

[Simon Cordell's Skeleton Argument \(2\) Pdf](#)

[Case No A2Q150064](#)

[Case No A2Q150064](#)

IN THE WOOD GREEN CROWN COURT

**IN THE MATTER OF AN APPEAL AGAINST AN ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR ORDER
BETWEEN :**

SIMON CORDELL

Appellant

-and-

THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS

Respondent

SKELETON ARGUMENT FOR THE RESPONDENT

References to page numbers are in [square brackets], [AX] being the Appellant's bundle and [RX] being the Respondent's bundle

1

Listing: For appeal hearing, 22-24/02/2016 for Three-days.

Issues:

- a) Whether The Appellant Has Acted in An Anti-Social Manner
- b) Whether An ASBO Necessary Recommended

Pre-Reading:

- For an Application for The ASBO [RI-3]
- The ASBO Made On 04/08/2015 [R13]
 - a) The Statements of DC Elsmore, The OIC [R14-35]
 - b) Statements Of "R's" Witnesses [R 36-66]
 - c) "A's" Statements [A1-X5]
 - d) Statements Of "A's" Witnesses [A16-30, A 258-272]

INTRODUCTION

- 1) The Appellant is appealing against a decision made by the district judge at Highbury Corner Magistrates' Court on 04th of August 2015 pursuant to S.1 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 ("the 1998 Act") to make him subject to an anti-social behaviour order (ASBO) to last for 5 years.
- 2) The facts relied upon by the Respondent are set out in the bundle of evidence placed before the court and, in particular, the witness statements of the Respondent's officers [R.14-35]. The Appellant has also provided a bundle for this appeal hearing [A],

[Simon Cordell's Skeleton Argument \(2\) Pdf](#)

- 3) The Respondent's case is that the Appellant has been integrally involved in the organisation of raves in London, particularly Enfield, and/or the supply of sound equipment to those raves.
- 4) The Respondent relies on each incident set out in the application notice to support his case [RI-3].
- 5) The Respondent submits that it is necessary for an ASBO to be in place to protect the public from further anti-social acts, specifically the organisation of raves, done by the Appellant.
- 6) A chronology of events is appended to this Skeleton Argument.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

- 7) Whilst the relevant provisions of the 1998 Act were repealed by the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, s.21 of that Act provides that these proceedings are unaffected except that, on 23rd of March 2020, the Appellant's ASBO will automatically become an Injunction under as if made under S.1 of that Act.
- 8) Section 4 of the 1998 Act provides that an appeal against the making of an ASBO lies to the Crown Court.
- 9) Section 79(3) of the Senior Courts Act 1981 provides that an appeal to the Crown Court is by way of a re-hearing.
- 10) The relevant test, therefore, is that set out in S.1 of the Act.
- 11) Pursuant to S.1 (4) of the 1998 Act, the court may exercise its discretion and make an ASBO if the two-part test set out in S.1(1) is satisfied. Section 1(1) states:
 - a) An application for an order under this section may be made by a relevant authority if it appears to the authority that the following conditions are fulfilled with respect to any person aged 16 or over, namely that the person has acted, since the commencement date, in an anti-social manner, that is to say, in a manner that caused or was likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to one or more persons not of the same household as himself; and that such an order is necessary to protect relevant persons from further antisocial acts by him.

[Simon Cordell's Skeleton Argument \(2\) Pdf](#)

- 12) It is for the Respondent to satisfy the court to the criminal standard that the Appellant has acted in a manner that caused or was likely to cause harassment, alarm, or distress to one or more persons not of the same household as himself.

13) However, the second limb of the test “does not involve a standard of proof: it is an exercise of judgment or evaluation” (R (*McCann*) v *Manchester Crown Court* [2003] 1 A.C. 787 at [371]).

14) In *R v Dean lioness* [2006] 1 Cr. App. II. (S.) 120, the Court of Appeal provided general guidance as to the creation of prohibitions forming an ASBO, the court held that:

- a) prohibitions should be individually tailored to the individual and that each individual prohibition must be necessary [28].
- b) An ASBO can include prohibitions not to undertake minor criminal activity that may be covered under separate legislation [30-1].
- c) However, an ASBO should seek to prevent a person from being able to commit that offence, rather than further penalise him when he does commit it [35]; and:
- d) the terms of the ASBO must be proportionate so as to be commensurate with the risk identified [37].

