit Category	What It Proves	Evidential Strength (1-10)	Comments
mother's address at 23 Byron Terrace. It also records the completion of government identity, address, previous-address, housing, household and banking processes and contains entries made by my mother on my behalf, identifying me as her son and demonstrating her continuing role in supporting me with official matters. When read with the longstanding overnight-care evidence, the Edmonton County Court order recording my established need for carers and family support, and Enfield Council's own later care-of-address record, this exhibit forms part of a continuing evidential chain. That chain shows that my mother and I had become mutually reliant upon one another for support and that my connection with 23 Byron Terrace existed long before the succession dispute.			
07. British Passport	Confirms Simon Cordell's identity and British citizenship	**10/10 for identity; 2/10 for residence**	Official government identity document. It authenticates the identity attached to the other exhibited records but contains no residential address and does not directly prove occupation of 23 Byron Terrace.
<u>British Passport: 10/10 For Identity And 2/10 For Residence.</u> This official government document confirms my identity as Simon Paul Cordell and supports that I am the same person named throughout the exhibited occupation records. Although the passport does not display 23 Byron Terrace or directly prove residence, it authenticates the identity attached to the separate official, medical, financial and commercial documents recording me at that address.			
08. Driving Licence	Official government-issued identification recording Simon Paul Cordell's residential address as 23 Byron Terrace	**10/10**	DVLA-issued driving licence dated **20 February 2024**, recording **23 Byron Terrace, Hertford Road, London, N9 7DG** as Simon Paul Cordell's address. It confirms both his identity and officially declared residential address, predates the succession dispute, and remained valid until **9 February 2034**.
<u>Driving Licence (Score: 10/10)</u> This official DVLA identity document was issued on 20 February 2024, before the succession dispute, and records my residential address as **23 Byron Terrace, Hertford Road, London, N9 7DG**. It directly connects my verified identity with the property and provides primary government-issued evidence supporting my residence there. The investigator should have specifically accounted for this exhibit when assessing my occupation claim.			
09. Parking Tickets and Vehicle-Release Records	Enfield Council's own records repeatedly connected Simon Cordell	**10/10 cumulatively**	Enfield Council's own records dated **20 January, 23 February, 11 March and 13 March 2026**

Exhibit Category	What It Proves	Evidential Strength (1-10)	Comments
	with 23 Byron Terrace, supported by several identification and address documents produced when collecting his vehicle before his mother's death		repeatedly connect Simon Cordell with **23 Byron Terrace**. The vehicle-release record also confirms that, when collecting the vehicle from the police compound before his mother's death, Simon Cordell produced his **driving licence, motor insurance and electricity bill** as supporting identification, with those separate documents connecting him to 23 Byron Terrace. The driving licence adds particular strength because it independently records 23 Byron Terrace as his official government-registered address. The repeated use of the same address across several Council records, together with multiple supporting documents produced during the official vehicle-release process, provides strong evidence of an established and continuing connection with the property immediately before the succession claim
Parking Tickets and Vehicle-Release Records (Score: 10/10 Cumulatively) Enfield Council's own records dated 20 January, 23 February, 11 March and 13 March 2026 repeatedly connect me with 23 Byron Terrace. The vehicle-release record further confirms that, when collecting my vehicle from the police compound before my mother's death, I produced my driving licence, motor insurance and electricity bill as supporting identification, with those separate documents connecting me to 23 Byron Terrace. My driving licence adds particular strength because it independently records 23 Byron Terrace as my official government-registered address. The repeated use of the same address across several Council records, supported by multiple documents produced during an official vehicle-release process, provides strong evidence of my established and continuing connection with the property immediately before the succession claim.			
10. Kings Oak Hospital Hernia Records	Independent healthcare records identify Simon Paul Cordell at 23 Byron Terrace during his hospital treatment in July 2025	**10/10**	The appointment confirmation and discharge record issued by The Kings Oak Hospital record Simon Paul Cordell's address as **23 Byron Terrace, Hertford Road, London, N9 7DG**. The discharge document confirms his hospital

Exhibit Category	What It Proves	Evidential Strength (1-10)	Comments
			admission and right inguinal hernia repair on **28 July 2025**. The address was therefore used within genuine NHS-funded medical treatment and communicated to his GP, providing strong independent evidence of residence before the succession dispute.
Kings Oak Hospital Hernia Records (Score: 10/10) These independent healthcare records identify me as Simon Paul Cordell and record my address as **23 Byron Terrace, Hertford Road, London, N9 7DG**. The records were created during genuine NHS-funded medical treatment, including my admission and right inguinal hernia operation on **28 July 2025**, and were intended for distribution to both me and my GP. They therefore directly connect my verified identity, medical care and GP records with 23 Byron Terrace before my mother's death and before the succession dispute. The investigator should have specifically accounted for this strong independent evidence when assessing my occupation of the property.			
11. Just Eat Delivery Record	A paid food order linked to Simon Cordell's digital account and banking details was delivered to 23 Byron Terrace as part of ordinary domestic living shortly before the succession claim	**9/10 standalone; 10/10 cumulatively**	The digital Just Eat record confirms that a paid food order was delivered to **23 Byron Terrace at approximately 23:55 on 6 May 2026**, using a Visa card ending **7011**. The account, order and payment details are capable of verification and matching to Simon Cordell. The late-night delivery strongly supports his physical presence and ordinary domestic use of 23 Byron Terrace as his home. The standalone score leaves only a remote possibility that another person used his account or payment details. However, when assessed alongside the remaining exhibits independently identifying Simon Cordell at 23 Byron Terrace, that possibility becomes extremely difficult to maintain, giving the evidence a cumulative value of **10/10**.
Just Eat Delivery Record: 9/10 standalone and 10/10 cumulatively This digital record confirms that a paid food order linked to my account and banking details was delivered to 23 Byron Terrace at approximately **23:55 on 6 May 2026**, shortly before the succession			

Exhibit Category	What It Proves	Evidential Strength (1-10)	Comments
claim. The digital account, order history and Visa card ending 7011 are capable of independent verification and provide strong grounds for identifying me as the customer. The timing and nature of the transaction are important. This was a late-night food delivery to 23 Byron Terrace as part of ordinary domestic living. It therefore supports that I was physically present and using the property as my home, rather than merely using the address for correspondence. The standalone score of **9/10** leaves only the remote possibility that somebody else improperly used my digital account and payment details. However, when this record is considered alongside the remaining independent exhibits consistently identifying me at 23 Byron Terrace, that remote possibility becomes extremely difficult to sustain. Its cumulative evidential value is therefore **10/10**.			
12. Giffgaff Mobile Account Records	Simon Cordell maintained an active mobile account registered to 23 Byron Terrace, supported by continuing payments from December 2023 to May 2026	**10/10 cumulatively**	The giffgaff account identifies **Simon Cordell**, mobile number **07864 217519**, and his address as **23 Byron Terrace, Hertford Road, London, N9 7DG**. It also records the linked Visa card ending **7011**, the address used for billing, and a continuous history of completed monthly mobile-plan payments extending from **December 2023 to May 2026**. This is not a single address entry created shortly before the succession claim. It is an established digital account showing sustained everyday use, regular payments and an address connection continuing for more than two years before Simon's mother died

Why 10/10 cumulatively?

1) The Account Identifies **Simon Cordell by Name**.
2) It Records His Mobile Number As **07864 217519**.
3) It Records His Address As **23 Byron Terrace**.
4) It Contains a Linked Payment Card Ending **7011**.
5) It Shows Completed Monthly Payments Dating Back to **December 2023**.
6) The Account and Payment Records Continued Through **May 2026**, Immediately Before the Succession Claim.
7) The Address, Identity, Telephone Number, Payment Card and Payment History Can Be Digitally Checked.
8) It Demonstrates a Continuing Pattern of Ordinary Personal and Financial Life, Rather Than a One-Off Use of The Address.

Giffgaff Mobile Account Records (Score: 10/10 Cumulatively)

This digital account identifies me as Simon Cordell, records my mobile number as 07864 217519 and records my address as 23 Byron Terrace, Hertford Road, London, N9 7DG. It further records my

Exhibit Category	What It Proves	Evidential Strength (1-10)	Comments
linked Visa card ending 7011 and a continuous history of completed monthly mobile-plan payments extending from December 2023 to May 2026. This was therefore not a single address entry created shortly before my succession application. It was an active account connecting my identity, mobile telephone, payment card, billing arrangements and continuing monthly expenditure with 23 Byron Terrace for more than two years before my mother's death. The sustained history makes this powerful evidence of an established and continuing residential connection with the property, rather than the address being used temporarily or solely for receiving correspondence. When assessed with the other independently verified occupation records, its cumulative evidential value is **10/10**.			

As Above is the Start of How the Stage 1 Investigator Should Have Reviewed the Succession Evidence

Overall Start of the Assessment

The issue is not whether evidence existed. The issue is that this evidence appears never to have been individually assessed, graded, or addressed.

