

1. What Happened Today — 17 August 2026

This morning at **9 AM**, I received a call from Michael Carroll's secretary. She told me that my bail conditions have now been **"Agreed As Varied"** and that I must attend at **8 AM** tomorrow to sign them. **"No Police Station Was Specified."** I thanked her for the update, but I explained that this does not resolve the original procedural defect. What is happening today is directly connected to what happened on **9th of May**, and the police are now trying to fix a process that was never lawfully completed.

2. My Refusal on 9 May 2026: And the Legal Requirements Not Followed

On **9th of May 2026** at Wood Green custody suite, when the officer first took me out of the police cell, he told me I was being released on police bail with conditions. Before we even reached the custody desk, I immediately asked him whether any of those conditions would restrict me from 23 Byron Terrace. He said yes, and at that moment in time, before any paperwork was attempted to be shown or read out by the sergeant or OIC in the case.

I already understood that any restriction on my access to 23 Byron Terrace would **Breach My Legal Rights, Including My Human Rights**, because of my bereavement, my succession case, my status as the primary resident, and the fact that my chosen support was in the property with me at the time of arrest, I knew that a bail condition excluding me from my home would unlawfully interfere with my **Legal Rights** in respect for my home and private life under **Article 8 ECHR**.

When we arrived at the custody desk and the bail process began, I refused to sign. I asked for a solicitor, either on the phone or in person, and that request was denied. I then refused to listen to the bail conditions being read out and stated clearly that the officers in charge **"Needed To Be Varied Because They Breached My Human Rights"** and my legal rights in relation to 23 Byron Terrace.

Under the Bail Act 1976 and PACE Code C, refusal to sign bail requires an immediate court hearing *unless* the custody sergeant and the officer in charge decide to vary the conditions on the spot. **"Those are the only two lawful options!"** I demonstrated that I understood this: I refused to accept conditions that would unlawfully exclude me from my home, and I made clear that either the conditions had to be varied immediately or I had to be remanded to court.

Neither lawful option was taken. Instead, I was removed from police custody suite forcefully even though I complied before any need for force was used, the bail process itself was unlawful.

3. Unlawful Release Without Signature

Despite my refusal and despite the legal requirement to either vary the conditions or remand me to court, the custody sergeant and officers released me anyway. **"There Was No Lawful Service Of The MG4A, No Signature From Me, The Form Was Not Signed In Front Of Me By Any Witness Signature Or Officers Due To My Refusal While in My Presence And I Received No Copy Of The Bail Sheet While In Custody."**

As my own record states: **“I Refused The Conditions And They Decided It Was Ok To Release Me And Not Detain Me To Court! No Legal Signature No Legal Binding Agreement.”**

This means the bail conditions were never lawfully imposed at the point of my release.

4. CAD and Custody Record Left Open — System Failure

After my release, the custody record and CAD were left open. Shift changes failed to recognise my absence and the record remained open for days. The sergeant failed to review at 24 hours, and the officer in the case failed to submit the case to CPS.

During this period, I repeatedly contacted **MET CCC “Because I Had No Paperwork And No Clear Bail Conditions!”** MET CCC sent multiple texts confirming CAD references and, crucially, one message on 9 May 2026 stating:

“I Have Passed To Our Dispatch And Control Room Team For Them To Contact The Officer In Charge And Get Him To Contact You Explaining Your Bail Conditions.”

This proves that, even on **9th of May 26**, the conditions were not properly recorded or explained, and the officer had not contacted me.

5. Officer’s Admission — Bail Conditions Were Not Uploaded

MET CCC also told me that the bail conditions were not visible on the system and that the custody record was still open. They advised me to contact the officer in charge.

When I eventually reached him on his mobile, he went away to check and then admitted that the CAD/custody record was still open. He said he had **“Just Closed It”** and had **“Just Uploaded”** the bail conditions, and that he would send me a bail sheet.

This confirms that the bail conditions were only uploaded after my repeated contact and **MET CCC’s** escalation and not at the time of my release.

