

Appeal Hearings Wood Green Crown Court

26/10/2015:

The appeal was set for this date but only listed for 1 hour hearing the case was put off due to the case needed to be 3 days.

09/11/2015:

Mention Hearing (No notes from solicitors)

Jan 2016

(Need to check this date Call court)

19-02-2016:

Solicitors put Application to Break Fixture this was dismissed by His Honour Judge Morrison

“The Court will not and does not accede to any application for the Appellants Solicitors to come off the record or to cease acting for the Appellant. Such an application was dismissed by His Honour Judge Morrison on the 19th February 2016. If any attempt is made to repeat this application the Court will require it to be made in person by the Senior Partner of Michael Carroll & Co”

This information is very important due to what occurred on the 21/09/2016 when HHJ-PAWLAK removed solicitors from record without Mr Cordell or a Senior Partner of Michael Carroll & Co being present in court. (See date 21/09/2016 as more notes)

His Honour Judge Morrison listed to be heard on the 22/02/2016 in front of HHJ-PAWLAK due to issues raised again regarding nondisclosure and he felt he was not the best judge to answer these issues.

The reason the solicitors gave to come off the record so close to the appeal hearing was a breakdown in communication and they also could not get a barrister to deal with this case, this is a impart misleading, the actual reason for them wanting to come off the record was due to the lack of work done by solicitors acting for Mr Cordell, in point of fact the case was not ready for the appeal hearing, They could also not get a Barrister.

His Honour Judge Morrison had never heard that solicitors that could not get a barrister and ordered that a Public Defender took over the case to act for Mr Cordell.

22-02-2016:

3 day appeal hearing listed for 22/02/2016, 23/02/2016 and 24/02/2016

Mr Morris acting Public Defender attended court on this day to act for Mr Cordell, Mr Cordell had not met Mr Morris before this date. Mr Morris had only had the case since the 19/02/2016 and was not ready for the 3 day appeal hearing. He wanted time to be able to go over all the large case bundles and be able to sit down and talk to Mr Cordell, so asked for an adjournment.

HHJ-PAWLAK was very unsympathetic and said he had the weekend to get ready for this case and that the appeal would go ahead. Considering this was the Public Defender that His Honour Judge Morrison had allocated to the case only 3 days beforehand it seemed that Mr Cordell was the one being penalised for the incompetence of his acting solicitors Michael Carroll & Co.

Mr Cordell's health had deteriorated considerably due to what was happening within this case and other issues, the mental health team had obtained a section 135 warrant under the mental health act. And it was only because of the disdain towards Mr Cordell that Miss L Cordell (Mother) had to hand this to his acting barrister to give to the judge knowing this would cause a huge rift between Miss Cordell and Mr Cordell. But she had no option as the judge was going to force the appeal hearing to go ahead, when Miss L Cordell knew he would not cope.

Upon Mr Morris handing the documents to the judge the judge then unwillingly adjourned the appeal hearing until the 26/09/2016 for a 3 day hearing.

The judge listed the case for a mention hearing also on the 04/04/2016

After this court hearing HHJ-PAWLAK wrote a letter to the acting solicitors Michael Carroll and co that had to be replied to by the 04/04/2016.

See Attached letter from Judge

See attached response from Solicitors dated 03/04/2016

The judge wrote a letter to Mr Cordell's solicitors on the 22/02/2016, Miss Ward who was dealing with this case for Mr Cordell at Michael Carroll & Co, knew the response had to be completed by the 04/04/2016 when the case was next listed in court.

Miss Ward did not start working on the response to the judge's letter until the 03/04/2016 and an email was sent to Mr Cordell and Mr Morris with what Miss Ward wanted to reply. But because Mr Cordell knew that Josephine Ward had sat on the letter from the judge and done nothing about it since February and then had rushed a response on the 03/04/2016 when Miss Ward had been asked repeatedly to address the letter from the judge, which now had not given Mr Cordell any time to go over the response Miss Ward had written. Mr Cordell amended Miss Ward's Letter to include multiple points that had been missed out and sent it back to Miss Ward via email.

Please see attached

04/04/2016

Upon attending court on the 04/04/2016 it was seen that Mr Morris had also drafted a response to the Judge's letter. This response was almost identical to Miss Ward's Letter except that it included one crucial section regarding the hearsay rule.

