

8. The legal technicality, to i.e. absence of trespass that does not prevent parties from being held in accordance of the law, I do agree may lead to a standalone anti-social behaviour order being granted if a person commits a public order offence, to which I did not cause as I was not organiser neither did I take part in the organisation of the party or did I commit any civil or criminal offence.
9. In any one un-regular occasion over the duration of the weekend I can; A. understand the noise nuisance and distress to neighbours this can cause if the allegations were to be true and not fabricated by police as I can prove. I was not the organiser of the event.

The case is based on what the respondent based it upon and in my case, this is the Organisation of Illegal Raves not the organisation of raves: -

1. So, I proved that indoor parties are not illegal unless there is a breach of the licensing act 2003 as this is the law for entertainment.
2. That the word rave cannot be used by law in a building; such as it has within my case as for sure section 63 requires key elements, one being of the nature that "trespass must have taken place in private Air" as clearly is not the situations in None of the incidents that I have been found guilty of and now the conditions being imposed upon my statue.
3. I proved that I was not the organiser to the events as I was not.
4. That I never took part in any anti-social behaviour or intended or encouraged any other person to neither.
5. Anti-social behaviour was not clearly caused as a result of the Progress Way by myself or my actions as I was only a visitor who never caused any offence.

I feel any legal professional should have the truth and my best interest at heart

and if any person Knows a police officer to be caught for being corrupt for the evidence that they have supported so that a human being faced a wrongful convection of any sort that they should encourage them to stand up for what is correct and right.

The response I made was already served on the 22/02/2016 and the Judge ask for the respondent to answer them questions by the 01/02/2016 and the respondent refuse to do so.