6. Rob Johnston’s Email — PNC and CPS Delay Confirmed

On **18 June 2026**, DS/PC Rob Johnston wrote to me:

“Concerning The Issues Of The Closing Of The Custody Record, This Resulted In PNC Not Being Immediately Updated.” “Your Case Is Being Submitted To The CPS For A Charging Decision.”

This proves:

- 1) PNC Was Not Updated Because The Custody Record Was Left Open**
- 2) The Case Had NOT Been Submitted Earlier**
- 3) CPS Could Not Review The Case Until After 18 June 26**
- 4) The Delay Was Caused Entirely By Police Procedural Failures**

7. Why PSD Cannot Fix This Now

From past negative experiences, I understand that a formal complaint to **“Professional Standards Will Not Be Investigated While A Criminal Case Is Active.”** PSD will only log the complaint and wait until the case concludes.

This means that filing a complaint now would not correct the bail errors, custody errors, **CONNECT/PNC Errors**, or **CPS Submission Failures**. I will remain in the same bail conditions until the case ends.

For This Reason, The Correct Method During An Active Case Is To: raise concerns directly with **“The Officers Involved, Which I Did.”** Despite this, no rectification was made at the time.

8. Why Asking Me to Sign Now Is Contradictory

The Police Bail Conditions of the 9 May 2026 were:

- 1) Unsigned,
- 2) Unserved,
- 3) Unexplained,
- 4) And Never Lawfully Imposed.

Because the officer attempted to apply conditions **Without Signature, Without Service, And Without Explanation**, the police are now trying to claim those same conditions **“Still Applied,”** yet they are simultaneously insisting I must attend at **8 AM** to sign them.

- **THIS IS THE CORE CONTRADICTION.**

If unsigned, unserved conditions were valid in May, then **Unsigned Conditions Would Apply Automatically Now**, meaning there is **No Need** for me to attend at **8 AM** to sign anything.

They cannot have it both ways.

Either:

- 1) **Bail conditions require lawful service and signature** → in which case the conditions were **never validly imposed on 9 May, OR**
- 2) **Bail conditions apply automatically without signature** → in which case asking me to sign now is **unnecessary, contradictory, and procedurally impossible.**

There is no third option.

Kind Regards
Mr. S. P. Cordell

Old orig

DEON'S CASE MY EMERGENCY ESCALATION FOR BAIL VARIATION AND/OR CASE DEPOSAL!

This morning at 9 AM, I received a call from Michael Carroll's secretary. She told me that my bail conditions have now been **"Agreed As Varied"** and that I must attend at 8 AM tomorrow to sign them. No police station was specified. I thanked her for the update, but I explained that this does not resolve the original procedural defect. What is happening today is directly connected to what happened on 9 May, and it is also connected to the emergency situation at 23 Byron Terrace involving succession, safeguarding failures, and new information from my sister Deon that she provided me with.

The Bail variation request was not random, as I had keep requesting it as I knew it was necessary to help me be able to fairly

because the current bail conditions prevent me from safeguarding my mother's home at 23 Byron Terrace, which is now at risk due to succession issues and escalating behaviour from relatives. Deon has sent new messages showing that the situation at the property has deteriorated and that immediate action is required to protect the home. These messages escalate the urgency of the variation because the existing bail conditions physically prevent me from attending the address to secure it, protect evidence, and prevent further interference.

What happened on 9 May — the refusal and the legal breach

On 9 May 2026 at Wood Green custody suite, I was presented with bail conditions, and I refused to sign them. I made it clear that I did not agree to the conditions and would not sign the bail sheet and would rather go to court to explain as they breached my Human Rights. **"Under The Bail Act 1976 And PACE Code C, Refusal To Sign Bail"** requires an immediate court hearing. I should have been remanded to court, not released.

Despite my refusal, the custody sergeant and officers decided to release me anyway. There was **No Lawful Service** of the **MG4A, no signature**, no **"Refused"** box properly recorded in my presence, no witness signature, and no copy of the bail sheet given to me in custody. As my own record states: **"I Refused The Conditions And They Decided It Was Ok To Release Me And Not Detain Me To Court! No Legal Signature No Legal Binding Agreement."** This means the conditions were never lawfully imposed at the point of release and are a **"Big Mess!"**

This unlawful release is now directly affecting the emergency variation request, because the conditions they imposed without signature are blocking me from safeguarding 23 Byron Terrace and dealing with succession matters.