Mr Cordell agreed the point about the hearsay rule did need to be included. But was adamant it was going to be his letter that was going to be handed to the judge with the oral addition of the hearsay. (This was the oral addition)

The Magistrates court hearsay rules 1999 do not apply to the crown court.

The defence do not accept that the Respondent has relied on the correct legislation to apply under the hearsay rules. In any event the Appellant requests that the Respondent call the witnesses who made CAD entries for cross examination.

It is neither professionally appropriate nor suitable for the Appellant to call police officers and question their Credibility, as proposed by the Respondent through their application under the Magistrates Court Hearsay Rules.

The Appellant submits that questioning the credibility of ones own witnesses would not be permitted by the court.

The Respondent has put forward no good reason for why these witnesses cannot be called. As to say it is not in the interests of justice to do so.

HHJ-PAWLAK granted the hearsay application, although opposed orally by Mr Morris. HHJ-PAWLAK informed that Mr Morris opposition to hearsay was contained in Mr Morris legal document, for which the Appellant did not allow Mr Morris to hand up.

HHJ-PAWLAK is informed that client wishes to hand up his own document to HHJ-PAWLAK against Mr Morris advice. Document read by all sides.

Considering in point 5 of the judges letter to Mr Cordell Acting solicitors how was this allowed the judge allowed Mr Morris to make oral submissions in regards to hearsay in court yet then said they were not allowed.

Michael Carroll and Co had also not done or prepared a skeleton argument for Mr Cordell's bundle, the judge stated that the letter that had been handed in could be used as Mr Cordell's skeleton argument.

Miss Ward was sitting in the back of the court taking notes of what was being asked by the judge.

12/07/2016: Informed by solicitor via email:

“Please note that Mr Andrew Locke has returned from a career sabbatical and he has agreed to deal with the appeal against the imposition of an ASBO. I am in the process of confirming a conference date with Mr Locke, hopefully within the next two weeks. I have notified Mr Morris from the Public Defender Service that Mr Locke is your preferred choice and I have requested the written submissions that he had prepared for the mention hearing in April 2016 that you did not consent to or permit us to serve upon the prosecution, instead your own document was served at your insistence and contrary to the advice given by both Mr Andrew Morris and myself. Please confirm any dates that you are not available so that this conference can be arranged.

I have requested previously the complete list of witnesses that you now insist on calling and specifying their relevance to the ASBO appeal and the issues as to whether you were an organiser of illegal raves. I cannot advise on whether the witnesses are relevant to an issue in the appeal without you confirming the list and specifying their relevance.”

I would like to say that no option was given to us about preferred barrister and if you notice the date of this e mail you will notice that it is a full 3 months since the mention hearing and its obvious the reason barristers needed to be changed was because she had not even spoke to Mr Morris and was only now asking for his court notes. Even through there were multiple emails being sent to Miss Ward asking for things to be addressed and dealt with in this case, emails was going un-answered for months, well in fact since this case started in 2014. As for the list of police officer Mr Cordell wanted to call Miss Ward had been told over and over the officers listed in the application case, also officers from the Public Order

Investigation unit at Scotland Yard and maybe one other officer Superintendent Specialist Operations Adrian Coombs.

16/09/2016

On this date it was listed for a mention hearing for Non-Disclosure, and also a meeting with Andrew Locke Mr Simon Cordell Barrister as he not seen any barrister since the 04/08/2015 hearing at the magistrate's court when the ASBO was granted by the judge with no legality found.

I was told by my acting solicitors to be at court by 09:30 hours but later this was changed to 09:00 hours so I could have a meeting with my barrister, which I agreed to.

I arrived at Court for 09:00 my barrister did not arrive until around 09:40. On arrival my barrister and I went into a side room for a talk. (My mother was also present) before we could discuss anything Andy Locke said he was sorry he was not feeling very well, And he also had some emails from Ms Ward that he had to read, on trying to open the emails he realized he could not and subsequently went out of the room to call Ms Ward.

At around 10:00 hours we were called into court Andy Locke came back into the room to get your things and then hurried walked back out towards the court room. I tried to stop him to expand to him what my concerns were (As we had not had a moment to talk) and I was concerned about the disclosure that was going to be asked for.