SUBMISSIONS

- The first limb of the test under S. 1 (1)(a) of the 1998 Act

15) The organisation of large-scale raves, whether or not they fall within the parameters of s.63 of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 and whether on private property or common land, fall within the definition of anti-social behaviour.

16) The Home Office Guidance: ‘*A Guide to antisocial beamer orders*’ specifies noise nuisance, particularly when late at night, as an example of anti-social behaviour.

17) It is submitted that, a person who helps organise or supplies equipment for a rave, where there is loud music late at night (except where there is a licence to do so and/or the music is played on licensed premises), has *prana jade* done an act in contravention of S.1(1)(a) of the 1998 Act.

3

91,

[Simon Cordell's Skeleton Argument \(2\) Pdf](#)

18) The Respondent relies on the evidence provided in the witness statements provided by various officers as well as supporting intelligence reports, the page references for this evidence are set out in the appended chronology.

19) The court is invited to take particular note of the evidence supporting the conclusion that the Appellant was integrally involved in the organization of raves and/or the supply of equipment:

- a) The Appellant was identified by gate security as the organizer of a rave of about 300 people on **07th & 08th of June 2014**.
- b) (See evidence of Insp. Hamill JR38] and supporting evidence of PS Miles [R36]).
- c) The Appellant admitted to Insp. Skinner that he was the organiser of the rave on 7/8 June 2014 [R41].
- d) The Appellant admitted to Insp. Skinner that he was the organiser of the rave organised and prevented on **19th of July 2014** [R39, R41].

- e) The Appellant admitted to PC Edgoose that he lent his sound equipment for use at raves and that he could get a significant number of people to turn out for a rave [R48, R88]
- f) And the Appellant was the organiser of the rave on **09th of August 2014** and provided the sound equipment as well as laughing gas [R42, R44-5, R47].
- g) When a crowd turned up and tried to force entry, the Appellant encouraged them to break the police line [R43, R45-6].

20) The Respondent further relies on the information set out in the intelligence reports and the documents provided to the court in the Respondent's bundle.

21) The evidence show the Appellant has witnessed by many different police officers supplying equipment for or helping to organise a rave.

22) The court will be invited to reject the Appellant's account as to his activities on the relevant, days as not credible.

- The second limb of the test under section 1 of the Act

23) It is first submitted that an ASBO is, in general terms, necessary.

4

92.

[Simon Cordell's Skeleton Argument \(2\) Pdf](#)

24) There is a significant body of evidence showing the impact of raves on people who live near where they occur [R51-66, R155-298]. The level of distress that these individuals suffered as a result of the raves organised by the Appellant was high. 'There is a need to prevent these events occurring in the future.

25) The ASBO (and interim ASBO beforehand) have been effective. The only time where the Appellant's behaviour has improved is when these proceedings were commenced, and it was made clear to the Appellant that his actions could not be tolerated.

26) "The Appellant has denied the acts alleged by the Respondent. He has shown no acknowledgment or desire to change his ways that might make an ASBO unnecessary.

27) As to the particular prohibitions on the ASBO, significant effort was made by the Respondent and by the court to ensure that any legitimate business activities that the Appellant wished to undertake would in no way be inhibited by this order.

28) For the Appellant to provide recorded music to a gathering of people he would either need to have a licence for that event or to provide the music on a licensed premise for fewer than 500 people with, a general licence to play recorded music (see s. 1 and Sch. 1 of the Licensing Act 2003).

29) This order specifically does not preclude him from providing regulated entertainment under the auspices of a valid licence.

30) The only amendment that the Respondent would seek is that the words “or s.63(1. A)” be added after the words “s.63(1)” in prohibitions a, b, and c of the ASBO.

31) It is submitted that the terms of the ASBO as drafted are necessary and proportionate in that they should have minimal impact on the Appellant’s life and legitimate business activities.

ROBERT TALALAY Chambers of 1 'torus Barton OC 5 Essex Court

31st January 2016

5

93.