A reasonable investigator would have been expected to identify each exhibit, state whether it was accepted or rejected, explain what weight was given to it, and explain how the evidence supported or failed to support the conclusion reached.

When Viewed Collectively Rather Than Individually:

Assessment Area	Grade
Quantity of Evidence	**10/10**
Quality of Evidence	**10/10**
Independent Third-Party Sources	**10/10**
Government Records	**10/10**
Medical Records	**10/10**
Financial Records	**10/10**
Documentary Continuity	**10/10**
Overall Evidential Weight	**10/10**

Argument: If an investigator intends to conclude that insufficient evidence of occupation existed, they would be expected to explain why GP records, hospital records, driving licence records, court documents, benefit records, banking records, insurance records, council records, and other exhibited documents were inadequate. Simply concluding that insufficient evidence existed without accounting for each category of evidence leaves the reasoning unsupported and impossible to properly scrutinise.

The Inherent Evidential Assessment

Although this part may not be separately labelled in the procedure, it is an essential part of any competent investigation. The Stage 1 investigator had to:

A. Verify and classify the exhibits.

1) Are they genuine?
2) Do they relate to me?
3) Which address and dates do they record?
4) Who created them?
5) Can their details be independently checked?
6) What relevant fact does each exhibit prove?

B. Assess corroboration and cumulative weight.

1) Do the exhibits support one another?
2) What do they establish when considered together rather than separately?

C. Check consistency and congruence

1) Do the names, addresses, dates, telephone numbers, account details, payment cards and other identifying information consistently connect the same person with the same property and period of occupation?

Applying the Evidence to the Housing Succession Test

Only after completing that evidential assessment could the Stage 1 investigator properly test whether the original decisionmaker had applied the exhibits to:

1) Whether A Succession Had Already Taken Place.
2) Whether I Occupied the Dwelling as My Main and Principal Home.
3) Whether I Occupied It as My Main and Principal Home for At Least 12 Months Before My Mother's Death.
4) My Qualifying Relationship with My Mother.
5) Whether The Property Was Suitable for Me.
6) Whether I Provided Care to My Mother.
7) Whether I Had Accepted Responsibility for My Mother's Needs and Needed to Live with Her to Provide That Support.
8) The Terms of My Mother's Tenancy Agreement, Against Which Each of Those Matters Had to Be Cross-Referenced.

So, the Correct Merited Outcome Should Have Been as Follows

NUMBER	TEST TO BE MET	EXHIBITS SUPPORTED BY THE CLAIMANT
1)	**Whether A Succession Had Already Taken Place.**	**No Claimant Exhibit Could Finally Determine This.** Enfield Council was required to check my mother's tenancy history, any previous succession record and the original tenancy agreement held within its own systems.
2)	**Whether I Occupied the Dwelling as My Main and Principal Home.**	1. **01.** Motor-Insurance Schedule: **9/10** 2. **04.** Care-of Address and Mother's Council Tax Letter: **10/10** cumulatively! 3. **05.** Doctors/GP Correspondence: **7/10** standalone; **8/10** cumulatively 4. **06.** Universal Credit Account and Banking: **9/10** cumulatively 5. **08.** Driving Licence: **10/10** 6. **09.** Parking Tickets and Vehicle-Release Records: **10/10** cumulatively 7. **10.** Kings Oak Hospital Hernia Records: **10/10**

NUMBER	TEST TO BE MET	EXHIBITS SUPPORTED BY THE CLAIMANT
		8. **11**. Just Eat Delivery Record: **9/10** standalone; **10/10** cumulatively 9. **12.** Giffgaff Mobile Account Records: **10/10** cumulatively **Result:**
3)	**Whether I Occupied It as My Main and Principal Home for At Least 12 Months Before My Mother's Death.**	1. **01.** Motor-Insurance Schedule: **9/10** standalone; **10/10** cumulatively 2. **02.** Mother's Letters Concerning Overnight Care: **10/10** for the longstanding caring arrangement; supporting historical evidence of occupation. 3. **04.** Care-of Address: 23 Byron Terrace and Mother's Council Tax Letter: **8/10** standalone; **10/10** cumulatively. 4. **05.** Doctors / GP Correspondence: **7/10** standalone; **8/10** cumulatively 5. **06.** Universal Credit Account and Banking: **8/10** standalone**; 9/10** cumulatively 6. **08.** Driving Licence: **10/10** standalone and cumulatively 7. **09.** Parking Tickets and Vehicle-Release Records: **9/10** standalone; **10/10** cumulatively 8. **10.** Kings Oak Hospital Hernia Records: **10/10** standalone and cumulatively 9. **11.** Just Eat Delivery Record: **9/10** standalone; **10/10** cumulatively 10. **12.**Giffgaff Mobile Account Records: **9/10** standalone; **10/10** cumulatively **Result:** These exhibits provide a continuous evidential history extending from the longstanding overnight-care arrangement beginning in 2013 through to May 2026. More importantly, the dated official, medical, commercial, Council and digital records cover the required 12 months before my mother's death and repeatedly connect my identity, ordinary domestic life, healthcare, vehicle, financial arrangements and continuing expenditure with 23 Byron Terrace. When assessed cumulatively, the evidence strongly supports that 23 Byron Terrace was my main and principal home throughout the relevant period.
4)	**My Qualifying Relationship with My Mother.**	1. **02.** Mother's Letters Concerning Overnight Care: **10/10** 2. **04.** Care-of Address and Mother's Council Tax Letter: **8/10** standalone; **10/10** cumulatively. 3. **06.** Universal Credit Account and Banking: **8/10** standalone; **9/10** cumulatively

NUMBER	TEST TO BE MET	EXHIBITS SUPPORTED BY THE CLAIMANT
		4. **07.** British Passport: **10/10** for identity; **2/10** for residence **Result:** These exhibits identify me as Simon Cordell, identify Lorraine Cordell as my mother, and establish our mother-and-son relationship.
5)	**Whether The Property Was Suitable for Me.**	1. **02.** Mother's Letters Concerning Overnight Care: **10/10**. 2. **03.** Edmonton County Court Order: **10/10** for the matters formally recorded. 3. **06.** Universal Credit Account and Banking: **9/10** cumulatively. **Result**: These exhibits support my need for suitable two-bedroom accommodation at 23 Byron Terrace, where my mother and I could continue providing each other with care and family support.
6)	**Whether I Provided Care to My Mother.**	1. **02.** Mother's Letters Concerning Overnight Care: **10/10** standalone and cumulatively. 2. **04.** Care-of Address: 23 Byron Terrace and Mother's Council Tax Letter: **8/10** standalone; **10/10** cumulatively. 3. **06.** Universal Credit Account and Banking: **8/10** standalone; **9/10** cumulatively. **Result**: My mother's contemporaneous letters specifically name me as one of her overnight carers and show that the caring arrangement was submitted to and recorded by Enfield Council years before the succession dispute.
7)	**Whether I Had Accepted Responsibility for My Mother's Needs and Needed to Live with Her to Provide That Support.**	1. **02.** Mother's Letters Concerning Overnight Care: **10/10** standalone and cumulatively. 2. **03.** Edmonton County Court Order: **10/10** for the matters formally recorded. 3. **04.** Care-of Address: 23 Byron Terrace and Mother's Council Tax Letter: 8/10 standalone; **10/10** cumulatively. 4. **06.** Universal Credit Account and Banking: **8/10** standalone; **9/10** cumulatively. **Result:** These exhibits establish the longstanding and reciprocal caring arrangement between my mother and me, her increasing care needs, my overnight presence at 23 Byron Terrace, and our continuing reliance upon one another for support.

NUMBER	TEST TO BE MET	EXHIBITS SUPPORTED BY THE CLAIMANT
8)	**The Terms of My Mother's Tenancy Agreement, Against Which Each of Those Matters Had to Be Cross-Referenced.**	**No Claimant Exhibit Could Replace the Original Tenancy Agreement.** Enfield Council held the tenancy agreement, commencement date, succession clauses, tenancy history and any previous-succession record. The original succession officer and Stage 1 investigator were required to obtain and cross-reference those records against the evidence I supplied.

Overall Merited Result

The claimant's exhibits strongly supported Tests 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. Tests 1 and 8 depended mainly upon tenancy records held by Enfield Council itself. The correct outcome was therefore not an unexplained finding that my evidence was insufficient. The Council was required to identify its own tenancy records, cross-reference them with my exhibits and make a reasoned finding against every test.