I asked Andy Locke if he could ask the Judge to adjourn the case for 5 or 10 minutes so we could speak which he replied "no that the hearing was only for disclosure about the schedule", I said "I knew this was not correct and this was one of the reason I wanted to speak to him about" and again asked "if he would ask the judge to postpone for 10 minutes" he yet again said "no", at which point I asked "why he did not want to speak to me, and should I act for myself"?

He had no time to talk to me but then spent around 4 minutes talking to Ms Ward on the phone and before ending this call he asked me if I was also dismissing my solicitors which I replied no, we then went into court and on entering the court in a raised voice Mr Cordell said to Mr Locke (who was ahead of me) so am I acting for myself then? He never replied to me just proceeded to talk to the Judge then walked toward the door and ushered us out. At this point I had no idea what was going on but proceeded to follow him outside the court room, it was at this point he turned around and said quite curtly "I do not want you to speak", as we got closer to him he also informed me it was not good to shout out in open court which I had to agree with.

My mother who had witnessed all of this tried to explain to my barrister what I wanted to say about the Non disclosure and asked Mr Locke to explain what the schedule is.

I also asked about the two article 6's which have never been addressed by the court which pertains to my Human Rights and my rights to a speedy and fair trial that had been handed to the court at earlier hearings as I knew Mr Locke knew nothing about these. He explained that the schedule was what the judge had asked for on the 04/04/2016 my mother replied this was not all the judge had asked for. Without replying Mr Locke walked towards the courtroom we followed and it was at this point I said to him I feel I should represent myself because I felt I was not being heard. All I wanted was to be able to speak to Mr Locke so that he knew what had been said at the earlier hearing on the 04/04/2016.

On entering the court Andy Locke addressed the Judge and said I did not want him to act for me, but this was no fully the case I only wanted to be able to speak to him. The Judge informed Andy Locke to remain in the court room, the judge asked what the case was listed for and the CPS addressed the Court

and answered, they also said to the judge that I had been sending letters to the court and CPS myself. This is not the case and I did not understand their comment. I was then addressed by the judge and I replied yes I did want Andy Locke to be my barrister; I just wanted time to speak to him, as I had not spoken to a barrister since the magistrates trial.

The Judge then addressed my barrister he said that I still wanted him to act for me, my barrister agreed to this. The judge also stated he felt he was not the best person to be hearing this case and passed it over to the judge that was hearing the appeal.

On leaving the court room we proceeded to go into a side room to talk with my barrister, we explained that a letter had been handed to your good self on the 04/04/2016, he said he knew nothing of this letter so we handed him a copy for him to read. Once he read this he said he knew nothing about this and had only seen one document that kept saying I Simon Cordell, (I have no idea what this I Simon Cordell letter until later) my mother proceeded to explain this is why he wanted to talk to you before going into court as this is part of the Non disclosure. He explained he only knew about the schedule to which my mother replied, the schedule had been asked for by the judge in addition to the letter that had been handed in that the judge stated could be used as my skeleton argument, that Miss Ward was in the court on the 04/04/2016 and knew exactly what the judge had asked for.

My mother then made a call to my solicitor and enquired as to what the judge should ask for on the 04/04/2016 in regards to the disclosure. Ms Ward stated she could not remember, my mother being dumbfounded by this said you was sitting in the back of the court room taking notes, and only last week said to me again we should have everything that the judge had asked for in his original disclosure plus what was asked for in Simon's letter and also the judge had made other additions. At no point did Ms Ward ever make me feel she did not know what was due to be disclosed, if she had have done this I would have asked her to relist this to the court and asked for this to be clarified. As the disclosure that we was asking for was very important to the appeal.

My mother then handed me the phone I asked Ms Ward about the letter I was supposed to have sent to the court and the CPS, I was still thinking we was talking about the letter handed to the judge on the 04/04/2016 which in court on this date it was also said I had wrote this letter myself, which was not the case. which I agreed to be handed in and my solicitor was at court so knew about it, It was at this point I said she had drafted the letter and I had only amended it, she at this said she did not draft the Letter and I wrote it, at this I did call her a liar as I knew she drafted it and said to her I can prove it I have the email you sent to me. (Since court I have checked the dates for when this letter was drafted by my solicitor and this was on the 03/04/2016 please see attached email and letter (marked 03/04/2016 Ms Ward).