[Simon Cordell's Skeleton Argument \(2\) Pdf](#)

Case No A20150064

IN THE WOOD GREEN CROWN COURT
IN THE MATTER OF AN APPEAL AGAINST AN ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR ORDER
BETWEEN:
SIMON CORDELL
Appellant
-and-
THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS
Respondent
SKELETON ARGUMENT FOR THE RESPONDENT

- 1C Essex Court
- Hugh Giles (Director)
- Metropolitan Police Service
Directorate of Legal Services
New Scotland Yard
Broadway
London
SW1H 0BG

6

94.

[Simon Cordell's Skeleton Argument \(2\) Pdf](#)

Case No A20150064

IN THE WOOD GREEN CROWN COURT
IN THE MATTER OF AN APPEAL AGAINST AN ANTI-SOCIAL

BEHAVIOUR ORDER

BETWEEN:

SIMON CORDELL

Appellant

-and-

THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS

Respondent

CHRONOLOGY

• **12/01/2013**

- a) Information pertaining to this date entered by PC Purcell that a vehicle belonging to the Appellant (Ford Focus Silver MA57LDY) was supplying equipment for a rave in Canary Wharf [R152-4]. Appellant accepts attendance but denies any organisational/supply role for a rave [A3]

• **24/05/2013**

- a) Information pertaining to this date entered by PC- Jackson that the Appellant was seen with another individual who told PC- Jackson that they were looking for a place to set up a rave over the ban holiday [R118- 120].
b) Appellant's account at [A4]

• **25/05/2014**

- a) Information pertaining to this date entered by PC Hoodless concerning a
b) report that there were trespassers on private premises.
c) The Appellant was spoken to and had a set of large speakers in his van (White Ford I transit CX52JPZ) [R112-4].
d) Appellant accepts attendance but denies any organisational/supply role for a rave [A4]

• **06th till the 08/06/2014**

- a) Police attended and broke up a rave at Progress Way, Enfield.
b) Evidence of the Appellant's alleged organisational involvement [R36-41, 110]; impact statements [R51-66]; CAD reports [R155-298].
c) Appellant denies attendance on 6 or 8 June 2014 and admits attendance on 7 June 2014 but denies any organisational/supply role for a rave [A5]

95.

[Simon Cordell's Skeleton Argument \(2\) Pdf](#)

• **20/06/2014**

- a) Rave in Neasden closed down. White Fold Transit CX52JRZ removed from the site [R102].
b) Appellant's account is that he provided sound equipment for a gentleman's birthday party and was informed the following day that his equipment had been seized [A5, A253-6]

• **19/07/2014**

- a) Police attended and closed down a putative rave on Great Cambridge Road, Enfield. Evidence of the Appellant's alleged organisational involvement [R39-41, R91].

b) Appellant's account is that stopped his car to help a homeless person from being arrested when he was arrested for a breach of the peace; he denies any organisational/supply role for a rave [A6]

• **24/07/2014**

a) Conversation reported by PC Edgoose in which the Appellant is alleged to have bragged about organising raves [R48, R88].

b) The Appellant's account is at [A6-7]

• **27/07/2014**

a) Information pertaining to this date entered by PC Chandler that the Appellant driving a White herd transit CX52JRZ was present at powering speakers at a rave on Millmarsh Lane, Enfield [R83-6J].

b) Appellant, accepts attendance at a birthday party but denies any organisational/supply role for a rave [A7]

• **09/10/08/14**

a) Police attended and broke up a rave on Millmarsh Lane, Pm field.

b) Evidence of the Appellant's alleged organisational involvement [R42-7, R80-1].

c) Appellant accepts attendance at a birthday dinner but denies any organisational/supply role for a rave

RIP APART

88,

[Simon Cordell's Skeleton Argument \(2\) Pdf](#)

Case No A2Q150064

Case No A2Q150064

IN THE WOOD GREEN CROWN COURT

**IN THE MATTER OF AN APPEAL AGAINST AN ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR ORDER
B E T W E E N :**

SIMON CORDELL

Appellant

-and-

THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS

Respondent

SKELETON ARGUMENT FOR THE RESPONDENT

- References to page numbers are in [square brackets], [AX] being the Appellant's bundle and [RX] being the Respondent's bundle.