Notes 1 of 2 Taken From: 16. Succession-Procedure-February-2025.pdf **[Passages All / 2.2.3 + 2.3.3]**
Notes 2 of 2 Taken From: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/contents **[Equality Act 2010]**

Mr. Simon Paul Cordell



(Signed) Mr. Simon Paul CORDELL)
(Date Signed) 21/10/2026

Stage 2 Official Claimant Attachment
Pages: 26
Provides: 3.7 pages for each 7 cores!
Core File 3
The Seven Core Complaint, the Investigation Duties It Created, and the Stage 1 Investigator's Failure to Properly Examine Them
Purpose of This Core File
This Core 3 File concerns the complaint itself.
It is not a re-argument of the succession application. It is an examination of the Seven Core Complaint that I formally submitted to **Enfield Council** and the investigation obligations that that complaint created for him or her! When the Stage 1 complaint was submitted, I did not provide a single allegation, a single email, or a simple disagreement with the succession outcome. I submitted a structured complaint consisting of indexed complaint files, chronology evidence, correspondence records, exhibits, supporting documents, and requested remedies. The purpose of that structure was to allow the investigator to examine each issue I raised of my concerns separately, follow the evidence relied upon, obtain explanations from the relevant officers, and provide reasoned findings against every significant matter raised.
The complaint is supported by documentary evidence throughout. The chronology, correspondence, exhibits and supporting documents had already been assembled and indexed before the complaint reached the investigator. My role as complainant was not to create evidence but to explain the significance of the evidence already supplied and why I believed the conduct, decisions, communications and actions of Council staff required investigation.
For that reason, the investigator's role was not simply to decide whether they agreed or disagreed with me. Their responsibility was to follow the evidence, identify the issues arising from it, obtain explanations from the relevant members of staff, test those explanations against the documentary record, and then provide findings supported by reasons. Throughout my complaint I repeatedly relied upon specific emails, records, exhibits and chronology entries. In many cases the complaint did not merely raise concerns about the final succession decision itself. It raised questions about how the process was managed, how evidence was handled, how information was communicated, whether procedures were followed correctly, whether representations made by staff were accurate, and whether the documentary record supported the explanations later relied upon by the Enfield Council staff, involved and accused.
The purpose of this Core 3 File is therefore to identify what the investigator was required to examine once the Seven Core Complaint was received and to compare those investigation duties decisions against the response that was eventually provided by them.

In Simple Terms, This File Asks a Straightforward Question:
Once the evidence, chronology, exhibits and complaint issues were placed before the Stage 1 investigator, did the investigation actually address them, correctly with the right merits and scoring?
The sections that follow examine the individual complaint files, the duties each file created, the findings that should have been made, and the matters that remain unanswered within the Stage 1 response.

Table of Context:

File 01 - Index
Purpose
01. Index.pdf I submitted this core file as the master reference document for the complaint I made. I created the file for persons of interest to be able to organise the complaint for ease of use, identify the evidence relied upon, establish the complaint structure, and ultimately direct the investigator to the underlying files, correspondence, exhibits and supporting evidence as the introduction of my complaint.

File Structure Review

Section	Contents	What This Required the Investigator to Review
A. This Complaints Index	5 Core Complaint Files (Index, Intro Email, Formal Complaint, Timeline of Proven Facts, Requested Actions & Remedies)	Review all Core Complaint Files and provide findings against each section.
B. Case Files Index	1 directory containing the collected succession correspondence	Review the complete correspondence trail relating to the succession application.
C. Combined Files	Single combined PDF binder of the succession correspondence	Review the succession history in chronological order and verify chronology against underlying correspondence.
D. Single Files	Individual correspondence files numbered throughout the succession process, including directories containing additional case files	Review individual communications, requests, responses, decisions, reviews, and supporting documents.
E. Additional Evidence Added 28-08-26	Additional correspondence, recordings, documents, and evidence discovered after I assembled the original complaint material.	Review newly discovered evidence and determine whether it affects earlier conclusions or demonstrates procedural failures.
F. Evidence Supplied To Georgina Solan	Main housing succession evidence bundle provided with the succession application	Review the evidence relied upon by the applicant to support residence, occupation, and succession.
G. Existing Exhibits A-J	Core exhibits already enclosed with the complaint	Review all exhibits and explain what weight was attributed to each exhibit.
H. New Exhibits A-H	Newly identified evidence discovered after the original complaint was prepared	Review whether the new evidence alters findings, raises new concerns, or supports existing complaint points.

Existing Exhibits Identified Within the Index

Exhibit	Description	Why It Required Findings
A	Email from **Georgina Solan** to police dated 17 May 2026	Complaint alleged that housing advice provided to police influenced subsequent actions. Stage 1 should explain whether this communication was reviewed and what conclusion was reached.
B	"We Will Review" email dated 10 July 2026	Complaint relied upon this correspondence when alleging the succession matter remained under review. Stage 1 should explain whether the communication was reviewed and what meaning was attributed to it.
C	Section 41 Notice	Complaint raised concerns regarding service, notification, and handling of the notice. Stage 1 should explain whether those concerns were investigated.
D	WhatsApp message evidencing concealment allegation	Complaint relied upon this as supporting evidence. Stage 1 should identify whether it was reviewed.
E	Freeze warning email	Complaint alleged warnings were provided prior to events complained of. Stage 1 should identify whether this evidence was considered.

F-J	Property, inventory, police, bail, and court-order evidence	Complaint explicitly relied upon these exhibits. Stage 1 should explain whether they were reviewed and, if reviewed, the findings reached.

What The Index Demonstrates

The Index demonstrates that the complaint was not submitted as:

1) A single email.
2) A single allegation.
3) A single succession dispute.

Instead, It Was Submitted As:

1) Multiple Core Complaint Files.
2) A Complete Correspondence History.
3) A Chronology.
4) Existing Exhibits.
5) Newly Discovered Exhibits.
6) Supporting Evidence Bundles.
7) Referenced Source Material.

What Stage 1 Should Have Demonstrated

The Stage 1 response should therefore have demonstrated:

Required Finding	Demonstrated Within Stage 1?
Which Core Complaint Files Were Reviewed	Reviewed and identified.
Which Exhibits Were Reviewed	Reviewed and identified.
Which Evidence Bundles Were Reviewed	Reviewed and identified.
Which Correspondence Files Were Reviewed	Reviewed and identified.
Which Pieces of Evidence Were Accepted	Reviewed and identified.
Which Pieces of Evidence Were Rejected	Reviewed and identified.
Why Evidence Was Rejected	Reviewed and identified.
Findings Against Each Core Complaint File	Reviewed and identified.
Findings Against the Timeline of Proven Facts	Reviewed and identified.

Stage 2 Observation

File 01 was not intended to prove a single allegation in isolation. It was intended to identify the complete complaint structure, chronology, exhibits, correspondence, and supporting evidence relied upon. The Stage 1 response does not demonstrate that the material identified by the Index was reviewed in its entirety, nor does it identify findings against the individual complaint sections referenced within it. Therefore, I remain concerned that the complaint was not investigated in the form in which it was submitted.

WHAT THE INVESTIGATOR WAS REQUIRED TO UNDERSTAND BEFORE ASSESSING MY COMPLAINT
FILE 02 - 02. INTRO EMAIL.PDF

01. Index.pdf
02. Intro Email.pdf
03. Formal Complaint.pdf
04. Timeline Of Proven Facts.pdf
05. Requested Actions & Remedies.pdf

06. SUBJECT ACCESS REQUEST.pdf

07. The Seven Core.pdf

When the complaint bundle arrived on the investigator's desk, it did not contain a series of unsupported allegations made by a dissatisfied resident.

It contained a complete chronological record of the events that had unfolded throughout the case, including emails, official correspondence, notices, decisions, and other documentary evidence that had been exchanged between the parties over time. These documents were already organised within the exhibit index so that the chronology could be followed from beginning to end. As the person living through these events, my narrative was not intended to create evidence. The evidence already existed within the exhibits. My role was to explain what those documents meant, how the events unfolded from my perspective, and why the actions being taken by council officers caused me to officially complain about them! Every statement made throughout the Seven Core Complaints was therefore rooted in documentary evidence already supplied to the investigator. The investigator was required to read my words alongside the documents from which they were derived, not separately from them.

For example, where I explained that I was led to believe succession was ongoing, that was not presented as a personal opinion detached from the evidence. It was my explanation of a sequence of documented interactions, communications and requests made by council staff which, when experienced in real time, would naturally lead an ordinary person to believe that their succession case remained active and under consideration. The investigator's responsibility was therefore to place themselves back into that moment in time and follow the events as they actually occurred. They had to examine the documents in the order I served them to them in, understand the position I would have believed myself to be in at each stage of the process, and find why I reached the conclusions explained within my complaint. Only after doing that could the investigator fairly assess whether my interpretation of events was correct. If the investigator disagreed with my conclusions, it was not enough simply to reject them without any acknowledgment of them. They were required to identify the documentary evidence upon which I relied, present that evidence to the relevant members of staff, with a fair line of investigation questions for complainants while obtain the staffs explanations, test those explanations against the chronology, and then provide a reasoned finding explaining why my interpretation was either accepted or rejected. Instead, where a complaint response addresses the eventual outcome without first addressing the documented chain of events that produced that outcome, the central issue remains unanswered. The investigator has not examined the lived experience revealed by the chronology. They have merely commented on where the journey ended before the complaint started! while also failing to demonstrate any fair investigate of how the investigator reached that destination. That distinction is fundamental because my complaint was not only about the final decision, as my complaint was also about the conduct, communications, actions, and omissions that occurred throughout the process and which are evidenced within the documentary record itself. Those are the matters that required a fair a thorough investigation that is not proved to of happened by the Enfield Councils Staff Responsible!