Andy Locke was listening to the phone call and after I ended the call he got up and said I will need to think about still representing you as you called your solicitors a liar, I stated that I can prove that she wrote the letter and she's denying as to doing so how would anyone feel that she has not lied, and if he was still going to represent me we would need a meeting at his chambers, at this point the meeting concluded with nothing really spoke of about my Appeal yet again.

A letter was sent to the Judge which includes all of this and the parts where we were in the court room would be within the court transcripts.

Please see attached:

20/09/2016

Solicitor wrote a letter and sent it to my email on 20/09/2016 which had also been sent to the court, putting an application again to be removed from record. This was listed in court to be heard on the 21/09/2016.

There were large sections within this letter that were incorrect and did not happen, this can be proven by the court transcripts for the 16/09/2016.

See Attached Letter.

21-09-2016

On the 21/01/2016 we were on our way to court and got caught in traffic, we contacted the court to get a message to the Judge to say we were going to be 5 to 10 minutes late, I know the judge got the message.

When we got to the court there was a barrister that Michael Carroll and Co had sent to the court to deal with the application for them to be removed from record.

The Barrister informed us she did not want to leave the court before explaining what had happened it seemed the judge had called this into court without us being present and removed the solicitors from record.

How could this have happened considering, Mr Cordell was not present at court, and there was not a senior Partner from Michael Carroll and Co and also what had been said previously by His Honour Judge Morrison on 19/02/2016.

The Barrister said the Judge wanted to see us and we would need to wait in court until we were called, as the Judge was dealing with a trial and we would be called in after it.

Around 16:00 hours we were called into court, the Respondent did make the judge aware at this point that what had been said by His Honour Judge Morrison on the 19/02/2016 stating that a Senior Partner was not present at court, The judge replied that he could not force a solicitor to carry on with a case they clearly did not want to, and that Mr Cordell could represent himself that the case was in much better order now. But Mr Cordell has learning difficulties and health problems which the court are well aware of, there was only a few days until the appeal hearing was due to start, how could a judge believe that a person with learning difficulties and health problems could be ready and cope with dealing with a three-day appeal hearing.

We did try to get the judge to adjourn the appeal hearing so we could try and get representation put in place due to knowing Mr Cordell could not cope or handle this case on his own, which was due to start on the 26/09/2016 for 3 day hearing the judge said he would not allow this and that the appeal hearing would go ahead no matter what.

How can a Judge expect someone that is known to be ill and have learning difficulties to be able to handle this case on there own, considering there is only four days until the appeal 3 day hearing is due to start. Nothing was put in place by the Judge to help Mr Cordell in any way.

Once again the solicitors had done nothing for this case and the judge had allowed them to walk away and it seems as if everything was being blamed on Mr Cordell. Once again the solicitors had done this days before the appeal 3 day hearing was due to start.

It was also noted while we had been waiting outside the court that the bundles we had been working from was very old bundles which had never been updated, and there were lots of documents missing we had never seen. It was stated by the respondent they had sent new bundles to the acting solicitors

Michael Carroll and co in Jan 2016, we had never been given a set of new bundles since this case had started in 2014, at hearing the Respondent stated in all there had been three sets of new bundles sent to Mr Cordell's acting solicitors, we had never been told about new bundles been sent and never given a new copy of any bundle.

When we were in court we did say this to the judge, the judge ordered the clerk of the court to contact Michael Carroll and Co solicitors and order the solicitors to bring them to court. the solicitors informed the clerk that the bundles were at Nexus Chambers, the judge was shocked that the solicitors did not have a copy of the bundles at there office. Mr Cordell's uncle who was also at court said to the judge he was willing to go to Nexus Chambers and pick the bundles up.

The Judge listed this for the 22/09/2016 after 14:00 hours to make sure we were all working from them same set of bundles.

Upon Mr Cordell's uncle getting home it was seen that the bundle he had was not the full set of bundles and only had part of the Skeleton Bundle.

22-09-2016

We attended court to inform the judge we still did not have the updated bundles and the Judge once again got the clerk of the court to call Michael Carroll and co solicitors to find out what was going on with the bundles, the judge was very upset that we still did not have the bundles for the case, the judge asked for the bundles to be brought to court before 4 PM, I stated that it would be easier for me to pick the bundles up from the solicitors on the way home from court, the judge asked if I was sure that he could get them brought to court I stated that it be faster for me to pick the bundles up from the solicitors on my way home.