The custody record and CAD left open: the system failure

After my release, the custody record and CAD were left open. Shift changes failed to recognise my absence and the record remained open for days. The sergeant failed to review at 24 hours, and the officer in the case failed to submit the case to CPS.

During this period, I repeatedly contacted MET CCC because I had no paperwork and no clear bail conditions. MET CCC sent multiple texts confirming CAD references and, crucially, one message on 9 May 2026 stating: **"I HAVE PASSED TO OUR DESPATCH AND CONTROL ROOM TEAM FOR THEM TO CONTACT THE OFFICER IN CHARGE AND GET**

HIM TO CONTACT YOU EXPLAINING YOUR BAIL CONDITIONS.” This proves that, even on 9 May, the conditions were not properly recorded or explained, and the officer had not contacted me.

MET CCC discovered the bail conditions were not uploaded

MET CCC also told me that the bail conditions were not visible on the system and that the custody record was still open. They advised me to contact the officer in charge. When I eventually reached him on his mobile, he went away to check and then admitted that the CAD/custody record was still open. He said he had **“Just Closed It”** and had **“Just Uploaded”** the bail conditions, and that he would send me a bail sheet.

This confirms that the bail conditions were only uploaded after my repeated contact and MET CCC’s escalation and not at the time of my release.

This late upload is now directly affecting the emergency variation request, because the conditions were never lawfully imposed and are now obstructing urgent safeguarding actions at 23 Byron Terrace.

Rob Johnston’s email: confirming the PNC and CPS delay

On 18 June 2026, DS/PC Rob Johnston wrote to me: **“Concerning The Issues Of The Closing Of The Custody Record, This Resulted In PNC Not Being Immediately Updated.”** He also stated: **“Your Case Is Being Submitted To The CPS For A Charging Decision.”**

This proves:

- 1) The Custody Record Error Prevented PNC Updating
- 2) The Case Had NOT Been Submitted Earlier
- 3) CPS Could Not Review The Case Until AFTER 18 June
- 4) The Delay Was Caused By Police Procedural Failures

This delay has now created further risk at 23 Byron Terrace, because the unresolved case and invalid bail conditions have prevented me from dealing with succession matters and responding to Deon’s escalating concerns.

Why Can’t PSD Fix This Now And Why I’m Right

From past negative experiences I’ve had, I learned that a formal complaint to Professional Standards will not be investigated while a criminal case is active. PSD will only log the complaint and wait until the case concludes. This means that filing a complaint now would not correct the bail errors, custody errors, **CONNECT/PNC** errors, or CPS submission failures. I will remain on the same bail conditions until the case ends.

For this reason, the correct method during an active case is to raise concerns directly with the officers involved, which I did. Despite this, no rectification was made at the time.

Why asking me to sign now is contradictory

Now, months later, the police are asking me to attend at 8 AM to sign bail conditions. This does not fix the original defect. The issue is not whether I sign now — the issue is that I refused to sign on 9 May, and instead of remanding me to court, they released me without

lawful service or signature, left the custody record open, and only later tried to upload conditions after the fact.

If the police claim that the conditions from 9 May “still applied” despite my refusal, no signature, no proper service, and an open custody record, then they are asserting that bail conditions can apply automatically without lawful imposition. But if unsigned, unserved conditions applied automatically in May, then unsigned conditions would apply automatically now, and there would be no need for me to attend at 8 AM to sign anything. They cannot have it both ways.

Either bail conditions require lawful service and signature, in which case they were never validly imposed on 9 May; or bail conditions apply automatically without signature, in which case asking me to sign now is unnecessary and contradictory to law.

The current request for me to sign is therefore not a routine step — it is an attempt to retroactively repair a process that was never lawfully completed. It is evidence that the original bail conditions were not properly imposed, not proof that they were valid.

And now, because of these defects, the unlawful conditions are obstructing urgent safeguarding actions at 23 Byron Terrace, preventing me from dealing with succession matters, and preventing me from responding to Deon’s escalating messages about the property. This is why the variation is an emergency.