Issues Enfield Councils Staff Failed too Recognised.
"Georgina led me to believe succession was active."

Binder No.	Document	What it shows
03	Succession application form sent by Georgina	She sends me a succession application and asks me to complete it.
05	Received 18-05-26	She acknowledges receipt and says: *"We can only consider your application once we have the supporting documents."*
07	Received 19-05-26	She says, *"She requests 12 months of bank statements."*
09	Received 20-05-26	She says, *"a Left in Occupation account will be open whilst your application is being considered."*

15	Received 12-06-26	She requests, the official death certificate of my passed away mother, stating for reasons of the housing succession claim to continue!
29	Received 10-07-26	She states: *"we will review the matter and include your latest evidence. I will update you on the outcome."*

Those are not my words. Those are the actual emails the narrative is relying on.

"I supplied all evidence requested."

Proved by:

Binder No.	Document
04	Succession application submitted.
06	11 folders of ID and supporting evidence sent.
08	Bank statements supplied after request.
12	Interim death certificate supplied.
16 & 17	Official death certificate supplied and resent
27.2 & 27.3	Extensive principal-home evidence and exhibits resubmitted.

"Succession was refused because of Burncroft."

Direct documentary proof:

Binder No.	Document
20	Refusal email stating succession denied because I have my own tenancy at 109 Burncroft Avenue.
23	Enfield Councils case management staff repeat their position again that I do not have succession rights as I remain the tenant of 109 Burncroft.

"The reason later changed, after Enfield Councils staff admitted I was correct when stating that I have legal rights to be allowed 109 Burncroft Avenue in my name and legally still be allowed to apply for housing succession of 23 Byron Terrace as 23 Byron Terrace is my primary home as my evidence proves."

Evidence trail:

Binder No.	Document
20	Original refusal reason = own tenancy at Burncroft.
26	Council later says it is not solely because of another tenancy and refers to wider evidence and principal home issues.

That is the actual document trail behind the allegation that the refusal basis changed.

"Georgina told police I had no occupation rights."

Direct evidence:

Binder No.	Document
0.1 Met & Council Police Cad	Georgina's email to police states: "Mr Cordell has no confirmed legal right of occupation under the tenancy."

"I was prevented from entering the property."

Evidence referred to in binder:

Binder No.	Document
A6 / Exhibit A1 material	Bail condition chronology.
32 Complaint Timeline	Return to property only after bail variation.
Intro Email	Records being allowed back after bail variation.

"Section 41 was happening while I was being told review was ongoing."

This is one of the strongest chronology points because both events are dated 10 July.

Binder No.	Document
29	Email to Mr. Simon Paul Cordell: *"we will review the matter and include your latest evidence".*
41 / Section 41 Notice	Notice dated 10 July 2026 warning property disposal after 9 August.

These Exhibits of the clamant are exactly what the Enfield Councils investigators must use as they provide the evidence to provide by proof, guilty convictions and must mandatorily be taken into account within the Enfield Councils response to my seven core officially logged stage 1 complaint!

What the Stage 1 Investigator should have done

The investigator was not supposed to read:

"Georgina misled me."

Then Not questioned whether he or she:

" Believe Simon?"

Instead, they should have read:

1) Email 03
2) Email 05
3) Email 07
4) Email 09
5) Email 15
6) Email 29

and then explain:

Why was succession paperwork issued, evidence requested, bank statements requested, death certificates requested and evidence said to be under review if the council position was as later described?

That is a countable investigation issue because it arises directly from the exhibited chronology. And importantly, The Enfield Councils Stage 1 response jumps to:

"You did not provide sufficient evidence."

without addressing the specific correspondence chains, I relied on throughout the binder.

OTHER INVESTIGATION FAILURE STATISTICS

Investigation Failure Area	Potential Failures
Failure to investigate evidence showing council conduct repeatedly indicated that the succession process remained active	6
Failure to investigate how a succession application could be relied upon whilst the process complained of had not been properly progressed	6
Failure to investigate statements which communicated that the decision was final and incapable of challenge	5
Failure to investigate whether relevant legal rights and possession procedures were ever properly explained	4

Failure to investigate how known disability, vulnerability and safeguarding responsibilities were considered throughout the process	5
Failure to investigate the circumstances leading to the use of the Section 41 disposal process	6
Failure to investigate how possessions, sentimental items and property came to be lost, removed, or damaged	6
Failure to investigate the relationship between exclusion from the property and the subsequent loss of possessions	4
Failure to investigate the complaint as a chronology supported by exhibited evidence rather than as unsupported assertions	6
TOTAL POTENTIAL INVESTIGATION FAILURES IDENTIFIED	**48**

Why These Failures Exist

These figures do not arise because I as the complaint questioned forty-eight separate questions, they arise because the complaint was supported by a chronological evidence bundle consisting of emails, official correspondence, notices, decisions, and other documentary records. Those exhibits established the sequence of events. The narrative which followed did not create new evidence. It explained the significance of the evidence already contained within the chronology. Each time the complaint identified something important flowing from that chronology, the investigator became responsible for examining it, obtaining explanations from the relevant officers, evaluating those explanations against the documentary record, and to record all findings appropriately but this has not happened! Where that process did not occur, a separate investigation failure arose.

What The Statistics Actually Measure

The statistics do not measure disagreement between investigator and complainant. They measure cases where documentary evidence identified a matter requiring investigation, yet no meaningful examination, explanation, finding, or response was recorded by the investigator, which has now led to further questioning being needed!

In simple terms:

1) Evidence Existed.
2) The Evidence Pointed Towards a Specific Issue.
3) The Complaint Explained the Significance of That Issue.
4) The Investigator Was Expected to Address It.
5) The Response Failed to Do So

Each occurrence represents a distinct investigation failure capable of being identified, counted, and evidenced from the complaint file itself.

File 03 - 03. Formal Complaint.pdf

01. Index.pdf
02. Intro Email.pdf
03. Formal Complaint.pdf
04. Timeline Of Proven Facts.pdf
05. Requested Actions & Remedies.pdf
06. SUBJECT ACCESS REQUEST.pdf
07. The Seven Core.pdf

Purpose

This is the first file that starts generating **Actual Investigation Obligations** rather than simply acting as an index or introduction.

Sections 1 to 1.3

The investigator was obligated to review these first four sections for references as for them to be able to label and mark down identifications of persons accused and understand an introduction for the purpose of this core section of this Seven Core Official Complaint. These sections themselves do not prove investigative failures:

1) **1. Urgent: Formal Complaint:** Identifies the Formal Status of The Document.
2) **1.1 Complainant:** Identifies Mr. Simon Paul Cordell, the Home and the Direct Contact Details Available to the Council.
3) **1.2 Respondent:** Identifies Enfield Council Housing & Regeneration As the Public Authority Responsible for Investigating and Responding.
4) **1.3 Officer Subject to Complaint:** Identifies Georgina Solan As the Employee Whose Documented Actions and Communications Required Investigation.

These sections receive ***zero failure points***. They establish the people, roles, property losses, and the investigators responsibility needed to understand the substantive complaint.

This Is a Main Point in The Complaint, Where the Investigators Failure Analysis Begins to Ripen!

1.4 Executive Summary

This Section Introduces Four Evidenced Complaint Conclusions:

1) What Georgina Solan Communicated to the Metropolitan Police On **17 May 2026**.
2) The **10 July 2026** Her Representation That the Succession Evidence Was Under Review While **Section 41** Action Was Occurring.
3) The fact that she Bypassed me unmorally by Communicating Through Estranged Relatives, **Causing:**
4) The Resulting Loss and Damage Discovered at The Property, Concerning My Missing Private Property, She Authorised for Them to Remove, With Her Management Knowing She Would Need My Legal Consent!

At section 1.4, the investigator was to **Record All of The Four Allegations with Merits but Has Not!** He or she should also not have yet given investigating totals such as **10, Out Of 10 or 0 out of 10 For Extreme or non-existent Failures for these raised concerns**. The investigator job was to trace through the statements the supporting evidence, while gathering such intel and then to pursue the alleged member of staff through a fair investigation of questioning for what evidence is being proved against them and to then afterwards document their findings in their Stage 1 response. No proof of this is exhibited in the report. The files being Exhibited by us were to be analysed and concluded as compared with having already been provided by us as exhibits. The files are contained in the seven Core complaints first page, as indexed.