When we left court I noticed I had had a text from Michael Carroll at 15: 21 stating the bundles was now at the office for collection, due to the time we left court I called Michael Carroll's office to say what time I would be there, I was told that the office would be closed by the time we got there so agreed to pick the bundles up first thing in the morning on 23 September 2016.

23-09-2016

On 23-09-2016 I left home early in the morning to go to Michael Carroll's office and collect the bundles with my brother Mr and recorder, Andrew Cordell went up to the office to get the bundles, when he came down he had a piece of paper that I needed to sign that I had collected the bundles from the office.

Upon getting home and looking at the bundles I noticed there was least 13 statements that we had never seen before from the Respondent bundle, the statements was all dated prior to the magistrates court trial. Upon looking at Mr Cordell's bundle it seemed this had not been updated or indexed since 2015, so all the new documents that had been submitted to be added to Mr Cordell's bundle was not in their. There was also no statements in Mr Cordell's bundle.

I spent all weekend trying to add missing documents to Mr Cordell's bundle and making copies so that when we got to court on the 26-09-2016 that these could be added to the Respondent bundle and the three judges bundles. Mr Cordell health had become unstable due to him knowing that he was going to have to be dealing with this himself.

I spent part of the weekend also writing a letter to the judge in regards to what had gone on and breaches in Mr Cordell's human rights mainly he's article 6 rights to a fair trial, there was also a list of things that

had gone on throughout the case since 2014 in regards to the nondisclosure, and other issues that was always being raised when a court. And the reason as to why legal aid had been granted:

1. Due to the complexity of the case.
2. Due to Mr Cordell's learning difficulties.
3. Due to the concerns of Mr Cordell health.

This letter was emailed to the court and asked to be passed to the judge.

26-09-2016

The three-day appeal hearing was due to start Mr Cordell was so unwell that there was no way he could attend court, Mr Andrew Cordell and Miss Lorraine Cordell attended court to speak to the judge. When the judge entered the courtroom he stated that he had had a letter that had to be addressed, he stated that he felt this would go to judicial review, he stated he had three options:

1. Carry on with the appeal in the hope Mr Cordell would turn up the following day.
2. Dismiss the appeal.
3. Adjourn the appeal to a new date.

The judge went over the letter in great detail, he stated around five times that he felt this was going to go to judicial review.

The judge decided to adjourn the case until the 16/01/2017, this was later changed for the appeal to start on the 17/01/2017. The Respondent had tried to object to the appeal being adjourned. The judge stated that we should try to find a new solicitor to take on the appeal and that he would help and also make sure that legal aid was in place.

The judge asked why Mr Cordell was not in court. I stated Mr Cordell had become so unwell due to what was going on in this case and that he was not coping. Information was passed to the judge that showed Mr Cordell was unwell.

It was also stated in regards to all the missing documents that was missing from Mr Cordell's bundle, and that there was no statements within the bundle, I stated to the judge that I'd spent a lot of the weekend trying to update Mr Cordell's bundle and make sure that he was indexed, I handed the documents that I was able to with new indexing, I also stated that I knew there was still documents missing from Mr Cordell's bundle which I did not have all was able to add. I also stated that there was around 13 statements that we had never seen that within the Respondent bundle that was dated prior to the magistrates trial.

The judge was very unhappy and passed me his own bundle for Mr Cordell to check to say if the courts bundles had been updated, upon looking the judge's bundle had also not been updated since 2015. I passed the judge's bundle back up to him explaining that it also had not been updated. At this the Respondent stated they would make new copies of the bundles and have them sent to us the judge thanked the Respondent. The judge was very unhappy and said he was not going to allow this to be dropped. And again made the clerk of the court call Michael Carroll and co to order them to attend court on the 14/10/2016 in regards to the missing documents. I stated I would try and add as many missing documents as I could but was unsure of what documents were missing.

I asked the judge if Mr Cordell would need to attend court on the 14/10/2016, is due to only being regarding the missing documents I felt Mr Cordell did not need to be there the judge agreed to this.

14-10-2016

Mr Andrew Cordell and myself attended court on this date, the solicitors did not turn up, I had a list of documents that I had made up and indexed that needed to be added to Mr Cordell's bundle which I passed to the judge. I stated to the judge that I could not be sure if there were still documents missing. I also stated that I had tried to call Miss Ward and had had no reply. The judge was very upset that the solicitors had not turned up. A letter had been sent by the solicitors Michael Carroll and co, the judge again got the clerk of the court to email Michael Carroll and co to tell them they had to be in court on the 19/10/2016.