In response to: -

Robert Talalay at the Chambers of: -

5 Essex Court

Temple, London, EC4Y 9AH

020 7410 2000

✓ clerks@5essexcourt.co.uk

✓ <https://5essexcourt.co.uk/our-people/profile/robert-talalay>.

Skeleton Argument Dated: - 31st January 2016

Bobby specialises in the areas of: -

- a) "Police Law,"
- b) "Public Law,"
- c) "Human Rights" And
- d) "Civil Liberties,"
- e) "Data Protection" And
- f) "Information Law,"
- g) "Malfeasance Claims,"
- h) "Prison Law,"
- i) "Inquests,"
- j) "Personal Injury Claims,"
- k) "Employment Law" And
- l) "Professional Misconduct."

He accepts instructions in all of Chambers' main practice areas.

Bobby's Recent Cases Include:

- An appeal to the Court of Appeal concerning civil restraint orders and
 - a) "Access to Justice."

- Multiple jury trials for: - "various police forces (including the MPS and GMP) in claims for: -
 - a) "False Imprisonment,"
 - b) "Data Protection Breaches" And: -
 - c) "Assault."

- A high value trial on causation, apportionment, and prognosis in respect of: -
 - a) "Lifelong Personal Injury."

- A contested judicial review, led by Jason Beer KC acting for the NPCC, concerning: -
 - a) "Police Retention of Criminal Records."

- An Upper Tribunal information law appeal for the Metropolitan Police concerning the: -
 - a) "Application Of S.23 FOIA 2000."

- An appeal to the Court of Appeal, led by Jason Beer KC acting for the NPCC, concerning: -
 - a) "Police Vetting and Recruitment."

- A contested judicial review concerning retention by the Metropolitan Police of: -
 - a) "A Child's Data" and
 - b) "The Prevent Duty."

- A contested judicial review on behalf of the prison service concerning: -
 - a) “Re-Categorisation of Prisoners.”
- A six-week art.2 inquest for Surrey Police (led by Jason Beer KC) where: -
 - a) “A Man Murdered Two Women Using a Shotgun for Which He Had a Licence.”
- An art.2 jury inquest for the Ministry of Justice touching upon: -
 - a) “The Death of a Prisoner.”
- Bobby also regularly provides lectures and training on a range of topics including, recently: -
 - a) “Claims For Stress at Work,”
 - b) “Public Order Policing,” And
 - c) “Police Misconduct.”
- Bobby was appointed to the Attorney General’s B Panel of Counsel in August 2022.
- **Hugh Giles**
- Now Works For: -
- ✓ <https://www.capsticks.com/our-people/hugh-giles>
- Hugh Giles was the (Main Director) of Law and Governance and he did manage the Asbo when he worked for the: -
 - Metropolitan Police Service
 - Directorate of Legal Services
 - New Scotland Yard
 - Broadway
 - London
 - SW1H OBG
- This name being inside of the Prosecution Teams Skeleton proves this and he is therefore responsible.

AAAAAAAAA

- 1/ The listing for the Asbo Appeal Hearing, was on the **22-24/02/2016** for three-days.
- 2/ The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and the Crown Prosecution brought an Asbo Application against the Now Claimant for the “Organisation of Illegal Raves,” the Now Claimant disputed their claims to be true.
- 3/ The Crown Prosecution had to prove the burden of proof in the two-stage test at the HMM Court Highbury and Islington and with them two stages in the test being:
 - a) Whether The Appellant Has Acted in An Anti-Social Manner.
 - b) Whether An ASBO Necessary Recommended.
- 4/ The Now Claimant Contended that the two-stage test could not be met to the required standards due to:
 - a) The Application for The ASBO [RI-3] [Being](#)