1.5 Phase Heading

The heading****"The Cover-Up & Denial of My Legal Rights and Home" **** states the conclusion that the evidence beneath it was intended to be established as proven fact for review! The heading itself is not counted as a separate failure. The evidence placed beneath it is what is designed to prove our substantiated conclusions.

1.5.1 Succession Evidence Table

This is where the substantive evidential testing begins.

The table's purpose was to use the participants' own words to show:

1) What Date I Requested for A Housing Succession Case to Be Opened in My Name.
2) What date The Enfield Councils Staff Issued the Application form to me.
3) What date I Returned the Housing application Form.
4) What date and why did the Enfield council rejected my housing succession application.
5) How the housing applications rejection was communicated to me and what was detailed withinside of that correspondence, **I.E**. Dates, Officers Names, Reason Given for Refusal, Options Given, Legal Remedies Given!

6) When Further Evidence Was Requested.
7) When Evidence Was Supplied how was it assessed alongside with meta data checks.
8) When The Application Was Described as Being Considered.
9) When A Decision Was Made and based upon scoring for each exhibited item and valid reasons.
10) What Dates I Requested for the Decision-Making Process to Be Called into Question.

Each Entry Must Therefore Be Processed Like This but is not:

1) **→ My Table Of/Or Entry**
2) **→ The Original Indexed Email**
3) **→ Staffs Under Investigation And/or My Exact Words**
4) **→ What Those Words Proved at That Date.**
5) **→ What Staff Had to Explain to Comply with Standards to Be Met Rather Than What Is Being Proved.**
6) **→ What Finding the Investigator Had to Make for The Evidence They Are Presented With.**
7) **→ Accountability & Liability Proven Facts.**
8) **→ What Not to Omit Out of the Stage 1 Response.**

An Example of An Investigating Case Handler Using a Table and The Intel They Are Processing Correctly, Is as Follows.

- Evidence Management and Then to Legal Observe the Civil and Criminal Movements & Actions of the Staff Member Being Accused of Any Offences!
- The Documented Needed Will Records Those Offences and May Contain a Table for Ease of Personal Use, **I.e.**
  1) Georgina Solan Attached to Me a Housing Succession Application.
  2) I Completed and Returned It.
  3) She Said the Application Could Only Be Considered After Supporting Documents Were Received.
  4) I Supplied Those Supporting Documents.
  5) She Requested Bank Statements, **"With No Mention to Myself of Me Not Being Eligible to Succeed!"**
  6) I Supplied Those Statements.
  7) She Later Requested the Official Death Certificate, and **"She Agreed to Set Me Up a Rent Account!"**
  8) I Supplied and Resent It all to her.
  9) Also, The Correspondence Expressly Referred to Me as The Legal Applicant who had applied for succession and prove I Meet the Legal Threshold of the Housing Requirements to Be Able to Apply to Succeed for Housing Succession so that I could have my case Considered at a Leal Housing Panel Hearing, and as a supported person by the Enfield Council Staff.

What This All Proves

This sequence proved by me is more than just the existence of isolated emails. It shows that an official process was being conducted due to my requests, responses, and representations. My statement that I was wrongly led to believe succession was actively continuing was therefore rooted in Georgina Solan's own communications and actions and therefore must be found in favour of my complaint as the evidence proves!

What The Investigator Had to Raise Internally but Has Failed to Do So:

The investigator was needed to put the complete sequence to Georgina Solan and require her to explain:

1) What Process She Was Conducting.
2) Why The Application and Further Evidence Were Requested.
3) Where The Application Was Logged.
4) Who Assessed the Supplied Material.
5) How The Evidence Was Used.
6) Whether Management or A Panel Considered It.

7) And Why Her Later Account Differed from The Process Represented in Her Original Correspondence.

Findings Required

The investigator had to make findings on:

1) Whether A Live Succession Claim Existed.
2) Whether The Application Was Formally Processed.
3) Whether The Supplied Evidence Was Assessed.
4) Whether The Represented Review or Panel Procedure Occurred.
5) Whether Council Conduct Caused Me to Rely Upon the Process.
6) Whether Any Staff Failure Prevented a Proper Determination; And
7) Whether The Later Assertion That I Did Not Qualify Was Being Used to Avoid Addressing How the Process Had Actually Been Managed.

Count Only After Comparison!

Only after reading the Stage 1 response can, we say:

1) Evidence Reviewed: Yes Or no.
2) Matter Put to Georgina: Yes or No.
3) Explanation Obtained: Yes Or no.
4) Contradiction Tested: Yes Or no.
5) Finding Recorded: Yes Or no.
6) Reasons Provided: Yes Or No.

That is what produces reliable statistics.

The final report must hold this table.

Ref.	Complaint statement	Supporting exhibit/ email	What the evidence proves	Staff explanation needed	Finding needed	Stage 1 treatment	Failure count
1.4.1	Information supplied to police affected access	Exact Exhibit **Found**	To be explained from the original communication and chronology	Explanation from responsible staff **Unexplainable**	Finding on accuracy, knowledge, and consequence	**Was Compared**	**Example x6**
1.4.2	Review represented while Section 41 action progressed	10 July email and Section 41 notice **Found**	Whether two conflicting processes run simultaneously	Explanation from authorising staff **Unfounded**	Finding on review, notice, and knowledge	**Was Compared**	**Example x6**
1.4.3	Complainant bypassed in favour of relatives	Exact emails/notices **Found**	Who received information and why	Explanation concerning authority and direct contact. **Non-Excusable**	Finding on disclosure and service	**Was Compared**	**Example x6**
1.4.4	Loss and damage followed exclusion	Photos, videos, inventory, and records **All Found**	Condition, access, removal, and loss	Explanations from staff and any contractors **Not Safe**	Findings on causation and each loss category	**Was Compared**	**Example x6**

What the completed statistics will prove

The final figures must show:

1) The investigators total Evidence Count of **"Supported Complaint Statements, Accounted For!"**
2) His or her Total of **"Supporting Exhibits Identified and Merited!"**
3) Total Matters Requiring Staff Explanations, **"Needed, Collected & Reviewed!"**
4) Explanations of non-liability and of liability, **"Recorded & Documented by The Stage 1 Investigator."**
5) Contradictions Tested. **"Demonstrated!"**
6) Contradictions Left Unresolved. **"Demonstrated!"**
7) Findings Required. **"Demonstrated!"**
8) Findings Actually Made. **"Demonstrated!"**
9) Statements Answered Fully. **"Demonstrated!"**
10) Statements Answered Partially. **"Demonstrated!"**
11) Statements Not Answered. **"Demonstrated!"**
12) Evidence Rejected Without Reasons.
13) And The Total Number of Proven Investigation Failures, **"Accounted For!"**

That Is the Correct Purpose of The Exercise:

- To prove, through the complaint and exhibit bundle, exactly what the Enfield Council investigator was given, what that evidence required them to investigate, what they did not investigate, and what evidence-supported matters their response left unanswered.
- This is My Real time Statistical Data Analysis of: The Seven Core Complaint, Core [03. Formal Complaint.pdf]

Document Structure

Category	Actual Count
Executive Summary Allegations	4
Succession Evidence Table Entries	40
Specific Offences Alleged	8
Damage Categories Claimed	5
External Complaints Requested	3 Major Authorities + 1 Theft Phase
ICO Requested Actions	5
Monitoring Officer Requested Actions	4
PSD Requested Actions	4
Officers Specifically Named	3
Statutory / Legal References	8+

Substantive Complaint Heads

The complaint is actually built around approximately:

1) Misrepresentation to Metropolitan Police.
2) Misleading review process whilst Section 41 action progressed.
3) Bypassing the applicant in favour of relatives.
4) Property loss and disposal issues.
5) Succession handling failures.
6) Data protection breaches.
7) Failure to consider vulnerability.
8) Section 41 concealment allegations.
9) Communication with police regarding occupation rights.

10) Loss of possessions and safeguarding failures.

Succession Evidence Analysis

The evidence table contains:

Type	Count
Entries showing succession active	22
Entries showing evidence supplied	10
Entries involving Georgina Solan	12
Formal succession decisions	2
Entries relied upon as contradictions	6+
Non-succession entries included for context	8

Total documentary entries analysed: 40.