I also stated to the judge that I had made many phone calls to other solicitors and due to the case being appeal stage no one was willing to take the appeal on due to the cost they would get under legal aid that he was a set amount as legal aid believed that the solicitors dealing with the appeal would be the same solicitors that dealt with the original trial, appeals are set at a standard rate so any solicitor taking on a case would not get paid to go over the complete bundles, and take updated instructions from the client.

Again I asked the judge if Mr Cordell needed to attend court on that date, which he replied no to.

19-10-2016

On the 19/10/2016 again Mr Andrew Cordell and I attended court, once again the solicitors was not in attendance, the judge had had a letter from Michael Carroll co stating Miss Ward no longer worked for the company, the judge was very upset and was not going to allow this to be dropped, the judge got the clerk of the court to email Michael Carroll and co to attend court on the 25/10/2016. When I got home I again tried to call Miss Ward with no reply I also text her with no reply to the text.

Again I stated to the judge that I had made many phone calls to other solicitors and due to the case being appeal stage no one was willing to take the appeal on due to the cost they would get under legal aid that he was a set amount as legal aid believed that the solicitors dealing with the appeal would be the same solicitors that dealt with the original trial, appeals are set at a standard rate so any solicitor taking on a case would not get paid to go over the complete bundles, and take updated instructions from the client.

25-10-2016

On the 25/10/2016 again Mr Andrew Cordell and I attended court, once again the solicitors was not in attendance, the judge was very upset and done an Internet search under Miss Ward's name to find out if she was working under a new solicitor, he found the new solicitors and sent an email demanding that Miss Ward attended court on the 11/11/2016.

Again I stated to the judge that I had made many phone calls to other solicitors and due to the case being appeal stage no one was willing to take the appeal on due to the cost they would get under legal aid that he was a set amount as legal aid believed that the solicitors dealing with the appeal would be the same solicitors that dealt with the original trial, appeals are set at a standard rate so any solicitor taking on a case would not get paid to go over the complete bundles, and take updated instructions from the client.

When I got home from court at 15:48 I received a phone call from Miss Ward, she stated that she knew nothing about the judge asked in her to attend court, that Michael Carroll and Co had not informed her in regards to any emails sent from the court. I said to her but I've tried to call you and text you and you have not replied or picked the phone up. She stated Michael Carroll had told her she was not allowed to contact us. We arranged to meet on 27/10/2016 to go over Mr Cordell's bundle to check for missing documents.

27-10-2016

On the 27/10/2016 I met with Miss Ward to go over Mr Cordell's bundle, upon looking at the bundle and the documents that I had added and indexed Miss Ward stated she believed there were no missing files, as time has gone on I have found other documents that should have been in Mr Cordell's bundle that were missing.

Miss Ward stated she had to attend court but gave a different date that the judge had ordered her to be there, I stated to her that the judge had given the date of the 11/11/2016 when we visit in court, she stated that is not what was put into the email that was sent to the company she worked for. I stated I would send an email over to the court to tell the court that we had met up and checked Mr Cordell's bundle we believed there was no documents missing.

01-11-2016

On the 01/11/2016 I wrote an email to the judge to state that I had met with Miss Ward and gone over Mr Cordell's bundle and believed there were no documents missing now. I asked if we still needed to attend court on the 11/11/2016 and if so could this be confirmed via email.

On the 02/11/2016 I received a reply from Wood Green Crown Court from the judge stating that we did not need to attend on the 11/11/2016 and the date would be vacated.

11-11-2016

Date was vacated by the judge.

19/12/2016

On the 19/12/2016 I sent an email to the judge in regards to still not finding a solicitor that was willing to take the appeal on, I asked the judge to help in regards to get in a solicitor to act for Mr Cordell regarding the appeal as time was becoming short for the appeal hearing.

21/12/2016

I received a reply to my email stating that the judge could not help with a solicitor. I still did not give up and I carried on trying to find one for Mr Cordell.