- b) The ASBO Made On **04/08/2015** [**R13**] contained fraudulent Statements of DC Steven Elsmore, The OIC [**R14-35**]
- c) The OIC a DC Steven Elsmore had evidently frauded his own statement and allowed the submission of other frauded police officers statements inclusive of modifying government protected data.
- e) A very large proportion of the Asbo is frauded material set out by the Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and the Crown Prosecution to paint the Now Claimant in a bad light to gain a wrongful guilty conviction that has led to restraints and the demoralising of the now Claimant and this frauded material includes the Statements Of **“R’s” Witnesses** [**R 36-66**]
- f) The Enfield Council and Metropolitan Police and the Crown Prosecution **“A’s” Statements** [**A1-X5**] ^ Statements Of **“A’s” Witnesses** [**A16-30, A 258-272**] are also, frauded material that they created.
- g) When The Crown Prosecution Teams, Asbo Case handler a Robert Talalay [Bracketed] the Skeleton Argument or in other words paginated and **ecologicaley**

Bobby specialises in the areas of: -

- m) **“Police Law,”**
- n) **“Public Law,”**
- o) **“Human Rights” And**
- p) **“Civil Liberties,”**
- q) **“Data Protection” And**
- r) **“Information Law,”**
- s) **“Malfeasance Claims,”**
- t) **“Prison Law,”**
- u) **“Inquests,”**
- v) **“Personal Injury Claims,”**
- w) **“Employment Law” And**
- x) **“Professional Misconduct.”**
- y) –
- z) **“False Imprisonment,”**
- aa) **“Data Protection Breaches” And: -**
- bb) **“Assault.”**
- cc) **“Lifelong Personal Injury.”**
- dd) **“Police Retention of Criminal Records.”**
- ee) **“Application Of S.23 FOIA 2000.”**
- ff) **“Police Vetting and Recruitment.”**
- gg) **“A Child’s Data” and**
- hh) **“The Prevent Duty.”**
- ii) **“Re-Categorisation of Prisoners.”**
- jj) **“A Man Murdered Two Women Using a Shotgun for Which He Had a Licence.”**
- kk) **“The Death of a Prisoner.”**
- ll) **“Claims For Stress at Work,”**
- mm) **“Public Order Policing,” And**
- nn) **“Police Misconduct.”**

INTRODUCTION

- 32)** The Appellant is appealing against a decision made by the district judge at Highbury Corner Magistrates' Court on **04th of August 2015** pursuant to S.1 of the Crime and Disorder Act **1998** ("the **1998 Act**") to make him subject to an anti-social behaviour order (ASBO) to last for 5 years.
- 33)** The facts relied upon by the Respondent are set out in the bundle of evidence placed before the court and, in particular, the [witness statements of the Respondent's officers \[R.14-35\]](#).
- 34)** The Appellant has also provided a bundle for this appeal hearing [A],

89,

[Simon Cordell's Skeleton Argument \(2\) Pdf](#)

- 35)** The Respondent's case is that the Appellant has been integrally involved in the organisation of raves in London, particularly Enfield, and/or the supply of sound equipment to those raves.
- 36)** The Respondent relies on each incident set out in the application notice to support his case [R1-3].
- 37)** The Respondent submits that it is necessary for an ASBO to be in place to protect the public from further anti-social acts, specifically the organisation of raves, done by the Appellant.
- 38)** A chronology of events is appended to this Skeleton Argument.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

THE CROWN PROSECUTION TEAM MEBER A

- 39)** Whilst the relevant provisions of the **1998 Act** were repealed by the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act **2014**, s.21 of that Act provides that these proceedings are unaffected except that, on **23rd of March 2020**, the Appellant's ASBO will automatically become an Injunction under as if made under S.1 of that Act.
- 40)** Section 4 of the 1998 Act provides that an appeal against the making of an ASBO lies to the Crown Court.
- 41)** Section 79(3) of the Senior Courts Act 1981 provides that an appeal to the Crown Court is by way of a re-hearing.
- 42)** The relevant test, therefore, is that set out in S.1 of the Act.
- 43)** Pursuant to S.1 (4) of the 1998 Act, the court may exercise its discretion and make an ASBO if the two-part test set out in S.1(1) is satisfied. Section 1(1) states:
- b) An application for an order under this section may be made by a relevant authority if it appears to the authority that the following conditions are fulfilled with respect to any person

aged 18 or over, namely that the person has acted, since the commencement date, in an anti-social manner, that is to say, in a manner that caused or was likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to one or more persons not of the same household as himself; and that such an order is necessary to protect relevant persons from further antisocial acts by him.