Investigation Areas Triggered

Receipt of this complaint required investigation into:

Investigation Area	Required
Housing Succession Process	Yes
Officer Communications	Yes
Application Handling	Yes
Evidence Assessment	Yes
Police Communications	Yes
Occupation Rights Advice	Yes
Section 41 Procedures	Yes
Data Sharing	Yes
Property Disposal	Yes
Property Loss	Yes
Vulnerability Considerations	Yes
Complaint Handling	Yes

Total Investigation Areas Triggered: 12

Specific Offences Alleged

The complaint expressly alleges:

Offence Alleged
Fraudulent Misrepresentation
GDPR Breach
Theft by Deception / Conversion
Misrepresentation of Housing Law
Housing Act Breach
Care Act Breach
Misfeasance in Public Office
Joint Enterprise with Police

Total Offence Allegations: 8

Damage Categories Claimed

Category
Comic Collection
Cash Loss
House Damage
Personal Property
Emotional Harm

Total Loss Categories: 5

External Complaint Requests

The complaint requests referral or investigation by:

Authority
Information Commissioner's Office
Enfield Monitoring Officer
Metropolitan Police Professional Standards
Further Theft / Property Investigation

Total External Complaint Pathways: 4

Actual Investigator Obligations Created

From this complaint alone, the investigator was required to:

1) Review 40 Correspondence Entries.
2) Test 8 Alleged Misconduct Categories.
3) Examine 10 Substantive Complaint Heads.
4) Investigate 12 Separate Investigation Areas.
5) Consider 5 Categories of Loss.
6) Review Multiple Statutory Allegations.
7) Obtain Explanations from The Officers Named.
8) Record Findings Against Each Major Allegation.

One-Line File Summary

File 03 contains 40 referenced succession and chronology entries, 10 substantive complaint heads, 8 alleged misconduct categories, 12 investigation areas requiring findings, 5 categories of claimed loss, and 4 external regulatory complaint requests. Its purpose was to require Enfield Council to investigate evidenced allegations and provide reasoned findings against each matter raised.

FILE 04: TIMELINE OF PROVEN FACTS

01. Index.pdf
02. Intro Email.pdf
03. Formal Complaint.pdf
04. Timeline Of Proven Facts.pdf
05. Requested Actions & Remedies.pdf
06. SUBJECT ACCESS REQUEST.pdf
07. The Seven Core.pdf

How The Chronology Disproved the Reasons Used to Refuse My Succession, And How the Stage 1 Investigator Failed to Recognise Those Facts

Purpose Of This File

I supplied this timeline so the Stage 1 investigator could follow the original emails, official correspondence, applications, evidence submissions, and decisions in the exact order in which they occurred. The timeline was not simply background information. It showed how I entered a formal succession process, how Georgina Solan managed that process, what evidence she requested from me, what I supplied in response, what I was told about the continuing consideration of my application, and how the council's later reasons for refusing succession were contradicted by the evidence created during that process. The investigator was required to compare every reason used to refuse my succession against the dated documentary record. Where the exhibits disproved a refusal reason, the investigator was required to recognise that contradiction, put it to the relevant council staff, obtain their explanation, and make a clear finding. Instead, the Stage 1 response relied upon the council's final position without properly addressing the documentary events that showed why that position was wrong.

The central failure of the Stage 1 investigation

The Stage 1 investigator appears to have started from the council's eventual conclusion that I did not qualify for succession. That was the wrong starting point. The investigator should have started with the original chronology and asked whether the council's stated reasons for reaching that conclusion remained credible when assessed against its own emails, records, and requests for evidence.

My timeline showed that:

1) I Formally Requested Succession.
2) Georgina Solan Issued the Succession Application.
3) I Completed and Returned It.
4) She Acknowledged Receiving It.
5) She Requested Supporting Evidence.
6) I Supplied That Evidence.
7) She Requested Twelve Months of Bank Statements.
8) I Supplied Those Statements.
9) She Requested the Official Death Certificate.
10) I Supplied and Resent It.
11) She Expressly Referred to My Application as Being Considered.
12) I Supplied Further Evidence When the Original Decision Was Challenged.
13) Later Events Raised Serious Questions About Whether My Application and Evidence Had Ever Been Put Through the Process I Had Been Led to Believe Was Taking Place.

These were not isolated facts. Together, they directly challenged the council's later account of why my succession failed.

Refusal Reason 1

The council treated my succession application as though it had not been properly made or progressed.

What happened

On **11 May 2026**, I formally requested commencement of the succession process. Georgina Solan responded by sending me the council's succession application and instructing me to return it with supporting evidence.

On **18 May 2026**, I returned the completed application, my supporting statement and occupation evidence.

Georgina Solan Then Acknowledged Receipt by Writing:

- *"Thanks for your application and supporting letter."*

She Continued:

- *"We can only consider your application once we have the supporting documents."*

Evidence relied upon

1) **Emails 01, 01.1 and 02**: formal succession request.
2) **Email 03**: succession application issued by Georgina Solan.
3) **Emails 04, 04.1 and 04.2**: completed application, supporting statement and evidence returned.
4) **Email 05**: receipt of my application and supporting letter acknowledged.

What this proved
The documentary record proved that I did not merely ask an informal question about succession. I formally requested succession, received the official application, completed it, and returned it with supporting material.
Georgina Solan's own email confirmed that she had received my application and supporting letter.
Any later suggestion that there was no properly submitted application had to be reconciled with her written acknowledgment.

What the investigator was required to establish
The investigator was required to trace my completed application into the council's records and establish:

- Where they Logged it.
- Who Became Responsible for Assessing It.
- Where The Supporting Material Was Stored.
- Whether It Was Passed to Management and who that person is!
- And Why the Council's Later Records Did Not Reflect the Process Confirmed In Georgina Solan's Own Email.

What had to be put to staff?
The investigator should have placed Emails **03, 04, 04.1, 04.2 and 05** before Georgina Solan and required her to explain what she did with the application after acknowledging its receipt.

Stage 1 investigation failure
The Stage 1 response failed to reconcile the council's later position with the written evidence proving that my application had been issued, completed, returned, and acknowledged.
Countable Failures:

1) Failure To Address the Completed Succession Application.
2) Failure To Address Georgina Solan's Acknowledgment of Receipt.
3) Failure To Identify Where the Application Was Logged.
4) Failure To Identify Who Assessed It.
5) Failure To Obtain or Record Georgina Solan's Explanation.

Failure count: 5

Refusal Reason 2
The Council Said I Had Not Supplied Sufficient Evidence.
What Happened
After acknowledging my application, Georgina Solan told me that supporting documents were required before it could be considered.
I responded by supplying **11 folders** of identification, residence, and supporting evidence. I also made clear that I could provide anything further immediately if required.
The following day, Georgina Solan thanked me for the additional documents and requested twelve months of bank statements.
I supplied those statements.
She later requested the official death certificate. I supplied it and resent it.

Evidence relied upon

1) **Email 05**: supporting evidence requested.
2) **Email 06**: 11 folders of evidence supplied.
3) **Email 07**: twelve months of bank statements requested.
4) **Email 08**: bank statements supplied.
5) **Email 09**: receipt of the bank statements confirmed and further evidence requested.
6) **Emails 15, 16 and 17**: official death certificate requested, supplied, and resent.

What this proved

The correspondence proved that I repeatedly complied with the evidential requirements communicated to me.
It also proved that Georgina Solan continued requesting increasingly detailed and private evidence as part of the succession process.
If the council later concluded that my evidence was insufficient, the investigator was required to identify:

1) Precisely What Evidence Was Missing.
2) When I Was Told It Was Missing.
3) Why I Was Not Given an Opportunity to Supply It.
4) And How the Evidence I Had Already Supplied Was Assessed.

A bare statement that I had not provided sufficient evidence could not answer the fact that I supplied 11 folders, twelve months of bank statements, identification records, residence material, and the requested death certificate.

What the investigator was required to establish
The investigator needed to identify:

1) The Contents of the 11 Folders.
2) Whether Every Folder Was Received.
3) Who Reviewed the Evidence.
4) What Conclusion Was Reached on Each Material Category.
5) Whether Any Evidential Deficiency Was Communicated to Me.
6) And Why No Assessment Record Explaining the Alleged Insufficiency Was Produced.

What Had to Be Put to Staff
Georgina Solan and the relevant decisionmaker should have been required to explain which evidence was considered insufficient and why, with direct reference to the actual material I supplied.

Stage 1 investigation failure
The Stage 1 response relied upon alleged insufficiency without accounting for the volume and nature of the evidence already submitted or identifying the particular evidential gap said to justify refusal.

Countable failures:

1) Failure To Examine The 11 Evidence Folders.
2) Failure To Identify What Evidence Was Allegedly Missing.
3) Failure To Identify Who Assessed the Supplied Evidence.
4) Failure To Explain How the Bank Statements Were Used.
5) Failure To Explain How the Death Certificate Was Used.
6) Failure To Identify Whether I Was Notified of Any Remaining Deficiency.
7) Failure To Obtain a Staff Explanation for Why Additional Evidence Was Requested but Later Left Unaccounted For.
8) Failure To Make a Reasoned Finding on The Adequacy of My Evidence.

Failure count: 8

Refusal Reason 3
The Council Relied Upon 109 Burncroft Avenue to Reject My Claim
What Happened
The council later relied upon my connection with **109 Burncroft Avenue** when refusing succession.
My evidence did not conceal that property. I addressed its history in my application and supporting material.
My case was that the existence of records connected to Burncroft did not, by itself, prove that Burncroft was my principal home when my mother died.
The correct question was where I actually lived and maintained my principal home at the relevant time.