12-01-2016

On the 12/01/2016 late in the day I was given a number for a solicitors called MK-Law I called them they were the first solicitors in all of the solicitors I had been contacting since September that when I said the case was at appeal stage wanted to hear what the case was about, I broke down in tears the company agreed to take the case on as long as the judge agreed to an adjournment, I stated to them I do not think the judge will agree to this as in September when he adjourned it he stated he would not adjourn it again. The solicitor stated that they would not have enough time to be able to get all of the bundles go over them to get a barrister to go over them have a meeting with Mr Cordell and take instructions within two days, that they would send a barrister to court on the 17/01/2017 to asked for an adjournment so that they could act in the best interest of the client, as that is what they are there to do. And so the legal aid.

17-01-2017 Appeal Hearing

We attended call and the barrister was there for Mr Cordell, we went into a side room and he spoke to Mr Cordell in regards to what the plans was and what he was going to ask the judge for which was an adjournment, that they needed adjournment so that they could act in the correct manner for him, so that they could go over the complete case bundles, take instructions, make sure legal aid was in place correctly, and instruct a barrister who would be dealing with the appeal for him, Mr Cordell agreed that an adjournment could be asked for.

We were called into court and the barrister spoke to the judge, explained the situation and that he was asking for an adjournment, he spoke to the judge in regards to the legal aid, the judge stated that he believed legal aid was still in place and it could just be transferred, the barrister stated if legal aid had been revoked then it would take at least two weeks for it to be put back in place, the judge adjourned the case so that a court could be made to the legal aid department, cause was made but legal aid could not confirm whether or not the legal aid had been revoked. Calls was made to Michael Carroll and Co who stated that when they was removed from record that the legal aid that was in place was revoked.

The case was called back into court and the barrister explained that the legal aid department could not say whether or not the legal aid had been revoked, but when a call was placed to the old solicitors Michael Carroll and co they had said that the legal aid that was in place had been revoked. The judge handed the barrister certificate of legal aid, the barrister stated that the certificate was not proof that the legal aid had not been revoked.

The judge stated I'm sure that you can be ready for the appeal to go ahead by tomorrow, the barrister stated that they have a professional obligation to act in the best interest of the client and that they would not have enough time in order to go over all the bundles take instructions from the client, and instruct a barrister within half a day. At this the judge stated well if you cannot be ready then Mr Cordell will have to act for himself, we will not adjourn the appeal again.

The barrister tried his hardest to get an adjournment of the appeal but the judge would not allow, the judge started talking about the conditions that was imposed by the magistrates court, he stated that he felt that parts was disproportionate, this was not the first time the judge had mentioned the conditions that Mr Cordell was under, but this time the judge went further to include what sections he thought were disproportional, to the people in the court Mr Cordell, Mr Andrew Cordell, Miss Lorraine Cordell, and the barrister he was therefore Mr Cordell the only way of looking at what the judge was stating he had already made his mind up that he thought the conditions was the only problem.

The judge would not allow an adjournment and stated Mr Cordell could represent himself if the barrister could not be ready by 10 o'clock the next morning, judge raised and left the courtroom.

Mr Cordell was in such a state we left the courtroom barrister called as into a side room and had to asked Mr Cordell if they were to change the conditions to something appropriate would he accept it. This put further stress on Mr Cordell, he has not done what the police are stating he has. If we was given the disclosure that we have been asking for since this case started that the police have on the police's systems this would prove it. The police have been unwilling to give any disclosure since this case started on within the places application there are so many errors and corruption within the CADs but it seems no judge has been willing to order the place to supply the disclosure.

Mr Cordell was willing to accept having the conditions changed and accepting the antisocial behaviour order, the reason being he has not done what the police are saying he has done

18-01-2017 Appeal hearing

Due to the solicitors not gaining adjournment they was unwilling to attend as they would also be putting their company reputation at risk by not having enough time in order to act in a professional and correct way for their client.

Mr Cordell was so unwell he did not attend court on this day, nor did Mr Andrew Cordell, or Miss Cordell, Miss Cordell did however write a letter to the judge asked in for a stay on the appeal until it was taken to judicial review in regards to what had gone on.

The judge decided to go ahead in the absence of Mr Cordell with the appeal, he heard the witness statements from police on this date.

19-01-2017 Appeal hearing

Again Mr Cordell did not attend court this case has made Mr Cordell so unwell, at the end of this day the judge dismissed the appeal against conviction, but he changed a few of the conditions that Mr Cordell was under, the conditions are still a breach of Mr Cordell's human rights.