12

90,

[Simon Cordell's Skeleton Argument \(2\) Pdf](#)

44) It is for the Respondent to satisfy the court to the criminal standard that the Appellant has acted in a manner that caused or was likely to cause harassment, alarm, or distress to one or more persons not of the same household as himself.

45) However, the second limb of the test “does not involve a standard of proof: it is an exercise of judgment or evaluation” (R (***McCann***) v ***Manchester Crown Court*** [2003] 1 A.C. 787 at [371]).

46) In ***R v Dean lioness*** [2006] 1 Cr. App. II. (S.) 120, the Court of Appeal provided general guidance as to the creation of prohibitions forming an ASBO, the court held that:

- e) prohibitions should be individually tailored to the individual and that each individual prohibition must be necessary [28].
- f) An ASBO can include prohibitions not to undertake minor criminal activity that may be covered under separate legislation [30-1].
- g) However, an ASBO should seek to prevent a person from being able to commit that offence, rather than further penalise him when he does commit it [35]; and:
- h) the terms of the ASBO must be proportionate so as to be commensurate with the risk identified [37],

SUBMISSIONS

- The first limb of the test under S. 1 (1)(a) of the 1998 Act

47) The organisation of large-scale raves, whether or not they fall within the parameters of s.63 of the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 and whether on private property or common land, fall within the definition of anti-social behaviour.

48) The Home Office Guidance: ***'A Guide to antisocial behaviour orders'*** specifies noise nuisance, particularly when late at night, as an example of anti-social behaviour.

49) It is submitted that, a person who helps organise or supplies equipment for a rave, where there is loud music late at night (except where there is a licence to do so and/or the music is played on licensed premises), has ***prana jade*** done an act in contravention of S.1(1)(a) of the 1998 Act.

12

91,

[Simon Cordell's Skeleton Argument \(2\) Pdf](#)

50) The Respondent relies on the evidence provided in die witness statements provided by various officers as well as supporting intelligence reports, the page references for this evidence are set out in the appended chronology.

51) The court is invited to take particular note of the evidence supporting the conclusion that the Appellant was integrally involved in the organization of raves and/or the supply of equipment:

- h) The Appellant was identified by gate security as the organizer of a rave of about 300 people on **07th & 08th of June 2014**.
- i) (See evidence of Insp. Hamill JR38] and supporting evidence of PS Miles [R36]).
- j) The Appellant admitted to Insp. Skinner that he was the organiser of the rave on 7/8 June 2014 [R41].
- k) The Appellant admitted to Insp. Skinner that he was the organiser of the rave organised and prevented on **19th of July 2014** [R39, R41].
- l) The Appellant admitted to PC Edgoose that he lent his sound equipment for use at raves and that he could get a significant number of people to turn out for a rave [R48, R88]
- m) And the Appellant was the organiser of the rave on **09th of August 2014** and provided the sound equipment as well as laughing gas [R42, R44-5, R47].
- n) When a crowd turned up and tried to force entry, the Appellant encouraged them to break the police line [R43, R45-6].

52) The Respondent further relies on the information set out in the intelligence reports and the documents provided to the court in the Respondent's bundle.

53) The evidence show the Appellant has witnessed by many different police officers supplying equipment for or helping to organise a rave.

54) The court will be invited to reject the Appellant's account as to his activities on the relevant, days as not credible.

- The second limb of the test under section 1 of the Act

55) It is first submitted that an ASBO is, in general terms, necessary.

[Simon Cordell's Skeleton Argument \(2\) Pdf](#)

56) There is a significant body of evidence showing the impact of raves on people who live near where they occur [R51-66, R155-298]. The level of distress that these individuals suffered as a result of the raves organised by the Appellant was high. 'There is a need to prevent these events occurring in the future.

57) The ASBO (and interim ASBO beforehand) have been effective. The only time where the Appellant's behaviour has improved is when these proceedings were commenced, and it was made clear to the Appellant that his actions could not be tolerated.

58) "The Appellant has denied the acts alleged by the Respondent. He has shown no acknowledgment or desire to change his ways that might make an ASBO unnecessary.