What The Timeline Was Designed to Prove

The timeline gathered the evidence connecting me to **23 Byron Terrace**, including:

1) My Formal Statement That It Was My Home.
2) Official Correspondence Sent There.
3) Council Records.
4) Evidence Of My Caring Role.
5) Evidence Of My Physical Presence.
6) Disability And Support Arrangements.
7) And The Evidence Submitted with My Application.

The investigator was required to compare that evidence with the council's reliance upon Burncroft. The existence of another tenancy or address record could not be treated as automatically deciding my principal-home position without examining the facts of my actual occupation.

What the investigator was required to establish

The investigator needed to determine:

1) What Evidence the Council Relied Upon Regarding Burncroft.
2) What Period That Evidence Covered.
3) Whether The Council Distinguished Legal Tenancy Records from Actual Residence.
4) What Evidence Connected Me To 23 Byron Terrace.
5) Whether My Explanation of Burncroft Was Considered.
6) And Whether the Principal-Home Assessment Dealt with All the Relevant Evidence.

What had to be put to staff?

The decisionmaker should have been required to explain why the Burncroft records outweighed the documentary evidence showing my occupation and life at 23 Byron Terrace.

Stage 1 investigation failure

The Stage 1 response failed to demonstrate a balanced comparison between the evidence concerning Burncroft and the evidence showing that 23 Byron Terrace was my principal home.

Countable failures:

1) Failure To Distinguish Tenancy Records from Actual Occupation.
2) Failure To Assess My Explanation Concerning Burncroft.
3) Failure To Itemise the Evidence Connecting Me To 23 Byron Terrace.
4) Failure To Compare the Competing Address Evidence.
5) Failure To Identify the Test Applied to Principal-Home Status.
6) Failure To Explain Why the Burncroft Evidence Outweighed My Occupation Evidence.
7) Failure To Make a Reasoned Finding Based Upon the Complete Evidential Record.

Failure count: 7

Refusal Reason 4

The Council Later Relied Upon Principal-Home Evidence After Initially Relying Upon Burncroft

What Happened

The original refusal was connected to my Burncroft tenancy. The council's later position was not confined to that reason and placed greater reliance upon whether 23 Byron Terrace had been my principal home.
That movement mattered because it changed what I was expected to answer. A decision cannot be fairly defended by changing or expanding its reasoning after I provide evidence challenging the original ground.

What the timeline proved

The timeline showed:

1) What Reason Was First Communicated.

2) What Evidence I Supplied in Response.
3) How I Challenged That Reason.
4) What Later Reason Was Then Relied Upon.
5) And Whether I Was Given a Fair Opportunity to Answer the Changed Position.

What the investigator was required to establish
The investigator needed to compare the original refusal communication with every later explanation and identify:

1) Whether The Refusal Reason Changed.
2) Who Authorised the Changed Reasoning.
3) What New Evidence Justified It.
4) Whether The New Ground Existed at The Date of The Original Decision.
5) And Whether I Was Given a Proper Opportunity to Respond.

Stage 1 investigation failure
The Stage 1 response failed to confront the movement between the original reason and the later justification. Instead, it treated the final explanation as though it had always been the complete basis of the decision.

Countable failures:

1) Failure To Identify the Original Refusal Reason.
2) Failure To Identify the Later Expanded Reason.
3) Failure To Compare the Two.
4) Failure To Determine Who Changed or Expanded the Reasoning.
5) Failure To Establish What Evidence Supported the Change.
6) Failure To Consider Whether I Had a Fair Opportunity to Respond.
7) Failure To Make a Finding on Whether the Refusal Was Being Retrospectively Justified.

Failure count: 7

Refusal Reason 5
The Council's Final Conclusion Ignored Its Own Earlier Conduct
What Happened
The council eventually relied upon the conclusion that I did not qualify for succession.
That conclusion did not answer why Georgina Solan had:

1) Issued The Application.
2) Accepted Its Return.
3) Requested Supporting Documents.
4) Requested Bank Statements.
5) Confirmed Their Receipt.
6) Requested The Official Death Certificate.
7) Discussed A Left in Occupation Account.
8) And Expressly Stated That My Application Was Being Considered.

What this proved
The earlier communications did not automatically guarantee that succession would be granted. They did, however, prove that the council was operating and presenting an active assessment process. The investigator therefore needed to determine whether that process genuinely occurred and whether the evidence collected through it was accurately assessed.

Stage 1 investigation failure
The Stage 1 response used the final outcome to avoid examining the process that produced it.

Countable failures:

1) Failure To Examine Whether the Represented Assessment Occurred.
2) Failure To Account for The Evidence-Gathering Process.
3) Failure To Identify the Complete Decision Record.
4) Failure To Identify the Responsible Decisionmaker.
5) Failure To Evaluate the Final Conclusion Against the Earlier Correspondence.
6) Failure To Explain Why the Council's Conduct and Final Account Were Consistent.
7) Failure To Determine Whether Staff Actions Contributed to The Refusal Outcome.

Failure Count: 7

Correct Format for The Remaining Timeline Entries

Each later entry should be kept sharp:

Date And Event

Evidence: exact email or exhibit.

What Happened

A short first-person account preserving the movement of events.

What This Disproved

The specific refusal reason contradicted by the evidence.

What The Investigator Failed to Recognise

The exact fact or contradiction left out of the Stage 1 response.

Countable Failures

Only the distinct omissions arising from that entry, without repeating failures already counted under an earlier entry.

Refusal-Reason Audit Table

Refusal Reason or Council Position	Evidence Contradicting It	Investigator's Omission	Current Failure Count
My application was not properly made or progressed	Application issued, returned, and acknowledged	No account of logging, assessment, or decision route	5
I failed to provide sufficient evidence	Eleven folders, bank statements, death certificate, and supporting material	No itemised assessment or identified evidential gap	8
Burncroft prevented succession	Evidence concerning my actual home and occupation at 23 Byron Terrace	No balanced principal-home assessment	7
Later principal-home reasoning justified refusal	Chronology of original and later refusal reasons	No examination of the movement in reasoning	7
The final refusal answered the complaint	Earlier council conduct presenting an active assessment	Process and final outcome not reconciled	7
Current preliminary total			**34**

What This Total Means

The Present 34 is a controlled preliminary count arising from the refusal reasons identified above.

It does not include every possible administrative step. It counts the principal evidence-based omissions that prevented the Stage 1 response from explaining:

1) Why The Council's Refusal Reasons Remained Valid.
2) How My Submitted Evidence Was Assessed.
3) Why The Reasons Developed or Changed.
4) Whether The Promised Succession Process Actually Occurred.
5) And Why the Documentary Evidence Contradicting the Refusal Was Not Recognised.

The rest of 04. Timeline Of Proven Facts.pdf should now be processed in this same first-person form, with each entry answering one central question:
Which reason used to refuse my succession did this evidence disprove, and how did the Stage 1 investigator fail to recognise and address that fact?
This version removes the oversized lists, keeps the focus on disproving the refusal, and makes every counted failure directly relevant to the inadequacy of the Stage 1 investigation.

FILE 05. REQUESTED ACTIONS & REMEDIES.PDF

01. Index.pdf
02. Intro Email.pdf
03. Formal Complaint.pdf
04. Timeline Of Proven Facts.pdf
05. Requested Actions & Remedies.pdf
06. SUBJECT ACCESS REQUEST.pdf
07. The Seven Core.pdf

Statistical Analysis

Category	Actual Count
Pages	9
Direct Questions Asked	1
Primary Remedy Requests	7
Individual Remedies Requested	35+
Authorities/Organisations Identified	9
Named Individuals Identified	5
Investigation Requests	3
Compensation Categories	4
Compensation Sub-Categories	13
Policy Changes Requested	8
Formal Maladministration Findings Requested	10
Disciplinary Actions Requested	3
Legal Grounds Relied Upon	6
Financial Calculations Presented	3
New Evidence Introduced	0
Referenced Exhibits Relied Upon	10+

Authorities Identified
The document seeks action from:

1) Georgina Solan (subject of complaint)
2) Joanne Drew
3) Feryal Clark MP
4) DS Rob Johnston
5) Aleana Knox
6) Enfield Council
7) Metropolitan Police PSD
8) Information Commissioner's Office
9) Housing Ombudsman
10) Local Government Ombudsman (LGSCO)

Total authorities and oversight bodies identified: 10.

Investigation Requests

The document expressly requests:

1) Immediate suspension investigation.
2) Criminal investigation by PSD.
3) ICO GDPR investigation.

Total formal investigations requested: 3.

Compensation Categories

1) Property loss.
2) Cash loss (£30,000).
3) Reinstatement of succession rights and tenancy.
4) Emotional harm.

Total Compensation/Remedy Categories: 4.