59) As to the particular prohibitions on the ASBO, significant effort was made by the Respondent and by the court to ensure that any legitimate business activities that the Appellant wished to undertake would in no way be inhibited by this order.

60) For the Appellant to provide recorded music to a gathering of people he would either need to have a licence for that event or to provide the music on a licensed premise for fewer than 500 people with, a general licence to play recorded music (see s. 1 and Sch. 1 of the Licensing Act 2003).

61) This order specifically does not preclude him from providing regulated entertainment under the auspices of a valid licence.

62) The only amendment that the Respondent would seek is that the words "or s.63(1. A)" be added after the words "s.63(1)" in prohibitions a, b, and c of the ASBO.

63) It is submitted that the terms of the ASBO as drafted are necessary and proportionate in that they should have minimal impact on the Appellant's life and legitimate business activities.

Robert Talalay at the Chambers of: -

5 Essex Court

Temple, London, EC4Y 9AH

020 7410 2000

clerks@5essexcourt.co.uk

Dated: - 31st January 2016

14

93,

6

94,

[Simon Cordell's Skeleton Argument \(2\) Pdf](#)

Case No A20150064

**IN THE WOOD GREEN CROWN COURT
IN THE MATTER OF AN APPEAL AGAINST AN ANTI-SOCIAL
BEHAVIOUR ORDER**

BETWEEN:

SIMON CORDELL

Appellant

-and-

THE COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS

Respondent

CHRONOLOGY

- **12/01/2013**
 - b) Information pertaining to this date entered by PC Purcell that a vehicle belonging to the Appellant (Ford Focus Silver MA57LDY) was supplying equipment for a rave in Canary Wharf [R152-4]. Appellant accepts attendance but denies any organisational/supply role for a rave [A3]

- **24/05/2013**
 - c) Information pertaining to this date entered by PC- Jackson that the Appellant was seen with another individual who told PC- Jackson that they were looking for a place to set up a rave over the ban holiday [R118- 120].
 - d) Appellant's account at [A4]

- **25/05/2014**
 - e) Information pertaining to this date entered by PC Hoodless concerning a
 - f) report that there were trespassers on private premises.
 - g) The Appellant was spoken to and had a set of large speakers in his van (White Ford I transit CX52JPZ) [R112-4].
 - h) Appellant accepts attendance but denies any organisational/supply role for a rave [A4]

- **06th till the 08/06/2014**
 - d) Police attended and broke up a rave at Progress Way, Enfield.
 - e) Evidence of the Appellant's alleged organisational involvement [R36-41, 110]; impact statements [R51-66]; CAD reports [R155-298].
 - f) Appellant denies attendance on 6 or 8 June 2014 and admits attendance on 7 June 2014 but denies any organisational/supply role for a rave [A5]

95.

[Simon Cordell's Skeleton Argument \(2\) Pdf](#)

- **20/06/2014**
 - c) Rave in Neasden closed down. White Fold Transit CX52JRZ removed from the site [R102].
 - d) Appellant's account is that he provided sound equipment for a gentleman's birthday party and was informed the following day that his equipment had been seized [A5, A253-6]

- **19/07/2014**

- c) Police attended and closed down a putative rave on Great Cambridge Road, Enfield. Evidence of the Appellant's alleged organisational involvement [R39-41, R91].
- d) Appellant's account is that stopped his car to help a homeless person from being arrested when he was arrested for a breach of the peace; he denies any organisational/supply role for a rave [A6]

- **24/07/2014**

- c) Conversation reported by PC Edgoose in which the Appellant is alleged to have bragged about organising raves [R48, R88].
- d) The Appellant's account is at [A6-7]

- **27/07/2014**

- c) Information pertaining to this date entered by PC Chandler that the Appellant driving a White herd transit CX52JRZ was present at powering speakers at a rave on Millmarsh Lane, Enfield [R83-6J.
- d) Appellant, accepts attendance at a birthday party but denies any organisational/supply role for a rave [A7]

- **09/10/08/14**

- d) Police attended and broke up a rave on Millmarsh Lane, Pm field.
- e) Evidence of the Appellant's alleged organisational involvement [R42-7, R80-1].
- f) Appellant accepts attendance at a birthday dinner but denies any organisational/supply role for a rave