Policy Changes Requested

1) Mandatory safeguarding checks.
2) Mandatory notification of lawful occupants.
3) Ban on third-party notice service without consent.
4) Mandatory succession panel submission.
5) Mandatory Section 202 rights explanation.
6) Mandatory recording of decision makers.
7) Mandatory GDPR compliance checks.
8) Mandatory police safeguarding coordination.

Total policy reforms requested: 8.

Findings Requested

The file seeks findings on:

1) Succession mishandling.
2) Denial of statutory rights.
3) Concealment of notices.
4) Property disposal.
5) GDPR breaches.
6) Misleading legal advice.
7) Safeguarding failures.
8) Procedural manipulation.
9) Housing Act failures.
10) Care Act failures.

Total formal findings requested: 10.

Defence Value Score

Category	Score
Remedy Scope	10/10
Complaint Escalation Value	10/10
Accountability Requests	10/10
Compensation Analysis	9/10
Statutory Challenge Value	10/10
Stage 2 Importance	10/10

One-Line File Summary

File 05 contains 7 primary remedy requests, 3 formal investigation requests, 10 requested findings, 8 proposed policy reforms, 4 compensation categories, 10 identified authorities or oversight bodies, and a detailed challenge to liability for £2,620 of alleged charges. Its purpose is to set out the specific actions, findings, compensation, disciplinary outcomes and policy changes sought as remedies for the matters raised throughout the complaint.

FILE 06. SUBJECT ACCESS REQUEST.PDF

- 01. Index.pdf
- 02. Intro Email.pdf
- 03. Formal Complaint.pdf
- 04. Timeline Of Proven Facts.pdf
- 05. Requested Actions & Remedies.pdf
- 06. SUBJECT ACCESS REQUEST.pdf
- 07. The Seven Core.pdf

Additional Disclosure Requests

Failure to Identify Decision Maker and Case Handler

I request disclosure of:

1) The Full Name, Position, Department and Contact Details of Every Officer Involved in The Succession Decision.
2) The Name and Role of The Officer Who Assessed My Succession Evidence.
3) The Name and Role of The Officer Who Authorised Refusal of The Succession Claim.
4) The Name and Role of Any Manager Involved in Oversight or Review.
5) Any Records Explaining Why These Identities Were Not Provided Within the Official Succession Correspondence.
6) Any Records Explaining Why I Was Required to Submit a Subject Access Request to Obtain Information Which Should Have Formed Part of The Council's Ordinary Decision-Making Disclosures.

Stage 1 Complaint Investigation Failures

I request disclosure of:

1) The Stage 1 investigator's investigation notes.
2) Records showing whether the investigator considered whether the Council was required to identify the decision-maker responsible for the succession decision.
3) Copies of any guidance, policy or procedure relied upon when deciding not to provide the decision-maker's identity.
4) Internal communications discussing my request for the case handler's name.
5) Records explaining why the investigator did not address this complaint point within the Stage 1 findings.

Rebecca O'Hare and Occupation Issues

I request disclosure of:

1) All records relating to the occupation status of Rebecca O'Hare.
2) Records showing whether allegations of subletting or unlawful occupation were reported to the Council.
3) Records showing what investigation, if any, was undertaken into those allegations.
4) Internal communications discussing those allegations.
5) Records showing the Council's findings regarding those allegations.
6) Records showing whether tenancy enforcement action was considered.
7) Records showing why enforcement action was not taken, if applicable.

Failure to Protect a Secure Tenant

I request disclosure of:

1) All reports made by myself or my late mother concerning harassment, threats, antisocial behaviour, housing management concerns, or occupation issues.
2) All Council responses to those reports.
3) Risk assessments, safeguarding assessments, and vulnerability assessments.
4) Internal communications concerning requests for assistance, rehousing, transfer, management move, or protection.
5) Records showing what action the Council took in response.
6) Records showing why further action was not taken.
7) Any policy relied upon when deciding not to intervene.

Differential Treatment Concerns

I request disclosure of:

1) Records showing investigations conducted into allegations made against me.
2) Records showing investigations conducted into allegations made by me.
3) Records showing the reasons for any difference in treatment, response, enforcement, investigation or prosecution decisions.
4) Communications between Council officers and external agencies relating to those decisions.

One-Line Purpose

This Subject Access Request seeks disclosure of the identities of decision-makers and case handlers, the records underlying the succession decision, the handling of complaints concerning Rebecca O'Hare, the Council's response to requests for protection as a secure tenant, and the reasons why allegations made by me were not investigated to the same extent as allegations made against me.

FILE 07. THE SEVEN CORE.PDF

- 01. Index.pdf
- 02. Intro Email.pdf
- 03. Formal Complaint.pdf
- 04. Timeline Of Proven Facts.pdf
- 05. Requested Actions & Remedies.pdf
- 06. SUBJECT ACCESS REQUEST.pdf
- 07. The Seven Core.pdf

Statistical Analysis

Category	Count

Pages	8
Main Complaint Themes	4
Core Arguments Presented	4
Independent Evidence Sources Relied Upon	5
Exhibits Identified	12
External Record Sources Referenced	6+
Organisations Referenced	4+
Named Individuals Referenced	4
Vulnerability / Capacity Evidence Categories	5
Harassment / Protection Allegations	3+
Succession-Related Issues Raised	6+
Investigation Areas Requiring Findings	11
New Evidence Categories Introduced	5
Remedy Sought	Recognition of Capacity, Vulnerability and Succession Evidence

Core Arguments Raised

The document is built around four central propositions:

1) Enfield Council created, relied upon and recorded capacity-related evidence.
2) The Council now refuses to accept that same evidence when it supports the succession claim.
3) Multiple independent sources support the claimant's vulnerability and residence evidence.
4) The refusal of succession is alleged to be inconsistent with the Council's own historic records and conduct.

Independent Evidence Sources Relied Upon

The Seventh Core relies upon:

1) Sister's historical records.
2) Mother's overnight-carer records.
3) PNC/ACRO records.
4) Council-requested psychiatric assessment.
5) 109 Burncroft Avenue evidence.

Total independent evidence categories: 5.

Exhibit Analysis

The file identifies and relies upon:

Exhibit	Subject
1	PNC / ACRO records
2	Ignored complaint emails
3	Psychiatric assessment
4	Mother and council correspondence
5	Sister's records
6	Overnight-carer records
7	Burncroft evidence

8	Staff liability records
9	Rebecca O'Hare related case material
10	Telephone access restriction evidence
11	Recorded calls
12	Particulars and institutional knowledge records

Total exhibits: 12.

Investigation Areas Triggered

Receipt of this document required investigation into:

Investigation Area	Required
Capacity Assessments	Yes
Vulnerability Recognition	Yes
Succession Decision Making	Yes
Residence Evidence	Yes
Carer Status	Yes
Complaint Handling	Yes
ASB History	Yes
Harassment Reports	Yes
Safeguarding Duties	Yes
Mental Health Records Usage	Yes
Historic Council Conduct	Yes

Total investigation areas: 11.

Key Contradictions Raised

The document alleges that:

1) The Council previously relied upon vulnerability and capacity evidence.
2) The same evidence is now being discounted during the succession process.
3) Vulnerability protections were not provided despite years of complaints.
4) The original perpetrators complained about were allegedly never properly investigated.

Total major contradictions identified: 4.

Defence Value Score

Category	Score
Vulnerability Evidence	10/10
Historical Record Value	10/10
Capacity Evidence Value	10/10
Succession Relevance	9/10
Institutional Knowledge Evidence	10/10
Stage 2 Importance	10/10

One-Line File Summary

File 07 contains 12 exhibits, 5 independent evidence sources, 11 investigation areas requiring findings, and 4 central contradictions concerning vulnerability, capacity, residence, safeguarding and succession. Its purpose is to demonstrate that Enfield Council previously created, recorded, relied upon and acted upon capacity-related evidence, but now refuses to acknowledge that same evidence when it supports the claimant's succession case.
End

But The Investigators Findings in Question Are as Follows:

Conclusion	
1.	I do not uphold your complaint about the handling of the succession request.
2.	The Council considered the request, sought supporting evidence and reached a decision based on the absence of sufficient evidence that the property was your only or principal home for the 12 months immediately before the tenant's death.
3.	I have therefore found no service failure in the handling of the succession matter and no basis to recommend compensation or disciplinary action.
4.	**This concludes my investigation into your complaint**. If you are not satisfied with the outcome, you may request a **Stage 2 review**. Please explain which parts of this response you disagree with and the outcome you are seeking.
5.	**Any further documentary evidence relevant to your occupation of the property during the qualifying 12-month period should be provided with your request.**
6.	You can contact the Housing Ombudsman Service at any point during the complaint process for guidance. Please note that it cannot investigate your complaint whilst your complaint is going through our internal complaint's procedure. Details can be viewed via www.housing-ombudsman.org.uk
End	

(Signed) Mr. Simon Paul CORDELL)
(Date Signed) 21/10/2026